


Join the
Labour
Party

Socialist ORGANISER

Break
links
with
Tories

Paper of the Socialist Organiser Alliance No. 143 August 18 1983 25p Claimants and strikers 10p



Pinochet: installed with US help in 1973. Mejia (left): Guatemala's new dictator, US-backed again. D'Aubuisson: El Salvador's strongman.

REAGAN'S DICTATORS

REAGAN'S dictators in Central and South America face mounting opposition. And our solidarity can help the fight against them.

Augusto Pinochet, the blood-drenched butcher of the Chilean labour movement, seized power almost ten years ago. But his chances look slim of surviving in power much longer than the tenth anniversary of the military coup which overthrew Chile's

by John O'Mahony

democratically elected Popular Unity government in September 1973 and then went on to pulverise the Chilean labour movement.

Last week saw the fourth big anti-government demonstration since a campaign against the regime began four months ago, with the first national day of protest organised by the copper mine workers' federation.

Many of those who supported Pinochet's coup now call for his resignation. A broad coalition - the Democratic Alliance - has been created by political parties ranging from the Christian Democrats to Allende's Socialist Party.

This movement began with demands for reforms; it has escalated in a few short months, and now tells Pinochet to get out.

Pinochet is forced to tolerate the Democratic Alliance, which is trying to convince the bourgeoisie and the armed forces that they now have a safe alternative to military rule.

Even the US ambassador in Chile, Mr James Theberge, has added his voice to the chorus of condemnation. He told a Chilean publication: "We are convinced that democracy is the system wanted by the great majority of Chileans."

To Pinochet this must sound like the voice of treachery and ingratitude.

The US government's CIA deliberately set out to 'destabilise' Chile, and helped mastermind the coup in 1973. Pinochet was their boy. He got his political programme from the CIA, his economic strategy from Chicago.

And right now, in Central America, the US continues to support the bloody regimes

in El Salvador and Guatemala, and to threaten Nicaragua, where the US-sponsored Somoza regime was overthrown four years ago.

US naval exercises off the coast, and a massive build-up of US troops and right-wing exiles on the Nicaragua-Honduras border, are threatening and trying to intimidate the Sandinista regime. Inside Nicaragua, ex-Somozist thugs have been on the rampage in border areas.

The best answer to the US sabre-rattling in Central America would be the overthrow of Pinochet - not by way of a 'palace coup' which would put the Democratic Alliance in power, but by the workers and peasants of Chile.

The Chilean labour movement has been reviving in the last few years, as the most savage repression of the middle '70s eased off and some trade union action became possible. The present agitation opens the road to complete that revival.

On September 11 the Chile Solidarity Campaign is organising a demonstration to mark the tenth anniversary of the coup and demand 'No More Chiles!'. A big turn-out will send a powerful message of solidarity from the British labour movement to the Chilean working class and the rebels in Central America.

On September 11 the Chile Solidarity Campaign is organising a demonstration to mark the tenth anniversary of the coup and demand 'No More Chiles!!'. A big turn-out will send a powerful message of solidarity from the British labour movement to the Chilean working class and to the rebels in Central America.

Inside



"Now we've got you, red scum! You spelt your name wrong on the application form".

The Cowley witch-hunt: see p.2

**Demonstrate September 11
1pm Clerkenwell Green**



US advisor with El Salvador soldier

EDITORIAL

End the blacklist!

'MOLES', 'conspirators', 'infiltrators', screamed the press. BL itself piously insisted that politics did not come into it: they had sacked 13 workers simply because of false information on their job applications, discovered as a result of a 'routine audit'.

But everyone knows that the sackings were political. BL has form when it comes to politically motivated victimisations. Back in November 1979, they sacked the then convenor of Longbridge, Derek Robinson, just for putting his name to a pamphlet criticising the Edwardes plan. With the thinly disguised connivance of the AUEW leadership, and a vicious red-baiting campaign in the press, the BL bosses rode out the spontaneous walk-outs by thousands of BL workers, and Robinson stayed sacked, probably never to work in industry again.

Exactly one year after Robinson's dismissal, six militants (including four shop stewards, one of whom was Jim Denham, a Socialist Organiser supporter) were framed up and sacked at Longbridge for allegedly leading a 'riotous mob' on a 'rampage' round the plant. The evidence against the six would not have stood up in any court outside a police state. Again the workforce struck spontaneously, and again BL won the day thanks to the weakness and cowardice of the union leadership, in this case the TGWU.

Like savage dogs who have tasted blood, the bosses turned next to Cowley, and seized their chance to sack one of the best-established and most widely respected militants in the industry, Alan Thornett. In November 1982, he was sacked for a trivial driving offence that normally would not have warranted even a warning. The local TGWU leadership gave Thornett verbal support, but in practice ensured that no industrial action took place.

The purges had their effect. The stewards' movement was cowed and terrorised. Rank and file workers lost confidence in the unions' ability to defend them. Known militants have to watch every step, consider every utterance, and be constantly on their guard. Any BL worker will testify to the reign of terror that Edwardes and his henchmen unleashed upon the workforce.

Meanwhile the track speeds crept constantly up, conditions were eroded, and real wage levels were slashed.

Elsewhere in industry, other bosses took careful note of Edwardes' tactics and followed his example. A spate of victimisations (and who knows how many threats of victimisations?) followed the Robinson sacking. Managers throughout the private and the public sectors have seen that blatant intimidation and straightforward industrial blackmail can succeed against shop floor activists, especially when union leaders like Duffy and Evans go along with it.

The case of the Cowley 13 is the latest and most dramatic example of such intimidation. The official reason for the sackings is a sick joke. Any trade unionist knows that blacklists exist, not just of political activists, but also of straightforward trade union militants. Falsifying job applications and arranging false references is the only way for many people to get a job at all, especially with over three million out of work. If everyone with untruths on their application forms were sacked, then perhaps 20 or 30% of the total manual workforce in the country would be out of their jobs tomorrow.

The newspapers speculate wildly about a 'conspiracy' to 'infiltrate' the Cowley plant. They describe the 13 sacked workers in terms that would be much better applied to the clique of professional tough-guy managers brought in by Edwardes specifically to bash the unions and intimidate the workforce.

Men like Tom Gray and Andy Barr, who closed down Speke and Rover Solihull, moved on to Longbridge to break the unions there, and then headed south to Cowley to put the boot in again. Or John Mackay — brought in from Chloride to manage Edwardes' image. He recently turned up as a consultant for management at the Financial Times in their long-running strike. These are the real infiltrators, and theirs is the real conspiracy.

As Steph Grant, one of the 13 sacked, says, 'If BL management knew I was a socialist, they would never have employed me'. That's the real scandal of Cowley.

If BL management and others like them get their way, socialists will have no right to work in this country.

Our answer must be clear and firm. We will fight for our socialist principles and for strong and effective trade unionism wherever we can. We will support, by the most effective methods we know, all those workers blacklisted and victimised. That means industrial action wherever possible against blacklists and for the right to work regardless of political affiliation or trade union activity.

The Labour Party must give a commitment that a future Labour government will reinstate all socialists and trade unionists victimised by the likes of BL management and their Tory backers.

It's a political witch-hunt

BRITISH LEYLAND is a company with a long record of sacking workers for their political and trade union activities. The dismissal of Derek Robinson and Alan Thornett, senior and deputy senior stewards in the Longbridge and Cowley car plants are the most well known examples of such victimisation. No one believes that Robinson and Thornett were sacked for the technical charges made against them. They were victimised for their political and trade union views and activities. And there have been numerous other less publicised sackings.

BL is lying when it says it does not dismiss workers on political grounds, or that it would hire workers in spite of their union record or socialist beliefs. Methods of political victimisation and exclusion are systematic in BL and large British companies.

This can be proved simply. If BL does not sack or prevent people from gaining employment for reasons of their political views or trade union activities why does it, like most large companies, operate a system of blacklists? Why does it employ organisations to check the trade union and political backgrounds of its workers or those applying for jobs?

The use of such methods is known to all those involved in trade unions and industrial relations, and the press; if BL denies this state of affairs it is merely falsifying its own, and other companies' practices.

Obvious

The facts are obvious. The BL management has not one single complaint against the work record of the thirteen dismissed during the entire time they were at Cowley. Everyone knows that the company would be taking no action against the thirteen if they were not suspected of having strong socialist views.

The real facts of the BL case were stated in the Financial Times on 13 August 1983, 'BL has been careful to stress officially the constitutionality of its procedure... In effect however its central concern was their sus-

The Socialist League has been the target of a most vicious witch-hunt in the press over the last week. 14 of its alleged supporters have been sacked from BL's Cowley assembly plant. As an act of solidarity with the comrades we print excerpts from their statement on the witch-hunt.

pected revolutionary affiliations."

Accusations of 'left wing conspiracy' are merely stupid. If BL did not victimise people for their political and trade union views in the first place no-one at all would bother to hide their views from the management. If BL states it would have taken on workers it knew were strongly in favour of trade unions and were active socialists then it is merely lying — as its entire past record

shows.

The charge that anyone with socialist views can instigate workers to go on strike, or are 'infiltrating' the trade unions is a conscious invention by the press.

Risk

Workers going on strike lose hundreds of pounds of their income and risk their jobs. They will not strike unless propelled

to do so by deep-seated and genuine grievances against the company. It is the activities of BL management, not any political group, which leads to workers strike in BL or any company.

The exclusion of the thirteen workers from Cowley should be opposed by the entire labour trade union and women's movement as an attempt by the company to enforce a political ban on recruitment and employment. If a policy of systematic exclusion from employment, and use victimisation, by companies continued and strengthened there will be a further major erosion of democratic rights to add to the many already carried out by this government and the BL management.

An attack on unions

Behind the witch-hunt, the unions are under attack! End Blacklists!

The witch-hunt and victimisation of 14 people at BL Cowley for falsification of their application forms is an attack on the trade union movement. They were clearly sacked for political reasons; there was no complaint about their work. They are obviously being victimised.

The Tory government has just started its second term of office. It is increasing its offensive against the working class, with rising unemployment, privatisation, cuts, and new attacks on the unions.

It is getting the assistance of the right-wing majority of the TUC General Council, which now wants to discuss with the Tories. As Arthur Scargill has said, this is like discussing the rope with your aspirant hangman.

To get through their attacks, the Tories must deal with those who are opposed to them and to their stooges in the TUC. They will now use the hysteria around the Cowley situation to boost their attack on the unions particularly at rank and file level and

The Workers Socialist League for many years has been the target of witch-hunts, victimisations and attempted victimisations at BL's Cowley plant. We print excerpts from a statement on the current witch-hunt put out by the National Committee of the WSL on 13 August 1983.

in industry — where the main opposition to the Tories will come from.

The press campaign is the start of this. Left-wingers come from outside the working class, they say. This campaign is designed to discredit all those, at all levels, who fight back, particularly those who try to change the leadership in the labour movement. Everybody who argues for militant policies becomes a suspicious person. Like rising unemployment, the campaign will be used to try to intimidate the shop floor.

On the day after the sackings, the shop stewards at Cowley got a report from the joint inquiry of trade union officials and management that came out

of the 'washing-up time' strike. This joint report talks about the 'political' nature of some shop stewards. It talks about shop stewards not being aware of the kind of increases in productivity necessary.

During the 'washing-up time' strike, the bureaucracy stopped the Cowley Assembly Plant shop stewards putting their opinions to the mass meeting. This was a go-ahead for the current campaign. It was saying to the membership that the stewards should not be listened to.

Right wingers in other unions will try to take up the same cry. Kate Losinska of the CPSA has already spoken on this.

We must refuse to be cowed. Trade union members have a right to be political activists. Left wingers have a right to have a job and be active in their unions. It is not a crime to be a socialist. The press thinks it is a crime, the capitalists and the Tories think it is a crime, the right wing thinks it is a crime to be a socialist in the unions or the Labour Party. We must oppose these witch-hunting ideas, and we must oppose all blacklists...

TWO SUNDAY Times reporters lounge against their car outside the terraced house in Bullingdon Road, Oxford, which for this week only has become the Marxist headquarters in Britain.

In their crumpled suits and white leather shoes, they look a cut above the scruffier colleagues from the gutter press who have been rifling the dustbins, haranguing the milkmen, and badgering the neighbours.

TV crews roam Oxford, setting up their cameras outside the homes of people thought to have left-wing tendencies and filming anyone going in or out.

The Daily Mail rings its list of well-known trouble-makers in Oxford several times a day to see if it can persuade any of them to join in the mole-hunt. 'They are not in', becomes the most widely-used sentence of the week.

Photographers shoot thousands of frames of women going in and out of Cowley, in the hope that they will catch that exclusive picture of Red Steph, or one of the other 'she-moles' (as they had inevitably been dubbed).

In the event the company hands her to them on a plate by telling Stephanie Grant that she must wait outside the industrial relations office for 15 minutes. Outside the industrial relations office is also where the world's press had gathered in the hope of a scrap.

In the event the company hands her to them on a plate by telling Stephanie Grant that she must wait outside the industrial relations office for 15 minutes. Outside the industrial relations

Daily Mail
EXPRESS
Press FINANCIAL TIMES **Gang**
The Daily Telegraph
Sun

By Patrick Spilling

office is also where the world's press has gathered in the hope of a scrap.

The Oxford Mail, irritated by the fact that it has run a low-key story about 14 people being dismissed on the same day as the Coventry Evening Telegraph splashes an exclusive story about 'red infiltrators', tries to make up in decibels what it lacks in speed.

On Friday 12th its lead article begins: 'Far Left fanatics from the Socialist League, which is dedicated to the revolutionary overthrow of the British way of life...'. Its editorial rages about 'the policy and action of the jackboot'.

The same report quotes Patrick Gray, chair of Oxford East Labour Party, saying, 'You get undergraduates studying something really obscure who have a miraculous conversion and decide to become dockers or miners. After a couple of years they revert to form'.

Patrick Gray should know. He gained a degree from Oxford University before getting a job on Cowley's production line. About a year or two ago he reverted

to form and took up a better-paid job, more like academic life.

Right-wing Labourite John Power, his own victimisation at Cowley long forgotten, is speaking as an expert on the 'ultra left'. Roger Rosewell, the former IS (SWP) organiser, is disinterred from his SDP cell to recite his familiar tale of atrocities. They seem to be harder and harder to remember.

He informs the world that revolutionaries are told that they must turn up to work on time, work hard, not take days off sick when they are not sick. Most sinister of all, they must make friends with their workmates. Ugh, makes you shudder.

The new bait for the press is the fact that half of those sacked are women. It is the women's houses that most reporters camp outside. It is the women who take the largest part of the press broadside.

The speed with which the sacked workers learn to close their windows and simply not answer the door or phone makes the press squad angrier and more frustrated. They prowl the

streets of Oxford like gang-rapists looking for a victim.

One set of neighbours complains of cooking smells. Fancy that!

At another house, a reporter manages to peer through the windows. The shelves carry books on Russia! A piece of paper in a typewriter reveals the beginnings of an article, 'Is the Russian Economy in Crisis?'

Meanwhile Michael Edwardes, MacGregor, and the rest of the politically-motivated outsiders pumped into industry by right-wing Labour and Tory governments alike to undermine the unions go about their business, unmolested by TV cameras up their nose or reporters searching their dustbins.

Personnel officers are advised to get more training in how to spot militants. A university degree in politics becomes as socially-accepted as a sick-note for herpes.

BL announces that it never uses outside agencies to screen staff or carry out investigations, and the press prints it seriously and uncritically.

The Sunday Times and the Guardian issue warnings that political discrimination must not be introduced into industrial life (forgetting for the moment about Robinson, Thornett, and the long list of political martyrs).

The crowd, sated by this spectacle of blood and gore, turns its attention back to sex or athletics.

14 Sun journalists are sacked because they had concealed from the management that they can read...

For an independent inquiry into the death of Colin Roach!
Roach Family Support Committee, 50 Rectory Rd, London N16



Strikes escalate in privatised Wandsworth

THE STORY so far: Pritchards took over the mobile gardening contract from Wandsworth Council, after a series of bitter disputes between unions and the Tory council over privatisation. The council claimed that the Pritchards tender would save £35,000 a year.

The only way Pritchards could undercut direct labour was by drastic understaffing. The council employed 35 full-time staff, plus extra summer casuals. Pritchards reckoned they could do the job with nine full-timers plus summer casuals.

Not surprisingly, they couldn't. After an initial penalty-free period, they clocked up £46,000 in fines, as complaints poured in about weed-choked flower-beds, knee-high grass, and overgrown verges.

Pritchards' response to this attack on their profits was predictable: off-load it on the workforce. They introduced a new piecework scheme which would have brought average wages down to £35/£45 a week, and meant less than £10 a week on some jobs. If the weather was bad, the workers would earn nothing!

Pritchards workers already had to put up with wages £30 a week below what the council paid, appalling work conditions (no protective clothing, no mess or wash facilities), and no contract of employment, so no holi-

Gerry Byrne reports on the action by gardeners and dustmen in the Tories' 'model' local authority

day, sick pay, or pension. They also had to sign an undertaking when they started that they would pay for any loss or damage to machines.

They tried to operate the new scheme. After two days it became clear that they would earn nothing. They walked out. All 38 NUPE members have now been on strike for four weeks.

The dispute escalated last week when the dust (employed by Grand Met) held a one-day strike, and whole depot which the Pritchards workers had been picketing was shut down. Fuel deliveries were turned away, and Pritchards strikers held a demo outside Pritchards head office.

There has been a simmering dispute with Grand Met since the refuse collection workers won a £9 a week pay award from the Central Arbitration Council to bring them up to council rates. Grand Met decided to finance this by sackings, leaving the remaining workforce to take on 25% more work.

Since many of the dust carts are out for over 8 hours a day anyway, and most are down to a skeleton crew of two, it's hard to

see where these productivity increases can come from.


40 casual workers — mainly black — who sign away their employment rights each week, are sacked from August 15. The dust are back at work after the one-day strike, trying to operate the new rotas, but the issue is likely to explode again at any time.

Pritchards stewards met the management last Friday, but without positive result.

Meanwhile the Tory leader of Wandsworth council has gone on record as saying that however useless or costly the Pritchards contract turned out, the Tories were not prepared to go back to direct labour. They have put no pressure on Pritchards to settle, indeed they have suspended the fines during the dispute.

Pritchards workers are keen to extend links with local tenants, both to get the message across about why the grass isn't being cut, and also to get feedback on whether scabs are out. (So far Pritchards have sent their managers from other sections out cutting grass — not very successfully). Local caretakers have agreed to notify the strike committee if they see any scabs working; and trade unionists in the job centres are blacking adverts for Pritchards jobs.

Money and requests for speakers to: Dave Benlow, c/o Junction Resource Centre, 248 Lavender Hill, SW11.



Join the picket line: 7am-4.30pm, Frogmore Depot, Dormay St, London SW18.

Fares fighter faces trial

THE Can't Pay, Won't Pay' campaign was formed in February 1982 to find other methods of fighting for cheap fares if the official Greater London Council campaign was unable to prevent the fare rise taking place.

