CORRUPTION? THE TORY SYSTEM IS BASED ON LEGALISED CORRUPTION!

A small corner of the curtain of secrecy which normally surrounds the affairs of the business community was raised in the bankruptcy court last week — and revealed part of the vast network of 'corruption', 'rake-offs', and backhander's in public life.

John Poulson, a Yorkshire architect, declared that he had paid out large sums of money to politicians (Tory and Labour) and to civil servants.

One of them is Home Secretary, Reginald Maudling, who, it seems, asked for £2,000 to be paid into a certain charitable trust. Alfred Roberts, Labour MP for Normanton was said to have got £1,500 and admits to £5,000 (over about 2 years). John Merritt, former Principal officer of the Ministry of Health, on Leeds Hospital Board, also received payments.

What services did these expensive "friends in high places" render for their rake-offs? They were, it seems, of service mainly as 'diplomats and public contact men. That architect Poulson was very much concerned with the business of building hospitals. was, we must believe, irrelevant....

Maudling was chairman of the International Technical Constructional Services company. The same gentleman was not long ago President of the Real Estate Fund of America and writing letters commanding his Nexta colleague, Jerome D. Hoffmann, who is now charged with.... corruption.

The Liberals have demanded a Parliamentary debate on "corruption in public life" (Labour didn't support them), and the government is conducting an enquiry.

By "corruption" they mean breaking the normal rules of the game, the rules under which all the parasites together make money in fantastic sums out of the workers. They do not consider it corrupt that there should be a high business value on the services of MPs and that ministers like Maudling should be valuable to the tune of £2,000.

Why are they valuable? It is not prestige, but contacts, knowledge of how the system works and can be bent to the interests of those in the know. This applies to Labour as well as Tories. A few years ago George Brown was admitted to have been for many years on a secret retainer fee as consultant to the Daily Mirror. It is only "corruption" if it shades into explicit fixing and direct bribery. In fact the shading is meaningless. The "network", the "business", political and civil service Mafia, has by definition sticky fingers. Grab as much as you can — that's the rule. The "honest hard day's work" philosophy is for the workers. Sacrifices are for the poorly paid, the aged, and the working class schoolchildren.

The Tories talk about 'fair' rents. Mr. Poulson's transactions show the...
Nixon's

Bombing:
The complicity of Russia and China

"TO SPEAK SIMPLY, THE chief running dogs of US imperialism now see 'to be Brezhnev and China." This is the lesson we must look to," said Hanoi. Ignominious.

The 1972 peace talks in Paris, the Vietnamese soldiers who have refused to fight - these are the great heroes of the war.

The title of this article is "The Complicity of Russia and China in the Vietnam War." It discusses various aspects of the Vietnam War, including the role of Russia and China.

"Nixon's bombing of Hanoi," the article begins, "is the second wave of the war in Vietnam, and it is the first wave of the war in Asia."

The article goes on to discuss the bombing of Hanoi and its impact on the people of Vietnam. It mentions that the bombing was a response to the Viet Cong's attacks on American soldiers in the area.

"The bombing has caused great suffering and loss of life," the article states. "It has also led to a rise in the number of refugees and displaced persons in the region."}

"The bombing has been a failure," the article continues. "The Viet Cong have not been defeated by the bombing campaign."

The article then goes on to discuss the role of Russia and China in the Vietnam War. It mentions that Russia and China have provided military and economic support to the Viet Cong.

"Russia and China have been instrumental in providing weapons and ammunition to the Viet Cong," the article states. "They have also provided training and advice on how to use these weapons."}

The article then goes on to discuss the impact of the Vietnam War on the people of Vietnam. It mentions that the war has caused great suffering and loss of life, and that the war has also led to a rise in the number of refugees and displaced persons in the region.

"The bombing has been a failure," the article continues. "The Viet Cong have not been defeated by the bombing campaign."

The article then goes on to discuss the role of Russia and China in the Vietnam War. It mentions that Russia and China have provided military and economic support to the Viet Cong.

"Russia and China have been instrumental in providing weapons and ammunition to the Viet Cong," the article states. "They have also provided training and advice on how to use these weapons."
A BLACK & TAN COMES HOME TO ROOST

WORRIED LABOUR MPs QUESTION THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE, LIONEL PATEL, IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ON JUNE 22 ABOUT THE VIEWS OF CERTAIN RIGHT-WING ARMY OFFICERS.

The Times had earlier published interviews with named high-ranking officers who fulminated against "industrial anarchy", and expressed the belief that the army must begin to play a major role in containing and smashing industrial unrest.

