THE KILLING of 5 innocent British soldiers at Aldershot in the Irish Republican Army bomb explosion at Derry on Saturday 16th February was a tragic accident. The IRA sympathisers with the Irish Republican Army deeply regret it. It was an accident caused by a mistake in the timing of a bomb, on a civilian as surely as by the British Republican Army as by us.

The other tragedy the military and political targets in Britain itself, the explosion failed in its objective to demoralise the officer corps of the Parachute Regiment, which cold-bloodedly butchered other innocent working people in Derry on January 30th.

That must be said clearly and without hypocrisy.

The bosses' press is making good use of this tragedy to wipe out the memory of Derry Bloody Sunday. Socialists are not in business to help them by unringing our bells in horror.

The IRA is the army of a people which is now being repressed and terrorised and part of whose country is forcibly occupied by the British Army. It recognises and-defends the IRA's right to live in an equal British state, and to attack legitimate targets in Britain itself when and if it thinks it useful or necessary.

Just to compare Derry with Aldershot is to see the vast difference between the two sides in this war.

On one side is the continuation of a struggle for liberation that has lasted for centuries. On the other side is a ruling class war of repression, state terror and increasing indiscriminate slaughter.

In Derry 5 weeks ago the British Government took a cold calculated decision to make a bloody example of peaceful and unarmed civilians and its soldiers carried out that policy with deadly efficiency.

At Aldershot the IRA chose a military target, intending to strike not at those they consider as their enemies, but at those they consider as their legitimate targets. In Derry, the IRA told the IRA that they had all made the expediency over Derry only 3 weeks ago.

For these ladies and gentlemen, of the Right and of the Left, every revolts around the exchange of police meaningless words, or equally meaningless angry words, as they dance their quinelle and play musical chairs with the Tories in Ireland. When but the realities of power politics intrude, then all of them, without exception, know their place, and know which side they are on.

The evolutionary right must also know which side it is on.

But already socialists and revolutionaries must see in the documentations that "Heal" is really defensible for Aldershot with condemnat.

The revolutionaries must know that if they want to change the world, they must know that the Irish state is incapable of fighting the backlash effectively. In fact, in doing this, they themselves contribute to the backlash and become part of it.

The problem is not the 'terrorism' of the IRA but the failure of the British left to explain the justice of the Irish cause to the masses of the working class.

Socialist Worker and Workers Press evade the principled issue and blindly pander to the chauvinism which they fear, using pre-fabricated 'Marxist rationalisations against 'terrorism' as a cover.

The attack on the officers mess showed that the IRA knows no enemies. The attack on the British government, the attack on the British army, the attack on the British police, the attack on the British state - it is all the same thing.

The IRA cannot be defeated by the British army, by the British government, by the British police, by the British state. The IRA can only be defeated by the British working class, by the British socialist movement.

And the Working Class must learn to know their friends and allies against the Tory ruling class.

The British Labour movement must allow that ruling class to use the tragic and accidental death of members of our class to justify its crimes in Northern Ireland.

And we must, above all, understand the way to end the killing and the violence is to take sides with the IRA and help it to break the stranglehold which Britain still maintains over Ireland.

There is no other road to peace in Ireland but the defeat of British imperialism.
THE RAGGED TROUSERED FOOTBALL FAN

IT HAS BEEN INTERESTING TO note the recent increases in wages and prices and unemployment, the mounting anti-Semitism and the general rise in crime and violence.

It is clear that the economy is in crisis. The government's response has been to cut social services and increase taxes, leading to further hardship for many people.

The labour movement must unite to fight against these cuts and demand a more equitable distribution of wealth. Workers have the power to make real change and must stand together to win a better future for all.
ON JANUARY 31 TORY HOUSING Minister Julian Amery boldly announced what he described as a "pretty sensational" boom in private house building. He also predicted that the upswing in trend would be maintained. Last year's building boom commenced on a total of 207,300 private houses. This figure showed a 22% increase over the figure for 1970.

The picture for the public sector, however, was 'disappointing', said Amery. Last year 17,500 council houses were built, less than in 1971.

Coming to discuss the reasons for the staggering increase in house building given the present crisis of confidence, Amery asserted that the reasons were to be found in the lifting of the freeze on wages (building workers would like to know about that one!) and prices. Also, he stated that the mortgage rates offered by building societies were now more attractive.

The true story of this 'boom' is slightly different — as the report of the Nationwide Building Society revealed when it was released the next day. The data in the report showed that the real cause of this 28% increase in private building FACT — the cost of a house rose on average in 1971 by 21%.

FACT — over the last few years some house prices have jumped by 72%.

FACT — the steep increases accelerated during the last six months of 1971.

FACT — taken over the whole country this increase represents a price rise of £1,000 on a house which cost £5,000 at the end of 1970.

PROFITS

Given these facts the increases in private building are not at all surprising. As Karl Marx explained when he predicted the workings of this system, capital always flows into those branches of industry which have the best prospects of profit. At the present time land and development of land is one of the new branches of capitalist enterprise which can today guarantee a good return on investment.

Consequently, investment has increased through the influx of capital into building, while it has slumped in other, less profitable branches of industry.

All this in search of profits — and profits are certainly there to be had, though the rate-race has not been without its casualties. Many small construction firms have been driven to the wall by the ferocity of their competitors. Nevertheless, the overall picture is far more favourable for prospective profit-seekers. Land values are at a premium, there is an enormous shortage of houses, and a high unemployment in the building trade enables employers to push down wages.

Not that this boom even touches the working class. The only people who benefit are the investors, the estate agents, and the middle class who can afford the rocketing prices.

To obtain mortgage for an average priced house in the London area (which would cost £6,044) a worker would have to earn £60 a week!

Nothing shows more glaringly the absolute incapacity of capitalism to deliver the goods! Nothing is more blatant than the bourgeois system's incapacity to provide decent homes for those who create its wealth.

And nothing better exposes the way in which the wealth created by the worker stands hostile to him after the capitalist has appropriated it.

WORKHOUSES

Thus, at the same time as this 'boom' was going on, 5,826 families were herded into hostels many of which resemble work houses in the conditions which they were housed in.

