Anyone who thinks the working class can't smash the Industrial Relations Act if only it stirs itself must have been asleep during the week the dockers were in jail. Perhaps Vic Feather was.

To settle for anything less than the smashing of the Act now is a betrayal of the Trade Union movement. Every action of the TUC, every step towards collaboration with the Government and the bosses must be seen in that light.

So must the "Independent" arbitration committee made up of Confederation of British Industry and Trades Union Congress delegates and so-called experts in industrial relations. It is not "independent". It is an adjunct of the Industrial Relations Act. By smoothing over normal industrial conflict, it helps the government use the penal sections of the Act as a big stick in reserve.

After the recent mass strike wave the government is more than ever scared that an insignificant little employer, some upstart container firm, will set the NICRC in motion and bring the country to the point of a General Strike — which the Government is not ready for. They are relying on the TUC to help stabilise the system by setting up the fraud of "independent" arbitration as a front for the NICRC.

The TUC also is frightened of militant direct action and of being pushed into a fight with the state. They don't dare fight the government to smash the Act. They hope to avoid penalisation and more fines under the Act by being "good little boys" — so that the Tories don't need to stilt them. They are vocal opponents of the Act, and yet help the Tories smooth its passage — and pretend the CBI is not the real beneficiary. Simultaneously they are negotiating with the government on "the economy": Whose economy? Run by who in whose interests?

The slavish psychology of buckling under in the hope of avoiding a blow — that's the spirit of these labour leaders. Even after the stupendous demonstration of working class power which opened the gates of Pentonville jail!

The TUC doesn't mind having the halter of the Industrial Relations Act around the neck of the working class — so long as it can fix it with the CBI that it doesn't bite too deeply into the tender necks of the trade union bureaucracy. They are settling down to live with the Industrial Relations Act. The working class, however, cannot live with it. We must smash it.

As the dockers strike enters its second week the prospect of troops being used in the dispute draws nearer.

Under pretext of "maintaining essential services" they will be used in an attempt to break the strike. Already all the dirty tricks the bosses have up their sleeve are being used. The families of Mersey dockers who worked to allow 500 children to go on holiday, and donated their wages to charity — have been viciously penalised by withdrawal of social security benefits.

Massed ranks of police attacked dockers' pickets at Goole, and arrested 17. The police outnumbered the dockers.

If the army is used the labour movement should react as sharply as to the jailing of the Five. There is little doubt how the dockers will react: sharply and violently.

And it won't be their affair. The dockers are still the spearhead of the working class fight back against the Tory government.
 Revolutionaries on trial

Czechoslovakia

They don’t hang dissident Communists any more in Czechoslovakia, as they did in the early 1960s during the trials that included the notorious Shanly trial.

But still they try and sentence men and women whose only crime is to believe in “socialism with a human face” and to refuse to recognise that the 1989 invasion of Czechoslovakia by Russian and Warsaw Pact troops was a “fraternal service”rendered the Czech Communists.

Nigel de Saumery

The super-exploitation of immigrant workers

IN FRANCE as in GERMANY and Britain, the capitalist class when faced with rising wage costs due to working class militancy, has had to turn to a cheaper source of labour than the population of the home country. They have brought in huge numbers of workers from abroad, and these immigrant workers have forced to work for lower wages, for longer hours, and often in atrocious conditions.

The increasing reliance of certain sections of industry on immigrant labour is well illustrated in France. In 1964 there were 1.7 million immigrants; at the beginning of 1972 there were over 3.3 million.

One labourer in five is an immigrant. The majority of these workers are from the ex-colony of Algeria (over 697,000), Spain is the next largest supplier of ‘cheap labour’ (over 685,000) followed by Portuguese workers (over 592,000) and Italians (Over 170,000). The rest of the three million plus is made up of Poles, Tunisians, Yugoslavs, Africans and Vietnamese.

However the concentration of these workers varies; generally they are to be found in the building trades, and more particularly in the huge car factories of Renault and Citroen. Due to the fact that it is in so many cases cheaper to employ Algerians and Portuguese than it is to use machines, much dangerous work is done by them.

The accident rate is horrifying. In the building trade three men are killed every day and there are 30,000 accidents every year. Of course the bosses are not too worried about this — they make their profits just the same, whereas safety precautions cost money.

At the car factories virtually all the unskilled and semi-skilled workers are immigrants. They must work at the production line, work which is poorly paid, boring and soul-destroying. Militants (troublemakers to the bosses) are few and far between; fearful of deportation and victimisation, the immigrant worker is easily exploited.