One of them had said: "... the whole period of the miners' strike was to realise that the present size of the police force is too small. We have got to the stage where there is not enough resources to deal with the increasing numbers of people who are not prepared to respect the law."

This is where the army is coming in, and the idea of a certain Brigadier Frank Kitson are important, and are rapidly becoming notorious.

Kitson's book, 'Low Intensity Operations', is the result of much experience in "counter-insurgency" in Korea, Malaya, Cyprus, and very recently, Northern Ireland. It is a serious attempt to examine the possibilities of applying some of the methods tried and tested on the colonial peoples against strikers and other "subversives" in Britain. It advocates direct and continuous involvement of the army in policing Britain, and clearly represents the view of an army boss of the army brass. It has a recommenda-
tion from Sir Michael Carver, Chief

Police today — army or armed police tomorrow?

continued from page 1

real finances of the building industry; while millions line up in dire housing conditions these parasites live of the fat of the nation, looting the public coffers of the public with bank-books.

The network of graft — legal and, possibly, illegal — with the entering into a publicised保证 of Paulson's affairs is a very small part of the

of the Imperial General Staff, dedicat-
ing it to "the soldiers of today" to "prepare for the operations of to-

morrow". Kitson foresees the time when in-

terest in Britain might reach a stage when the army would be required to restore the situation rapidly.

Internal subversion and civil anarchy are the dangers of the future, rather than wars between nations. The major role of the army will be in combating subversion at home, and that is always 'political'.

The army must abandon the pose of being an impartial, non-political body, and see right into the conflicts of British society flying its true colours as the naked defender of the British bosses, their property, their profits, and their parasitic existence. He puts it

less frankly, but that is what he wants, what he sees as necessary to the main line in the coming period. He advocates a specially trained force for strikebreaking against dockers, railworkers, and others.

Such a direct involvement could mean recce breaking strikes, lines, and acting as snipers, breaking up demonstra-
tions, and so on. The miners were once faced rubber bullets, CS gas, and all the weapons that were used in Northern Ireland long before the BIA campaign got really under way. As conceived by Kitson it would also mean involvement in "antiparty" undercover work, sup-
posing that the army bosses' interest in the battlefronts probably the tactics they'll try first.

What's new about Kitson is not

French CP accepts NATO

Following years of haggling over the draft of the future procedures of a marriage contract has finally been signed. The Italian Communist Party has agreed to make a NATO acceptance on the same conditions that in Germany, and also one of the most corrupt, "socialist" parties in Europe — and in a position to call the shots in the leadership.

Measures, leader of the CP, has prou-
ded his agreement means that the two parties have evolved a complete and practical common platform "leading towards a socialist society, no more democracy for socialists. The state of terms of the programme is to bring in "an advanced form of capitalism", which would be transformed into socialism at some indefinite future date, through the norm-
al processes of parliamentary democracy.

The programme is to reform amenities; nationalisation of 13 basic industries; nationalisation of the power of the "strong" President; pensions at a level of the national basic minimum wage; land reform for the right to preempt building land; improved Social security, etc, and the CP would remain in the EEC, working to turn "a Europe of big business" into a "Europe for the workers!"

N A T O

Most important, however, is the agree-
ment on NATO. On taking office the new vanguard government was to do its socialist duty by calling for the simultaneous dissolution of both NATO and the Warsaw Pact. But calling for it won't make it happen.

And when it fails to happen? It is implied that the "New France" would remain in NATO.

Previous negotiations between the two parties have stuck a stroke of the preceding policy differences. To be exact, on the CP's long-standing allegiance to Moscow and the Peking line, which clashes violently with the SP's support for a foreign policy which serves best the French bourgeoisie.

The CP's concessions here must be seen in the context of the growing cordiality of capitalist-Soviet relations.

But still it is a departure which could mark a qualitative transformation for the French Communist Party.

TWO SOULS

For long the two souls of the modern mass Communist Parties have been at war with each other. The one expressed

the CP's, the other the reformists or the Parties in their own country, the other the subservience to Moscow's foreign policy.

The latter meant that the CPs, for all their rhetoric, were unacceptable to the bosses as an ordinary Government party, and led to much frustration for the bosses in the Parties. Since the early '60s, and the open breakdown of the monolithic unity of the world capitalist

The tendency has been towards loosening the ties with Moscow. The Italian CP has al-
ready travelled far in that direction.