Jan Wallgrave is coordinator of the fares fight in Haringey, and in April 1982 took part in the campaign of refusing to pay the fares increase.

She was one of the 18 among the several thousand who took part to be charged by the London Transport Police with fare avoidance.

Why are you doing it, Jan? You're all on your own, all your friends seem to have deserted you. Some people would say that your gesture is just a little futile?

I consider it is worthwhile carrying on with this campaign because the battle for London Transport is entering a new and more significant phase with the government's new White Paper which proposes to remove London Transport from local democratic control.

Good, but do you feel, nonetheless, that the Can't Pay, Won't Pay Campaign has been a failure? Why was that?

I think it was the inevitable result of the decision of the Law Lords which was taken by many to have been a travesty of justice and a politically biased judgement by people who are supposed to interpret the law impartially. The Campaign found itself faced with the fact

that the trade unions' resistance did not appear to be sufficiently strong and there was no alternative as we saw it but to take 'direct action'.

Can you tell us what you have achieved by taking this action?

A considerable amount of publicity. It drew the attention of the public to the unbelievable action of the Law Lords in flagrant breach of all that could be seen as reasonable and democratic, i.e. a cheap fares policy that benefitted the majority of Londoners of all ages which was undoubtedly both popular and successful.

What support did you get from the comrades at County Hall for your actions?

We had considerable backing from Dave Wetzel, Chair of the GLC's Transport Committee — and one of the defendants — as well as John McDonnell, chair of the GLC's Finance Committee, together with other Labour

councillors and party members who both took part and actively helped us during the campaign itself and during the period of the court cases.

What would you say to those who feel that you would have been better advised to follow the lead given by the transport unions?

The trade unions' action was unfortunately not very effective, and we felt that without further determined action in opposition to the Law Lords decision, resistance would have totally collapsed.

When we look back on the battles of the past to achieve the women's right to vote, or trade union recognition, etc., the law of the land was often broken. The suffragettes were also accused of being frivolous and childish. We feel we are trying to follow in that tradition, the tradition of challenging the law — where and when necessary. What now? What message have you for the London Labour Parties?

Get out and organise support in defence of the democratic control of London Transport, the accountability of local councils and the policies that the GLC was elected on. The battle for the GLC is only just beginning, sitting around and passing resolutions is not sufficient to defeat the Tories' plan. Action is needed now!

Labour movement CONFERENCE

September 17

September 17, 10.30am-5pm
University of London Union
Malet Street, WC1

Called by
Socialist
ORGANISER

How to fight the Tories



DESPITE the holiday period, sponsorships, requests for credentials, and inquiries are already coming in for the September 17 'How to Fight the Tories' conference proposed by Socialist Organiser.

From Basingstoke alone we have had half a dozen applications for credentials, from a number of different organisations: Trades Council, GMWU branch, Labour Party...

For the workshop on privatisation, the organisers have invited speakers from British Telecom and from Wandsworth. On public service cuts, speakers have been invited from hospital occupations and anti-closure campaigns.

A workshop on the shop stewards' movement will discuss varying experiences in different sectors, with introductions from a car industry steward and an NHS steward.

We'll be looking at the recently launched Black Trade Unionists' Solidarity Movement, and other autonomous black workers' organising, in a workshop on black workers. And we hope for speakers from the Gay Teachers' Group and the NALGO Gay Group for a workshop on gay rights.

Women's special concerns and demands will, we

hope, be discussed in all the workshops, but there will also be a special one on women in the labour movement — looking at the fight for women's rights in the Labour Party, the recent victories in the TGWU, and how the battle can be spread to other unions.

The CND workshop will discuss organising for the Youth Council lobby of Labour Party conference and the big CND demonstration on October 22, but also the politics of CND, and the CND leadership's apparent shift from unilateral disarmament to the 'nuclear freeze' policy.

How should the trade unions respond to the Tory government's new Youth Training Scheme? How can we organise the trainees? There'll be a workshop on that.

Conference papers are in preparation on many of the workshop themes. For details or for credentials (£2.50 waged, £1.50 unwaged), write to Socialist Organiser, September 17 Conference, 28 Middle Lane, London N8.

Open to delegates and observers from all labour movement bodies.

Credentials (including discussion papers) £2.50 (employed), £1.50 (unemployed).

Please send me details/credentials for the September 17 Conference. Enclose £

Name _____
Address _____

Send to:
Socialist Organiser, 28, Middle Lane,
London N8. (Please mark the envelope
'September 17 Conference')

Platform and workshop speakers include:
Jeremy Corbyn MP; Reg Race, Joy Hurcombe (Labour CND)*; Val Dunn (Manchester Labour councillor)*; Andrea Campbell (COHSE Group 81)*; Colin Taibot (POEU Broad Left)*.

Workshop discussions, coupled with the showing of videos, will cover a wide range of topics and current strategies, and enable everyone present to contribute in debate on policies for the way forward.

CRÈCHE FACILITIES WILL BE AVAILABLE ALL DAY.

Brum YTS action

THE Birmingham 'YTS Action Group' came into existence a few months ago, when activists from the trades council, who planned to monitor YTS schemes and to launch a union recruitment drive on them, found that workers at the Birmingham Trade Union Resource Centre were also thinking along similar lines.

It made sense to pool resources, and a series of joint meetings have been held, at which trade unionists affected by YTS (like supervisors from mode B schemes, shop stewards at factories with mode A trainees, NATFHE members from FE colleges) have exchanged experiences and drawn up plans for

unionising staff and trainees in the Birmingham area.

Roger Kline, a full-time researcher at the Resource Centre and the convener of the Action Group, is also building up an extensive file on abuses of trainees, health and safety on schemes, good and bad agreements and so forth. The group intends to expand this aspect of the work into a systematic monitoring process.

Roger's file, together with copies of relevant MSC and trade union publications, are being kept at the Resource Centre and are available for any trade unionist to look at (photocopies can be sent out). Information from other parts of the country is always welcome.

The Action Group has a leaflet for trainees, informing them of their rights, and encouraging them to join a union. This will be distributed early in October by which time the trainees who start in September will have had a month to get a taste of just what YTS is all about.

The Group is also planning the publication of a regular YTS Bulletin aimed at trainees, supervisors and trade unionists.

It is hoped to convene a conference of trade unionists involved with YTS from round the country, towards the end of the year.

Contact: YTS Action Group, c/o Roger Kline, TURC, 7 Frederick St., Birmingham B1 3HE. 4021-2363323).

CND leaders stamp down on youth

THE Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) executive, under the leadership of Bruce Kent, has moved to try to close down the Youth CND National Committee, elected at the YCND conference on July 2/3.

This follows measures against Labour CND, which has had CND executive members put into its committee with right of veto.

Several members of the Youth CND National Committee have put out a statement in response to the CND executive's move and to a report in the London magazine 'City Limits'.

"We see the changes proposed in YCND", they say, "as a political move, aiming to effectively silence any possible opposition to certain changes in the public face of CND."

"The first printing of leaflets for the big CND demonstration (forthcoming on) October 22, for instance, leaned heavily on the theme, 'Freeze the nuclear arms race', mentioning neither unilateralism nor NATO."

"YCND and Labour CND have been the first victims of this new, heavy-handed policy". The rest of the statement reads:

AS MEMBERS of the YCND National Committee that was elected at the recent conference in Manchester but has since been dissolved, we reject the idea that YCND has been "tem-

porarily wound up after allegations of entryism by Trotskyist groups" (as City Limits put it).

CND has denied that a spokesperson for CND made the comments attributed to CND in the (City Limits) article, and as far as we are concerned the only reasons that were given for the dissolution of the committee were that membership cards and ages were inadequately checked.

Cards

Many YCND members do not in fact possess membership cards, due to administrative difficulties... However, we do not see how this means the conference was invalid — delegates were registered in advance and their names were checked against a computer print-out of members before delegate cards were issued.

(But now) the YCND National Committee, consisting of ten officers elected by conference and regional representatives from all over the country, has been dissolved, and a CND Youth Committee set up in its place, with regional representation drastically cut and several regions not being recognised... The six democratically elected Ordinary Officers are excluded.

At the first meeting of this committee CND staff put forward proposals involving the absorption of YCND into CND, supposedly to free young people "from most of the administrative and bureaucratic side of the campaign" — a move that would effectively remove both our democratic rights within the

campaign and our ability to organise independently where necessary.

Despite previous assurances that a recall conference for YCND is the eventual aim of the committee, the proposals since put forward seem to be far less liberal. "The idea of a 'recall conference'" (according to a document presented at the committee meeting) "seems to go against the concept of YCND as an integral part of the campaign, and its purpose is obscure. We therefore recommend to the Executive that there be no recall conference."

In view of the unwarranted and undemocratic manner in which YCND lost its National Committee, seven young people present at the meeting of the new 'CND Youth Committee' refused to recognise the Committee, registering instead several no-votes and putting forward a statement to the minutes explaining our reasons for doing so.

For the sake of unity within the campaign we called upon YCND groups and individuals to carry out proposals decided by the committee for action, but at the same time we feel it is important that an informed debate is carried out in the campaign, culminating in a final decision as to YCND's status through an emergency resolution to CND conference in December.

Tom Rigby, Tracey Doyle, John Green, Satvinder Singh, Melissa Oliver, YCND National Committee members



Tom Rigby, editor of the YCND paper Second Generation, at LPYS summer camp, arguing for more active support by the YS for CND. Photo: John Whitton.

What you can do

TO DEFEND Youth CND and its rights, we have to organise for activities like the lobby of the TUC, and at the same time argue the issues within the disarmament movement.

Here are two model resolutions for your CND group, YCND group, or (if affiliated to CND) Labour Party or trade union branch.

1. To the CND Executive: 'We condemn the decision of the CND Executive to rule unconstitutional the YCND Conference,

and dissolve the National Committee. We believe that this is an unnecessary and divisive act, and call on the CND Executive to reverse it'.

2. Emergency resolution to CND conference: 'This conference reverses the action of the CND Executive in dissolving the YCND National Committee and declaring the YCND conference unconstitutional. It re-establishes YCND as a specialist section, acting within the framework of the aims of CND as a whole'.

Lobby the TUC

by Tom Rigby

IN THE next few weeks and months, Youth CND will be taking the issue of nuclear disarmament into the labour movement.

We have two national events as a focus for this. First, a lobby of the TUC in Blackpool in early September; and then in October, along with Labour CND, a demonstration and rally at Labour Party conference.

The key political message for these events is the need for the labour movement to move beyond existing paper policies of unilateralism and to start organising mass action against the missiles.

To get this message across, YCND and CND as a whole will have to build on their existing links with the labour movement.

Youth CND groups should be looking to the labour movement locally and nationally, to help build for the two lobbies.

There are lots of things to do: *Write to Labour Party and trade union branches, trades councils, etc., and get them to sponsor, support and publicise the lobbies.

*Send speakers to trade union branch meetings so that YCND can develop a dialogue with activists in the labour movement opposed to nuclear weapons. If possible, try to organise workplace meetings, to explain the issues to the largest possible audience.

*Contacts built up this way will provide a solid base for the YCND trade union conference planned for early next year, at which we hope to discuss education/information work and a plan of action against the missiles.

This is not all YCND has planned. Annual Conference voted to support two important demonstrations.

On September 11 there should be a big mobilisation from YCND groups for the demonstration called around the slogan "No more Chile". This demonstration marks the tenth anniversary of the coup in Chile and is centred on opposition to US involvement in Central and Latin America.

CND has a mass demonstration planned for October 22 in London. YCND will be working for the largest possible mobilisation of youth.



Class Fighter national secretary Judith Bonner, with Satvinder Singh (chairing) at the Class Fighter fringe meeting. Photo: John Whitton.

YOUNG SOCIALISTS SUMMER CAMP

THE Labour Party Young Socialists have had an annual summer camp since 1979. About 600 people took part this year, like last year.

Summer camp is a good opportunity to assess the strengths of the YS and the changes which have taken place over the year. This year there were a lot of new, independent-minded YS members present, many more than last year. New people seem to have been drawn into the YS through the general election campaign, and have brought with them a willingness to get involved in single-issue campaigns.

The youth who has just joined a YS branch led by the dominant 'Militant' tendency, but still wants to Rock the Bomb, doesn't seem to want to get involved in hurling abuse at other YCNDers — even if they are members of the YS minority around 'Class Fighter'.

The following report is from Class Fighter supporters who went to summer camp.

"SO LONG as it's not raining, I don't suppose it'll be too bad," was how a good few Class Fighter supporters felt about going to the LPYS summer camp at the beginning of August.

In fact, this year's summer camp turned out to be the most successful for Class Fighter and most of us actually enjoyed it.

Summer camp has several workshops a day and an evening rally, which amounts to a much better opportunity to argue politics than YS conference. This year there was even a workshop on gay rights. The YS National Committee have been forced to change their attitude to gay struggles after intense pressure and the NUT confer-

ence proving that trade unionists and workers are interested in gay and lesbian rights.

The other workshops were much the same as usual but this year Harry McShane came along. He spoke about Red Clydeside and when comrades asked him about his own and his contemporaries positions on Ireland the chair ruled them out of order and threatened to throw them out if they objected.

The Militant suffered badly in the YCND debate. Britain out of NATO is apparently a pacifist demand, ultra-leftist and impractical because it won't get rid of the bomb.

Outraged YCND members took the opportunity to point out

that the NATO connection was used by the right wing in the labour movement to fudge conference decisions on unilateralism during the election campaign. It was also made quite clear that any talk of nuclear disarmament and staying in NATO was fooling people.

The most worrying workshop was on YTS. Everyone agreed that YTS is a bad thing, but how do we fight it? Very little came out, but talk of a conference on December 10. All the conditions to be fought for were agreed, but we should have gone on to discussion how to approach the unions, how to talk to non-political students unions in colleges where YTS youth will be placed.

We also should have talked about just when and how we raise the question of joining the YS during the campaign to unionise YTS. Swapped experiences from YOPs work would have helped. We could have found out if it was generally the case that comrades feared scaring off potential union members.

Class Fighter's ideas for activity and explanations of the shortcomings of Militant's programme hit home to a definite section of the camp. New YS members, who have been influenced by the mass movements against the bomb, who are anti-authoritarian and not sectarian, aligned themselves with us. We found more people who wanted to talk to us this year than anyone can remember.

El Salvador Solidarity Campaign: affiliation £5 for individuals and £10 for organisations, from 29 Islington Park St., London N1. (01-359 2270)



Women have built this movement too!

Jack Smiley's article last week sat rather uncomfortably on the Women's Page, straining somewhat at the seams. Unfortunately, like Tom Mann's speech, it did contain "crude, sexist and economistic" elements. For instance, the statement that it is "the labour bureaucracy that has been historically responsible for reproducing patriarchal values within the working class" is a rather gross over-simplification. Aren't there some more material factors also operating?

Similarly, the assertion "that it is only through the common mobilisation of women and men, together in struggle against a class that is grinding them down, that men are going to be broken from the disfigured conceptions that they have of women", while true, begs a whole number of questions.

And he does seem to have swallowed Bea Campbell's bait in identifying militant class struggle as the prerogative of male workers (though clearly he draws different conclusions). He cites the great dockers strike of 1889 — he could equally well have pointed to the match girls strike. Women have built this movement too!

The 150 years of accumulated experience of class struggle doesn't just revolve around the actions of skilled male workers.

This said, Jack Smiley's approach is still infinitely preferable to Bea Campbell's class-pacifism, and he does point to a real issue that needs to be taken up: the rhetorical cooption of the "insights of the women's movement" in the service of rotten class collaboration.

The Labour Coordinating Committee is foremost, though not alone, in this process — smarmy nods in the direction of feminism and then back to the real business of stabbing the left in the back. But they are very selective "insights" it draws on. Not only socialist, but radical, separatist feminists should be outraged by this sleight of hand.

One of the mechanisms for this is the myth of the "patriarchal-isation" of the labour movement. The ascendancy of the skilled male white workers' interests at the expense of other groups, especially women, is pointed as the original sin of class politics.

Activity

The reality was rather more complex; the conclusions the opposite of Bea Campbell's:

"In a variety of ways they were able to find means of protecting their position within an increasingly stable system. They left behind the mass politics of the earlier part of the century, which represented more of a direct challenge to the whole system of industrial capitalism at a stage when it was far less secure and established. In

Gerry Byrne takes up a debate opened by Jack Smiley (Socialist Organiser 142).

doing so, the skilled workers also left behind the unskilled workers and the women, whose way of life did not allow their participation in the more structured political forms. These forms required both regularity of working times and regularity of income for participation to be possible."

The point is women were active in the early working class movement, the Chartists:

"This was a transitional period in which traditional forms of political activity — such as mass demonstrations and other acts which involved entire families and communities — coexisted with early versions of the more sophisticated organisational forces which were to be the pattern of late 19th century politics. Women... had previously been involved in food riots and demonstrations, early female friendly societies and trade unions. In the 1830s and 1840s women continued to be actively involved. They organised food boycotts and occupied churches. They were particularly active in demonstrations against the new Poor Law of 1834 and in the 1842 Plug riots. Women were also active in the internal organisation of the Chartist Movement, attending meetings, decorating halls and speakers' wagons, and they were important in the social side of the movement, creating, for example, alternative schools for children."

Feminist

This is something of a contrast with the picture of women's passivity presented by both Jack Smiley and Bea Campbell! It was the stabilisation of capitalism, fuelled in Britain especially, by massive imperialist expansion, which created conditions for the dominance of patriarchal values in the working class movement. Alongside this, developed a new bureaucracy of the movement but with material interests apart from it.

Nor did this go unchallenged. One thing that is missing from virtually all feminist accounts, which serve to berate the male-dominated left, is the role of conscious socialists, Marxists.

The arguments around women's right to work, against male protectionism, created enormous divisions in the working class movement internationally. It was the Marxists who consistently took the side of women's rights, seeing their involvement as central to any strategy to overthrow capitalism.

It was those who continued the Chartists' stance of irreconcilable war with the system who resisted women's exclusion, and



"Militant class struggle is not the prerogative of male workers". A mass meeting during the occupation at St. Mary's Hospital, London W9. Photo: Christine Cadin.

those who would settle for carving out a comfortable (or at least tolerable) niche within the system who championed male privilege within the labour movement.

Now, if the LCC and their ilk were serious about the insights that women's history offers the labour movement, if they were genuinely concerned to find forms of organising which don't exclude women, they might care to look at the insurrectionary actions of Chartist women. They don't even need to look that far back. "Bourgeois" feminism provides many examples of militant direct action: hunger strikes, arson, damage to property.

If they're keen to look resolutely to the present, where do they stand on fire-bombing sex shops or "rough justice" for rapists? While we may have sharp political differences with all these actions, they do seem to indicate that militancy, even violent, direct action is not and never has been an exclusively male preserve.

Bea Campbell is not wrong in wishing to broaden out the concept of class struggle beyond simply "point of production" industrial action, but in removing the "struggle" element.

The answer is not to go back to the early working class movement, where the distinction between "industrial", "community" and "political" action barely existed, negating 150

years of experience. The openness of that movement was the product of the formlessness of the working class and the infant instability of capitalism. What we need to do is recreate that unity and openness on a higher level, drawing on that experience.