There are, in 1972, more homeless families than ever before. In the London area alone the Shelter organisation puts the figure as high as between 50,000 and 200,000 families needing homes.

And this figure will increase if the Tories get their way, which their allies in rent control, tenancy and council houses.

This does not make the prospect of adequate housing very bright for workers. Nor does it offer any hope to the 5 million who live in substandard houses or to the 1,800,000 who live in 'homes' unfit for human habitation.

The Shelter organisation and its sights on Sir John Wilson (who accepted a job with the Tory Government) offer as a solution slum clearance, 'more houses' and — a solution on how to prevent people from becoming homeless.

At a time when the property sharks are at their most active, sidled and abetted by their friends in Government, shelter's 'solutions' are not even mildly reformist.

And meanwhile working class families continue to be broken up and dehumanised in the most foul and demoralising conditions.

This is all to be traced back to one fact: namely that capitalism invests only where there is an easy profit, and that right now land and property represent a much more secure store of value than paper bonds and shares which could become devalued even worthless.

The only way to begin to solve the problem is to cut right through the Tory Government nationalisation of the land, of finance companies and the building industry, without compensation — in fact, it is they who will have much to compensate for.

Nothing can even approach meeting the needs of the working class.

WHY JOE KELLY DIED

JOSEPH KELLY, 18, of Blyth, Northumberland, was recently murdered by the Tory government.

After 6 months wandering the streets, looking for work at factories and building sites, he took his own life.

The Coronet at Blyth recorded the verdict that he took his own life while the balance of his mind was disturbed. A simple way to brush the real cause of death under the carpet.

After all, what is more simple than to lay the blame on the lad himself and, at the same time, to imply that his needs and faculties were not all they might have been.

But look behind the neat and tidy explanation of the coroner and we see something else. We see the fact that the British ruling class and its executive arm, the Tory Government, has consigned over a million people to a life without a future, on the order.

It was this class — the brigade who trip to Ascoy, the crowd with the second Rolls Royce — who signed Joe Kelly's death warrant, which came in the shape of the little white slip given him each week at the docks.

The history of the working class is scattered with martyrs. Like the 13 dead in Ferry, Joe Kelly was a martyr — but in a different way.

He was not in active struggle. He never got that far. He was not shot by bullets. But he was murdered. Murdered by the system which places greater profits on making profits than on guaranteeing the right to work.

As his father told a newspaper, "He never stood a chance, our Joe: The grim reality of the present destroyed Joe's future."

So next time you hear the Tories telling us that unemployment is the fault of the working class, remember Joe Kelly in the best way you can, by strengthening your resolve to make an end of the Tory system once and for all.

RUTH BLACK

DAVID BLACK
I.S. WRITES ITS OWN HISTORY

What, one may ask, is the purpose of these "selected Documents" relating to the history of the Fourth International?

To the uninformed it may appear to be an exercise in educating the present membership of the Fourth International in the history of the Socialist International Group. A superficial reading of the documents, however, will show that the editors have been careful to present the documents in such a way that the reader is encouraged to make his own judgments about the events and the people involved.

One of the best-known documents is the "Red Book" of the Socialist International Group, which was published in 1920. This document was written by a group of Socialists who had broken with the Second International and formed the Socialist International. The document contains a detailed account of the struggles of the workers and the poor, and it calls for a new, socialist society.

Another important document is the "Manifesto of the Fourth International". This document was written in 1930 and called for the unification of all working-class organizations into a single, international body. The document was significant because it marked the beginning of the Fourth International.

Other documents include speeches given by leaders of the Fourth International, such as Leon Trotsky and Anton Chekhov. These speeches provide valuable insights into the thoughts and beliefs of these leaders, and they help to explain why the Fourth International was so influential.

In summary, the "selected Documents" provide a valuable resource for anyone interested in the history of the Fourth International and the development of the socialist movement. They offer a unique perspective on the struggles of the working class and the need for a socialist society.
The question that has to be asked now is why these particular documents were reproduced at this time, and why Hallas has to write such a falsified introduction to them?

Certainly new members of IS will want to know about the origins of IS and its present leaders. This respect both the selection and introduction serve as a starting point to cover up for more than was intended to reveal.

That CILF would be in a position of the organisation’s ideas and has remained with it all along cannot be doubted.

But the inclusion of Hallas’ documents from 1951 (dressed up as the Group’s main policy document but in fact only a rehash — ‘for use on contacts’ — of a Secretariat resolution endorsed two months previously) along with his introduction serve as camouflage to prevent these comedies where Hallas was during the intervening years.

Certainly he cannot claim a continuous membership of the organisation since its inception. Indeed even in the first two years of its existence his membership was put in question. There is a record in the Nov. 1952 minutes of the NC where it was noted that Hallas had been the only signed member of the group.

It would be instructive for new members of IS to look through the issues of Socialist Review from the 1950’s. They will be hard put to it to find any contribution by Hallas. The book ‘A Socialist Review’ published in 1965, which was a selection from articles from over the years from the paper, contains not one contribution from Hallas.

The whole of the present exercise is like someone trying to answer the question ‘what did you do in the war daddy?’ In fact during those long hard cold years during the 1950s and early 1960s Hallas seemed to have dropped out. It must all be a bit embarrassing for him to have to describe Trotsky as a bigger revisionist than Bernstein.

If such antics can not despicable they would be funny. There are always those for whom there is no world war was not only possible but imminent.

If anyone reads the above in this context one can see that the report was based upon the assumption of a quicker tempo of development than subsequently occurred and that it posed a very real and legitimate possibility of some social democratic leaderships or sections of them being forced into a revolutionary direction by the pressure and activity of those mass forces.

The report in fact says — ‘In all these countries it is expected that the new socialist parties will be born and at the moment unforeseeable developments, that the radicalization of those parties and the first stages of the revolution, of the objective and subjective conditions and policies, will manifest themselves within these organisations. The main forces of the revolutionary parties of these countries will spring up by differentiation or disintegration of these organisations.’

Does Hallas really think (even in these brave new days of the 12 page Socialist Worker...) that there can be a complete collection of the existing organisations of the working class in the building of a new society, or is it not reasonable to suppose that ferment within them and splits and disagreements will be a part of this process?