The new French CP line on NATO is a major step towards the logical goal of this tendency — a break with Moscow. The CP forms the main "social" party in France, but it is now being seen in the context of having merged with workers as the major obstacle in the struggle for socialism. Since a number of socialist groups have been gaining

group the new challengingly reformist programme, which is a strong response to the prospects of an actual military alliance, can only help them. Stan Lonac.
THE COMMON MARKET SIDESHOW

The biggest, most cynical fraud in current politics is the anti-common market campaign. Heath and the TUC delegation would have liked to hold a referendum, but as it turned out no one would "pair" with him. (Can't blame them, can you?) Doesn't it just warm the cockles of your heart with faith in democracy to see one overweight yachtsman rushing to vote in a debate he's heard a word of?

LETTING DOWN THE CENTRE?

Who's this making all that fuss about Harry "the Gammy" Hyams' profits from the empty block of offices known as Centre Point? Can it be Mr. Peter Walker the Minister for the Environment? You mean, Mr. Peter Walker we should call "Walker" in Slater-Walker, one of the country's biggest property developers.

What is it, Walker - jealousy?

SELLOUT TO THE BOSSES - YES SELLOUT TO THE TORIES - NO!

Imagine the scene: Vic Feather works out a plan with the CBI for a "conciliation" board expressly excluding Tory ministers. Well, you don't need imagination because it's already happened.

It's a typical bit of the twisted logic of reformism. Feather says: They have their hands tied down with the Tories any more than he has to. Why? Because the Tories are enemies. Right? But aren't the bosses also enemies? Aren't they in fact the decisive enemy? Certainly! Well then, why sit round the table with them? That's easy. It is the job of the trade union official to negotiate, that means "getting round the table", and if you get round the table with someone, you might as well sit down. That's what the job's all about, it seems...

WALL STREET 1929 - CLAPHAM HIGH STREET 1972?

"...All comparisons, even with 1929, are totally inadequate and meaningless. In the first place, what has underpinned the continuance of capitalism in the Second World War has been broken, and the consequences are literally incalculable. All relations established in the capitalist world in the post-war period came to an end this morning..."

That was the Socialist Labour League Political Committee greeting the floating of the Dollar last August! That was the first Apocalypse. Last week the Pound was floating. Now we expect the Second Coning?

From the enormous waltz of newsprint lavished recently on the economic situation facing British capitalism anyone might think that "floating" the pound was going to make an enormous difference to the way the economy is going. Nothing of the kind! As we said in WP no. 1, "In conditions of long run creeping stagnation measures such as devaluation will become increasingly in demand but increasingly effective in stabilising the system."

The Tories were forced to "hold the pound" by a number of public servants and financiers. There was their failed curd price increases; their in ability to curb wages through a policy of the "75% norm", the cost of joining the Common Market together with the final blow of a threatened dock strike.

DEVOLUTION

The floating pound is disguised version of devaluation. And just like devaluation this latest attempt to defend a decaying British capitalism can only mean a further attack on workers' living standards. For instance about two thirds of Britain's food is imported. The prices of those goods cannot be expected to rise by a scandalous 10% on top of the increases due to joining the Common Market and due to Vote Add-on Tax.

If devaluation is to work for the ruling class, they must try to hold down the working class, and prevent it from increasing its wages as the tide of rising prices laps round our ears.

The old Labour trick - the "incomes policy" - is on the cards. And the Tories are being helped in this by those trade union leaders who are so eager to call off the confrontation between government and workers that they have been almost running to support the Tories. This presents us with the ridiculous sight of Joe Grimsey, leader of the mine-workers' union that gave the Tories such a drubbing five months ago, actually supporting the idea of an "incomes policy."

Dressed up under varying names such as "Incomes Policy", "price policy", "Prices and Incomes Policy", it means, in essence, one thing only: wages control.

PROFITS DECIDE

Under capitalism, a system subject to its own definite laws, for the bosses and their government this is really the only "price control" either possible or desirable. Of course there's plenty of jabber from the government about "profit control" as well but that is a sham to bamboozle the workers.

After all, if a worker foregoes a wage increase with prices rising all the time, he has in reality allowed his wages to be cut. What has he lost but has lost for good.

But profits, which are not drawn off are ploughed back into the company owned by share-holders who need not eat, and so on again, and a more bountiful crop is reaped later.

As we said, capitalism is subject to its own definite laws. Thus even if governments wanted to they couldn't curb profits without paralysing the whole economic system. For this system, profit is the "be-all and end-all": the petrol in the tank of economic activity. The capitalist controls industry directly in so far as the decisions he takes are his and his alone. If his profits are fixed and regulated by the government he rapidly loses the incentive for economic growth, or expanding the company's activities, for cutting costs of production. With fixed control of the returns he will have little or no interest in improving. The inevitable result of tinkering with the profit making system of capitalism would thus be economic stagnation.