An idea of the potential (though that's all it is at present) for overcoming these distinctions between industrial, political and community action can be gauged from the struggle against the missiles. The combination of women organising in the community reaching out to isolated women, mass political demonstrations and industrial blacking is potentially unstoppable. Once again posing a mortal threat to capitalism would be the best way to revive the memory of that early unified movement.

Arenas

For women, the separation between industrial, social and political arenas of struggle has never taken much of a hold. It's an index of how spurious is the LCC's commitment to women, that their central campaigning plank within the Labour Party is to drop any further moves to democratise the party and freeze discussion on policy. Since women's representation has not been won and there are whole areas of policy concerning women which have never

filtered up, this can only damage our interests. (It's no accident, e.g. that women in CLPD have rejected this strategy).

And if you look at one area of policy which the LCC is concerned to change — council house sales — again it doesn't look as if much consideration has been given to women's interests.

Since the net effect of Tory housing policy will be to create a subsidised sector of homeowners and a ghetto of poor (low-wage and claimants) council tenants, trapped in high-rise, under-maintained, unsuitable flats, who are the likely losers if Labour acquiesces with his policy? Single parents (9/10ths women), the low paid (two-thirds women), claimants, families with children and homeless single people.

Only men, by and large, can afford to be home-owners. so much for concern for women and breaking out of the stereotype of the white, male, manual worker!

For too long has the soft left been able to use "feminism" demagogically as a cover for its craven retreat, feminists in the labour movement must stand up and disown this ploy — we can speak for ourselves thank you.

(Quotes from 'Women and Radical Politics in Britain, 1820-1914' in 'Dreams and Dilemmas', Sheila Rowbottom, published by Virago.

Bradford occupation calls for union support

by Frances Gates

TWO weeks ago the staff at Thornton View hospital, Bradford, declared an occupation to defend their hospital. Fourteen frenetic, action-packed days are a long time for an occupation staff who have never taken such action before.

But it has proved a long time for the "proper channels", both in NUPE and COHSE.

The Thornton View workers have had to organise things themselves, with the help of a support committee and a local NUPE branch secretary.

The occupation is being run by a working committee of staff on both shifts and wards with a good representation of the 100 staff who work at the hospital.

Non-medical management are being kept out. The Nursing Officer came into the work-in in the first couple of days but was accompanied everywhere by a member of staff, to prevent intimi-

idation and interference with the occupation.

The occupation has had support ranging from the Consultant Geriatrician to virtually all the relatives of the 82 geriatric patients at the hospital.

Some months before, the entire Bradford Council passed a resolution supporting the Thornton View Hospital Campaign and "any action the staff may take to prevent closure". Even the Tories voted for this.

But only Labour councillors, of course, especially Barry Turner, have come along to the Occupation Support Committee.

The Work-in Committee make clear their opposition to all cuts and closures. They don't want

their hospital saved at the expense of another somewhere else.

They demand adequate government funding and a statement from the Health Authority that no non-medical personnel be involved in the removal of patients, and no interference in patient referrals.

They further demand that the DHA acts upon a trade union inquiry on the facilities the hospital has to offer and how they can be improved, and that the DHA make their accounts (un-audited) available to the workers and users of Bradford NHS.

Also, the work-in committee demand full supporting strike action if the occupation is threatened in any way.

And they call on the trade unions in the Bradford area to establish an inquiry into the real level of need for geriatric provision.

Fighting



RACISM

Roach appeal

THE Roach Family Support Committee has decided to petition the European Parliament for support for the setting up of an independent inquiry into the death of Colin Roach in St. Newington police station. Lomas, Labour member of the European Parliament for London North East.

Lomas says "The demand for an independent inquiry is a modest one, given the circumstances surrounding the death of Colin Roach. The Roach Family Support Committee is honest seeking to get the truth of the tragic affair. They want some answers to many unanswered questions. So do I."

Get your local Euro MP support the petition or an independent inquiry into the death of Colin Roach.

The Commission for Racial Equality has been asked to investigate alleged discrimination in the BBC's appointment of employees to its external services.

The Association of Broadcasting Journalists and the National Union of Journalists have both accused the BBC of racial discrimination. John Foster, the NUJ's Broadcasting Officer, said that the figures for those with staff jobs and those on short term contracts showed that discrimination is taking place.

This follows hot on the heels of the CRE report which said that 50% of firms discriminate against black applicants.

On September 29 the first International Black Solidarity rally in London is to be held at Friends House, Euston Road. The speakers include Stokely Carmichael, one of the leaders of the Black Power movement in the USA during the '60s and '70s.

Other speakers will be representatives from the ANC of South Africa, the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) of Namibia plus a rep from the Caribbean.

This summer there have been racist goings on on the cross channel ferries from Dover to Calais. A coach load of mainly black British holiday makers were refused entry into France. They were trying to get in on the perfectly legal 60 hour excursion identity cards.

White Guardian reporter Susan Tirbutt and two black students went across the Channel together to monitor discriminatory practices.

In Dover the black students were asked if they had any other identification and were directed to a notice which claimed that the French authorities had gone back on the long-standing agreement which permitted travel on the ID cards. They were told to expect trouble in France.

The white Guardian reporter was also asked if she had any other ID. She said she hadn't and that was the end of the matter.

The French authorities are reported to blame the refusals on the British Nationality Act. They fear that black tourists may have no right of re-entry into Britain.

Socialist ORGANISER

LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE MEETING

Socialist Organiser's Labour Party conference meeting this year will be on building Labour Party workplace branches and the fight against the Tories. Speakers will include activists who have had direct experience of building workplace branches.

TUESDAY OCTOBER 4, 5.30PM
KING'S HOTEL, BRIGHTON

International news

France, US, Libya pile in

Why Chad is at war

by Martin Thomas

BETWEEN 500 and 1,000 French troops are now moving into the front line against the Libyan and rebel forces in Chad. Francois Mitterrand's government is continuing France's long record as an imperialist gendarme in Africa.

France and the US have also sent massive military aid to the Chad government of Hissene Habre. Strongly pro-Western Zaire has sent 2,000 French-trained troops to help, and Habre has also recruited hundreds of European mercenaries.

US ships are cruising off the coast of Libya, and 5,500 US troops are joining a military exercise in neighbouring Egypt.

According to the Paris daily Le Monde (July 12), a British company, Heavy Lift, has also been involved in the airlift of French supplies to Chad.

The French socialist weekly L'Unité Ouvrière (August 6) condemns Mitterrand's intervention and comments, "French imperialism and American imperialism are protecting their interests."

The defence of imperialist interests, LO continues, "demands the installation of and support for military dictatorships capable of maintaining order for the profit of the capitalists and at the expense of the local population."

"The problem in Chad is that there are at least two rival local 'warlords' claiming their role: Hissene Habre and Goukouni Oueddei... Whichever wins, the result will be the same for the people of Chad..."

Chad has been a battlefield for rival warlords since the late '60s, and especially since 1978.

The country is not a nation, but a shape drawn on the map by French colonial administrators.

Its huge expanse — 1,000 miles from north to south, 500 miles from east to west — includes over 100 languages and a multitude of ethnic groups and religions.

There are three main ethnic/regional religious groupings:

- *The Toubou and other nomadic peoples of the desert north, Muslim in religion (about 18% of Chad's 4 million people);
- *The more settled Muslim

peoples of the centre, many of whom are of Arab ethnic origin; *The Black African people of the south, mostly Christian or animist in religion.

Before France colonised Chad in 1900, empires based in or around the central region generally dominated the area, using the peoples of the south as slaves.

Under French colonial rule, the south developed economically more than the centre and north (though the whole country is still one of the poorest in the world). After independence, southerners dominated. Now both the factions fighting for supremacy are mainly northern-based.

Frolinat

Both Goukouni and Habre were formerly leaders of Frolinat, the 'Front for the national liberation of Chad'. Despite its name, Frolinat had nothing to do with the independence of Chad from France, which was granted in 1960, six years before Frolinat was founded.

Frolinat was founded to fight for Muslim domination in the country, against the regime of Chad's first president, Tombalbaye, a southern Christian.

Tombalbaye called France in to support him in 1968. But in 1975 he was overthrown in a coup engineered by Camille Gourvenac, the French director of his secret police. Another southerner, Felix Malloum, took over.

Habre and Goukouni had split in 1976, and in January 1978 Habre agreed to a ceasefire with Malloum. Following massive French intervention against Goukouni's forces, Habre became prime minister under Malloum in August 1978.

The coalition quickly broke down. 100,000 Christians (according to Keesings press digest) fled the capital, Njamena, and there were pogroms against the Muslim minority (mostly merchants, shopkeepers, traders) in the south.

Since then there has been a running civil war between Habre and Goukouni, with shifting alliances with external powers



Captured rebels in Njamena

and with Kamougue, strongman of the south.

According to Le Monde of August 14, Habre was negotiating with Libya right up to March 1983. Libya was ready to back Habre and dump Goukouni on three conditions:

- *That Chad be declared an Islamic Arab republic (although less than half the population is Muslim, and only about one-third Arab);
- *A military/strategic alliance with Libya;
- *Chad to accept the Libyan annexation (in 1973) of the reputedly uranium-rich Aozou strip in the north of the country.

Mitterrand

Habre is reported to have balked at the third point; and so he turned to France instead.

Habre has accused France of wanting to dump him — and there may be some truth in it. Since Mitterrand came to power in May 1981, France has been trying to improve its relations with oil-rich Libya.

But French capitalism's goodwill does not extend to allowing the ambitions of Libya's military

ruler, Col. Gaddafi, to upset the balance of forces in Africa. And that is also the concern of the United States, for which Libya is bugbear number one in Africa and the Middle East.

Libya's attempts to invade, sponsor rebellions in, or merge with a whole range of states in the area, and its erratic alliance with the USSR, are a threat to US-sponsored stability — and Reagan wants to slap Gaddafi down.

Chad thus becomes a football in the rivalries of the two international blocks — the US and USSR, and their respective clients and lieutenants.

Reagan's sabre-rattling suggests there could even be a danger of a direct US attack on Libya — an African counterpart to what he is doing in Central America.

But whichever warlord wins, the people of Chad will lose. And they will continue to lose until the aim of the revolutionary leaders of African independence — a pan-African federation, with equal rights for all Africa's many peoples — can be realised. The only force capable of achieving that aim is the growing African working class.

Since 1978

1978: Massive French intervention against Goukouni's Frolinat forces.

August 1978: Habre forms a coalition with Malloum — but it quickly breaks down into sectarian slaughter. Goukouni gains ground.

March 1979: Talks to form a new coalition government for Chad open in Nigeria.

November 1979: Government installed with Goukouni as President, Kamougue (chief warlord of the south) as vice-president, and Habre as minister of defence.

April 1980: French troops withdraw. Fighting breaks out in capital between Goukouni and Habre forces.

December 1980: Goukouni, with massive Libyan aid, defeats Habre. Habre regroups in the north-east with aid from Egypt and Sudan.

January 1981: Goukouni announces 'merger' of Chad with Libya; then retreats after strong objections from Kamougue, from African states, and from France.

May 1981: Mitterrand government comes to power in France,

seeks deals with Libya. Libyan troops withdraw from Chad. Goukouni calls in Nigerian, Zairean and Senegalese troops (heavily aided by the US and France) but they stay neutral between him and Habre.

Spring 1982: Goukouni gets military aid from France.

May 1982: Goukouni appeals unsuccessfully to Libya for aid against Habre. Kamougue distances himself from Goukouni.

June 1982: Habre takes the capital, Njamena, and is promptly recognised as ruler by US, France, Nigeria, etc. Despite pleas from Habre, Nigerian, Zairean and Senegalese troops withdraw.

September 1982: Habre, in alliance with anti-Kamougue southerners, forces Kamougue into exile; refuses all demands for autonomy for the south. Kamougue subsequently links up with Goukouni and Libya.

March 1983: Talks between Habre and Libya break down.

June 1983: Goukouni starts a new offensive, with massive Libyan aid; according to the Paris daily Le Monde, some 3,000 troops and 50 aircraft.



North and South

by Patrick Murphy

The North heats up

MANY CATHOLICS spent the month of July working in factories surrounded by a forest of Union Jacks and loyalist symbols. It's been like that every July for a hundred years.

This time the Catholics working at the May Park poultry factory in Dungannon, Co. Tyrone, where the workforce of 80 was half Catholic and half Protestant, decided they weren't having it.

They struck work and refused to return until the flag was taken down.

Then the Protestant half of the workforce walked out and demanded that it be put back.

The strikes went on throughout the marching period. At the end of July the management — Ulster Farmers Investment Limited — sacked the entire workforce and closed the factory down.

This story is symbolic of the situation in Northern Ireland. It also illustrates the fact that the six counties of Ireland in July 1983 show all the signs of a society in which the communal battlelines are being redrawn and hardening alarmingly.

In the aftermath of the hunger strikes and the Assembly elections the spirit of resistance within the nationalist community has been visibly growing stronger. The 100,000 votes for Sinn Féin in the general election indicated the depth of commitment to that resistance.

The response of the majority loyalist community has been slow and less spectacular but during the July Orange celebrations they began to flex their muscles.

July has always been the month when the nationalists of Northern Ireland are reminded who the bosses are and when the Protestant ascendancy reasserts itself.

This year the first sign of a backlash came on the eve of 12 July celebrations when an Orange mob stormed through a Catholic estate in the town of Ballynahinch in Co. Down.

Catholics did not miss the fact that after five hours of riots involving 500 loyalists, only three people had been arrested. Nationalists are dealt with quickly and brutally. There was some reaction to these events and individual Protestants were evicted from houses surrounding the town.

In Tyrone Catholic houses were burnt out in a mainly Protestant estate after an Orange march, and most Catholics in the area moved out.

Youths from the Bogside in Derry reacted angrily the following night and attacked a Protestant block of flats. This action was condemned as 'anti-republican' and 'stupid' by Sinn Féin Assembly member Martin McGuinness.

There are many forms of struggle, of violence and of sectarianism which have become common in the North of Ireland over the last decade, but mob attacks like these are not one of them. Nothing like this has happened since the late 1960s or early '70s up to the outbreak of large scale sectarian assassinations — mainly of Catholics by Protestants — in 1972-3.

Purging council estates of Catholics is a frightening return to this period when the British army was put on the streets and the Provisional IRA emerged.

During the Orange celebrations the loyalist leaders banged their anti-IRA drum and called for the return of hanging as usual. But they went further than that.

Harold McCusker, Official Unionist MP for North Armagh is generally regarded as a 'left wing official unionist', one who in Britain would be in the Labour Party. He attacked the Health Service for employing too many Catholics.

All the signs — the strike against the Union Jack, for example — are that the nationalist community is militant and in the mood now to challenge everything — loyalism, the legitimacy of the state, the British connection, the symbols of their oppression.

Catholics recognise that there are no reforms coming from the Northern Ireland state. Catholics have still generally been unemployed much longer and are unemployed in much larger numbers than Protestants.

The skilled engineering jobs in the major plants, Shorts and Harlands, Mackies, Fords Autolite are overwhelmingly Protestant controlled (94%, 90% and 100% respectively). Harland and Woolf still employ 100% Protestant skilled workers.


Discrimination is rife in the Civil Service and in the Northern Ireland Electricity Service. Loyalist councils operate discrimination openly and they admit to it, both in employment and housing. After 11 years of attempted reform by British governments the reality is clear, Northern Ireland exists on the basis purely of sectarianism and discrimination.

The British government is presenting as 'liberal' the policy of replacing the British Army with the RUC and the UDR, the locally recruited security forces. What this policy really means, however, is an even more threatening return to the 1960s with armed sectarian militias terrorising the nationalist community.

Together with the return of 'internment' through the 'remanding' system and the extremely dubious use of 'supergrasses' or 'converted terrorists' these developments amount to a stepping up of repression and an increasing reliance on the sectarian machinery of the Northern Ireland state itself.

With all this evidence of a return to the militancy of the 1960s and early '70s, on both sides, it seems clear that the struggle in the North is going to become more intense and isn't necessarily going to take the course most socialists would like.

Events in the crisis-torn South will be important to the outcome but so will the response of the labour movement in Britain. The problem is that those fighting imperialism in Ireland will probably conclude that the British labour movement has hardly moved since the 1960s and is no better prepared to show them solidarity than it was then.



Afghan guerrillas attack Kabul bases

LAST weekend, according to reports by western diplomats, Afghan Muslim forces attacked Russian military bases in the capital city of Kabul. Fierce battles are said to have occurred.

This is the latest indication that firm control of Afghanistan still eludes the USSR, 3½ years after its December 1979 invasion.

There are now over 100,000 Russian soldiers in Afghanistan. They occupy the cities, but they are not secure from attack there. Muslim forces have been able to mount repeated attacks within Kabul and other major cities. In October 1982 a rocket was fired into the Soviet Embassy in Kabul.

The Russians have no control at all over most of the countryside. Muslim control of the Panshir valley has survived repeated full-scale attacks from massed tanks and planes. They have been strong enough to impose a truce for the area, an important military base, on the Russians throughout most of 1983.

In most of the countryside the Russian army is at war with the entire population. It relies on the well-known techniques of occupying armies in such situations — punitive bombing raids on villages, including napalm bombing; scorched earth tactics against crops and so on.

The American State Department has repeatedly accused the Russians of using chemical warfare — defoliants to destroy crops, poison water supplies and kill livestock. An investigation into these charges by the United Nations reported that there was no definite proof to support the allegation but that "circumstantial evidence" did suggest that the USSR has

by John O'Mahony

used toxic chemicals in its Afghan war. (NY Times, 5 December 1982).

UN relief organisation figures put the number of refugees who have crossed the border into Pakistan at around three million. Other accounts put it as high as four million, or roughly the population of the 26 counties of Ireland. (Estimates of the Afghan population vary from 16 to 20 million).

Most of the reports come from people hostile to the Soviet Union, but there is no serious ground for doubting that the general picture is accurate and that the Russians are in full-scale military confrontation with the vast majority of Afghans.

The Russians invaded in December 1979 because the regime installed by the military coup of April 1978 was crumbling. Afghanistan had been a client state of the USSR since the mid-1950s. The '78 coup was organised by officers trained in the USSR and members of the middle class Communist Party, the PDP.

With no base outside the officer corps and Kabul, the regime relied from the beginning on napalm bombs and gunships to terrorise the Muslim population. This, and clumsily bungled attempts to impose reforms from above, roused the country against them, under the leadership of Muslim reactionaries.

Bitter faction-fighting between two PDP factions — Khalq, in control; Parcham, which had the support of Moscow — decimated the regime.

Purge and slaughter almost wiped out the top ranks of the Russian-trained airforce, and for

months before the invasion the USSR was running the airforce. The Russian invasion removed Khalq (its leader Amin was shot), and put Parcham in power. They retreated from the Khalq's programme of radical land reform.

3½ years on, the Muslim forces probably control more of the country than before the invasion. There is now serious outside intervention — CIA, Chinese, etc. (In 1979 talk of serious CIA involvement was just Kremlin propaganda).