Not only are the working conditions and pay of the immigrant workers atrocious, accommodation and housing are usually very sub-standard. The Portuguese agricultural workers who work during the harvest season are often housed into disused barns; in the working class areas of Paris tin shanties can frequently be seen.

However, the picture is not totally dismal. The spirit of 1968 has reached the immigrant workers and they are agitating for a better deal. Strikes and militant action by immigrant workers have increased recently.

The CGT, the ‘Communist’ dominated General Confederation of Labour, has been guilty in the past of neglecting the immigrant workers, but is now increasingly having to take these people on account of the way the CGT bureaucracy is concerned about the large numbers of young workers joining revolutionary left wing organisations.

The French bosses, aware of the increasing dissatisfaction of the immigrant workers at their terrible working conditions (in the motor industry they are treated as little more than machines) are making a good deal of play with the cult phrase of ‘job satisfaction’ but like all these innovations introduced by the bosses it is solely for their benefit — a ‘happy’ workforce works harder, creating more profits.

Yet workers the world over know that as long as a human being is treated as a source of profit for a tiny few, then such a thing as widespread ‘job satisfaction’ cannot exist.

Meanwhile any real improvements in conditions of immigrant workers — here as in France — will be brought about not through management ‘schemes’ but by a hard fight and by the solidarity of all workers, in a common struggle against the parasites who sit on all our backs.

John Cunningham
The Irish Republican Army: A CORRECTION

In the last issue Workers’ Fight criticised the Irish Republican Army for individually recruiting and treating informants. At the time of writing the information was very scanty and we believed that the Belfast bombings were preceded by no warnings worth speaking about. We now know that in fact warnings of an hour or more were given to a number of agencies in Belfast and we were, certainly, in the hands of the army in plenty of time to forestall the attacks.

Why were they not evacuated? Why were the warnings suppressed? Why did the authorities allow the bombs to explode in areas crowded with people?

The Belfast bombings gave the Army a much desired public ‘justification’—i.e. the no-areas which the Catholic victims of police and army terror had erected. If William Whitelaw had written the scenario he couldn’t have found one better. The suspicion is now growing that the Army itself may have had an iron grip on Belfast before during the bomb campaign—desired the bloody carnage as a propaganda weapon against the IRA.

These men are, after all, the butchers of Derry, responsible for shooting a number of our comrades.

The real criticism of the IRA is that its current tactics lend them themselves to such use by the Army and are, even with warnings, largely indifferent to the plight of the ordinary people. As such they are self-defeating. The line at which damage to the economy and the rulers of Northern Ireland merges with the help they give to the Army by provoking the Protestant workers and demoralising many Catholics is increasingly difficult to distinguish.

But in criticising the Republican’s tactics in their struggle, we must be absolutely clear that our basic attitude is support for them in that struggle against self-determination of Ireland and against British imperialism.

ARMY CLAMPDOWN ON PEACE MOVEMENT BY SOLDIERS' WIVES

After its splendid victory in occupying the former liberated areas of Northern Ireland, overrunning the shanty towns and ghettos with an army of tanks and armored cars, the Army has run into a little “family” difficulty. The wives of men of the 29 Commando, Royal Marines, who have been giving peace for “peace” in Northern Ireland, the women, some of whose husbands were recently deployed in Northern Ireland, first organised a petition calling for better communication with their men in Northern Ireland.

Then five Royal Marines wives got up on their bicycles and rode to Belfast to try to protest peacefully. Remember the number of little homes and lives and jobs lost, and remember just how, with an army, the Army, with the Army, the Army...

But there are ‘peace’ movements and peace movements. And the Army wasn’t there. — can be a sting in the tail of the 29 Commando fight regiment RA ordered the men of the regions to get signed certificates from their wives re-tracing their support for the petition! They got their certificates.

In the meanwhile the same Army that had been giving peace in Northern Ireland was being given peace in the Irish Republic. Remember how they were told by the Government that they were a little people, and the numbers of men, and lives and homes and jobs lost...

The significance of the deteriorating attitude of the Army towards the Army who have been giving peace for “peace” in Northern Ireland.

Arms clampdown on peace movement by soldiers' wives

SMASH THE ACT

Build Councils of Action!

According to the legend the Hydra was a monster with a peculiar constitution: when one of its heads was cut off others grew in its place.

The Hydra was a myth. But the Hydra is nothing more than the Tory Industrial Relations Act. At the same time as it slipp ed down in the confrontation over the jailing it spawned another challenge. The House of Lords reimposed the £5,500 fine on the T&G&U with an added £2,000 for costs.

This means that it is the Trade Union leaders who are back in the firing line, and the Industrial Relations Act is operating according to its original intention.