CON-TRICK

Similarly general price control is beyond the power of the bosses and their state. Control of the price of labour power either by brute force or by trickery - this is the only open control to the bosses which does no violence to either
Value created by labour equals 40

Workers' share is 20/40, i.e. 50%  
Bosse's share is 20/40, i.e. 50%

Now suppose productivity rises by 5%. Then a total of 
60 units of raw material and 20 units of wages would be 
given out to labourers. If wages were increased by 10% 
and productivity by 20%, the result would be an increase 
workers' share of the total output by 6 units. This 
would be 6 units more than was given at the same rate in 
the previous example. The benefits are increased as the 
number of units of productivity increases.

Value created by labour equals 44

Workers' share is 22/44, i.e. 50%  
Bosse's share is 22/44, i.e. 50%

Under the "incomes policy", money wages are allowed to rise only by the same proportion as productivity. Therefore the wages will be 22. We see that although workers have increased total wealth their share of the added value that they have created is still the same (50%).

However the big con-trick of incomes policy is still to come. Wages in money terms are linked to real changes in productivity. If prices rise by 10%, the price of the total output is now 121 units. But under the incomes policy wages increase in money terms by the same rate as productivity, i.e. 10%. So wages are 22 units. Therefore we get the following:

CLASS COLLABORATION

This means that incomes policy is adhered to then the workers' standard of living is no longer determined by the effective bargaining power but at the whim of the bosses.

Incomes policy is a pernicious class legislation. However, because the class bias of it is veiled behind phrases like "national interest", "working together", "working for a better future for the industry", "helping the economy", etc. the ruling class has relied heavily on the workers' "own" pettio to sell the idea to the working class.

The class-collaborationist idea that the incomes policy is founded on suit the equally class-collaborationist Labour con-men down to the ground. Hence we have seen the support of large sections of the ruling class for Labour-type parties throughout Western Europe since 1965.

This was typified by the support for Labour at the time of the 1965 General Election by the bosses' magazine, The Economist.

So we see that if workers accept the conditions of the incomes policy but the capitalists increase prices, the share workers get of the value they have created actually decreases. It is now 40%.

Even if wages increase in proportion to increases in productivity and price increases, their share remains only 40% as before. Under incomes policy there is no way for the working class to increase its share of the total output.

If prices rise, the bosses are rewarded (increas their share of the total increases) for not keeping them internationally competitive. While on the other hand workers are penalised for accepting wage restraint.

Incidentally, the above model assumes that each enterprise realises the average increase in productivity. The problem is that in some industries the rise in productivity is below average. For this average to be maintained, therefore, the percentage wage increases in industries with above average productivity must fall below what would be a corresponding percentage increase in productivity.

Whatever the particular results of incomes policy it takes the workers' share of wages and standards dependent entirely on factors totally out of his control. Under incomes policy the workers' share depends on productivity which in turn depends very largely on the employers' use of more efficient machinery. It also depends on prices, which again are determined by the market and by the bosses.

The bosses of course say that "productivity" is in the hands of the worker. He can work harder, longer, faster. In other words, according to the bosses, the only way in which workers are allowed even to the most marginal extent to determine productivity is by more sweat and sacrifice.

Workers' state

Tory Macmillan follows policies pioneered by "left-wing" Castle.

Precisely because of the class collaborationist content of "incomes policy" and its shop floor cousin the "productivity deal", we have seen attempts to subordinate the unions to the state by means of so-called "independent" arbitration committees.

The present talk of conciliation is just that of the same mechanism of subordination of the unions to the state - at a time moreover when the union rank and file are hammering the government. This is often motivated by saying "it's better than legal sanctions". But the result is the same: subordination of the interests of the workers to those of the employers.

Some weeks ago (as we reported in WP no.8) Scanlon said - "I believe that conciliation will work far better than legal sanctions and the government's policy of naïve trust and cooperation." And Tom Jackson (UPM leader), at the same meeting, said that a Council for Industrial Research, Conciliation and Arbitration should be set up.

The present Tory government, and the Labour government that preceded it, have tried the alternatives to incomes policy, but with little effect. Unemployment (the traditional way of reducing the workers' bargaining power and cutting imports) has hurt; but the self-confidence and the militancy of the employed has not only remained unshaken but in a number of sectors it has actually risen. Deviations and floating exchange rates can only halt the course of the crisis temporarily.