The base of the PDP is probably even narrower: one report of the weekend's fighting says that some Khalq joined in the attacks on the Russian bases in Kabul.


The USSR says it wants to get out of Afghanistan. It wants "a peaceful solution that would end the rebel threat" and leave the present regime in power.

Talks have been going on for nearly a year between the puppet Afghan government, Pakistan, and UN Under Secretary General Diego Cordovez, to find a way of reaching a 'political solution' which would allow the refugees to return and lead to Russian withdrawal.

Last March UN secretary-general Javier Perez de Cuellar met Mr Andropov in Moscow for talks which included a search for 'ways of normalising the situation around Afghanistan'.

According to a report in the Paris daily Le Monde, the KGB, the Kremlin's experts in political control, are pressing within the bureaucracy for withdrawal. But some observers see the Russian willingness to talk as no more than an attempt to placate its Third World critics.

Meanwhile the bloody war continues.



THE explosion of sectarian violence against Sri Lanka's Tamil minority seems to have subsided for now.

It leaves an officially admitted 300 dead and perhaps as many as 80,000 homeless: tens of thousands of Tamils have moved north to 'their own' area of Sri Lanka.

Something like \$300 million worth of property has been destroyed by Sinhalese gangs systematically burning down Tamil-owned houses and shops.

Whole areas of the capital city, Colombo, have been destroyed. The damage to the economy — in which Tamils have long been disproportionately prominent — is said to be massive.

Politically, President Jayewardene is now effectively a dictator. The main opposition in Parliament, the Tamil United Front, has been outlawed under new laws which prohibit advocacy of a separate Tamil state.

Three left wing parties, the CP, SVP and NLSP, have been banned.

The last general election was in 1977. Last year a referendum

answered yes to Jayewardene's proposal to prolong the life of the Parliament without election. The next general election is not due until 1989.

The concentration of embittered Tamil refugees in the north must increase support for the democratic Tamil demand for a separate Tamil state.

The anti-Tamil pogroms were

sparked off by the killing of 13 Sinhalese soldiers by Tamil guerrillas.

Support for the guerrillas and for an armed struggle to win Tamil independence will inevitably grow in these circumstances.

Sri Lanka now faces the prospect of a full-scale war.

Labour delegation tours Six Cos.

Report from Rob Johnstone

THE American NORAD delegation to Northern Ireland was the one that made the headlines, but an important delegation from Britain toured the Six counties at the same time.

This year's annual TOM delegation to the North of Ireland — 200 delegates — was a marked improvement on previous ones.

Many were delegates from labour movement bodies like Birmingham Trades Council.

This is a sign that the question of Ireland is making some headway in the labour movement.

The picture we saw in Northern Ireland was indeed grim and horrifying. Armed soldiers and RUC patrols to repress the nationalist community, acts of murder by the British army and security forces — it is these that have forced the nationalist community to look to something more aggressive than the "Constitutional" methods of the SDLP and produce the massively increased Sinn Féin vote in the recent elections.

The British army's idea of "keeping the peace" is to repress the nationalist community.

The Springhill Community Centre in Ballymurphy where we were entertained is surrounded,

to the north west by Henry Taggart British Barracks and to the south-west by Fort Jericho, another British barracks, while just over the back to the south east there is Macrory Park Police Post.

And in these forts sits your local friendly bobby looking out through his gunsights.

These forts and barracks which are all over the place in Catholic West Belfast are not to be seen in any of the Protestant areas that we travelled through.

I spoke to Peggy, an elderly woman, in the Divis Flats, near the city centre who said she felt sorry for a lot of the young British soldiers but that they were just used by these pigs in the RUC to do their dirty work.

Young or old the attitude was the same.

Steven, a fourteen year old was building a bonfire alone with his friends to mark the anniversary of internment. He told me that this was the fourth time this week. I asked why. "Because the Brits come round in their Saracens and knock down."

Why didn't they just wait till Monday and built it then? "Because then the Brits would think they'd won."

Poland: repression continues

THE Polish Parliament today revoked martial law. At the same time, it adopted a series of constitutional amendments and a law giving the government special transitional powers until 1985. In view of these developments, the Coordinating Office Abroad of NSZZ 'Solidarnosc', reiterating the position of the Temporary Coordinating Commission (TKK) and the leader of our Union, Lech Walesa, emphatically declares that the lifting of martial law on July 22 1983 in no way restores the legal framework prevailing between September 1980 and December 1981.

NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' and other trade unions remain outside the law even though they are still considered by the majority of Poles to be the only representatives and defenders of workers' rights.

All the repressive measures directed at creative arts associations introduced during martial law remain intact, whereas the powers with which the state administration is now endowed eliminate what little autonomy was enjoyed by these associations and by centres of higher learning.

The law on "social parasitism" remains in effect. Because of the state's monopoly over employment, this law makes it possible to use its shameful provisions against persons blacklisted because of their union activity and political views.

Permanent restrictions on workers' rights have been

introduced, preventive censorship of the press, of publishing activities and of entertainment has been tightened, the powers of the political and security services have been significantly strengthened.

We welcome with joy the release of any political prisoner.

It must be noted however, that the lifting of martial law is not accompanied by the anticipated general amnesty. The announced amnesty does not apply to the activists of the Confederation for an Independent Poland (KPN), the former Workers' Defence Committee (KOR), or the leaders and activists of

Release these activists!

This statement is being circulated by the Solidarnosc Trade Union Working Group, seeking signatures from British trade unionists and others

WE ARE artists, intellectuals, trade unionists and politicians, active in the progressive movements in the British Isles. Some of us spend much of our time working within the peace movement. It is our profound conviction that intellectual and artistic freedom, the freedom to organise democratic movements without official interference and to communicate openly are essential if humanity is every to progress to a just and peaceful world.

It is with much disquiet that we hear of plans in your country to put on trial former members of the Workers Defence Council (KOR), as well as several leaders of the trade union Solidarity. These persons have already served fourteen months in prison camps and prisons without charges being brought against them. They stand for the same principles of social justice,

peace, freedom and human and workers' rights as we do. They should be immediately released, since the charge against them — that they attempted to overthrow the Polish political system by force — is plainly untrue. They cannot be held responsible for the crisis that Poland has reached.

The sentencing of these individuals would strike a major blow against any international process of healing and reconciliation. It would be seized on by the most reactionary elements in our own society to justify their own retrogressive social and Cold War policies.

Co-existence between states in conditions of isolation, estrangement and mistrust cannot be stable. As fellow Europeans, we appeal to you not to proceed with the prosecution of these individuals, our fellow human beings.

NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' who are arbitrarily designated as "extremists" by the authorities.

The Coordinating Office Abroad of NSZZ 'Solidarnosc' once again brings to the attention of governments and banks, Poland's creditors, that the fundamental socio-political conditions needed for genuine economic reform have not been set in motion. Therefore, unconditional loans to Poland cannot bring about positive economic results but will only increase the burden on society of repaying the country's debts, even though society is not responsible for them.

This Office also asserts that the consolidation and reinforcement of emergency legislation negates claims of "normalisation" by the official propaganda.

Society's resistance has not been broken. The struggle for the release of all political prisoners, for the restoration of trade union rights and for the fulfillment of the Gdansk Agreement goes on, and will continue in the future.

The Office appeals to the free trade union movement and to public opinion in all democratic countries to continue supporting politically and materially, authentic trade unions and independent organisations in Poland.

Brussels, 22 July 1983
Co-ordinating Office Abroad of NSZZ Solidarnosc
Reprinted from 'Voice of Solidarnosc'.



Solidarnosc

WITH EDMUND BALUKA

LET'S GET HIM OUT OF GAO

Edmund Baluka was recently jailed for five years by the Polish Stalinist regime. They have offered to release him if he is prepared to leave the country, which he will not do. Get your union to send a protest to the Polish Embassy in London, demanding his release.

Tony Benn disc

MT: A lot of people on the Left are now coming round to the view that to talk about withdrawal from the EEC is a futile gesture. What we should be doing is recognising the reality of the European integration of capitalism, and devising socialist policies on an European scale to deal with that. What's your reaction?

TB: The arguments that led us to say that we would have to break with the Treaty of Rome are un-

answerable. If you elected a Labour government that introduced exchange controls, planned trade with a view to getting back to full employment, and intervened massively in basic industries, it would be illegal under British law. Any British company that suffered as a result of those measures could take the Government to a British court and get it ruled illegal. Some new Lord Denning

would do to an elected Labour Government what Denning himself did to Ken Livingstone. This theory that it's all settled and all over is like saying that capitalism is here to stay, let's drop our opposition to it and live with it.

If you say, on the contrary, that our objection is not to European unity, not to cooperating with the working class movements in Europe, not to moving to a European nuclear free zone — then I agree with you. But the Treaty of Rome is the only constitution in the world that legally commits the countries that are signatories to it to capitalist solutions. And that is not acceptable.

The Treaty of Rome is hostile to the interests of French and German and Italian and Benelux and Irish and Danish working class movements. You cannot build socialism by using the institutions of international capitalism. That's all we're saying.

If you present the European argument that way, then there is a total break with the old Powellite view.

So I don't think that this idea that now we've lost we should drop withdrawal from the EEC is valid. I might put this point to those who say that: did they ever believe in it? If we had won the election, wouldn't they be now saying we couldn't do it?

The main proponents of dropping the socialist approach to Europe, which includes a break with the Treaty of Rome, are those who have never supported it anyway. Maybe that's your view...

MT: Yes!

TB: Well, I think you were wrong then, and you are wrong now.

MT: The argument is not like accepting capitalism. It's like accepting that capitalism has developed to the stage of monopolies and multinationals. Our answer is not to take it back to the small, nationally-based firms...

TB: This is a weak analysis. We're talking about a constitution. You appear to be saying that it is right that the British electorate should lose the right by their vote to determine their economic and industrial policy. You're not reversing the entry to the Common Market, you're reversing the Chartists and the suffragettes.

That argument is an attack on the whole democratic tradition of the Labour Party.

Then if you ask how you fight multinational capitalism — that's been there for ages. After all, in a sense the old trading companies like the British Virginia Company and the East India Company were multinationals. The whole history of the working class movement has been to get some control over how we respond to this.

It isn't that anybody believes that by leaving the Common Market capitalism would go back to corner shops and middle-sized businesses. It's a question of how you fight multinational capitalism.

When I dealt with the oil companies, at one stage I rather thought the same thing, I must confess: that because big business had gone international, we should go international, and the Common Market was an example of it. But I very quickly realised as Energy Minister that what we were able to do to the oil companies here — which was to bring them into partial public ownership and get half the oil — was completely dismantled as

As the Left reconsiders its traditional 'Britain out' view on the EEC, Tony Benn discussed the issue with Martin Thomas of Socialist Organiser.

We also print excerpts from an article by Leon Trotsky, written during World War 1.

soon as you went into the EEC.

The oil companies were passionately pro-EEC. Every multinational in the world is in favour of the Common Market, because they see what I see, namely that through the Common Market you can dismantle the domestic democracies of the member states. So be very careful that you don't accidentally line yourselves up with Ford and IBM and Westinghouse and Exxon.

MT: Would you be in favour of the EEC Parliament acquiring the powers to remake the Treaty of Rome, to decree such measures as a 35 hour week throughout the EEC, or to take multinationals into public ownership on an EEC level?

TB: No, I would not. That is a very faulty socialist analysis, because no socialist believes that these things are done by parliaments anyway. I don't believe that: I've always believed that pressure for social change begins at the bottom, and the last place to get the message is the House of Commons.

The idea that you can just leave it to a few Euro-MPs, who are really nothing more than a public relations cover for the exercise of bureaucratic power, to take over capitalism, is really very naive.

MT: Why are measures of public ownership, or other reforms, carried out by an EEC Parliament, less valid than those carried out by a British Parliament?

TB: Nationalisation is quite permitted in the Common Market — subject to one condition, that the nationalised firms have to operate exactly like private corporations. The idea of public ownership on a European scale, operating under the Treaty of Rome, would mean Euro state capitalism, nothing to do with socialism at all. The Common Market will not permit interference with market forces.

I'm not in favour of a federal Europe anyway. I think if anything the problem at the moment is that power is far too remote from most people.

A lot of people now are with-

**VIVE
L'EUROPE
OUVRIERE
SANS
PATRIES
NI
FRONTIERES**



Above: French revolutionaries' poster for the last European Assembly elections: 'Long live Workers' Europe without fatherlands or frontiers'. Below: the capitalist alternative to European unity — devastation in the German city of Aachen, 1945.



Trotsky on a United Europe

TO bourgeois politics the destruction of "internal" European customs houses is an insurmountable difficulty; but without this the inter-state courts of arbitration and international law codes will have no firmer duration than, for instance, Belgian neutrality. The urge toward unifying the European market which, like the effort towards the acquisition of non-European backward lands, is caused by the development of capitalism, runs up against the powerful opposition of the landed and capitalist classes, in whose hands the tariff apparatus joined with that of militarism (without which the former means nothing) constitutes an indispensable weapon for exploitation and enrichment.

Militarism

The present war speaks eloquently enough on this score. Lastly, the disharmony and irreconcilability of capitalist interests between the Allies themselves is still more visible than in the Central States.

Under these circumstances, a halfway complete and consistent economic unification of Europe coming from the top by means of an agreement of the capitalist governments is sheer utopia.

Here, the matter can go no further than partial compromises and half-measures. Hence it is that the economic unification of Europe, which offers colossal advantages to producer and consumer alike, in general to the whole cultural development, becomes the revolutionary task of the European proletariat in its struggle against imperialist protectionism and its instrument — militarism.

The United States of Europe — without monarchies, standing armies and secret diplomacy — is therefore the most important integral part of the proletarian peace programme.

Excerpts from 'The Peace Programme, 1915. Breaks in the text have not been indicated.

The ideologists and politicians of German imperialism frequently came forward, especially at the beginning of the war, with their programme of a European or at least a Central European "United States" (without France and England on the one side and Russia on the other). The programme of a violent unification of Europe is just as characteristic of the tendencies of German imperialism as is the tendency of French imperialism whose programme is the forcible dismemberment of Germany.

If the German armies achieved the decisive victory reckoned upon in Germany during the first phase of the war, then German imperialism would have doubtless made the gigantic attempt of realising a compulsory military-tariff union of European states, which would be constructed completely of exemptions, compromises, etc., which would reduce to a minimum the progressive meaning of the unifications of the European market. Needless to say, under such circumstances no talk would be possible of an autonomy of the nations thus forcibly joined together as the caricature of the European United States. Certain opponents of the programme of the United States of Europe have used precisely this perspective as an argument that this idea can, under certain conditions, acquire a "reactionary" monarchist-imperialist content.

Yet it is precisely this perspective that provides the most graphic testimony in favour of the revolutionary viability of the slogan of the United States of Europe. Let us for a moment grant that German militarism succeeds in actually carrying out

the compulsory half-union of Europe, just as Prussian militarism once achieved the half-union of Germany, what then would be the central slogan of the European proletariat?

Would it be the dissolution of the forced European coalition and the return of all peoples under the roof of isolated national states? Or the restoration of "autonomous" tariffs, "national" currencies, "national" social legislation, and so forth? Certainly not. The programme of the European revolutionary movement would then be: The destruction of the compulsory, anti-democratic form of the coalition with the preservation and furtherance of its foundations, in the form of complete annihilation of tariff barriers, the unification of legislation, above all of labour laws, etc. In other words, the slogan of the United States of Europe — without monarchies and standing armies — would under the indicated circumstances become the unifying and guiding slogan of the European revolution.

Possibility

Let us assume the second possibility, namely, an "undecided" issue of the war. At the very beginning of the war the well-known professor Liszt, an advocate of "United Europe",

argued that should the Germans fail to conquer their opponents, the European unification would nevertheless be accomplished, and in Liszt's opinion it would be even more complete than in the case of a German victory.

Obstacles

By the ever growing need of expansion, the European states, hostile to one another but unable to cope with one another, would continue to hinder each other in the execution of their "mission" in the Near East, Africa and Asia, and they would everywhere be forced back by the United States of North America and by Japan. Precisely in case of a stalemate in the war, in Liszt's opinion, the indispensability of an economic and military agreement among the European great powers would come to the fore against their own working masses. We pointed out above, the colossal obstacles that lie in the way of realising this programme.

Even a partial overcoming of these obstacles would mean the establishment of an imperialist trust of European States, a predatory share-holding association.

And this perspective is on occasion adduced unjustifiably as proof of the "danger" of the slogan of the United States

"If the capitalist states of Europe succeeded in merging into an imperialist trust... the proletariat would have to fight for not the return to 'autonomous' national states, but for the conversion of the imperialist state trust into a European Republican Federation."

"The programme of the European revolutionary movement would be: the destruction of the compulsory, anti-democratic form of the coalition with the preservation and furtherance of its foundations..."



**US hands
off El
Salvador!**

El Salvador Solidarity Campaign: c/o 29 Islington Park Street, London N1.

Brussels the EEC

drawing from interest in the British Parliament, which is potentially very dangerous. The extent of withdrawal from, or non-interest in, any belief that Brussels could do it, would be even greater.

People would be driven into desperation or apathy or protest, but they wouldn't be able to use the mechanism which is open to them now of dismissing a government.

A full federal Western Europe, under the Treaty of Rome, with its own army, its own currency, its own acts of nationalisation, in terms of socialist aspirations and achievements, would be a hundred years behind the United States, where capitalism on a similar scale has failed. So why should it work any more on a European scale?

MT: You seem, then, to think that the European Commission would present an unstoppable obstacle to socialist measures on an EEC scale. The EEC Commission

has a bureaucracy about the size of one department of the British civil service. Yet you have argued that socialist measures in Britain are possible despite the conservative nature of the civil service...

TB: The bureaucracy in Brussels is at a very high level. I'll give you a few examples.

When I was Energy Minister, we had a scheme which Ted Heath had introduced, under which in order to encourage jobs in Scotland Scottish firms were able to borrow money at 3% below the going rate provided that they were building for the North Sea equipment business — because all the oil companies were buying every hammer and chisel back in Texas.

I was called up before three Commissioners, and told it was illegal. In the end they took me to court. They took me to court on polling day, 1979, and the scheme has been dropped.

Another example: I was called

up before Guido Brunner, the Energy Commissioner, who said it was illegal for us to insist that all the oil from the North Sea be landed in Britain, because the North Sea is an Euro-asset.

Similarly on nuclear matters: we are signatories of the International Atomic Energy Authority safeguards. But Euratom has a rule that all nuclear material must circulate freely within the Community. So we would buy Canadian uranium under safeguards, and under Euratom we found that the French, who weren't signatories to the non-proliferation treaty, were entitled to have it.

These are not based upon some theoretical nationalist concept. They're based on the hard facts of the situation.

The Commission could consist of as little as half a dozen people, though actually it's much bigger than you make out — but it has the power under the Treaty to enforce policies that would lead a

Labour government in Britain to dismantle its defences and its development of our own economy.