Finally, last Hallas and I think the Socialist Workers Party of British India was an imperial war in Britain, let me quote from a ‘Socialist Review Youth Supplement’ of the same period:

“The world today is divided by an alliance into two hostile blocs — the Power blocks, both striving for world supremacy. You may be quite ignorant of the great world powers, but you can not deny that these figures of these countries but of one thing you know for sure, and that is that these blocks threaten world peace, and war between them is inevitable.”

Now does this sound like the same one with the picture of IS being right all the time and you just idiotic if you disagree? Dubious readers will now understand why only “some documents” were republished, and others left to mould in the archives.

SMOCKSCREEN

Birmingham — Peter Radcliffe, 110, Gough Road, Edgbaston, B15.
Bolton — Roy Ratcliffe, 24 Crawford Avenue, Tidesley, N. Bolton.
Bristol — Tony Brockman, 57 Comwell Crescent, Brisol 8.
Croydon — Dave Edward, 17 Winstead Avenue, Earlsdon, Coventry.
Derby — Trevor Cave, 97 School House Hill, Hove, Derbyshire.
Liverpool — Peter Barker, 110 Edge Lane, Liverpool 7.
London North — Phil Lewis, 949 Alexandra Park Road, N.2.
London West — Ken Stratford, 86 Rosebank Road, Haswell, N.
Manchester — Fran Brodie, A6 Thornhill Road, Deoyliden M.T.
Middlebrough — Tony Duffy, 79 Clynes Road, Grangemount, Teeside.
Newcastle — John Foster, 55 Percy Street, Whitley Bay.
Northampton — Dave Green, 46 Chiltem Way, Northampton.
Preston — Steve Cobishley, 29 Stanley Place, Preston, Lancs.
Stoke on Trent — Martin Thomas, 88 Princes Road, Hartshill, Stoke Swanso — Bob Cook, 859 Camaran Road, Floeston, Fitch, Swansea.
Stockton on Tees — Phil Thorne, 13 Heathrey Close, Stocket on Tees Wellington — Ivan Wells, 14 Craigie, Wellington, Northants.

The fight Against Redundancies

G.E.C.

COVENTRY

A NEW WORD IS BEING USED in Parliament bars; Stock Exchange corridors and other corridors of power — Weinstocking.

The word originates from Sir Arnold Weinstock, managing Directo of GEC. Its meaning — mass production and feedback with less workers.

There is no doubt that 1971 was a highly successful year for Sir Arnold and GEC shareholders, and a disastrous one for GEC workers.

In COVENTRY, GEC is the biggest single employer of labour — 14,000 workers. In 8 factories. GEC Stoke is the biggest of these factories, with 8,000 workers.

Four weeks ago 1,000 redundancies were announced at Stoke, 750 manual workers and 250 clerical workers.

Management say that only 150 workers will be actually sacked, others will be redeployed within the company and natural wastage will take care of the rest.

They blame a fall off in orders for transmission division they make the telephone exchange switching equipment.

They have not revealed details of the fall off, but it is known that the multi-million pound orders from the Post Office are no longer forthcoming, and that production in this area this year is to be cut by a quarter.

Clearly this is part of Weinstock’s shack-out and streamlining policies. Wages council on 150 workers over a year could amount to £5 million extra profit for redeployment could mean workers moved to lower grade jobs on lower grade pay — once again a saving for GEC.

And what is this natural wastage? A man retires at 65, a girl leaves to have a baby, a couple leave for Australia — and their jobs are not filled (by a redeployment within the plant).

That’s one less job vacancy, one more place on the dole.

GEC save their wages every week, and have already saved paying redundancy money! What could be better — for GEC?

To fight back, GEC workers should demand:

1. No sackings
2. No loss of pay or status with redeployment
3. Every worker leaving voluntarily to be replaced from outside

The management’s action in GEC Stoke is typical of their policy elsewhere in this group. They all in London and plan which factory’s workers to isolate next.

A strong GEC combine shop stewards committee is absolute essential to link struggles in all areas.

It is no use thinking that the only battle will come only once and then will go away.

When Britain enters the Common Market and GEC workers with Siemens and Philips, shake-outs and closures will get worse, not better.

A combine will have to be built if electrical workers are not to be smashed by their employers and left alone between Fife and Colchester.

Dave Spencer

subscribe!
"They Came in the Morning"

compiled by Seamus O'Tuathail

ONE OF THE MYTHS most consistently fogged by the Press is that of "British standards of justice."

At a time when the nature of imperialism is being seen more clearly, even on a world scale, Britain's image remains to most of her citizens totally unshattered.

We believe that Hitler and his fascists committed inhuman outrages.

In Britain we believe that the Americans are guilty of atrocities in South East Asia, we believe that the French tortured the freedom fighters in Algeria. But the British, so far as their sense of fair play is too strong.

No one can say that the women and Gentleman prevents them from behaving like their French counterparts.

The fact that time and again allegations of brutality and torture by Her Majesty's Forces have been made throughout the world, has not yet dented this national image. But this was all in Aden, in Cyprus, where the people involved were far away and could readily be represented as "savages".

Here, again, such allegations are being made, coming this time from only a few miles away, from the democratic quarter of British speaking workers not very different from those to be found in Birmingham, in Manchester, in Liverpool, in Innsbruck, in Blackpool.

THEY CAME IN THE MORNING is evidence for the methods employed by the British forces in the enforcement of "law and order." It is the treatment of the men seized by the troops when internment was introduced, in the following story.

It rejects all the conclusions of the Commission of Enquiry (set up by the Government) and attempts to set out what really happened. Most of the time spent in British camps is devoted to accounts taken from the British themselves, and substantially by doctors, lawyers and clergymen.

All the men who were seized on the night of August 8th suffered from starvation, from being kept in their heads, from being forced to run in their bare feet over stones and broken glass, and from being beaten and tortured.

ELECTRO-TORTURE

Some were treated even worse.

For instance, Michael Fallon was taken to his house on the night of October 1st by the police.

"He walked me over to another big, bare room, and left me in the charge of two uniformed R.U.C. men. One of these went out and came back in grabbing my legs, and the other point out the two arms. I had only a jersey and trousers on me as I dressed hurriedly when they came in."