WORKERS' STATE

One solution to the capitalist class's problem is to defeat or smash the workers' collective strength and reduce wages. Until they feel they have to do this - or when they feel they need to manoeuvre - they will continue to prepare themselves for such extreme action - the employing class tries a different tack.

It is part of those collective strength by submitting it (through the agency of the sell-out Labour and trade union leaders) to "conciliation", to "arbitration" and "industrial co-operation". In other words the ruling class tries to subordinate the workers' interests to some totally mythical "common", "national" interest. To what is, in reality, the interests of capitalism. Today they are latching to beat down the working class - and distracting attention while they gather strength, with talk of conciliation.

There is a third way: the smashing of the bosses' collective strength. In other words a socialist revolution. Indeed it is only in the state that such a revolution would set up - a democratic workers' state - that an incomes policy could be acceptable. For here the proportion of income not paid out in wages, instead of being profits in the hands of a small section of the community, is used for the common good and for accumulation to increase the wealth of the whole community.
The Black and Tans (above) began their operations in March 1920. They were Special Constables recruited mostly in England (the authorities showed a special preference for men with criminal records). They were aided by the Auxiliaries, recruited from ex-officers. These forces carried out atrocities against the Irish people, including for example the sack of Balbriggan, the burning of the centre of Cork city and the murder of its Lord Mayor Thomas MacCurtain.

Concurrently the Orange counter-revolutionaries in the North began a series of pogroms against Catholics (1920-22). Catholic homes and shops were burnt and Catholic workers were driven from jobs where Protestants predominated in the work-force. Altogether some 400 Catholics were killed, 1,796 wounded, around 18,000 driven from their jobs and 23,000 made homeless.

Finally the British Government opened negotiations with Sinn Fein and imposed its terms on the Irish delegation under the threat of "immediate and terrible war" (Lloyd George's phrase). The Dail backed the Treaty by the narrow margin of 64 votes to 57.

Griffith and Collins moved to set up the Free State, but were opposed in the political area by De Valera and his fellow republicans, and also by the majority of the IRA.

Civil War finally broke out on June 28th, 1922 when the Free State Army attacked the Republican HQ in the Four Courts in Dublin, with the aid of artillery borrowed from the British Army.

The Republican Army was led by middle class 'Republicans' like De Valera whose differences with the Free Staters were marginal, formal. The Republican forces, mostly farmers' sons and workers, confined themselves to warfare, and in no sense challenged the social domination of the middle class, whose mercenary Army it fought. The wealth of the Irish capitalists, the equipment of the British Empire combined with the disappointment of the common people to smash the Republic.

Invading areas of the Republican South West in seaseone landings, the Irish stages of British imperialism finally smashed those who wanted independence, without knowing that the only way to gain it, whose middle class was allied to imperialism, was to make James Connolly's Revolution and build a Republic of the working people.

50 YEARS AFTER P/ How BRIEFLY IRELAND?

by Chris Gray

IRELAND IS A COUNTRY under imperialist domination. This is true of the supposedly independent Twenty-six counties as of the six counties currently under direct rule from Westminster. Any serious assessment of the political situation in Ireland must start from this point.

A brief glance at Irish history over the past fifty-odd years will show how the way in which British imperialist capitalism has continued to exercise control over the whole island.

At the general election of 1918 the people of Ireland voted overwhelmingly in favour of independence: out of 105 seats, 73 were won by Sinn Fein candidates pledged to a policy of withdrawal from Westminster and the establishment of an Irish parliament (Dail Eireann), which was duly set up on January 21st 1919.

The British coalition Government, acutely conscious of its strategic interests (an enemy in possession of Ireland can strike at almost any part of Britain) across the Irish Sea, described Dail Eireann and introduced a Bill which came into force the following year and is known as the Government of Ireland Act, 1920.

This was the legal instrument that divided the country in two; it provided for the setting up of two separate parliaments, one for the six counties and one for the twenty-six - the areas designated 'Northern Ireland' and 'Southern Ireland' respectively.

The British Government tried, by means of the Black and Tan forces, to bludgeon the Irish people into submission, but in spite of the terror the people stood firm and as a result Sinn Fein won 80% of the seats in the local government elections of 1920 and captured a majority in 25 out of 32 counties.

The 9th County parliament envisaged in the Act was set up in 1921 and accepted partition - this despite the fact that the Dail Eireann and the Unionists didn't want it. They wanted all Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom.

Sinn Fein was, of course, equally opposed to partition, but it was likewise imposed on them via the 1921 Treaty settlement. This Treaty led to Civil War in the South and the destruction of the Free State.

