

Equal Employee Representation: The Key To Industrial Expansion

The following are extracts from the Minority Report of the Bullock Committee, which were prepared by Mr. N. P. Biggs, Sir Jack Callard and Mr. Barrie Heath. The Minority Report, in contrast with the Majority view of the Bullock Committee, calls for worker representation on supervisory boards, based on the West German model, which would leave the existing board structure in British industry virtually intact. Further, the report envisages the formation of such supervisory boards, to have no formal links with the trade union apparatus, only following a number of years experience with work councils within each company.

We present this minority report in the confidence that our views will have the support of large sections of the industrial community. We are unable to satisfy ourselves that sufficient notice has been taken of the evidence and advice of those who work in industry — employers and employees alike — whose views and experience are most relevant and most valid. It would be exceedingly unwise for the nation to disregard their practical realism and accept the theories of those who see this debate as a means of changing the structure of society in this country and who would seek to bring the boards of the private sector under trade union control.

Our own first-hand experience of companies which operate in West Germany leads us to believe that it is the German insistence on effective works councils separated from the union negotiating system, representing all employees and given extensive powers, which is one of the key factors in the success of the German system of employee participation.

We believe that the substructures can be power houses of ideas, wisdom, and influence on a company's activities, and that they are essential complementary arrange-

ments to any form of board representation.

Our recommendation, subject to the creation or existence of a suitable substructure, is that if there is to be employee representation at board level, it should be on supervisory boards.

We propose that a supervisory board, where adopted, should consist of: one-third elected by employees; one-third elected by the shareholders; one-third independent members. Included in the one third employee elected representatives should be at least one member from the shop floor payroll, one from the salaried staff employees, and one from management.

If a supervisory board is to serve a useful purpose, it should not be a watchdog without teeth. It should exercise general supervision over the conduct of the company's affairs by the board of management, but should not participate directly in the management of the company, nor be empowered to initiate policies.

The effect of this proposal would be to leave the existing structure, organization, and purpose of boards of directors in the United Kingdom substantially unchanged, but it would introduce a new and, we believe, important element of accountability.

We believe that no candidate should be eligible unless he or she has: been employed by the company for a minimum of 10 years; been a member of a sub-board council-committee for not less than three years; and undergone adequate and appropriate training to enable him or her to participate effectively in the supervisory board discussions.

Extracts taken from: *Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Industrial Democracy* (Command 6707, Her Majesty's Stationery Office)

Carter Networks Use British Courts Against Callaghan

A decision to prevent political action against the fascist settler-regime of South Africa handed down by Britain's second highest court this week has become the leading edge of a right-wing destabilization campaign against the government of Prime Minister James Callaghan, under the manifest supervision of agencies in New York and Washington, D.C. The court decision, an injunction against boycott activities directed at South Africa by parts of the British labor movement, has directly challenged the role of Parliament as final arbiter of law in the nation, and reflects a deliberate intention to weaken Callaghan's ability to head-off the U.S. Carter cabinet's policies of military confrontation in Africa and the Mideast.

The unprecedented judicial action was taken by the British Court of Appeals, which served an injunction against the British postal unions who have been organizing a boycott of all mail and telecommunications with South Africa. With support from the Carter cabinet, South Africa's Vorster government refused to withdraw military support for the outlaw Rhodesian regime of Ian Smith, as the British government has demanded. The postal union's action is therefore consistent with British government policy.

The court acted to sabotage this peace policy at the behest of the right-wing National Association of Freedom (NAF) which charged the postal union with "arrogance of power." The court, moreover, delivered its injunction

only after Attorney General Sam Silken, an appointee of Callaghan and Labor Party Member of Parliament, had refused to interfere with the postal union campaign "in the public interest." The court, calling upon Silken to explain why he had not halted the boycott organizing, declared that "Political reasons are not necessarily good legal reasons," a hint of the underlying constitutional issue involved: Who is the final arbiter of the law, the courts or Parliament? (With broad support from Parliament, Silken insists that he is answerable only to Parliament, not the courts, and charges that the court has exceeded its authority, and has no business inquiring into the grounds of a decision for which he is accountable by English traditions only to Parliament.)