"The other R.U.C. man lifted two wires out of the floor with what appeared to be two black caps on them and taped them on each side of my chest with sticking plaster. Then the other R.U.C. man put over my two arms. Nothing had been said by the police."

"The R.U.C. man had my hands fixed a light switch on the wall and the wires came off and fell down on the floor. My body was 200 volt and a wire and my body was convulsed, I jumped up and down and the wires came off and fell down on the floor. My body was convulsed, and a nervous twitch set in. I could not speak and straight and was all convulsed, I was also British subject."

After further maltreatment this man was released, as clearly there was not a shred of evidence to associate him with the I.R.A. Not that that matters. It only serves to illustrate that in their eyes oppression the British Army are indiscriminate in their choice of victims.

For they are threatened by a section of the whole population, and therefore the whole Catholic population is the enemy.

OPPRESSION

This is the recurring pattern where imperialism, whether it be American, French, British, is threatened by the mass upsurge of the people it oppresses. The oppression of the people within the capitalist system is far more acute than it has 20th their grasp over whole nation, and squeezes them of their livelihood.

There, in the new order, the robbery of the masses is completed, that capitalism cannot proceed to be benevolent, Massive unemployment, low wages, deficiencies of the people to rise up in rebellion. Because the widespread and determined nature of this rebellion, and the capitalist methods of enforcing "law and order" are not enough.

The whole population must be terrorised, whatever rights it had must be taken away, in an attempt to maintain their exploitation. That is why imperialism, as this booklet says "leaves the smell of human flesh behind it wherever it goes."

AND IN BRITAIN...

But we must not make the mistake of thinking that capitalism is basically different there, as far as the high level of industrialisation and unemployment in Britain has meant that normal business as usual cannot be maintained. In simple terms, while the profits come rolling in, the forces of the state will be happy and powerless.

But when this profit falls off, as is beginning to happen, and when the working class refuses to accept unemployment and cuts in standards, then we can expect the events described in this booklet to be re-lived in the cities of Britain.

TORY MURDER IN DERRY

"But you don't call it murder when our lads get killed.

There's a war on in Ireland. On one side is the Irish Republican Army, popular militias fighting for a chance in Ireland to develop independent from the extermination and domination of British rule. On the other side is the British Army. Are they fighting to defend you and your home and rights? Do you gain anything from their presence here? The working people pay them (8 million last year) to fight in Ireland so that English bosses can keep the profits coming in, and in fact the present set-up of police state, discrimination poverty and unemployment.

The British Army is there to support the oppressors of the working people of the North, the I.R.A is defending the oppressed against them. Do you think it wrong that any other capitalists should have the right to try to kill people, then it is right that people should organise themselves to resist this.

"But still, our lads are getting killed." The British Army are "our lads" as long as they are on relatives or friends or neighbours. But when they are cut down into just the Army, then the question is whether they are ours, the interests are whether they are not ours - they are the people. We can't side with the shooting down Irish workers, no more than we can side with the greedy capitalist pickets."

"The troops are not the people they have to be. They can't expect them just to sit back when they're fired at."

Quite true. But they do not just shoot people out of self-defence -

If they did, their best defence would be to get out altogether. The people who ARE defending themselves are the people of the slums, Ardoyne, Baggotside and the other Catholic areas. Without the I.R.A. they would be quite defenceless against the troops, who bust up people's houses and drag the men away for torture and unlimited imprisonment.

So you would do better to ask: "Can you expect the Republicans to take all that and not fight back?" And fighting back against the British gunmen with stones and sticks and words is pretty silly. The Republicans have in fact been forced to fight with guns with guns.

"But the troops are there to keep peace between Protestants and Catholics."

The Protestant workers have a few privileges, it is true, and some of them are prepared to fight if they feel these are threatened. But this too is the fault of British imperialism, who set up the Orange state to defend their interests, and tried to buy off the Protestants. Down the centuries it has been Britain's deliberate aim to create and foster divisions in Ireland. Now they pretend to be the 'peacemakers,' but they are not neutral. They are using the I.R.A. as a weapon, and they have created an excuse to avoid troops to drive down on those who now dare to demand the regime Britain has imposed.

"But the I.R.A. are just terrorists."

What do you mean by 'terrorists?'

Yes, we use bombs and snipers, but if they had 15,000 trained men, and tanks and machine guns and perhaps an internment camp or two they wouldn't need to. They have to use any methods they can.

C.C.
murder

In our lads get killed

Because they are fighting for a just cause, they have a right to use any weapon they can against the oppressors.

Anyway, their activities are dis- torted by the British press, which naturally supports the present system.

Take two examples, from Eamon McCann’s pamphlet “The British Press and Northern Ireland”:

On 5th May 1971 the mother of John McKeague, a militant Protestant, was killed by a petrol bomb. The RUC issued a statement saying that they did not believe the incident to have any sectarian significance. In the Northern Ireland context this meant clearly that they did not believe the IRA was responsible. John McKeague’s “Loyalist News” claimed that the killers were known, and were not members of the IRA – “we are on from a rival Orange group.”

Yet the “Daily Telegraph” non- theless carried a front-page headline “MOTHER DIES IN I.R.A. BOMB F I R E.”

Another example: On 3rd September 1971 someone threw a grenade on a British army patrol in Belfast. The bullet missed, ricocheted off a wall and killed 17-month old Angela Gallagher.

On 6th September Annette McGowan, 14 years old, was killed by a British army bullet, aimed according to the Army, as a suspect.

The headlines reporting the two deaths were significantly different in tone.

On 4th September:

“BABY GIRL SHOT DEAD
BY I.R.A.”

“EXPRESS: I.R.A. IN STREET
TERROR: BABY SHOT
DEAD”

On 7th September:

“SUN: “GIRL, 14, DIES IN
GUN BATTLE”

“MAIL: “GIRL SHOT DEAD IN
GUN BATTLE”

“MIRROR: “GIRL, 14, DIES IN GUN-
FIGHT”

“EXPRESS: “GIRL, 14 KILLED IN
DERBY CROSS FIRE”

“Perhaps you’re right, we should get the troops out and let the Irish fight it out among themselves.”