The wing of Sinn Fein, led by Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith, on British Government instructions, with the aid of English arms, called 'Irish Free State'. The so-called 'Irish Free State' which emerged after the Treaty was a state with a truncated sort of freedom. Not only did it not control the national territory in its entirety, it also lacked complete financial independence from Britain. The banking system remained tied to the UK, with Irish banks being compelled to dispose of pound in London for every pound of cash reserves they themselves held.

The cost of buying out the Anglo-Irish landlords continued to fall on farmers in the Twenty-six counties (the so-called 'Land Annuitities') and the money found its way into the British exchequer.

English law was retained, together with the British vassals - squirels and judges. Naval bases at Cobh and Lough Swilly were retained.

But not least, members of Parliament were compelled to take an oath to the British Crown, provision was made for Appeals to the UK Privy Council in legal cases, and a Governor-General was appointed with power to veto legislation.

It was the achievement of Éamon de Valera, whose party Fianna Fail came to power in the early thirties, to get rid of many of these encumbrances. He got rid of the Oath and the Governor-General and Appeals to the Privy Council, retained the Land Annuities as capital for use for industrialisation, and negotiated British withdrawal from the naval bases.

Financial independence, however, was not achieved; partition also remained. In view of the fact that de Valera's main concern was to develop Irish capitalism as far as possible within the framework of the Twenty-six Counties, this is not surprising. He did indeed achieve his very limited object, and a number of new industries were established under protective tariffs.

EMIGRATION

By the late fifties, however, the limitations of this policy...
ARTITION
STILL

“Ireland since The Rising” (p.104).

Dillon’s successor, Sean Lemass, changed course and
began a policy of closer integration
with the UK. In 1958, the first breach was made in the
Acta introduced by Fianna Fail to
ensure Irish control of new
companies. Foreign-owned export
firms could now be set up.

In 1963 came the Anglo-Irish
Free Trade Agreement, which offered the Twenty-six Counties
access to the British market for agricultural goods, in
return for the removal of tariffs on most UK goods entering the
Twenty-six Counties.

Meanwhile, a policy of lavish aid to foreign capital invest-
ment was started, which led to
increased penetration of
the economy by foreign capital-
massively British, but also German, US and other E.E.C.

This policy was successful for a time in reducing the high
level of emigration which had built up in the fifties, as the
following table shows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1926-1936</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1946</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1951</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1955</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1958</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958-1961</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1966</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“EXPANSION”

The policy of the Twenty-six County
administration was able to provide
enough jobs. A recent commentator
has written: “Had it not
been for the safety-valve of emi-
gration (400,000 in round fig-
ures for the decade 1950-60), the
frustration and desperation of
these years must have led to
mass riots.” (T.P. Cooan,

POLLUTION ‘71

Homelessness, unemployment and capitalist graft and corruption together
with indifference to the struggle in Northern Ireland: the condition
of Britain’s client 26-County Irish “Republic”, seen by a cartoonist in the
United Kingdom,汉堡包, the Official Sinn Fein.

THE NORTH

If the Twenty-six Counties are a “republican” or client state of
British imperialism, the remain-
ing six are most certainly a colony pure and simple.

Under the Government of Ire-
land Act of 1920, Stormont was
deposed from legislating on
matters such as the Crown, war
and peace, the armed forces, for-
ign trade, treaties with foreign
states, radio, air navigation,
colonies, weights and measures
and other matters.

Just in case anything came
up that wasn’t provided for,
section 75 of the Act states that
“the supreme authority of the
Parliament of the United King-
dom shall remain unaffected and
unimpaired over all persons
and matters and things in North-
ern Ireland.”

Hence in the very unlikely event of a vote at Stormont to
declare Unilateral Independence, section 75 could have been in-
voked immediately, and the
Stormont ministers declared to
have exceeded their powers
under the Act. As we have seen, Stormont itself can be suspended
and the whole territory adminis-
tered from Westminster — not,
however, without the aid of
15,000 British troops.

The economy of the Six
Counties is also tightly
controlled by British
monopoly capital. By 1960-61 foreign
(mainly British) investment was
running at around £200 million
and increasing at a rate of £40
per year. By 1948 some 60% of
all investment was held outside
the Six Counties (mainly in
Britain) and this figure has
no doubt increased. All this
means that Stormont’s powers of taxation
only produced 10% of its
revenue and we get a clearer
picture of the Unionists’ room
for manoeuvre. (Needless to say
the unions are similarly tied
to the UK Big Business.)