MT: Why then is it not possible for socialists and trade unionists to get together on a European scale, to say that we want a united Europe too but a socialist Europe, and to fight to get powers for the European Parliament that it can instruct the EEC Commission, change legal provisions, etc.?

I don't think fighting through the EEC Parliament would work in the end, any more than I think that a parliamentary road to socialism is possible in Britain, but I don't see why we're any less likely to get victories on a EEC scale than in Britain.

TB: It is open to the British people if they choose to do so, at the next election whenever it comes, to defeat Mrs Thatcher and put in power a parliamentary majority that could alter legislation and benefit our people. But the Treaty of Rome would prevent it.

And it's the British courts, not the European Court — because actually the EEC Commission are very realistic people, they don't want to have a punch-up with Britain, and the European Court would adjust its judgments. The British courts would be used by Capital to offset the result of the election.

Theoretically the world could go socialist. Let's wait for that, let's wait until we have it all... that's a sort of millennial dream. You have to struggle where you are, to see that your weapons of advance, which are free trade unions and the ballot box, aren't taken from you.

MT: I would agree that a socialist government in Britain should not let itself be restricted by the Treaty of Rome. But that's not the situation we face at the moment.

TB: Every country has to develop in its own way. Socialism must be about people finding their own way forward.

To suppose that out of a crisis in capitalism, expressed in a Common Market that is now

In France, in Germany, in Britain, throughout Europe, workers have fought for a 35 hour week. The trade union leaders pay lip service to the idea of a European-coordinated struggle for it. We should hold them to their word



outdated by events, you could produce a living federation, is just an illusion.

It may be a dream of those who think like Trotsky that a Socialist United States of Europe would be a good thing. But a socialist world would be a good thing. And we are here and now fighting very hard battles to defend our people. To the extent that we float above them with some great new theory that if only Brussels had elected MPs we'd all be prepared to accept it, is very false.

It might trigger off some of the most destructive anti-socialist nationalism. You could have the right-wing Scottish Nationalists, who are very hostile to an interventionist economy, emerge as an

answer to your dream of a Socialist United States of Europe — even assuming a United States of Europe was socialist, and it does not follow at all that it would be. With the crisis of capitalism in the '80s as in the '30s it could swing the other way and you could have a very authoritarian right-wing federation of Europe within which we were locked even if we had a Labour government in Britain.

I think this is a dream of a dangerous kind, because it is not founded on a proper socialist or Marxist analysis. It isn't reflected in the hearts and minds of the people who would have to make it work, and it hasn't got much to do with the immediate problems that we have got to tackle.



A common workers' cause in Europe: the fight against unemployment. Trade unionists demonstrate in West Germany.

of Europe, whereas in reality this is the most graphic proof of its realistic and revolutionary significance. If the capitalist states of Europe succeeded in merging into an imperialist trust, this would be a step forward as compared with the existing situation, for it would first of all create a unified, all-European material base for the working class movement. The proletariat would in this case have to fight not for the return to "autonomous" national states, but for the conversion of the imperialist state trust into a European Republican Federation.

However, the further the war progresses and reveals the absolute incapacity of militarism to cope with the questions brought forward by the war, the less is spoken about these great plans for the uniting of Europe at the top. The plan of the imperialist "United States of Europe" has given way to the plans, on the one side, of an economic union of Austria-Germany and on the other side of the quadruple alliance with its tariffs and duties supplemented with militarism directed against one another. After the going it is needless to say on the great importance

which, in the execution of these plans, the policy of the proletariat of both state "trusts" will assume in fighting against the established tariff and military-diplomatic fortifications and for the economic union of Europe.

Epoch

The United States of Europe is the slogan of the revolutionary epoch into which we have entered. Whatever turn the war operations may take later on, whatever balance sheet diplomacy may draw out of the present war, and at whatever tempo the revolutionary movement will progress in the near future, the slogan of the United States of Europe will in all cases retain a colossal meaning as the political formula of the struggle of the European proletariat for power.

In this programme is expressed the fact that the national state has outlived itself — as a framework for the development of the productive forces, as a basis for the class struggle, and thereby also as a state form of proletarian dictatorship. Our denial of "national defence", as an outlived political programme for the

proletariat, ceases to be a purely negative act of ideological-political self-defence, and acquires all its revolutionary content only in the event that over against the conservative defence of the antiquated national fatherland we place the progressive task, namely the creation of a new, higher "fatherland" of the revolution, of republican Europe, whence the proletariat alone will be enabled to revolutionise and to reorganise the whole world.

Herein, incidentally, lies the answer to those who ask dogmatically: "Why the unification of Europe and not of the whole world?" Europe is not only a geographic term, but a certain economic and cultural-historical community. The European revolution does not have to wait for the revolutions in Asia and Africa nor even in Australia and America. And yet a completely victorious revolution in Russia or England is unthinkable without a revolution in Germany and vice versa.

The present war is called a world war, but even after the intervention of the United States it is Europe that is the arena of war. And the revolutionary problems confront first of all the European proletariat...

The obstacles to socialism

by Martin Thomas

IN THIS interview Tony Benn pinpoints for the first time exactly how the EEC would be an obstacle to a left government in Britain.

"The EEC Commission are very realistic people, they don't want to have a punch-up with Britain, and the European Court would adjust its judgements. The British courts would be used by Capital..." (emphasis added).

In terms of real social forces, the problem would be the British courts, not anything in Brussels. EEC law would simply be one possible pretext for the bitterly Tory British judiciary to obstruct radical change.

It could have plenty of British-born-and-bred pretexts. "After all, the British constitution requires the Queen's say-so for every law. She is hardly likely to give her approval to socialist measures, and there is no constitutional way of removing the Queen's power unless she agrees to it."

The real problem does not lie with the pretext. The ultimate defence of capitalist power is not this or that law, written on a bit of paper, saying 'socialism is illegal', but the material force of the capitalist state: courts, police, prisons, bureaucracy, armed forces...

The main enemy, as the old revolutionary slogan said, is at home. The main obstacle for us is the repressive power and the

ideological power of the British state.

The policy of 'Britain out' is misleading — directing our energies against a subsidiary obstacle (Brussels) and missing the real enemy.

Tony Benn disagrees. He argues that if Britain remains in the EEC, "the British electorate (will) lose the right by their vote to determine their economic and industrial policy... (it's) reversing the Chartists' and the suffragettes."

He is right that the EEC is undemocratic. The EEC Commission is not controlled by the European Assembly even to the extent that the Whitehall bureaucracy is controlled by Westminster.

Why not respond to that by fighting for the European Assembly to have more power? Tony Benn replies that this notion of a parliamentary-democratic EEC is a "dream", an "illusion", a "great new theory" floating above the battles here and now. We should instead focus on defending what parliamentary democracy we have in Britain.

But why is winning something on an EEC scale more remote and unrealistic than winning it within Britain? If a struggle is broadened to the EEC scale, the enemy becomes a broader one — the allied capitalist classes of

the EEC, rather than just the British capitalists. But the forces that can be mobilised on our side are also broadened — from the British working class to the EEC working class.

Winning radical demands on an EEC scale is a "dream" only so long as real EEC-wide workers' unity is a dream.

We are in fact a long way off from effective EEC-wide workers' unity. But remedying that failure is not optional.

So long as capitalism continues to exist, it will create international connections and strategies. It is a world system, not a series of national economies loosely tied together. Socialists have to recognise this, and develop working class internationalism to match. Trying to turn the clock back is no answer.

Tony Benn is quite right to indict the EEC as anti-socialist. The question is, how to fight it.

'Britain out' is no answer. It would not touch the essential obstacles to radical change. It would not stop international capitalist coordination, only change its form.

Inevitably, despite the best intentions of some of its supporters, the 'Britain out' policy means the labour movement slewing away from the path of class struggle, towards a nationalist path. Class struggle, and maximum international coordination of that class struggle, is the surer answer.



Photo: Half Moon

Left to right: Ken Morley, Stephen Tiller, and Bill Thomas in "The Ragged Trousered Philanthropists", a play adapted by Stephen Lowe from Robert Tressell's novel. At the Half Moon Theatre, 213 Mile End Road, London E1. (01-790 4000).

The Great Money Trick

How Robert Tressell explains exploitation

Owen, playing the part of the capitalist, starts with three pieces of bread, representing raw materials; three knives, representing machinery and equipment; and three coins representing money capital.

Three workmates play the part of the workers. They start with nothing. The 'capitalist' offers them work at a wage of one coin. The workers set to it. The job is to cut one piece of bread into three pieces. At the end the capitalist has nine pieces of bread, representing inputs for the next round of production and consumer goods.

The workers want food and clothing, the capitalist is willing to sell them. The price is one coin for one piece of bread. The coins return to the capitalist.

The capitalist himself consumes two pieces of bread. So at the end of the cycle the capitalist has four pieces of bread left, plus three coins. The workers still have... nothing.

The cycle repeats itself. Next time the capitalist ends up with five pieces of bread and three coins, and the workers once

again with nothing.

So it goes on. At each stage there is 'fair exchange' — but the capitalist gets richer and richer, the workers remain as poor as they started.

Then Owen, the 'capitalist', suddenly lays the workers off. The workers complain. The capitalist explains that he can't employ them because his warehouses are glutted.

The workers beg for charity. The capitalist gives them a coin, and promptly recoups it by selling goods from his stock. The workers applaud the capitalist's generosity — but at the end of it they are still equally poor, the capitalist is still rich.

The workers organise an unemployed protest. Owen calls in another workmate to play the part of the policeman, who chases the workers away and receives a bribe from the capitalist in return.

The policeman is, after all, only defending Liberty, Equality, Justice, Property — the right of every citizen to protection and free disposal of his property...

Ireland made too easy

Martin Thomas reviews 'Ireland for Beginners', main text and illustrations by Phil Evans, additional text by Eileen Pollock. Writers and Readers, £2.95.

of the very different social content at different times of Irish nationalism and of Protestant Loyalism.

The criticism made of the Republican tradition lacks historical sense. All military actions — from those which, whatever their political advisability, are certainly legitimate acts of war against British occupation, through to indefensible pub bombings — are deplored as terrorist, and exactly the same criticisms as for today are made of the armed uprising led by Robert Emmet in 1803. (In the name of what alternative is Emmet criticised? Working class mass action? There was no cohesive working class.)

A sense of social and economic change is equally lacking from the account given of British ruling-class policy towards Ireland. Why did the Liberal Party — at the time the main representative of the industrial bourgeoisie — push Home Rule for Ireland from the 1880s through to World War 1? No explanation is offered.

No mention is made of the British ruling-class policy of pacifying the Irish countryside by a state-organised buy-out of the landlords in the late 19th and early 20th century, nor of the attempts by the British bourgeoisie in the '60s to edge towards reunification of Ireland.

Britain's continued presence in Ireland is explained far too crudely in terms of the profitability of investment in Northern Ireland. Don't the overhead expenses far exceed the profits? Phil Evans concedes that they do — but then shifts to the idea that the purpose of the military presence is to protect British investments in the South.

This is nonsense. Straight economic domination, without any direct political intervention, is quite adequate

for British capital in Ireland — just as it is adequate for the US capitalists who are now the biggest investors in the 26 Counties. The problem is that in the meantime the British ruling class is committed to beating down the Northern Ireland Catholics as a precondition for the desired cold, controlled remodelling from above.

The book could not reasonably be expected to give a complete perspective for Protestant/Catholic working class reconciliation. It can, however, be criticised for vastly oversimplifying the problem through its lack of grip on social and economic change.

Evans ends with an assertion of faith in the possibility of unity. 'It has been done before' — by Wolfe Tone. Yes, except that Tone's Ireland was socially and economically worlds apart from the island today.

'The 26 Counties is non-sectarian', Phil Evans states — oddly, in view of the fact that just some 60 pages earlier he has pointed out its sectarian features. This sugary avoidance of unpleasant facts is all too common on the left, and probably is part of the reason why we have not been able to convince more people about our basic argument for Irish freedom.

In 1970 the Irish socialist Michael Farrell wrote, in a pamphlet published by the SWP (then IS): 'The one million Protestants in the North are not like their co-religionists in the South in 1922... The Northern Protestants are overwhelmingly working class. Though they have little enough in the North, they stand to lose even that in the South... They fear that history may bring its own retribution and the discrimination used against the Catholics in the North might be used against them in a united Ireland'.

An attempt to impose 'a Green, Tory, united, Ireland'

stration, the boss-serving idea that masters and men should 'pull together' keeps its grip on the men and paralyses them.

The hounding, spying and intimidation of the work foreman Hunter helps grind the men down into submission. They submit even to arbitrary cuts in wages which are already at starvation levels.

As a simple illustration of the need for solidarity and organisation at work, Tressell's work is remarkably pertinent today in Margaret Thatcher's Britain. As a clear view of class politics and capitalist ideology it serves as a fine starting point for a budding Marxist analysis of society.

For those sensitive to its contemporary importance it is chilling. For all, it is very enjoyable and witty. As a play it is remarkably well performed using the maximum effect from paint, brushes, catwalks, ladders, trestles and tables.

A must for trade unionists and political activists and a very good evening out.

would, Farrell argued, lead to no better than 'a communal bloodbath' and 'the desolation of the North'. The problem could only be solved by 'an organisation of genuine socialists fighting Green Tory gommeen men in the 26 Counties as vigorously as the Orange Tories in the North'.

By 1976 he was writing that 'the 26 county state has been fairly free of anti-Protestant discrimination' and 'There would be no basis for sustained Unionist resistance to a United Ireland' (i.e. even a Green Tory united Ireland).

What had changed? Had the prejudices of the Protestants proved less powerful? Or the 26 County state more enlightened? Far from it.

Farrell had shifted (rightly) from a focus on civil rights within the Northern state plus general socialism to a realisation that the fundamental 'civil right' in question is the right of the Irish people as a whole to self-determination; but then he had modified his perception of the facts to fit more comfortably with the conclusions. From illusions in the possibility of ignoring the Border, to illusions about the possibility of reconciling the Protestant workers with Green Catholic nationalism...


There ought to be a good market for a book on 'Ireland without illusions'.

Advertisement

Workers Socialist Review

Special issue on the struggle in the unions: also contains articles on workers' politics and national liberation, and the Stalinist state 'unions'

70p (plus 16p p&p) from WSL, PO Box 135, London N1 0DD



BUNUEL

AS a tribute to the great surrealist director Luis Bunuel, who died recently, BBC 2 is showing a selection of his films. Friday 19th, The Young and the Damned. Friday 26th, The Republic of Sin. Both at 9.25 p.m.

What Japanese productivity means for Japanese workers

SATOSHI KAMATA worked for Toyota as a seasonal worker in an assembly plant in Toyota City for six months in the second half of 1972.

His journey to begin work at the plant was the same as my own when I visited a Toyota Assembly Plant in Toyota City last year — by superexpress from Tokyo past Mount Fuji to Nagoya. However, while I travelled the 20 miles from Nagoya to Toyota City on the modern subway system which serves Nagoya and the surrounding district, Kamata entered the Toyota world straight off the superexpress. He describes the journey and his arrival at Toyota this way:

"Finally a big bus with a Toyota logo painted on it arrives. Once inside, we keep silent, even after the bus starts moving. We feel awkward. We drive through downtown Nagoya and then up and down hills surrounded by rice fields."

"When big factory building and company-owned houses appear, we know we are almost there. Finally the bus stops in front of a four storey concrete building behind a chain link fence. It is already dark. On the building is a sign which says 'Sacred Heart and Pleasant Breeze Dormitory'. This seems to be our new home. No building less suits its name; it looks more like a prison camp. There's even a guard house at the gate... a guard yells at Kudo (who had become his friend since they met at the interview in Tokyo) for smoking a cigarette."

Kamata is not a worker and did not go to Toyota because he needed a job. He is a left wing journalist who went there in order to write about it. Whilst he is a socialist he was in no way a militant while at Toyota, in fact managers regarded him as a model worker and tried to persuade him to stay on at the end of his contract.

He writes from a pro-worker and more or less class standpoint. He sets out to show the 'inhumanity of it all' and views things mainly from the effects of Toyota on the individual. His daily diary — of which the bulk of the book comprises — nevertheless does it very well:

"Thursday September 14. Like yesterday, the orientation starts at 8.30. Today we learn the important rules:

- 1) Don't divulge secrets learned during work.
- 2) Try hard to increase efficiency and productivity.
- 3) Follow instructions con-



Japanese workers demonstrate for import controls. But it is not 'national character' that has enabled Japanese bosses to get such high rates of exploitation.

Satoshi Kamata is a leading freelance journalist in Japan and the author of numerous books. Japan in the Passing Lane is his first book to appear in English. It is here reviewed by Alan Thornett.

cerning your duties.

Conditions of discharge.

- 1) If the employee is no longer needed.
- 2) If the employee has physical problems.
- 3) If the employee is absent from work for more than 20 days because of an accident outside his work.
- 4) If the employee is absent for more than 15 days for personal reasons.
- 5) If the employee is absent for more than four days straight without reporting.

Monday September 18. (His first day on the production line). Almost as soon as I begin, I am dripping with sweat. Somehow, I learn the order of the work motions, but I am totally unable to keep up with the speed of the line. My work gloves make it difficult to grab as many of the tiny bolts I need, and how many precious seconds do I waste doing just that? I do my best, but I can barely finish one gear box in three within the fixed length of time. I'm thirsty as hell, but workers can neither smoke nor drink water. Going to the toilet is out of the question. Who could have invented a system like this?

Friday September 22 (His first day without help). I've survived another day. It's 1.30 am. I just got a real shock when I saw my face in the mirror. Dry skin and dull, blood-shot eyes — it looked inhuman, the face of a loser who pities himself and secretly hates himself for doing so. Something in me is breaking."

I'm tired. I don't believe anybody could be more tired. Is this what "labour intensive" means? I never imagined there was labour so "intense" that you couldn't even rest for one second. What kind of labour is this? Toyota has designed this job so that a worker can only keep up with the line by always exerting the utmost effort at top speed... it's as if you are tied to the conveyor, exhausted and gasping for breath.

Sunday October 1.

I've been working for two weeks now. When I come back from work, I do nothing but sleep. I try not to think about the job; even then thought of it is enough to make me feel sick. I still fall behind at work. As soon as I push the alarm button my team chief runs up to me and asks in a disgusted tone, 'Haven't you learned yet?'

Thursday October 3. I'm so worn out I feel numb all over. As soon as I return to the dorm I spread out my bedding, lie down, read a newspaper, but I can't stop myself from falling asleep. I wake up an hour later and go to the bath where I massage my wrists and fingers.

Thursday 12. I've survived another day. It's 1.30 am. I just got a real shock when I saw my face in the mirror. Dry skin and dull, blood-shot eyes — it looked inhuman, the face of a loser who pities himself and secretly hates himself for doing so. Something in me is breaking."

Kamata brings out the harsh realities of the working conditions very well. The necessity to work before the shift and during break time, unwrapping or preparing components in order to keep up. A system which has no relief workers at all, even for sickness. Where managers study the bio-rhythm of the workers and use it to explain, and blame the workers for accidents. Where living conditions are such that supervisors have access to private apartments and workers are disciplined if they are caught with a girlfriend in their dormitory (there are no women production workers, of course).