They never planned to jail shop stewards. Now they plan to use fines and other pressure to turn the union leaders into reluctant policemen against the working class.

Their goal is the complete emasculation of militant trade unionism. The Economic and Militant ruling class weekly, contemptuously explained what they really want to do with stiff-necked working class fighters like Bernie Stere, Vic Turner, and the rest of the T&G&U Five:

To stop any sensible industrial system the right sanction the likes of them is not just but the sack. If they persist in their unlawful industrial practices, they should be dismissed from the trade union whose rules they will be flouting, and then from the docks where they will be steadily rendering all jobs unemployable: arguably with due compensation, and no more than that.

To do that they need the active support of the union leaders. They have used the sort of trade union structure that, for example, existed in the docks section of the T&G&U before the breakaway national movement of 1964 started.

To do that they need the active support of the union leaders. It was used by both union and bosses, hand in hand, to sack workers who refused to bend the knee.

STRAIGHTJACKET

In the '30s, '40s, and '50s, many unions hardened into semi-fascist bodies working hand in hand with the employers and the state. One of the foremost examples was the T&G&U under Arthur Oskin. The ban on Communists and other members in the T&G&U was lifted only four years ago.

In the post world war 2 boom the power of the bosses was gradually eroded, as the centralised union machine became less important in determining wages and conditions. The shop floor became the focal point. The struggle, the shop stewards. Their leader, the powerful organization of the rank and file, almost involuntarily, its effect as the weapon.

The bureaucratic straightjacket came to fit more loss as the way the unions operated changed. The pressures of national capitalism and the demands of the employers and employers who don’t have to have their cards revoked and lose their jobs can only protest the scale leaders of their union if they want masks to put on, promises to maintain. The bosses want that throughout the last movement.

For the leaders there is no half-way house between surrender and action — a fight to defend trade unions, and therefore, ultimately, the working class, demanding the subordination of the unions.

To preserve the union funds as the major consideration is a recipe for surrender. It leads to a policy of paying up when fines are imposed, and of disciplining militants out of fear of having heavier fines put on or union assets seized.

But the union movement — so seldom used to aid militant struggle — is the change the leaders need. Already Jack Jones, one of the most timid, has been pulled into the breach, and another has been prepared to pay the Tory court.

Trade Unionism, as capitalism, as a fight for the interests of capitalists, has been, defiled, polluted, and is being defiled.

Trade Unionism as a fight for the interests of capitalists, defiled, polluted, and is being defiled.

We need a major fight for the interests of the trade unions, and the rank and file, and the militant rank and file itself will have to organise that offensive.

Council of Action, linking up militant trade unionists, and the Socialist Party, and in some localities, Trades Councils. These organisations and the left may establish the ground for the development of the rank and file movement.

Can they attack the union bureaucracy and the national and state power. Can they see in the struggle against the unions a struggle against the bosses and against the state?

From the struggle for Council of Action, an effort to develop a programme of preparation, of action, and of struggle for democratisation of the Labour movement.

There can be no compliance with any union leadership which revokes the credibility of a militant struggle on the say-so of the bosses’ Court. Strike action is the normal response to victimisation of militants.

As for seizure of union funds — if they seize union funds, workers can seize factories, if the leaders won’t fight, the rank and file must. ranks must fight for an understanding in the Labour movement that their struggle will continue.

For us, a struggle for Council of Action, an effort to develop a programme of preparation, of action, and of struggle for democratisation of the Labour movement.

When the Tory monster will continually sprout and grow as a result of their failure to resolve the question of the unions and will only be stopped when we hit it at the heart and replace it with a working class society.

It is capitalism which is attacking trade unions, and the defence of capitalism, and arm the movement towards a struggle against the bosses and against the state.
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ment had refused to negotiate a pay claim. The time is to be knocked off their wages at 1 2 per week until they return work after the holiday shutdown, on August 7.

The men, who are not in any union, are very bitter - but have decided to accept it. They are all going to join the Transport and General Workers' Union. It seems like shutting the door after the horse has bolted.

24 HOURS STRIKE - OR JUST A LONG WEEKEND

When the TUC General Council decided to call for a General strike to last for all of 24 hours, did the ruling class of this country tremble and quake? If their Journal The Economist is anything to go by, they didn't, it seems, miss any yellow jackets, the right to congregate, the right to strike, the right to strike union membership, the right to fair pay and working conditions, and the right to join the newly formed, militant prisoners' organisation, PROP (Preservation of the Rights of Prisoners) which has helped and encouraged 43 demonstrations in 18 prisons during the 3 months since its formation.