It may be objected that 60% of
the population of the Six
Counties support the link with
Britain, so that the area isn’t
really a colony at all, in its
formal part of the United King-
dom. But in that case, how
can “Northern Irishmen” have this
special relationship with the
Westminster Parliament, a rela-

tionship quite different from that
of Scotland or Wales or Devon-
shire, for example?

Because, say the objectors, the other 40% of the population are
disloyal Fenians who require to
be kept down by force.

But if we examine the griev-
ances of these “Fenians” we
come back to the developments
of the last seventy years or so,
which show quite conclusively
that the very existence of the
Six County state is a denial of
the clearly expressed wishes
(and needs) of the overwhelming
majority of the whole Irish
people for independence from
Britain. Indeed, two of the
County councils elected in 1920
— Tyrone and Fermanagh —
vote allegiance to Dublin Castle
but were not allowed to
leave the U.K.

Similarly it was stated that
“Ulster” must not be “seceded” —
although British troops were
simultaneously busy cocooning
the Irish people up until the
1921 truce, and subsequently
the Free State Government rec-
ceived British aid in order to
force those who rejected the
Treaty.

Correction, then, is fine — just
so long as it works in the inter-
est of British imperialism. In
this case it has worked to prod-
uce in both parts of a divided
Irish state a continuing colonial-type economic relation-
ship with British monopoly
capitalism.

flag of neo-colonialists: bowler-hat William
THE FRENCH COMMUNIST Party was founded to lead the socialist revolution, but in fact Buried the capitalists through all their tribulations for nearly four decades.

The construction of the Party, started under Lénine and Trotsky, completed under Stalin (though not on the same plans, nor for the same purposes as led by Leon Trotsky), was a party in strong dependence on Moscow. With the Fall of France, the October Revolution; then the Moscow of the Stalinist counter-revolution. Today, Trotsky’s dear friend and fellow-communist, is perhaps the true Leninist of the day.

The French CP was not built out of nothing. It emerged from the tambaran of the 1920’s, its members, most of whom had seen the CP under the leadership of the Moscow’s Stalin crowd, had been at the forefront of the struggle against the Bonapartist government, under the leadership of Vladimir Lenin and Trotsky.

The CP had a long and glorious history, a history of internationalism, of struggle against imperialist aggression, of the struggle for freedom and democracy.
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ON ALMOST EVERY MILITANT working-class demonstration today the main cry is 'Death Out!'. But it is not just Death that the demonstrators are protesting against. They know that the National Industrial Relations Court has been one of the bosses' main weapons against the labour movement. Those who have been involved with the Social Security recently, particularly strikers, will know about its mean and oppressive ways.

Detailed plans have been drawn up for a possible strike. And if the kind of strike that has consideration. The State apparatus—civil service, army, police, the judges and the Courts—is in reality a neutral machine, non-partisan, which serves society under the control of the private controllers, will be on the list for a possible strike. Different views exist on how this democratic crisis might be resolved. Some federalists of the present argument have been that the same control exists in the whole. The widespread cynicism about elections and parliamentary politicians is only a natural reaction to the situation of the whole system. At best the democracy of elections amounts to a few people.

'PLURALISM'

Many apologists for capitalism have made it clear that the views emanating from the view that elections cannot be resolved. Take an example: the bringing in of “The State is also specifically the organ responsible for the general administration of society, and the articulation of the political system. The arbitration is, of course, done in capitalist tradition. The concern that the political party system has to provide a negative, defensive power, to sustain partial internal stability. The government may be able to fight or hide some capitalist class movements, but the basic direction of ideology is still decided by the capitalist interest of profit.

CONTRADICTION

The State, Engels wrote, "is the admission that this society has become entangled in an economic contradiction with itself, that it is cleft into iron and steel. One part is full of gold, it is powerless to "dissipate. As the contradiction is unresolvable, the solution is to break the group, so the intervention of the State increases.

Capitalist free enterprise leads to the elimination of the weak in competition with the strong, the destruction of the great generation of that free enterprise, the concentration of production in huge monopolies. These enterprises, and take over basic industries (communications, banks), when private...
MURDERS PROVIDENCE

HARRY ROTHMAN’S book describes and analyses the problem of pollution and its impacts on the social, economic, and environmental conditions of the working class, as well as the responses of workers, especially women workers, to environmental crises. His book is a clear and concise explanation of the environmental crisis and its causes, and how it affects the working class. The book is well-written and easy to read, and I highly recommend it to anyone interested in the history of labor and environmentalism.

Dr. John Smith
MACHINE TOOLS

DAVENPORT NEXT TO GO

The Herbert-Isenrath factory in Davenport was built in 1968, as the most advanced in Europe. Since then it has made a 1 million per year.