The realities of capitalist exploitation Kamata describes are very well done. But if they are to be taken as any kind of precisely valid yardstick to compare current Japanese levels of exploitation to European or American levels they have to be seen in context.

Vehicle production throughout the capitalist world is a ruthless operation. The fact that BL sat out a 4½ week strike recently over 3 minutes washing up time says it all. A journalist going onto a track in Cowley would find it a traumatic and "inhuman" experience — as indeed it is.

Kamata's account, however, is completely valid in general terms. There is a substantial difference in work effort to which I can testify. I judged the work effort I was able to observe as well in excess of 50% more than British standards.

Damage

One very good description of the working conditions he gives is of the conditions of a friend he visited in another part of the plant. It reminded me of the appallingly damaging conditions and incredible work effort I witnessed in the engine plant I visited:

"Kudo races around inside his small work space, joining a driving shaft, turning it in the balancing machine, welding on small metal pieces to correct its weight, marking it, putting on oil and paint, lifting it and hanging it on the trolley conveyor. The last time I visited him he looked at me and happily explained his work. He also had time to introduce me to the worker next to him."

Today he is moving things twice as fast as before and can't stop running. I try to lift a shaft and can barely do it with both hands. Kudo, shorter than I, has to lift it higher than his eyes to hang it on the conveyor. Nine hundred shafts a day. I don't feel right to talk to him, and it doesn't seem polite to watch him work, so I leave. Without exaggeration I must say he is doing the work of three people. I have never seen such quick motions. Kudo will come back after eight tomorrow morning, exhausted and pale, and will fall on an unmade bed without tak-

ing a bath. It's not surprising that he does nothing but sleep on Saturdays and Sundays."

The insight Kamata gives us into these conditions is very important. There is however another very important issue, and that is how do Japanese employers achieve these levels of exploitation? On this crucial question Kamata tells us little. He does however pose the problem.

"Why does everyone work at this goddamn job without complaining? Incredibly, thirty minutes before the second shift, everyone is always ready. They change clothes unhurriedly, begin preparing the parts they'll use in their work, and five minutes before their own shift they're already working with the guys on the other shift. They're so docile and undoubting that I could almost cry."

"They're so quiet and look so beaten. Hardly a single one exhibits a striking personality or even a defiant look."

That Kamata attempts no explanation of this leaves his account begging the main question. It is also not a complete account. He makes no mention, for example, of the numerically small but strong and determined group of militants who struggle in Toyota under very difficult conditions. I have met militants who were active in Toyota in that period.

More important he says nothing of the trade unions — except to observe from time to time that they are useless. The

problem is that is not the point about unions in the Japanese car industry. The point is that they are yellow. They are employer-created unions, incorporated into the company structures. In Toyota they are so controlled by management that Toyota can switch their personnel at will from management jobs to union jobs as part of their careers structure.

It is the combination of this and the success of Japanese capitalism itself and the success of other techniques of the Japanese employers like QC circles (or 'worker participation') which has created these conditions in the Japanese working class.

There is an explanation in the book of how these levels of exploitation are achieved, but not a very useful one. That is given in a lengthy contemporary foreword by Ronald Dore of the Technical Change Centre, London.

He puts a right-wing line which decries Kamata's pro-worker approach and supports fully Japanese management techniques — although possibly with some of the rough edges smoothed off.

He of course sees submissiveness as a good thing, although probably not achievable to that degree amongst Western workers. He sees it of course in sociological terms, as the product of a submissive Japanese character. This is the usual simplistic approach which misses everything.

From this you would think that Japanese workers had always been "submissive". You wouldn't know of the militant, near revolutionary period of the Japanese workers in the immediate post-war period, when powerful independent unions were built.

You wouldn't know that the Japanese employers had to smash these unions and replace them with yellow unions before they could establish the conditions which exist today. You wouldn't know of the Toyota strike in 1950 — although Kamata does mention it.

Despite all this Kamata's book is important. It is published at a time when Japanese management techniques have become a major issue for the trade unions wherever cars are produced.

All manufacturers have their sights firmly set on Japan — like the Ford UK AJ (After Japan) plan. The more workers facing such attacks know about the realities of Japanese methods the better and Kamata's book (although limited and dated as far as techniques are concerned) makes a contribution to that.




To join or affiliate, write to Chris Richardson, 21 Devonshire Promenade, Lenton, Nottingham NG7 2DS. £5 for individuals, or for affiliated organisations, per 1000 members. £2 for low-waged individuals. £1 for unwaged. Add 50p if you want the special issue of Gay Socialist.

BOOKS

Critique of the Gotha Programme, 30p; Wages, price and profit, 40p; Communist Manifesto 60p; Capital volume 1 £3.95. Available c/o Socialist Organiser, 28 Middle Lane, London N8: add money for postage.

by MARX



Socialist ORGANISER

Where we stand

*Organise the left to beat back the Tories' attacks! No to attacks on union rights; defend the picket line; no state interference in our unions! No to any wage curbs. Labour must support all struggles for better living standards and conditions.

*Wage rises should at the very least keep up with price increases. For a price index calculated by working class organisations, as the basis for clauses in all wage agreements to provide automatic monthly rises in line with the true cost of living for the working class. The same inflation-proofing should apply to state benefits, grants and pensions.

*Fight for improvements in the social services, and against cuts. Protection for those services against inflation by automatic inflation-proofing of expenditure. For occupations and supporting strike action to defend jobs and services.

*End unemployment. Cut hours, not jobs. Fight for a 35 hour week and an end to overtime. Demand work-sharing without loss of pay. Organise the unemployed — campaign for a programme of useful public works to create new jobs for the unemployed.

*Defend all jobs! Open the books of those firms that threaten closure or redundancies, along with those of their suppliers and bankers, to elected trade union committees. For occupation and blacking action to halt the closures. For nationalisation without compensation under workers' management.

*Make the bosses pay, not the working class. Millions for hospitals, not a penny for 'defence'! Nationalise the banks and financial institutions, without compensation. End the interest burden on council housing and other public services.

*Freeze rent and rates. *Scrap all immigration controls. Race is not a problem: racism is. The labour movement must mobilise to drive the fascists off the streets. Purge racists from positions in the labour movement. Organise full support for black self-defence. Build workers' defence squads.

*The capitalist police are an enemy for the working class. Support all demands to weaken them as a bosses' striking force: dissolution of special squads (SPG, Special Branch, MI5, etc), public accountability, etc.

*Free abortion on demand. Women's equal right to work and full equality for women. Defend and extend free state nursery and childcare provision.

*Against attacks on gays by the state: abolish all laws which discriminate against lesbians and gay men; for the right of the gay community to organise and affirm their stand publicly.

*The Irish people — as a whole — should have the right to determine their own future. Get the British troops out now! Repeal the Prevention of Terrorism Act. Political status for Irish Republican prisoners as a matter of urgency.

*The black working people of South Africa should get full support from the British labour movement for their strikes, struggles and armed combat against the white supremacist regime. South African goods and services should be blacked.

*It is essential to achieve the fullest democracy in the labour movement. Automatic reselection of MPs during each Parliament and the election by annual conference of party leaders. Annual election of all trade union officials, who should be paid the average for the trade.

*The chaos, waste, human suffering and misery of capitalism now — in Britain and throughout the world — show the urgent need to establish rational, democratic, human control over the economy, to make the decisive sectors of industry social property, under workers' control. The strength of the labour movement lies in the rank and file. Our perspective must be working class action to raze the capitalist system down to its foundations, and to put a working class socialist alternative in its place — rather than having our representatives run the system and waiting for crumbs from the tables of the capitalists and bosses.

Agenda

Binlids and Barricades. A 75-panel exhibition on women and the war in Ireland, produced by the Armagh Co-ordinating Committee. Available for hire from the Armagh Cmttee., 374, Grays Inn Rd., London WC1.

Leggin' it for peace East London Youth CND March, 17/18 September, from Kelvedon Hatch Civil Defence HQ to London Fields, Hackney. For details contact E. London YCND, 39, Albion Road, London E17.

THE Polish Solidarity Committee [Glasgow]:

working conference in Glasgow 17/18 September. Proposed sessions include: 'Democratic forms of social organisation in Czechoslovakia 1968 and Poland 1980-1'; 'The peace movements in Eastern Europe'; and 'Developing solidarity with the people of Eastern Europe'.

Contact Gordon Morgan as soon as possible at: 59, Durward Avenue, Glasgow G41 [041-649 8958]

OXFORD Claimants Defence Committee one day conference Saturday September 3rd at East Oxford Community

Centre, Princes St., Oxford. Discuss the 'Operation Major' [Sept. 82] ruthless police & DHSS swoop on homeless & unemployed and subsequent events. Fee only £1.50, less unwaged. Contact CDC, c/o 44b, Princes St., Oxford.

BANGLADESHI Divided Families Campaign: Britain's racist and sexist laws keep more than 11,000 people apart. Demonstrate Saturday September 3, 2pm from Mancunian Way, Oxford Road, Manchester.

ANNIVERSARY of Solidarnosc: demonstration organised jointly by the Solidarnosc TU Working Group, the Charter 77 club, and others. Wednesday August 31, assemble 6pm at Speakers' Corner, Hyde Park, London.

Amendments

Where it is still possible, Socialist Organiser urges our readers and supporters to submit the following amendments to resolutions for the 1983 Labour Party conference.

Amendment to resolution no.109 from Wallasey: Add at end, 'Conference therefore resolves that no individual member of the Party should be liable to expulsion provided that s/he accepts the Party's objects as defined by Clause IV and provided that s/he does not stand or campaign against the Party's candidate in a public election'.

Amendment to Resolution no.125 from Bow and Poplar, or to no.124 from Greenwich: After 'opinion' (end of first sentence), in-

sert new second sentence, 'Conference respects our basic freedoms of thought, speech and association'.

Amendment to Resolution no.19 from Wantage CLP: Add at end, 'Conference further believes that such a policy, in clear defence of working class rights and interests, is an essential ingredient in building support and membership for the Party. It therefore instructs the National Executive Committee to launch a recruitment drive together with the above policy, laying particular emphasis on the establishment of workplace branches'.

The deadline for amendments to be received at Walworth Rd is August 26.

Where to find Socialist Organiser

SCOTLAND

Glasgow. Contact Stan Crooke, 34 Garturk St., Glasgow G42. Meetings: ask paper sellers. On sale: West End bookshop, Rutherglen shopping arcade, Friday lunchtime, Coatbridge shopping arcade, Saturday lunchtime, Marhill dole, Tuesday morning.

Edinburgh. Next meeting Monday August 8, 7.30, Ruskin House, Windsor St. Business meeting. Contact Dave, 229 4591. SO is sold at Muirhouse (Saturday 10.30-12) and the First of May Bookshop, Candlemaker Row.

NORTH-WEST

Rochdale. Next meeting Monday Sept. 12, 8pm at the Castle Inn, Manchester Rd.

Manchester. Contact: 273 6654. SO is sold at Grass Roots Books, Newton St, Piccadilly.

Stockport. Meetings every Sunday, 7.30pm: phone 429 6359 (38 Broadhurst St) for details. SO is sold at Stockport market every Saturday, 11 to 12.30.

Wirral. Contact Lol Duffy, 3 St. James Court, Victoria Road, Wallasey.

Liverpool. Contact 733 6663. SO is sold at Progressive Books, Berry St, and at News from Nowhere, Whitechapel.

Hyndburn. Contact Accrington 395753.

Stoke. Next meeting: 'The Labour Movement after the Election'. Date to be fixed. Contact: Paul Barnett, 151 Broadway, Meir (328198).

YORKSHIRE AND NORTH-EAST

Huddersfield. Contact Alan Brooke, 59 Magdale, Honley, Huddersfield HD7 2LX.

Next Socialist Organiser delegate meeting: Saturday September 3, 11 to 4.30, at the Labour Club, Bristol St, Birmingham.

Socialist Organiser Annual General Meeting: Sunday October 30, 10.30-5, County Hall, London SE1.

National Socialist Organiser dayschool, Saturday October 29, in London.

Read all about us!



36p including postage from Socialist Organiser, 28, Middle Lane, London N8 8PL.

Durham. SO is sold at the Community Co-op, New Elvet. Contact Andy, 64088.

Leeds. SO is sold at Books and Corner Books, Woodhouse Lane. Contact Garth, 623322.

Harrogate. Meets every other Sunday evening, starting August 21. Details from SO sellers. Public meeting: 'Where We Stand', Tuesday August 23. SO is sold outside the market, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday lunchtimes. Contact Mark Osborn, 522542.

Hull. Meets every Wednesday 8pm. Details from SO sellers. Childcare available.

Halifax. Contact 52156. SO is sold at Halifax Wholefood, Gibbet St, and at Tower Books, Hebden Bridge.

York. Contact 796027. SO is sold at Coney St on Saturday mornings, at the Community Bookshop, outside the dole office most mornings, and at the University on Friday mornings.

Sheffield. Next meeting, Monday August 22, 7.30 at the Bull and Oak, The Wicker.

SO is sold outside Boots in Fargate (Saturday 12-1) and at the Independent Bookshop, Glossop Road. Contact Rob, 589307.

WALES AND WEST

Cardiff. Contact 492988.

Bristol. Contact c/o 28 Middle Lane.

Taunton. Contact c/o 28 Middle Lane.

MIDLANDS

Birmingham. No meeting in August. SO is sold at the Other Bookshop, Digbeth High St.

Coventry. SO is sold at the Wedge Co-op, High Street. Contact Keith White, 75623.

Leicester. SO is sold at Blackthorne Books, High St. Contact Phil, 857908.

Northampton. Contact Ross, 713606.

Nottingham. Meets every Thursday evening, 7.30 at the International Community Centre. SO is sold outside the Victoria Centre (Saturday 11 to 1) and at the Mushroom Bookshop, Heathcote St. Contact Pete Radcliff, 585640.

SOUTH

Oxford. SO is sold at the Cornmarket (Saturday 11 to 1) and outside Tesco, Cowley Rd, Friday 5 to 7. Also at EOA Books, Cowley Rd.

Basingstoke. Business meeting Thursday 1 August 26, 7.30 at Chute House. SO is sold at 'Good News' in London Street.

LONDON

North-West London. Next meeting Monday August 25, 7.30, for venue phone Mick, 624 1931. 'The Way Forward for the Labour Movement'.

Hackney. Contact Andrew Hornung, 76 Carysfort Rd, London N16.

Haringey. Contact 802 0771 or 348 5941.

Tower Hamlets. Contact Susan, 377 1328.

Richmond. Inaugural meeting, Tuesday August 23, 8pm. Richmond Community Centre, Sheen Road, Richmond. Speakers include John O'Mahony and Tom Rigby.

SO will be sold at Richmond Quadrant every Saturday 11.30 — 1.30. Further details, contact: Nick De Marco, 876-6715.

Hounslow. SO is sold outside All Saints Church, Hounslow High St., Saturdays 10.30 to 12. Contact Chris, 898 6961.

Islington. Contact Nik, 278 1341.

Southwark/Lambeth. Meets every other Wednesday at Lansbury House, 41 Camberwell Grove, London SE5. Next Open Forum — Ireland. Speaker: Penny Newall, a member of the August TOM delegation to Northern Ireland. Wednesday August 31 at 8.30 p.m. (Business meeting at 7.30).

South East London. Contact Siu Ming, 691 1141.

Orpington. Contact c/o South East London.

Putney. Monday August 22, 8pm. Debate with Militant. For venue, phone Gerry, 789 7587.

LONDON CUTS conference organised by the Southwark Campaign Working Party: Sunday November 6, at County Hall, London SE1. Contact: Southwark Campaign Working Party, Town Hall, Peckham Rd, SE5.

SO is sold at the following London bookshops: Collets, Central Books, The Other Bookshop, Bookmarks, Bookplace (Peckham Rd, SE15), Kilburn Books, and Reading Matters (Wood Green Shopping Centre).

Socialist Organiser Alliance

I want to become a Socialist Organiser supporter, want more information.

Name.....
Address.....

Send to Socialist Organiser, 28, Middle Lane, London N8 8PL.

Become a supporter of the Socialist Organiser Alliance — groups are established in most large towns. It costs £1.50 a month [20p unwaged] to be a supporter.



Rates: £5 for three months, £8.75 for six months, and £16 for a year.

Bundle of 5 each week: £12 for 3 months. Bundle of 10 £21 for 3 months.

Name.....
Address.....

I enclose £.....
To: Socialist Organiser, 28 Middle Lane, London N8 8PL.

Subscribe

Mary Archer

IT is with sadness that we have to report the death of Mary Archer. She will be greatly missed by all activists within the Haringey labour movement, where she spent the latter years of her life.

Over these years she built up a reputation of commitment and activity in the Labour Party and Labour campaigns, always acquitting herself well. However Mary was not simply a hard worker who got on with the job at hand. Her dedication to the movement came from the future she anticipated for it. She was first and foremost a political person. Mary had joined the Trotskyist movement in the 1930s, staying with it right up until her death.

It was in the arguments and debates that her political experience came to the fore. It was always quite beguiling listening to Mary argue her corner against the CP or Labour Party wets, drawing in the experience of struggles and lessons of the labour movement which she had learnt often many years before her adversary was even born.

It is as a lifelong revolutionary socialist that Mary Archer should be remembered.

Bert Atkinson

I WONDER if we could borrow a few inches of our column space to announce to your readers and his old comrades the sad news of the death of the old revolutionary Bert Atkinson, on July 30, two weeks after his 70th birthday.

Bert Atkinson came from a lower middle class/upper working class family, and entered politics in the early thirties when he joined Islington branch of the Communist Party. He witnessed the change from the Party's unemployed demonstrations and its "Third Period" political line to that of the "Popular Front", and the beginning of its search for respectability.

He broke with Stalinism along with half a dozen other comrades at the time of the Spanish Civil War, when they began to question exactly what sort of class society the "Communists" were fighting for in Spain.

They were purged from the Communist Party at the insistence of the man now known to have been the Communist International's 'representative' in the British CP, David Springhall, and then joined the Trotskyist movement.

After a brief time in the Revolutionary Workers League of Bill Duncan and Cliff Stanton, they passed over into the Workers' International League and took part in the fusion which created the Revolutionary Communist Party in 1944.

Bert was the first, in an internal bulletin of the RCP to defend Max Schachtman's theory that the Soviet Union was neither a workers' state nor state capitalism, but a new type of exploitative society.

Bert continued to follow the progress of the working class and revolutionary movement long after physical circumstances prevented him from playing a role in it. He was exceptionally well-read, and had none of the narrowness of all too many of today's activists.

He continued to assist young people to work out their socialist ideas right up to his death, visible proof of the existence of that working class tradition of self-education that is the backbone of the revolutionary movement. We are proud to recommend his example to your comrades and supporters.

SAM BORNSTEIN
AL RICHARDS
Tooting

Minimum wage is not incomes policy!

I WAS puzzled by Alan Thornt's opposition to a statutory national minimum wage (in his report on the TGWU conference, Socialist Organiser no. 140).