“Certainly we should get the troops out. But that is not enough. If we oppose the Tory government on the miners’ strike, we must recogni- se that they serve the same inter- ests as the interest of the IRA. Their attitude towards the miners. There are two sides – the Tories on their Army, police, press and the people they oppress, including the workers in Britain and the Irish people, on the other.

Ireland is a separate nation from Britain, with a separate history and a separate culture. The majority of the Irish people have always resisted the imposition of British rule. The present fighting is one battle in a long war.

If we do not support the miners, then we must recognise that they have NO RIGHT AT ALL in Ireland, and we must support unconditionally those who are trying to get them out, and recognise their right to do it any way they choose: including pursuing the British Army onto its own home ground, whether this be Aldershott or anywhere else.

As long as British workers can be cleverly into supporting our own bosses in their exploitation of Ireland, we’ll never be able to fight them properly ourselves.

That is why British workers must stand clearly for the victory of the Irish Republican Army.

No Brutality?

Excerpts from a statement taken in Armagh Jail from George Burt of Belfast. The statement, taken by a priest, is among a number made by people detained by the British Army in Northern Ireland, and collected by the Association for Legal Justice.

“We were arrested in the early hours of Sunday morning in the beginning of December. ... We were brought to the Royal Victoria Hospital because of gunshot wounds in the back and head. ... We were put into a private ward.

There were about 15 soldiers in the ward and two outside. They started squabbling at me – ‘Shoot me! Shoot me!’ Three of them with Stirlings immediately took the magazine out of the Stirlings and shot me in the hospital bed with the drip on my arm.

When I tried to stop them they started shooting at me and shot me around the arm. The other did the other leg. Then I grabbed hold of one of the Stirlings. One with a sniping rifle came in and stopped and fired on me. He brought it down on the inside of my hand. There is a scar still there about my left eye.

I went on for an hour. Then they cooled off.

They kicked me when I tried to roll over and then they got sick. When I put my head over the side to vomit one of them put his boot up and kicked me under the right ear. When they got tired they looked about and found a syringe, started sticking needles up my legs and feet.

After a while they started kicking me on the legs from the bottom and the top of the bed. A soldier came in and did a bit of whispering. Then they really got stuck into me, went crazy with the Stirlings on my legs. One brought the butt of his rifle down on my ribs. I threw my arms around my ribs and ankles and knees to prevent them. They lashed away. One of the arms got stuck from that beating. They took me away in a scarred red car to Hollyood. By that time I was quaking, just a bundle of nerves. They had to lift me out in a stretcher.

After a lot of hours I tried to get some sleep but got none. Policeman hanged chairs and plates shouting ‘keep awake you rats’; there were other prisoners there. I was taken into another wooden hut, partitioned off for interrogation. There were three investigating me the first time. One said: ‘Someone here wants you. Man came in with side hol- der, pistol hanging out of it. He hit me with the pistol on the shin where most of the damage was done.

They took a verbal statement from you – did this, you did that and so on. I said yes. I did, yes, I did, every time. I said anything as a matter of fact, as long as they told me to lie.

They brought me back to the cells where most of the men were. I could barely walk. Someone shooed me to the rest of them there: ‘Look around. This is what you’ll get if you don’t talk.’

Someone looked around. Some didn’t.”
This Tory Government has once again demonstrated that its policies are motivated solely by the need of the capitalist class to make profits.

This is what lies behind the recent attempted settlement with the Smith white-supremacist regime in Rhodesia.

The American's latest slogan is "The World Faces a Choice: Zimbabwe Shall Be FREE or she will remain an ailing British economy. Declining profit rates and a shrinking share of world markets in the face of competition from less sick capitalist rivals have forced the Tories to cut their losses and use a deal with Smith.

The settlement means that they give recognition to the Smith regime and call off the face of sanctions, which were damaging the British bosses' most treasured possessions, their moneybags and bank vaults. The only effect sanctions had was to deprive British industry of cheap sources of raw materials and of Rhodesian export markets. Meanwhile, other capitalist countries took full advantage of the situation and carried on trade with Rhodesia, via the backdoor, using South Africa as an intermediary.

Among British companies which stand to gain from a settlement are: British Leyland (around 25 million in export orders), Imperial Tobacco and B.A.T. Tobacco, where monocotan collagen which stands to gain between them around 165 million, Rhodesian tobacco being cheaper than the American tobacco they were forced to sanction to buy). BAC will make 2.6 million from the sale of three BAC 111 aircraft. Turner and Newall (who own the asbestos mines at Shabani) stand to increase their profits by about 25 million annually.

The fate of the Zimbabwe (Rhodesian) people, which erupted as a result of the proposed settlement, was sparked off during a demonstration of 3,000 miners from the Shabani mines on January 11th. They were on strike for the reinstatement of sacked workers and for a pay rise. The police opened fire, killing at least seven workers and imposed a curfew after the demonstration had developed into a riot.

The workers expressed their hostility to the settlement by taking up unanimously the simple slogan "NO", and emphasizing it by burning beer halls, municipal buildings and storing and burning any cars (all cars were white owned) that got in the way.

The special forces turned into a fire in the next week as Africans in town after town took to the streets expressing their contempt for the regime, for what they saw as a sell-out by Britain and for the Pearce commission.

Gatons, Salisbury, Umtali, Que Que and Fort Victoria saw mass demonstrations by angry Africans.

The white racist bosses responded by buying for blood, and met the demonstrations with all the savagery and brutality they could muster, using armoured cars, machine guns, dogs and helicopters to quash the resistance of the Africans. The police admission to having killed 14 people, and there is no doubt that the real figures are much greater. Even mild critics of the regime, the Tondies, who in England would be considered to be the right of the Liberal Party, have been imprisoned without trial.

The Pearce Commission, which was sent out to Rhodesia to do a clean-up job on the settlement, has now really got its work cut out in the face of mass hostility from the Africans and the embarrassment of a white backlash.

It is significant that the large spontaneous demonstrations were in the main led by workers, with the trade unions, 100,000 strong, in the forefront.

The upsurge of the African workers has cleared away forever the myth of Smith's "happiest Africans in the world." The African workers have stood up and said: "Enough!"

This first struggle will lead the Zimbabwe workers along the road to the smashing of Smith and the white colonial ruling class. Their regime is a regime of violence and suppression. It can only be combated and defeated by the organised counter-violence of the African workers.