The court notably refused to investigate the NAF, whose intelligence agency origins and nature are not obscure, and which has been catapulted into national prominence by the case. Its decision, which implies a fundamental change in Britain's uncodified constitution, befits an operation which amounts to a treasonous conspiracy against the British government directed from the U.S. side of the Atlantic.

The NAF is tied closely to David Rockefeller's New York Council on Foreign Relations, the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, and the intelligence-linked underside of the Tory party. The NAF shares personnel and policies with the London Institute for the Study of Conflict, the agency which has stage-managed every "red-scare" in Britain for the last three years. The Institute's director, CIA agent Brian Crozier, was identified by the Soviet daily *Izvestia* in November, 1976 as co-ordinator of Forum World Features, used by the CIA until 1968 as an "instrument...in the struggle against Communist propaganda." Robert Moss, who is now the ringleader of the National Association for Freedom, worked as a correspondent for Forum World Features, and specializes in terrorism and Third World destabilization — a fact revealed by both *Literaturnaya Gazeta* and, more recently, the *Manchester Guardian*. Moss is a top policy advisor to British Conservative Party chairman Margaret Thatcher, according to the *Guardian*. Moss, also editor of the London *Economist's* confidential weekly "Foreign Report" has recently authored "Chile's Marxist Experiment" — reportedly for the CIA.

Although the NAF vigorously denies connections to the Tory Party, its directors include Sir Keith Joseph, (Mrs. Thatcher's "right hand man"), Tory education spokesman Rhodes Boyson, and Conservative M.P. Ian Sproat,

who recently alleged that the Labour Party had been infiltrated by "crypto-Communists and fifth columnists."

Mrs. Thatcher herself — a member of the Bilderberger group carefully groomed by the Rockefellers' Council on Foreign Relations to take over Callaghan's job — is not above putting in an appearance at NAF functions, as recently when the guest of honor was Soviet dissident Vladimir Bukovsky. Right wing sources in the U.S. have affirmed that the "human rights" issue now being centered around Bukovsky in Britain could also easily be used to compromise Callaghan's fight for improved East-West relations on the basis of expanded trade and economic cooperation, in conjunction with the Carter administration confrontation policies which give added clout to the Tories' anti-Sovietism.

Callaghan's vulnerability to Cyrus Vance's destabilization attempts was revealed this week when, just after he had outlined British Government thinking on South Africa to visiting Trilateral Commission emissary Walter Mondale, eight bombs rocked through London's central shopping district — the work of the Rockefellers' Interpol terrorists. Just last week, British fascist Enoch Powell was trotted out again to give, according to the press, his "most startling and chilling prognosis yet" on the imminence of race war in Britain. Powell, now a member of Parliament from Ulster, has been inciting British workers to fight each other for years. This time, he said, all that was needed was a "few thugs, a few shots, a few bombs at the right place and time — and that is enough for disproportionate consequences to follow."

The Labour Party and the trade unions have already taken steps against such a possibility. Trade union leader Jack Jones, uncharacteristically coming right to the point, warned that Britain nearly faced a right-wing coup two years ago, and the same people "are still around." The press was full of "colonel this and captain that," recalled Jones. "Around the top echelons of society there was quite a lot of loose talking and quite a degree of undemocratic talk." In a warning to Callaghan not to hesitate in pushing forward with his policies for growth and economic stability, Jones noted that Britain had averted a coup two years ago only due to "progressive management" and the solid alliance between the Labour Party and the trade unions. Callaghan's Foreign Secretary Anthony Crosland has similarly urged the press to devote more attention to exposing the swing toward right-wing extremism in the Tory Party.

Gov't. Gives Industrial Strategy Concrete Direction

Describing their proposals as "frankly experimental," British Chancellor of the Exchequer Denis Healey and Industry Secretary Eric Varley laid before members of the National Economic Development Council during their meeting Feb. 2 proposals to boost British exports by as much as £36 billion by 1980. The proposals, which are being seen as the first concrete implementation of the

government's much-discussed industrial strategy, focus on the importance of government-sponsored development of five key sectors of British industry for sparking a general recovery of the economy.

Held in the context of successive buoyant economic announcements, including a balance of trade surplus, a 75 per cent increase in the reserves in the last month, and