"It was argued", Alan wrote, "that this (a national minimum wage) is 'not an incomes policy by the back door'. Of course that is just what it is."

Formally and literally, it is possible to describe a statutory national minimum wage as an incomes policy. It means the government intervening in

wage-fixing. But there's a difference between measures to push wages up and measures to push wages down!

Socialist Organiser supporters in most unions, I think, have recognised this, and supported a minimum wage law at the same time as they oppose wage controls.

To define a minimum wage law and wage controls as both examples of the same thing (incomes policy) is playing with words. To use this definition as

an argument against a minimum wage law is as wrong as using it as an argument for wage controls.

Of course, a lot of right-wingers and 'soft lefts' do use it as an argument for wage controls — and TGWU general secretary Moss Evans is one of them.

But the fact that people try to use it as sugar on the pill of wage controls is no reason to oppose the minimum wage. After all, shorter hours, inflation-protection clauses, and work-sharing deals are all used for the same purpose. We do not therefore oppose shorter hours, or inflation-protection, or work-sharing. We demand the sugar and refuse the pill.

Like other reforming labour legislation within capitalism — laws limiting working hours, or laying down health and safety conditions, or outlawing sex discrimination — minimum wage laws are limited in effect.

Nonetheless, the fight for such laws is an important way of making the wages issue a class issue rather than just a sectional issue. It is a way of using the strength of the best-organised workers to win improvements for the least-organised or most weakly placed.

COLIN FOSTER,
Islington.

Don't defend CPs

WITH A perspicacity unusual amongst London SO supporters, Andrew Hornung (Writeback, SO 141) points out the logic involved in the argument that socialists should not defend the Tudeh Party (TP), which the Khomeini regime in Iran recently banned.

"Logically, Stan Crooke is arguing that the CPs in general have ceased to be an element in the working class movement and that they represent nothing more than agencies of reaction", he writes.

Quite so. Trotsky pointed out that, in its repression of the working class, the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union was no different from fascism. The whole record of Stalinist regimes underlines the truth of this statement.

On what basis therefore should political organisations which support such regimes, albeit by using the language of vulgarised Marxism, be regarded as 'elements in the working class movement' rather than as 'nothing more than agencies of reaction'? Doesn't the record of the TP, or any other Communist Party you care to think of, prove Stalinist organisations to be 'agencies of reaction'?

(And doubly so in the case of the TP: exported from Moscow after the fall of the Shah, the TP was not qualitatively different from 'a clique of KGB agents'. Kianouri's confessions are at least accurate on this point.)

Yes, we should defend Mujahedeen supporters from repression, even though they are not part of the workers' movement. They at least are fighting against the regime, and deserve solidarity on that point. The TP, on the other hand, continues, even now, to defend the regime.

In certain circumstances, socialists should also defend Communist Parties from repression. An obvious example is the overthrow of Allende in Chile, which involved a massive defeat for the working class. But the situation in Iran is not comparable: the in-fighting between anti-working class factions of an anti-working class regime is not an issue upon which socialists take sides.

Would socialists have defended the Strasserite ('Left wing' Nazis passed in 1934) from the 'injustices and abuse of civil rights' which occurred on the Night of the Long Knives? I think not. And the same holds true for the Iranian Night of the Long Knives.

Andrew Hornung's position amounts to making defence of Stalinists axiomatic for socialists because they are allegedly 'a section of the working class movement'. More logical would be to

proceed from the interests of the working class.

Where a successful attack on Stalinists would involve a setback for the working class (e.g. Chile) we should defend them, whilst not giving them political support.

But where the outcome of such attacks is of no interest to the working class, as in Iran, the socialists should not defend the Stalinists from the consequences of their own anti-working class and completely reactionary politics.

STAN CROOKE, Glasgow.

The road to Hiroshima

The story of the nuclear bomb, as recounted in Robert Jungk's 'Brighter than a thousand suns'.

SCIENCE

By Les Hearn

goes to make up atoms.

The neutron can pass easily into the nucleus of an atom, unlike an unattached proton, and can make it unstable (radioactive) or even cause it to split. It is therefore the key to nuclear fission. Though Rutherford, the first to change one element into another, pooh-poohed talk of using the neutron to release the enormous energy locked up in atoms, the Hungarian Leo Szilard realised that if an element could be found to give out two neutrons on absorbing one, then a chain reaction could be started to release atomic energy.

First, physicists bombarded light atoms with the newly discovered neutrons, but from 1934 they tried bombarding uranium, the heaviest natural element, to see if they could make new and heavier elements.

Irene Joliot-Curie in Paris was doing this experiment when she found she was consistently getting odd results. Ida Noddack, a German chemist, had previously suggested that uranium might disintegrate instead of just getting larger when struck by neutrons. In 1938, Lise Meitner correctly interpreted Joliot-Curie's results. Meitner, a non-Aryan refugee from Nazi Austria, realised that fission had taken place.

On hearing this, Szilard confirmed that surplus neutrons were produced during fission and hence that a chain reaction was possible. He tried to persuade fellow-scientists to stop publishing further results and when this failed, in 1939, he

changed his approach.

Misunderstandings caused physicists outside Germany to fear that Hitler was proceeding full-speed towards the A-bomb and Szilard helped organise an appeal, signed by Einstein, to the US President. America was to build an A-bomb to pre-empt Nazi Germany who would have no scruples about using such a weapon. Ultimately it was "democratic" America which lacked the scruples.

Germany did not even try to construct the Bomb due to the loss of many exiled physicists; the poor organisation of research by the Nazis; and the attitudes of the remaining physicists. The Nazis did not understand the possibilities of uranium fission and the physicists were not keen to enlighten them.

Incidentally, Russia might have achieved the Bomb first had Stalin not decided that all foreign physicists in Russia were spies.

Meanwhile the Manhattan Project was initiated, under the military control of General Leslie Groves, with the Göttingen graduate Robert Oppenheimer as scientific director from 1943 at the Los Alamos Laboratory in New Mexico.

Jungk describes in detail the scientific triumph and moral failure of Oppenheimer. A former socialist, he became a willing and uncritical tool of American imperialism but was cynically destroyed in the anti-communist hysteria of the 1950s.

To the disappointment of the


display their backwardness and embarrass them with anti-gay bigotry.

Nothing practical came out of the workshop in terms of activity but it has served its purpose in placating the NC supporters among the 300 who signed a petition demanding a debate and the 200 who came along to the Gay YS fringe meeting at the last conference.

A single workshop, which doesn't even have a gay activist on the platform does not constitute a youth movement taking up the fight for gay and lesbian rights, but it may be a start.

LINDA JOHNSON,
London.

Writeback



Send letters to Socialist Organiser, 28 Middle Lane, London N8. No longer than 400 words please: longer letters are liable to be cut.

Gays and LPYS

A WORKSHOP on gays and socialism at the LPYS summer camp? What, an official one? Yep, YS summer camp actually did have a gay workshop this year.

Class Fighter supporters have been arguing for the last seven or eight years that the YS should start fighting for gay and lesbian rights. During this time our gay comrades have been harassed, threatened and abused at YS national events. Gay rights has not even been timetableable for conference debate — "it isn't a priority". In fact there has been no debate because the YS NC is scared. They cannot be confident that their supporters will not

US military, the Germans surrendered before the bomb was ready. An atomic physicist working with the US Army, Sam Goudsmit, established that the Germans were at least two years behind the Americans in developing the Bomb. Though this information was top secret, it still got back to Los Alamos, where the scientists found that their justification for working on the bomb had gone. The majority were in favour of finishing their work but against bombing Japan.

Groves on the other hand set up a study group to work out where to drop the Bomb. It was to be a target with military importance and lots of houses and buildings nearby which would be susceptible to blast and fire damage. The built-up area was to be about a mile in radius.

In addition the target was to have been spared previous bombing so the Americans could see exactly what damage an A-Bomb would do and the bomb was to be dropped without warning.

It was at this stage that the Franck Report was presented to the Secretary of War. This prophetic document pointed out that there was no effective defence against A-bombs; that failing international agreement and cooperation, use of the Bomb on Japan would start an extremely dangerous arms race as the bomb could not be kept secret.

Finally Franck, Szilard and the other authors pleaded that the Bomb be demonstrated to the Japanese on an uninhabited island, to encourage surrender without further bloodshed.

Nevertheless, 38 years ago this month, two A-Bombs were dropped and the world continues to live with the awful consequences.

'Brighter than a thousand suns' by Robert Jungk is published by Penguin at £2.25.

Pickets can win this fight

How long has Sacomando [the factory's owner] been running this place?

For about 2½ years. He used to run a factory in Corbett Street. He told us he moved out of that one because he needed bigger premises. But at one of the Labour Party branches we were speaking at last week, the local councillor told us that in fact his old factory got shut down for breaching health regulations.

By all accounts this place isn't much better. Is it true that green mould used to grow on the walls in here?

Hive-off battle

by Fred Hessler

WORKERS have staged a one-week strike at Edinburgh District Council Cleansing Department's spanking new £3 million maintenance workshop. The dispute is about jobs being hived off to private firms.

Normally all running repairs are carried out by the Department's direct workforce. Only specialised repairs, warranty and excessive damage are sub-contracted out.

On Wednesday August 3, seven running repairs were sent out to private firms; the next day six trucks. The stewards for the craft unions in the workshop went to management and told them that if another truck was sent out they would call a shop meeting and recommend industrial action.

The next day, Friday, management called their bluff. A mass meeting voted overwhelmingly to strike.

On Monday 8th, the Leader of the Council's minority Labour Group set up a meeting with the stewards and Labour Councillors. Meanwhile the strike has not been made official. It was proving difficult to get in touch with the union officials.

On Friday August 12 a mass meeting voted unanimously to return to work on Monday 15th, after the Director of Cleansing gave a verbal agreement of status quo and the union full-timers promised they would seek an early meeting with him.

While waiting to see what comes of that, a promising avenue of inquiry now is to inspect the books of the Department.

Council elections take place next May and a thoroughly researched campaign against privatisation would serve to give the Labour Party Council what they need about support for the cleaners' money.

Yes. We were meant to clean it off, but you never had time to clean it all, and it would grow again. The bird droppings were really bad as well. At night it was like an aviary in there. There were more sparrows in there than out here.

Has the Environmental Health been down since the strike began?

Yes, but the inspector didn't let us know anything. He just mumbled something about him having three weeks to clean the place up.

Supposing Environmental Health shut this place down as well. Would you regard that as a victory, even though you'd be out of a job?

Sacomando has to accept us back and accept the union. Otherwise we'll shut him down, Environmental Health or not. Now it's between him and us. We'll only go back if we win, so if he doesn't accept the union

THE STRIKE for union recognition, reinstatement of the nine sacked workers, and better working conditions at the Carousel wafer factory in the East End of Glasgow is now nearly a month old.

Stan Crooke talked to Carol Rodger, Andrew Patton, Christine Miller and Marie McIntyre.

it'll be a victory if he gets shut down.

What impact has the picketing had?

Quite good. Enbisco, one of the biggest customers has stopped collecting, and the pig bins aren't collected either. The mail has been stopped so he has to go and collect it himself.

But the scabs are still going in, though some of the people turning up for an interview have gone away again. And his own

drivers are still making deliveries, though not as many as usual.

What's been the attitude of the police to the picketing?

They came down this morning and said that if Sacomando phoned them one more time to complain about us, then they'd come down on us like a ton of bricks.

We've been stopped from using the megaphone, and we can't call the scabs 'scabs' or 'blacklegs' anymore. All we're supposed to do is ask them not to cross the picket line.

How about the reaction of the scabs themselves?

They've generally ignored us. One or two stop to chat to us, but in the end they still go in. They're just a bunch of pains in the arse.

How much support are you getting now from trade unions, the Labour Party and so on?

We're getting better support all the time. We've had money coming in from different union and Labour Party branches.

We've had people down on the picket line from hospitals, the mines, the shipyards, the District Council and other places. And we've been asked to speak at a lot of meetings as well.

Have you had any contact with Sacomando since the strike began?

No, but David Marshall, the local MP, was in seeing him yesterday. Sacomando told him that we were just a few stupid kids, that everyone else in the factory was happy, and you could pick up £90 a week in there. But there's no way that's possible. Two TGWU full-timers were in today, but he

never said anything about taking us all back or recognising the union.

What support are you looking for?

We want mass pickets, we want as many people down here as possible, and also financial donations. That way he'll change his mind as quickly as possible.

Because most of Carousel's suppliers and customers are non-union firms, effective picketing is of crucial importance to winning the dispute. The recent TGWU national conference committed the union to defiance of Tebbit's anti-picketing laws. Let's do it!

Apart from urging their members to support the picketing anyway, local TGWU branches should be sending motions to the Glasgow District Committee and Glasgow Trades Council demanding that they call days of action for mass picketing.

Defend S&K 2

THE WORKERS at Sandhar and Kang wholesale warehouse in Birmingham are now entering their seventh week on strike.

Basically, the dispute is in defence of trade union organisation — won after a month-long strike last June. Six weeks ago, S&K sold off the dispatch department, which also meant the transfer of the T&G section steward and another union member.

An added twist is that the company that has bought the department — Euro Packing — is itself owned by the husband of S&K's accountant.

The 23 Asian strikers are determined to stay out until their two workmates are reinstated as S&K employees.

Messages and donations to: S&K strike fund, TGWU, 211 Broad St, Birmingham B15.

Knives are out for Clyde yard

WITH THE announcement of British Shipbuilders losing £117 millions in the last financial year, the knives are out for the Scott Lithgow shipyards on the Lower Clyde.

Over half the losses, £66 millions, were run up at Scott Lithgow, an average of £12,500 per person employed there. Since nationalisation in 1977, the total deficit of the yards amounts to £158 millions.

The publication of these figures was the signal for the unleashing of a wild campaign against the workers at the yard. In the Commons, Norman Lamont, the Tory minister for shipping, attacked the yard's 'very poor performance' and warned of the need for 'a very remarkable improvement' if the yard was to survive.

But this was tame stuff compared with the venomous attacks of Sir Robert Atkinson, chair of British Shipbuilders. The '5,000 deaf men' at the yards, he claimed, 'had let the corporation down, let the nation down, and let themselves down'.

Foul knives indeed. But this was not the end of their evil ways. The Prime Minister had lent over backward to help the yard, but the yard's performance has let

Mrs. Thatcher down!

Off with their heads, I hear SO readers cry in unison. Unfortunately though, the Tories lost the attempt to re-introduce the death penalty. So British Shipbuilders are going to do the next best thing: sack the lot of them.

Even before the announcement of the latest losses, BS had been calling for 2,000 voluntary redundancies in the yard. The wild attacks which have accompanied the announcements of the losses can only be a preface either to complete closure of trimming the yard's workforce down to the bone.

The response of STUC General Secretary Jimmy Milne to all this is no response at all. His 'solution' is that civilian yards like Scott Lithgow should be allowed to build warships: 'They did it in wartime and there is no reason why they can't do it again'.

Presumably he would therefore regard another Falklands foray as a large-scale job-creation scheme.

The response from the shop stewards committee within the yards has been no better. Judging by the attacks of convenor Duncan McNeil on unfair competition by the Japanese and Koreans, he seems to believe that it still is wartime.

Whilst rightly condemning the anarchistic way in which the yards switched from merchant shipping to oil-rig production, McNeil has also said: 'We are not asking for a further subsidy. We want to stand on our own feet and be profitable. Even the likes of Ted Heath ditched that idea years ago.'

A more positive response to management attacks was displayed by the 200 plumbers and craftsmen who went on strike at the yards on the eve of the announcement of the losses. Within twenty-four hours though their own union officials had forced them to return to work.

But it is only through independent class action in the form of strikes and occupations, not making endless sacrifices for the benefit of the profit margins, that jobs at Scott Lithgow and throughout British Shipbuilders can be saved.

Tops for speed-up

ACCORDING to the Financial Times, BL now claims to be near the top of the European car manufacturers' productivity league.

Austin Rover, an internal circular says, produces 13 cars per employee per year. Ahead is the German Opel at 16 cars per employee year. Citroen and Fiat are presumed to lie around the nine cars mark.

These figures are only guestimates. Few companies disclose detailed productivity figures. There are 'hidden extras' too. Cross company comparisons assume like-for-like production.

But figures from a single company across a number of years do show real changes in productivity.

In 1979 output was 5.9 cars per employee year. In 1980 — it was only up to 6.2 cars but by 1982, when Edwardes had settled in, it had risen to 10.1 cars.

Explaining the new productivity rise, BL and the FT see highly automated machinery as secondary to Edwardes' influence. Edwardes transformed working practices and increased the rate of exploitation of BL workers. Productivity is up, but wages aren't.

Rail: union unity needed

WITH the recent acceptance at the Railway Staff Joint Council of a common date for the back-payment of the 'award' for flexible rosters, the resistance of ASLEF to variable rostering has wound down to its bitter conclusion.

The agreement, so far only in principle, allows for the 50p per shift payment to be paid retroactively from January 3rd 1983. Flexible rostering will come in under the terms of a national agreement to be reached in time for the introduction of the new timetable in October.

A close examination of the deal reflects the enormous divisions and confusion that have been created in the union since the enforcement of variable rosters following the TUC sell-out virtually a year ago to the day.

At that time, flexi-rosters were to be introduced following local negotiations. The policy of the ASLEF EC was to 'obstruct' the introduction of the rosters and thereby to demonstrate, in some way, to the BRB that they would not work. In reality this policy placed the entire responsibility for the resistance to flexible rostering at local level.

At many smaller depots, the new rosters were imposed in a climate of fear and since the ASLEF EC were not prepared to offer any tangible support to these depots, variable rosters were speedily introduced.

The other side of the coin was the position that strong depots found themselves in. Having observed ASLEF policy to the letter and obstructed

Steve Good reports on a bitter end to the flexi-rosters battle.

the rosters by disputing interpretations of the guidelines in the McCarthy report with local management, the stronger depots became increasingly isolated in the battle.

The result is that now only 40 depots out of around 270 on BR, are not working to flexible rostering.

Even the common date for backpayment for variable rosters is a sham. All depots will receive their backdated from January 3rd, but depots that accepted the rosters before that date will receive in addition a 'lump-sum payment'. In other words there are two separate backdated payments, and some depots will only receive one of these payments. They are, of course, the depots who observed the policy of the trade union!

This situation has obviously caused great bitterness. The inadequate and equivocal policy of the EC, providing no national back-up for the depots fighting the new rosters, has resulted in those depots actually being penalised for supporting Trade Union policy.

The ASLEF EC are adopting a 'blame the membership' stance. Having created a situation where it was inevitable that resistance to variable rostering would collapse in the face of a hardline, confident local management, and having failed to give a lead in defence of the depots in the frontline they not turn around and blame the membership for this shambles. A membership that stuck out six weeks of

industrial action last year under extremely difficult conditions.

ASLEF's EC intend to conclude a national agreement for the rosters in less than 8 weeks. This, under conditions where depots such as King's Cross in line with union policy have amassed up to 40 separate grievances on their interpretation of the safeguards produced under McCarthy's original report. Any agreement made by the EC in the short time available will inevitably sweep these grievances under the carpet.