The whites are not just a racial group; they constitute at the same time the ruling capitalist class. For the black people to end their racial oppression they must overthrow this capitalist class.

The struggle for African liberation is inseparable from the mobilisation of the African workers on a revolutionary socialist programme. The white working class in its millions, such as ZANU and ZAPU which are not explicitly socialist, who want to establish African rule and yet do not go down with the capitalist system, can offer no road forward for the Zimbabwe workers and farmers.

British workers must support the fight of all those sections and organisations of the Zimbabwe people who fight to clear out Smith. In so doing they are weakening the British Leylands and the Turner and Newalls who we have to fight in Britain.

Ken Stratford
EVERYONE KNOWS the miners’ victory in smashing through the Government’s 7% ceiling was due neither to the reasonableness of Milliborne nor the obvious justice of their case. Justice can be armed with a tool. The miners won a power confrontation.

The reasons for this victory should be understood by all workers, and the experience assimilated to be used in future battles.

Here were not two armies, each with a given number of men and weapons. The Government and the miners met on the same field, not two opposing fronts. On the one side were the employers and the Government with 7% ceiling, and on the other they pressed their plans lined up.

But on the other side stand not only the miners, but the whole working class —confused, divided, unorganized, believing in an irresistible force that if it were all brought into play, the nation was a fighting machine.

It is a misnomer, so not a clash of given forces, but for the workers a test of the capacity to mobilize. The tactics used by the miners showed the possibilities inherent in decisive action by workers.

A case where it was used to the full was the response to the attempt by the Tsarist General Kornilov to overthrow the Russian Revolution in August 1917.

HUMAN LINKS

 Trotsky described it like this:

“The conspiracy was conducted by those circles who were not accustomed to know how to do anything without the lower ranks, without labour forces, without the large army, without the large industrial associations, without the great leaders, without the large masses. The contribution of the peasantry, the non-working class, was essential.

There immediately appeared queues of people eager to join the ranks of the red guard... the organized workers formed companies for trench digging, street fighting and the barricading of the streets... the railroad workers tore up and barricaded the tracks... the railroad workers, unionized, armed and sent them along the lines. The rail workers were the most obvious target..."

“The rebel general had stampeded his foot, and legions rose from the ground — but they were the legions of the enemy.”

“The railroad workers in those days did their duty. In a mysterious way they surrounded themselves moving on the wrong roads. Regiments would arrive in the cities, and the miners would be sent up a blind alley, staff would get out of communication with their units.”

“The Telegraphers held up the orders of Kornilov. Communication unfavourable to the Kominternists was immediately blocked. Wires were distributed, passed up, passed from mouth to mouth. The machine-resistant sections, newly drawn into struggle, have proved the most vital and inventive, the least set in traditional forms of conflict.”

TIDAL WAVE OF STRIKES

It was for example at first the struggles for union recognition by the previously unorganized which swept millions in America in the 1930s into a tidal wave of strikes such as that country has not seen before or since, evolving as they went ever more daring tactics.

Paving the way came the Toledo Auto Lite strike of 1934, the first public success of the United Auto workers. Despite court injunctions the Unemployed League brought its members onto the mass picket lines where 10,000 fought a six day pitched battle with armed police and National Guard, and routed them, besieged the scabs in the plant for 15 hours and then shut it down.

This was the first victory of the union to come.

While this struggle was reaching its climax another was being waged by the lorry drivers and warehousemen of London’s buses and trains — a struggle ever sought and never yet attained.

These tactics bring in a whole series of questions political questions — they involve a challenge to management’s right to control in its own property — its buildings and stock.

They take the challenge beyond local confrontations, challenging wider sections of the employers and drawing on the solidarity of wider sections of the working class. This brings on a confrontation with the state, bringing in the whole question of who runs society.

Yet it has always been the case that in most periods of even limited demands for wages and reforms can only be effectively waged by tactics whose potential is revolution.

If their logic is carried out.

In the coming wage battles, the implications of mass pickets, sit-in strikes and so on must be understood. We own society, and we can only break the Tories and the system they represent.

by Connie Lever

NEW TACTICS NOW

In the past period, with expanding production and manpower shortage, tactics which involved massive confrontations and extensions of the struggle seemed unnecessary. Victories could be won in the industrial factory or even the individual shop, often by short actions or by the mere threat of them by small numbers of key men.

But capitalism could afford it then. Now these victories have to be fought for. Since 1968 we have seen the revival in France and Italy of the sit in strikes so widespread in the 20s and 30s, and the beginning of the extension to Britain.

Now we have the adoption here too of the massive mobile pickets which won such tremendous victories in America in the 1930s. Their potential is enormous — preventing the use and movement of decisive materials and of finished products could be a powerful force in many disputes. Again, could group-picketing, for instance, perhaps bring about a unified strike
FRANCE — THE FRUITS OF OFFICE

The French tax system has become a major scandal. The satirical paper Le Canard Enchaîné revealed that the Prime Minister had paid no taxes for years on his large income and property.

In the face of this, the government has ordered a thorough investigation of all French tax laws. It aims to remove any loopholes that allow wealthy individuals to avoid paying taxes.

BANGLADESH

MUKTI Bahini DISARMED AS BHIKHAR CONTINUE THE KILLING

The desire of the Mukti Bahini (Liberation Forces) rank and file to eliminate the threat of armed Bihari terror is more than a simple thirst for revenge.

The Biharis, armed by Yahya's troops, have demonstrated a relentless determination to inflict massive casualties on the Bengali people. While the relatively few instances of revenge killings by Bengalis have been splashed over the front pages of the Western press, the role of the collaborators in the March-December murders has generally been relegated to the inside pages.

The end of the "time of the guerrillas" in Bangladesh has been punctuated by a series of major developments that had been predicted by the Mukti Bahini rank and file.

Following the collapse of the Pakistani regime, unimpressed by the Awami League's prestige, thousands of Biharis have returned to their homelands. On January 29, while Bengali guerrillas were on route to Dacca to give Rahman their arms, bands of Biharis (non-Bengalis who collaborated with Yahya) opened fire on Bengali refugees returning to their homes on the outskirts of Dacca.