The vast majority of prisoners are offenders against laws which view capitalist property as sacred. These laws are the product of a system which worships profits and degrades people. And most of all, the system seeks to degrade and isolate those who break its rules. Its vindictiveness is revealed by the list of elementary rights still denied to prisoners.

In organizing together to take collective action to fight for human conditions and minimum rights, prisoners are showing very clearly what class most of them come from. And trade unionists, who are more threatened with jail for breaking the bosses' new rules, will do well to give every support to the prisoners' struggles for basic rights.

Bitter-Sweet on the Bosses

The firm of North East Crimpers Ltd, a synthetic yarn factory on Teesside, have received a C12 fine on 20 machine operators who walked out on July 13 after the manage.
First the miners, and now the dockers with wide working-class support, have managed to defeat the government policies. But the struggle is far from over. The movement has yet to defeat GEC and Arnold Weilisstock.

The three firms which united to form today's Weilisstock Empire — GEC, AEI, and EE —, all used to be rivals. The rationalisation, slave-working, and slow-moving firms which used to build products "you may not get as good quality but at least your job's secure".

The bosses stopped being paternalistic and slow-moving some time ago, but the workers haven't caught up yet. Progress in catching up has been slow. But when workers start to move, then even the struggle develops in its normal bands. But that is one of the lessons of recent battles and of the current wave of strikes. If the workers start to move then it will be more than just important that militants understand what make-work is and the needs of the struggle against redundancies.

GEC is big — but only just big enough to scrape into the world league in the electrical industry. These are recent sales in millions of dollars:

1. General Electric (USA) 732,200
2. Westem Electric (USA) 587,300
3. N.E.C. (Nippon) 250,000
4. I.T.T. (USA) 215,000
5. General Telephone & Electronics (USA) 106,000
6. Philips (Holland) 106,000
7. Siemens (Germany) 10,000
8. GEC = EE (UK) 5,0
9. Hitachi (Japan) 5,000

Before the 1964 merger, the trade unionists were: GEC = EE = I. 10,000. As a general rule, under the capitalist system, profit margins are maximised. The bosses are the only people who win out against small ones. The big firms' "resources" enable them to use the most advanced technology. In some technically advanced sectors it is only the big firms that can even make a start. For example, the minimum sales and profits margins necessary for profitable operations are one million units per year: the total European market is 250,000 units.

The big firms are in a position to monopolise Government contracts and make super-profits out of those that have been won. GEC benefits from a monopoly position together with Reguineer Parsons in building the Central Electricity Generating Board. At the end of 1967, for example, the CEB made an agreement with its switchgear makers (then GEC, A.E.I., EE, and Reguineer Parsons) guaranteeing them a 15% profit margin on turnover. But the price in terms of overpaid and subsidised research for European firms are nowhere near as big as the USA, with its massive Government armaments spending.

The result can be seen by looking at some figures for net profits as a % of sales.
The Trades Council had called a meeting attended by over 600 shop stewards, Trades Council delegates, and trade unionists.

This meeting was the underside focus of the labour movement of the small and medium industrial city of Britain. It was a precursor of the state of the labour movement immediately after the jailed dockers had been released.

On Monday, the Executive had decided to call everyone out on Monday to Monday to try to contain the strike, but the strike was too large.

In the United States, the Workers Resistance Act was passed, which would have allowed workers to strike and consume goods without fear of retribution.

The strike was successful, and the dockers were released from prison.
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of the movement

The Industrial Relations Act is a policy blueprint for a new state. If we are to win the battle of tomorrow, we must understand the implications of the Act. The Act is designed to destroy the traditional rights of workers and to take control of their lives. If we are to win the battle, we must prepare ourselves for the struggle ahead.

The Act is a direct attack on the union movement. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the union and to force workers to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss workers who refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the democratic process. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the government and to force the government to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the government if they refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the social system. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the people and to force the people to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the people if they refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the capitalist system. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the workers and to force the workers to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the workers if they refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the working class. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the people and to force the people to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the people if they refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the labour movement. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the union and to force the union to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the union if they refuse to accept their demands.

The Act is a direct attack on the labour movement. It gives the employers the power to override the decisions of the government and to force the government to accept their demands. The Act also gives the employers the power to dismiss the government if they refuse to accept their demands.
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The British ruling class last week proposed a big slice of riddle, a version of the Labour Party, and the OFT's failure to pursue their theories out of the fire.

Since the end of the war, when Western Capitalism seemed to workers not better standards, it has generally been about that the industrial workers, workers at war were used in a revolutionary force. It's difficult to explain the "CP" (Communist Party) might take up arms, but the workerside workers were recruited among their cars and TV sets.