And now it has brought in the Receiver. 175 workers were sacked last year and now 220 of the 450 left are to join the door queue by order of the receiver, with very little chance of another job in the area.

Meanwhile workers at Churchill's (Altrincham), another Herbert factory, were threatened again with closure in August, after six months recovery. Other large Machine Tool firms and orders. Schwinger international, specialising in cutting tools, have announced a 10% cut in their workforce. "Robo Tools" in Birmingham have halved their workforce over the last two years.

200 recently. Masson, Scott and Thornhill, who make machines for the paper and publishing industries, have closed down their Wimbledon factory, making 420 unemployed, and have bought their equipment for their Swedish factory. There is a further cutdown at the Dower-owned Cervin factory in London. There is a further cutdown at the Dower-owned Cervin factory in London.

Some overall picture is given by the order losses. In the first quarter of 1971, home orders were down 11% on the first quarter of 1971, and export orders down 48%. A third of its workforce had been laid off. Then the 

AWEU REPORT

All this underlines the message of a recent report by the AWEU engineering section, which describes the prospects in the UK metal tool industry as "very bleak indeed" and calls for the immediate and total nationalisation of the industry.

Already it is said that the government will now match any private buyer for Herbert-Isenrath's machines, but all that is needed is not this sort of government pressure to soften the blow for the workers. What they are saying is that the union's claim policy is worth. In London (and it was the same at Eastbourne and at Hastings). Sculley's theme was 'alibis'. He was unable to escape the criticism that he was using the occasion of the press to strike at his political opponents. The main thing is that he himself is using this line as a go out. He was close to the start when Tom Illilley from CAV Lucas spoke of the aspiration of Engineers Claim.

ALIBIS FOR SCANLON

"FIRSTLY I TAKE IT WE ARE at one" were Hugh Sculley's opening words when he and CAV Lucas addressed the workers at Condor steel workers on July 3rd. But, as the meeting showed, if the stews were of one mind, they were unable to escape the criticism that the union's claim policy is weak. "It could be that he is not up to the job" he suggested. The main thing is that he himself is using this line as a go out. He was close to the start when Tom Illilley from CAV Lucas spoke of the aspiration of Engineers Claim.
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THE STEEL INDUSTRY is under going a major upheaval at present and is faced with serious threats, both to their work and trade union status.

Since 1965 the industry has been in a state of near stagnation. There has been scarcely any increase in the level of steel output and moreover, the industry has only managed to average an annual growth rate of 1%.

If we compare this with the major changes in the steel industry over the last 20 years, we can see that there is a definite need for further rationalisation.

The British Steel Corporation has rationalised its operations, reduced its workforce and improved its efficiency, resulting in a significant increase in productivity. However, the industry as a whole remains vulnerable to external factors such as changes in global markets and competition from other countries.

The steel industry has been hit by a series of economic and social changes, including the decline of the manufacturing sector in the UK, and the rise of competing industries in other countries. As a result, the industry has had to adapt and change in order to stay competitive.

For more information on the steel industry, please visit the following websites:

- British Steel Corporation
- Steel Authority of Canada
- Steel Industry of India

**RATIONALISATION**

The word “rationalisation” means the “wasting” or “cutting back” of unnecessary labour force to save unnecessary expenditure. It is a process of reducing unnecessary expenditure in order to improve the efficiency and productivity of an organisation. The steel industry is no exception to this rule and must continue to implement rationalisation measures in order to remain competitive.

**PARTICIPATION**

Once they had decided that the “Green Shield Stamps” app- reach was not enough, what did their lordships come up with? “Joint Consultative Committees and ‘Employee-Directors.’” The steel industry has a history ofjoint consultation and participation in management. This involves “employee directors” joining other part-time directors from private industry, universities etc. on the four Steel Company Boards in order to participate with top management in shaping the company’s affairs and its policies, and share responsibility for the company as a whole.

The British Steel Corporation plans to make 1500 workers redundant at Stanton Ironworks, Llanwern, and the Port Talbot Works over the next two years. The blast furnaces and associated activities will be moved to a new site in Harworth, Lincolnshire.

The Managing Director of the company has stated that the redundancies are necessary due to the economic downturn.

*We’re at a turning point in history, a turning point in the way things are done.*

---

*“Let’s see if we can save the steel.*

The steel industry is facing many challenges and must continue to adapt and change in order to stay competitive. Rationalisation and participation in management are essential for the industry’s future.

---

*The Steel Industry’s Future* 

Stan Staveley

---

*See the steel industry’s future.*