In two Bihari-dominated neighbourhoods, Mohammadpur and Mirpur, fighting raged for three days. Despite the Western bourgeoisie's hypocritical concern for the well-being of the accomplices in Pakistan's gen-

PECULIARITIES

The growing mood of discontent coincides with the stagnation of the French economy.

The 1973 general election will give some opportunity to express this. Most workers are determined to return a government which will guarantee their current demands.

But as with the Labour Party in 1964, the possible candidate has not been able to offer an alternative. The policies of the Communist Party seem likely to lead again into the same blind alley of some empty reforms and class collaboration as before.

Their electoral programme is even, this early stage, already ambiguous in its return to a 1949 week to combat unemployment.

Typically, this is promised not "at once", but "in due course".

C.L.

Pakistani's Legacy: and the Murdering Collaborators Are Still at Large

The growing mood of discontent coincides with the stagnation of the French economy.

The 1973 general election will give some opportunity to express this. Most workers are determined to return a government which will guarantee their current demands.

But as with the Labour Party in 1964, the possible candidate has not been able to offer an alternative. The policies of the Communist Party seem likely to lead again into the same blind alley of some empty reforms and class collaboration as before.

Their electoral programme is even, this early stage, already ambiguous in its return to a 1949 week to combat unemployment.

Typically, this is promised not "at once", but "in due course".

C.L.

BANGLADESH

MUKTI Bahini DISARMED AS BHIKHAR CONTINUE THE KILLING

The desire of the Mukti Bahini (Liberation Forces) rank and file to eliminate the threat of armed Bihari terror is more than a simple thirst for revenge.

Even during the last days of the Pakistani occupation, the Biharis, armed by Yahya's troops, demonstrated a relentless determination to inflict massive casualties on the Bengali people. While the relatively few instances of revenge killings by Bengalis have been splashed over the front pages of the Western press, the role of the collaborators in the March-December murders has generally been relegated to the inside pages.

The end of the "time of the guerrillas" in Bangladesh has been punctuated by a series of major developments that had been predicted by the Mukti Bahini rank and file.

Following the collapse of the Pakistani regime, unimpressed by the Awami League's prestige, thousands of Biharis have returned to their homelands. On January 29, while Bengali guerrillas were on route to Dacca to give Rahman their arms, bands of Biharis (non-Bengalis who collaborated with Yahya) opened fire on Bengali refugees returning to their homes on the outskirts of Dacca.

In two Bihari-dominated neighbourhoods, Mohammadpur and Mirpur, fighting raged for three days. Despite the Western bourgeoisie's hypocritical concern for the well-being of the accomplices in Pakistan's gen-
After Derry

The workers move in the South

By Carol Coulter

THE SHOOTINGS IN DERRY have radically transformed the situation in the South of Ireland. From an attitude of passive sympathy, the workers’ population moved into a position of solidarity with the Catholic people of the North, and of opposition to British imperialism.

Before the Derry murders both wings of Sinn Fein, the political parties of the two sides, failed significantly to whip up any mass support for the strike in the North. This contrasted unfortunately with the ‘68 bombing campaign, when thousands of unemployed young workers threw themselves against British imperialism.

There were many reasons for this, but the most important was how weak and demoralised by massive unemployment and emigration. Consequently individualists vented their frustration in isolated anti-imperialist actions. But the 60s saw the increase and strengthening of the working class, arising from economic expansion. The industrial record of the Irish workers became the most militant in Europe.

On the one hand they were bereft of any political consciousness. They failed to see how the struggle related to their interests.

But on the other it showed a healthy reluctance to be drawn away from their own immediate struggles into nationalism, which had so often in the past proved a blinding alley of defeat and demoralisation.

GENERAL STRIKE

Consequently it is both significant and to be expected that when the true face of British imperialism was brutally unmasked in Derry on January 30th it was the trade union movement that took the lead in transforming the political movement which mobilised the workers against British Imperialism.

It was the trade union march which burned down the British Embassy they were the only people with the strength to protect those who actually threw the bombs.

On Tuesday February 1st a general strike took place throughout the whole country. It was called a “national day of mourning”, but this is the usual technique of the Government to try and disguise the class nature of the question. The same thing happened in 1917, when De Valera was forced to call a “national day of mourning” in order to forestall a general strike, with all its implications.

On Wednesday 2nd the whole country was convulsed by spontaneous stoppages, when workers downed tools and marched.

The reaction to this by all the political parties has been, understandably, one of terror. The pacifist collaborationist policies of both Parnell Paud, Phe Noi and the Labour Party have been utterly discredited. On the other hand, the Republicans with both Parnell Paud and the Labour Party are afraid of the social implications of the upsurge, and are reduced to empty pharisaism. Nobody wants to be in power at the moment, knowing that they are faced with a mass mobilisation of the working class.

If all this took place in a vacuum it might be possible to defuse the situation in a pseudo-republican basis, continuing it to gestures and empty talk. But, sadly for the ruling class, this is not the case.

Before the events in Derry the Government had quite enough on its hands. The economic situation was deteriorating for some time. Unemployment was rising steadily. What was in effect a wage freeze had been instituted.

Most important, these measures were not being met with passivity on the part of the working class. Even the Union leaders were forced to make militant noises about unemployment.

These first months of 1972 are when the “wage agreement” is really beginning to bite. But the maintenance men, the most influential section of the working class, have put in for a big increase and a 35 hour working week. Two years ago their strike brought the country to a standstill.

To add to the Government malaise, the EEC referendum (demanded by the Constitution) is only three months away, and the C.N.U. have voted to oppose entry.

SOCIAL CRISIS

So this massive reaction to the Derry shootings comes at the intersection of a national and a social upheaval in Ireland. This makes a huge step forward. The whole nature of imperialism and its repressive state apparatus has been exposed.

Lynch’s conjecture in the workings of imperialism, in Britain’s continuing domination of Ireland, is becoming clearer and clearer. And this coincides with a huge attack on the jobs and living standards of the workers.

The mobilisation of the labour movement shows what can be done to the workers. The failure of anyone except the labour leaders, workers, as they are, to mobilise this reaction shows the organised strength and self-reliance of the Irish workers.