Add to that, the Board's stated intention not to pay the backdated to any depot which has not agreed to the introduction of the rosters by October, and you complete the picture of a catastrophic capitulation by the leadership.

It is clear now that the productivity initiatives of the BRB have not been leading to more investment in the railway, such as electrification. The Tories have seized on the BRB's attack on railway jobs and conditions as the foundation for privatisation. Indeed, tenders have already been made by private capitalists for certain lines.

The defeatism of the ASLEF EC and the mood of defeat they are spreading must be overcome. The recent developments over the Federation between the NUR and ASLEF offer the possibility to do just that. Local ASLEF and NUR branches should seize upon this opportunity to build local branches of the Federation to prepare for the defence of the railway industry.



TROOPS OUT NOW!

Join the Labour Committee on Ireland.
BM Box 5355, London WC1N 3XX

An open letter to the 'Militant'

Comrades, you have accused fellow socialists — in particular supporters of Socialist Organiser — of witch-hunting you in Coventry South East Labour Party.

This accusation stems from resolutions passed at the GMC of that constituency on July 20. These resolutions were critical of the role of Militant supporters in the recent successful General Election campaign in Coventry SE, in which Dave Nellist, a supporter of Militant, was elected MP.

Comrades, you have made a very serious allegation, one which requires a serious and detailed answer. Let us examine what actually happened before, during and after that campaign.

Comrade Nellist had been selected as Parliamentary candidate a good 18 months before the election. The whole of the Left in the constituency (the right-wing is very marginalised, primarily in one Ward — St. Michaels) rallied firmly round him as candidate.

Fuel

Of course the local and national press witch-hunted Nellist. The witch-hunt in the Labour Party was also gaining momentum.

What you did during the election campaign could only help fuel that witch-hunt.

Constituency activists, even some who were politically sympathetic to Militant, were cut out of decision-making and even out of many aspects of the campaign itself! And this was not accidental. Constituency officers were deliberately misled by the candidate and his Agent, Tom Smith (also one of your supporters). Party activists were lied to. They were often denied access to canvassing. They were denied an input into the content of the election leaflets. The list could go on. All non-Militant activists in the Constituency have their own horror stories.

Ward

Let us take the example of the Left in St. Michaels Ward. This is the most solid Labour Ward in Coventry SE. There were no Militant supporters in the Ward, but there are a number of Socialist Organiser supporters who had been central in building a Left up to 80-strong over the last few years. This had led to a tremendous battle with the Right, involving Annual General Meetings of more than 120. The Right are holding on by the skin of their teeth.

The socialists in the Ward wanted a local Committee Room. Many of our members are unemployed and very few have transport. But our request was initially resisted by Comrade Smith as Agent. He had unilaterally decided that canvassing of St Michaels Ward should be done from the Coventry Labour Party offices two miles away. The evidence indicates this decision was taken for two interconnected reasons:

Priority

a) to allow Militant supporters from all over the country priority access to canvassing, etc.

b) to artificially keep control of the campaign in the hands of your supporters, excluding the activists in the Ward itself.

The problems did not end when Comrade Smith finally did agree, under pressure, to allow a Committee Room in the Ward. Your comrades alleged that no local Ward members were willing to canvass. Led by Socialist Organiser supporters, St Michaels Ward members then gave a commitment to organise a daily contingent from our Committee Rooms. We more than honoured this commitment. Between ten and twenty Ward members were available each night, but canvass cards were still withheld, or issued in inadequate numbers.

Comrades were on occasions told that no canvass cards were available, only to leave the Committee Rooms and see carloads of Militant supporters from outside the Ward canvassing nearby streets.

Full-timers

Full-time Militant supporters, many from outside Coventry, took an arrogant 'we know best' attitude, treating Ward members with contempt. They ignored local advice in dealing with sensitive areas, language difficulties for example.

Even if your accusation that local Labour Party members were unwilling to canvass were true (and it isn't!) would that in the circumstances be surprising?

As it was, Socialist Organiser comrades spent a good deal of our time during the campaign persuading disillusioned Ward and Constituency members to stay in the campaign.

If we need to further prove our point let us tell you that in St. Michaels Ward during and since the election, the Left (not supporters of Militant), despite the way the campaign was organised, have recruited 38 new socialist members to the Ward. Hardly a sign of inactivity on our part!

At the recent YS summer camp and in Labour Parties throughout the country Militant supporters have accused supporters of Socialist Organiser in Coventry SE, whose MP is Militant supporter Dave Nellist, of witch-hunting Militant there. Richard Paine, Nick Lawrence and Judith Bonner reply to this libel in an open letter.

Such experiences were not limited to St Michaels Ward. Nor did the methods of your supporters go unchallenged elsewhere. Complaints were initially ignored. There was growing antagonism towards the handling of the campaign from the vast majority of Constituency activists. But Party members, despite this, continued to unite, in whatever they were allowed to do, behind the campaign.

In the end, even some of your own comrades accepted the criticisms, Comrade Smith in particular.

Nellist

Both he and Comrade Nellist ended up arguing that other Party members should forget the problems during the campaign and then take them up after the election. Members took this suggestion in good faith.

As your own supporters had agreed, after the election it was up to the entire Left in the Constituency to decide what it wanted to say and do about the appalling manner in which the Campaign had been run.

We all thought it would be dealt with within the Constituency Broad Left (BL), rather than allow the small right wing the chance to use the occasion for their own witch-hunting purposes and thus risk fuelling the press witch-hunt of Militant.

A Broad Left meeting was called to discuss the election campaign.

Militant supporters were informed well in advance and asked to be there. They agreed. In the event none of your supporters turned up. In commenting later, they said that if Party activists wanted to discuss the handling of the campaign, then they should do it at the Constituency GMC. It was your choice.

The resolution passed almost unanimously by the very large Broad Left meeting thus became — in effect at your comrades' suggestion — a model resolution from three of the four wards to the GMC.

These resolutions specifically reaffirmed CLP policy against witch-hunts!

In the fourth Ward, right-wing dominated St Michaels, Socialist Organiser supporters persuaded some others on the Left that a similar resolution should not be put because it would create a witch-hunting opportunity for the right wing majority in that Ward.

We also felt the other resolutions as they stood were in some respects wrong. In talking about 'outside unaccountable organisations', they could be construed as witch-hunting, and they missed the point anyway. The problem isn't 'outside unaccountable organisations'. We are in favour of socialist groups and organisations being in the Labour Party, or at least affiliated to it. The problem in Coventry SE was that supporters of Militant didn't abide by the norms of socialist democracy. Instead you behaved like sectarians towards other members of the local Labour Party.

So at the GMC on July 20 we

moved amendments (reprinted elsewhere). Our amendments to two of the resolutions were passed. To the third they weren't and our comrades accordingly didn't vote for the resolution.

When some individual(s) (as yet unidentified) later leaked the original resolutions to the press, the witch-hunting scribes picked out (as we had feared) the very phrases whose deletion we had moved.

Your comrades have since accused us of putting the amendments to ease our consciences. We think it is downright arrogant of you to imagine that our motives are modelled on your own methods of operating. Our political reasons are explained above.

You have also accused us of lining up with the right wing. In fact it was your own comrades who lined up with the right-wing in voting against the amendments on the GMC! What extraordinary behaviour!

We, and the large majority of Constituency activists, were simply not prepared to let the matter rest. Why should we? Socialists have been struggling for democracy and accountability in the labour movement over the years. To suggest that we should then turn a blind eye to the plainly anti-democratic behaviour of your supporters in a General Election campaign is an insult to those socialists and their struggle.

If you believe that shouting 'Witch-hunt!' will let you off the hook every time your tactics are criticised, then you are wrong.

Once the issue went to the Constituency GMC there was a big chance it would be leaked to the bosses' press. But we can't simply abstain from discussing vital issues of accountability (local or national) just because the press might get hold of them.

And the fact that it went to the GMC in the first place was your responsibility.

We have described the facts of the matter. We regret it was necessary to waste our time on doing so. But your accusations require an answer.

We have shown that your accusations are totally unfounded. Your attitude to accountability is quite inexcusable. Worse, your comrades have drawn unnecessary attention to a matter which should have been quickly dealt with within the Coventry SE Broad Left.

In choosing to act this way, you have diverted attention away from what was, despite the way the Campaign was run, a very good election campaign. You, for whatever obscure, sectarian reason, would like people to forget the resolution unanimously passed at the same GMC praising the Campaign — the large-scale leafletting and canvassing, the factory gate and public meetings, etc.

And are you really seriously questioning the SE CLP's attitude to the witch-hunt, or that of Socialist Organiser? The Constituency attitude is crystal



Dave Nellist

clear — total opposition.

Only at the CLP EC meeting last Wednesday (10 August) this was illustrated once again. The letter from the NEC instructing Party organisations to refuse facilities to Militant was read out. A Socialist Organiser supporter on the EC moved that the EC recommend to the GMC that the secretary reply, stating the CLP notes the comments and refuses to comply with them.

Accusation

This was passed by the EC with only one dissenter, and only because he felt the NEC letter should be put in the bin and just ignored! And yet according to you we are witch-hunters! Comrades, you know your accusations are without foundation.

Your accusations can only be a scurrilous muckraking attack on Socialist Organiser. We demand an unreserved apology from you and a withdrawal of your unfounded accusations.

Finally let us say that in our opinion there are deeper issues that lie behind these events — issues that fundamentally question your paper's politics.

What is it about the politics of Militant which makes you unable to work as a minority tendency within a broad campaign? Are you afraid of political defeat? Your unwillingness to take part in political discussion in the Coventry SE CLP over the past 18 months has been plain.

When we have had political discussion — our attitude to Palestine and affiliation to Labour Against the Witch-hunt spring to mind — your point of view has been defeated. Are you trying to avoid further political defeats by riding roughshod over your fellow socialists? We believe so.

Ask yourselves, too, what your actions during the campaign say about Militant's view of workers' democracy.

Comrades, you are fond of avoiding debate by saying that your conception of socialism is different from that of Socialist Organiser. We think you are right. For you, workers' democracy is okay, as long as your views are accepted.

We believe that the relationship of revolutionaries to the working class is very different to that. The recent events in Coventry SE illustrate that only too well.

The resolutions

We, the Coventry South East Constituency Labour Party, are glad at the victory of our Candidate at the recent General Election, and we congratulate Dave Nellist. Also we would like to re-affirm our strong opposition to all the witch-hunts and proscriptions that have occurred recently in the Labour Party. We re-affirm our support for all socialists in our Party. We deplore, however, the conduct of Dave Nellist and his Election Agent, Tom Smith in certain particular aspects of the recent Election Campaign.

In defiance of long-established custom and practice it is felt that they organised a campaign that excluded deliberately local constituency members and their ward organisations. In their place full-timers and others from the Militant Tendency and the Labour Party Young Socialists from other parts of the country were used by the Candidate and his agent to organise the election campaign.

To our minds there can be no excuse for the imposition of an outside, and locally unaccountable, organisation on our constituency's campaign. We feel that the Candidate's and his Agent's actions were:

- 1) In flagrant breach of the Party's Rules.
- 2) In total disregard of the wishes of the majority of the constituency membership.
- 3) An insult to many of the candidate's friends and supporters who selected him as a candidate in the first place.
- 4) In contravention of the understanding between the candidate and the General Committee

that he would reflect the wishes and policies of the South East CLP.

We therefore demand:

- a) An immediate and unequivocal apology from the Candidate for his behaviour in this aspect of the campaign.
- b) The resignation of the Agent as soon as he has fulfilled his legal commitments for this General Election.
- c) An undertaking from the candidate that he will never again allow any organisation other than the South East CLP and its constituent wards and affiliated organisations to be the main organisers of any campaign in conjunction with himself and his future agent.
- d) That the candidate reaffirm that he will work in accord with his CLP's democratically decided policies.

Lower Stoke Labour Party

Amendments moved by SO supporters. Socialist Organiser supporters successfully amended this resolution as follows:

Delete: reference to 'outside, and locally unaccountable, organisation'.

Delete: reference to 'full-timers and others'.

Delete: '(1) In flagrant breach of the Party's rules.'

Insert instead: 'Party members not accountable to the constituency effectively controlled the campaign.'

Similar amendments were moved by SO supporters to the other resolutions on this subject at the same GMC meeting.

LABOUR PARTY

AGAINST THE WITCH-HUNT!

Join LABOUR AGAINST THE WITCHHUNT Membership open to Constituency Labour Parties, trade union organisations, Labour Party affiliates, and individuals.

Fee: CLPs and unions £10, wards £5, individuals and other organisations £3. Write to: LAW, 11 Wilderton Road, London N16.

Socialist ORGANISER

Michelin workers beat speed-up

VICTORY!

Letter from Nicaragua

by Jeremy Corbyn MP

THE delegation of seven people from Scotland have been very well received by the Sandinistas and the country is festooned with posters saying "Todas las armas al pueblo", the Fourth Anniversary slogan of the 1979 revolution.

Contra forces from Honduras have killed over 500 Nicaraguan defence forces in the past few months and the whole country is on a state of alert against the possibility of an American invasion.

Despite the American blockade of Nicaragua, there are amazing developments in housing and health care for the poorest people, including the introduction of minimum and maximum wages and the construction of a very large number of cheap houses for the homeless people. The government is also attempting to develop thermal energy, and build railways from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast.

Junta

The government of the country relies on a junta of three people, the nine commanders of the revolutionary forces and the Council of State of 51 members, who represent the trade unions, women's organisations, youth, the churches and the private sector. All proposals for future changes in the country have to go before the Council of State for discussion, including agreement of pluralism in elections as there are eleven political parties, six of whom fought the revolution.

There is now discussion on bringing in military service for the Nicaraguans, although the effect of this is nil as virtually all Nicaraguans are in local militia or in the army in some way. Each local community has its own street committees which oversee public health, education, security and defence against invasion.

The demands that are constantly expressed to us are for the Americans to lift their military and economic blockade and to withdraw the forces in Honduras, and to send the American fleet home.

We have met the representatives of the Council of State and some of the trade unionists who all expressed complete support for the revolution of 1979 and hatred of the Somoza dictatorship and the legacy of poverty and misery that has left. Everyone we have met expresses hope for the future and a determination that there will be decent living standards for all as soon as possible.



WORKERS at Michelin's Stoke plant have won a massive victory over management. After four weeks on strike, the workers crushed management's attempt to introduce speed-up and four-shift working, which would have destroyed workers' social lives and contrary to management claims, would have resulted in a reduction in earnings.

On Monday 8 August, at a

by Arthur Bough

mass meeting at Stoke Town Hall, striking workers cheered and clapped as their full time official announced that the proposals had been unconditionally withdrawn by management, and that they had capitulated on all points in dispute.

As a sign of their strength and

new-found confidence, the workers also voted to give full support to any other group of workers on the plant threatened with the introduction of new working conditions.

Workers at the plant were under no illusions as to why they had won. They confidently stated that the victory was due to their determination rather than the

contribution of their full time union official.

Indeed many workers, before the mass meeting, came up to Socialist Organiser supporters having read an SO leaflet which warned of the danger of a sell-out, to say how much they agreed with its content.

Such expectations were founded on the performance of the union bureaucrats during the period of the strike. It took them three weeks to make the strike official, thus depriving strikers not only of strike pay but of official support for blacking and solidarity strikes.

Such official backing was vital given the conditions in the plant. Another, smaller section of the plant, the Retread or DCP, had been forced to accept the new shifts last February. Feeling confident, management attempted to bring the new shifts into the light-weight and heavyweight production departments which employ 1,100 out of the total 6,000 at the factory.

They obviously believed that this section, too, could be isolated and forced to accept the new conditions.

Whilst the strike remained unofficial, the branch officials from the production department were forced into a situation of taking on the Michelin management on their own, for fear that including any other unaffected departments in any votes would have resulted in acceptance.

Sections

They were forced to attempt to win the support and sympathy of these other sections during the course of the strike.

It was for that reason that initially no pickets were mounted on the gates and that when pickets were deployed their intention was to stop the movement of

material into the plant and tyres out of the huge distribution warehouse.

Clock

When picketing did begin, it did not take long for the workers to realise the usefulness of mass pickets and within a couple of days, between 40 and 50 pickets were stationed on most gates, picketing round the clock.

In the last week of the strike, support for the workers flooded in. Telexes were sent from Michelin workers in Holland and in France, pledging their support.

Letters of support also came from local Labour Parties. This support did not go unnoticed by workers at the plant, who after their jubilant mass meeting thanked Socialist Organiser supporters for their support on the picket line.

As one worker pointed out as he left the meeting, "Now that we are on top, we've got to keep pressure on for the rest of our pay and conditions negotiations."

Blow

Such an attitude is vital because the possibility of some kind of deal over new working conditions in the future was hinted at by TGWU National Officer John Miller in a statement to the local newspaper.

Already workers at the Simplex factory owned by Tube Investments have been forced to take industrial action to prevent the introduction of similar shifts there.

In this latest round of the bosses' offensive against pay and conditions, the Michelin workers have struck a great blow for the working class. It is up to the labour movement to take inspiration and learn from their victory.

AUGUST FUND - TOO SLOW!

Group	Monthly target	July	Per cent	Target by October 31
Glasgow	40	62	155%	120
Edinburgh	40	10	25%	120
Rochdale	10	-	-	30
Manchester	40	-	-	120
Stockport	10	-	-	30
Wirral	30	-	-	90
Liverpool	25	6.95	28%	75
Hyndburn	5	-	-	15
Stoke	20	20	100%	60
Huddersfield	10	-	-	30
Durham	15	-	-	45
Leeds	15	-	-	45
Sheffield	40	42	105%	120
Birmingham	40	-	-	120
Cardiff	10	-	-	30
Blackpool	20	-	-	60
Nottingham	10	-	-	30
Oxford	110	55	50%	330
Basingstoke	30	-	-	90
Cardiff	20	-	-	60
N.W. London	30	39.61	132%	90
Hackney	45	22	49%	135
Haringey	25	-	-	75
Hounslow	30	62.50	208%	90
Islington	45	67.50	150%	135
S.E. London	25	50	200%	75
East London	30	-	-	90
Southwark, L.	45	63	140%	135
Others	-	71.89	-	-

THE final tally for July is shown below. So far for August we've got £145.59 - not a very good start, especially given that we're offering local groups a discount on back debts if they clear them promptly by fund-raising before September 17.

Thanks so far

Thanks to: Halifax £10
Will Adams £13; Jim Denham
£5; Tom Cashman £1; Oxford
jumble sale £30.49; Ricky
Houston £5; Nottingham
(Alan Simpson, Joe and Matt)
£7.50; Glasgow £15.50;
Sheffield (John Cunningham,
Ros Makin, Mick Sidaway
and others) £8.10; Haringey
supporter £50.

Send money to: The
Treasurer, 214 Sickert Court,
London N1 2SY.

Next issue

Because of the holiday period, the next issue of Socialist Organiser will appear on September 1, featuring a special supplement for the TUC conference on Tebbit's new anti-union proposals, plus regular national and international coverage.