Recent events show more clearly than anything else the truth of Connolly’s dictum “The Irish working class are the inarticulate inheritors of the fight for Irish freedom.”

But they will only fight this fight seriously, bringing to bear the full might of their organisation, if they see it to be in their interests. Only a socialist programme can make this clear. Any nationalist programme which puts the socialist transformation of society off to a distant future, until after Britain is thrown out of Ireland, will not gain the mass adherence of Irish workers, unless they suffer a defeat in a battle for their own rights.

Irish workers have learned what can be gained by a battle for a better life. They are not going to forget that lesson.

That must now be fused with the fight against imperialism. A defeat in the struggle for wages and jobs could lead to the kind of demoralisation of the ‘68 bombing campaign, and this would undoubtedly be combined with a national action against Britain. But Irish socialists will fight against the possibility of such a defeat.

Socialists in Ireland are fighting in the trade union movement for a real, effective action against British imperialism. They will fight to stop the leaders backing down.

Meanwhile material help is bound to go to those fighting the British Army. The labour movement must be mobilised to throw out British imperialism and its Irish collaborators, and to restructure the country in the interests of the working class.

These events are very important for English workers. The Irish workers are fighting the same fight for better wages and against unemployment as the miners, the Pleasure workers and, indeed the whole British working class. The Army they are opposing is the army of the British employers, ordered by their Government, the Tory Government. The fight is different, but the enemy is the same.

United action by the British and Irish working class can hasten the downfall of this whole rotten regime.

That is what we are all fighting for.
Battle ahead for Printworkers

ALL WORKERS IN THE GENERAL print trade now face a major battle which could determine the whole pattern of wages and conditions in the industry for many years. Employers in the industry are determined to cut the real wages of trade unionists. The miserable pay increase they have offered is well below the rise in the cost of living and would leave workers worse off than a year ago.

In the face of this offensive from the employers, workers in every chapel should insist that there should be no retreat from the original demands. Industrial action in support of the claim should receive the fullest support.

Last November, the four main print unions, representing over 180,000 general print workers, met the bosses' organisation, the British Federation of Master Printers, and submitted a joint list representing the following demands:
1. Re-classification.
2. Establishment of the Graduation System.
5. Establishment of Grade II towns.
6. Adjustment of Apprentices and Learners' percentage rates.

I.R.O. strike sparks
Rank & File

A DISPUTE HAS BEEN ON AT the I.R.O. Computer Centre at Beeston, Nottingham, in which the electricians contracted by James Scott & Co. struck for a living wage in February 1971. The strike spread, as other electricians and site labourers joined the picket. The demands were made ultimately at the I.R.O. agreement, which was later to increase 'productivity' (i.e. exploitation) and which directly affected the basic methods of trade union organisation, like site-level negotiations.

After a disgusting history of trade union bureaucracy, management collaboration in victimising the militants, the men finally came out unofficially on October 20 under the leadership of their strike committee, demanding a decent wage, an end to blacklisting, and site-level negotiating rights. The strike committee issued a leaflet which attacked the role of the trade union officials who had totally ignored their demands.

But rank and file working class support had been growing steadily. Demonstrations have been joined by other workers, and a rank and file organisation has grown up. This has put the strikers in a stronger position in relation to the Union.

At the beginning of this month the strikers travelled to London to get support.

Ten building sites agreed to support them with levies, and six EPTU branches (including Frank Chapple's branch) overwhelmingly passed a resolution calling on the EPTU to make the I.R.O. strike official.

CHARGED

On February 5th John Byrne (chairman of the I.R.O. strike committee) was told he would be charged under the I.R.O. penal clauses.

Every electrician must sign the JIB agreement individually, and thus it is legally binding. The penal clauses, never used before in 5 years, allow for penalties ranging from withdrawal of all benefits and £100 fines, to a permanent ban from the industry.

As Bro. Byrne said, "This is the employers' last desperate move. They can't break us any other way. They can't get men on the picket line."

"They, and the EPTU officials, are worried about a national rank and file movement will develop around the strike."

The I.R.O. has in fact sparked off the beginning of a national movement.

On March 20th, (*) there will be a national rank and file conference of contracting electricians and plumbers to fight for:
* £1 per hour
* Implementation of EPTU Co-ordination decision
* The right of site stewards to negotiate.
* A mutual basic methods of trade union organisation, like site-level negotiations.

(*) 6pm at Central Hall, Newsham Street, Liverpool. Moral support for the I.R.O. strike should be sent to J. Byrne at 44, Sidney Road, Bootle 26, Lancs.

Paul Barker

Coventry Toolroom

The Coventry Toolroom Rate has been broken. The Rate, agreed in 1941, meant that in the Coventry area (Coventry, Nuneaton and Leamington) covering 49 federated firms, the wages of the 7,999 toolmakers were fixed every month to the average earnings of the area's pieceworkers.

The Engineering Employers considered that the Rate was inflationary and caused "wage drift". Also, since Coventry workers' wages were competitive, high, the toolmakers' wages were national standard for workers in other areas to aim for parity.

In November the 7 month dispute over the Rate ended with an agreement to have 3 months of individual plant bargaining to replace the old district scale.

So far 15 domestic agreements have been reached covering half of the toolmakers. The minimum basis for plant agreements is 105.9 p. an hour or £42 a week.

Jugoslav Toolroom workers have negotiated a rate of £48 a week, which may become a guideline for all British Leyland toolroom workers. Triumph Engineering (BSA) workers have negotiated a rate of £52.50 a week. These agreements are in well organised factories. In the smaller, weaker plants, lower rates will apply, as they have Mr. Alan Berry, Secretary of the Coventry Engineering Employers' Association, is well satisfied with the new moves.

He said, "These new wage rates are no higher than could be expected from the old toolroom rates and in many cases a good deal lower."

This breaking of the Coventry Toolroom Rate together with the attempt to introduce Measured Day Work into British Leyland, plus growing unemployment in the area, is part of the Government's and employers strategy to keep a ceiling on wages in the Coventry area, and to prevent national claims for parity and wage leapfrogging.

Traditional rights and bargaining methods are being attacked everywhere, and being replaced by what always turns out to be a worse deal. These innovations will have to be resisted, because they mean a cut in real wages for less men employed, in the long run.

D.S.