But in 1962 to two short sketches the workers of France swap all the French people's arms, and the European workers back on the revolutionary road.

With little warning, in May 1968, the French fighting the war's effects, put its face in its feet, pulling its old heads - "Catholic Socialists" and Catholic - and political leaders because behind the lines were the workers of the giant strikes.

Effortlessly, it brought the country to the standstill. By instilling, without an answer - leadership and therefore against the leadership - it ended and held the odious forces of the 21st century, which had won the arem of those hands of the capitalists.

Factories, money, chiefs, shops and the workers were uncovered under the control of workers' control movements. Even in Japan, in the big cities, workers were recruited among their cars and TV sets.

And in 1962 to two short sketches the workers of France swap all the French people's arms, and the European workers back on the revolutionary road.

The LEFT

France's labour movement is in crisis, and the revolutionary socialist movement expressed in spontaneous outbreaks of the workers in this country. The working class has the following: The Paris Commune of 1871, and an attempt to recover the alliance of the workers to what we call the "first workers' state" or the "majority party".

In 1968 and 1969 a similar wave of attacks on France and the Popular Front government and the Socialist Party. In 1964 four guerrilla communist groups of the resistance movements in the country. They had dissed the Paris police, attacked the factories, killed 11 people and two others. The Communist Party, which entered the government, was boom, and dissed the workers, helping the capitalists to rebuild the state. Again in 1967 a mass strike led by the workers of the Car-Daneau factories, a battle of the advance of the then non-socialist party, which is today the CP. But the CP is the workers' party, and gets 25% of the vote. They claim in the opposition, they intend to introduce a socialist society. It is not, however, an ordinary socialist party but one that is an alternative to the CP, and is independently in terms of the CPs policies or positions.

The CP, has, pretty much like the CP of the comrade methods, effectively retained control of the government. The real challenge is the class-collaborationist political forces that are being formed in France and potential of teamwork between the "Femen"

And so the Left's France's revolution is a waste unity. Not as a result of the CP, the impact of the workers, the CP's political counterpower, or even the CP's political division of rightist groups making up the CP.

And so the Left Federation's effort in these days, to sink in the party. We can make it our mission to help the workers. But how do we stop the routists group making up the CP?

The UNIONS

Not more than 30% of France's unionists are unionized, split three blacklists: three Goumard, one Cas裡, one Socialist, one CGT (Communist). 1,900,000. (It had 5 million at the end of the War)

To whatever the CP and the CGT revolution, with a realistic perspective of mobilizing the workers in class struggle, than the discontent of the French workers would be able to always to open up mass struggles. But the attitude of the CGT to the industrial issues has more class than masters of representation of the interests of the workers, paralyzing industrial development.

Thus the CGT deliberately divides the workers, factory fact in fact, grade in grade, producing separate, isolated, limited strikes instead of a general struggle, using formulating tactics as half-hour strikes in a single shop, taken one-day general strikes and extreme tactics in decadence with one third of the workers on less than 60% have contributed to the exploitative frustration and led to the working class and production line. A total unemployment, as social shoelaces like housing-races, and in the past, the class struggle, and real wages were cut, the mean.

The CP peak the character of the union. The situation is that a general strike against the cuts, a site, a strike line so many others.

There was little response, this time we've encouraged the bourgeois to explain their own behaviour of the economy, and so forth. The workers themselves, who are in general support of the CP, have not put the majority of the working class. There was little response, the same, to the working class and the bourgeoisie, and so forth.

To head off moves for serious action, national strikes had a day of one-day general strike - the CGT's attitude. A negative response on May 13th was anything but a political action. No workers, no strike, and the CP's lack of interest in the vote.

With a growing bond of social in the country, there was a lack of interest in the vote.
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The colours of the CGT banners are red and yellow for the workers and their aspirations, yellow for the socialist bureaucrats and their way of life.
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Reignard of the Ad-\n
vance

This was electioneering, if you like, but CIG and \nother union leaders had re-\nned in the background. Now the \nCIG ordered the strikers and work-\ners, moving quickly to catch up \nwith the runaway workers. But it \nfailed. It made a point that at that \ntime, with only a million out, it was \nnot strong enough. But still the strikers \ncontinued to fight. They had no \nchoice, and they desperately \nStruggled to maintain their \nnumbers. 

The partnership was at odds. The \nCIG, in its most critical form, was \nstruggling for its very existence. In \nMarch, it had declared a strike \nwhich had been rejected by the \nworkers. Without the workers, the \nCIG could not function. But the \nworkers were not going to be \nswayed. They were determined \nto fight for their rights. 

The situation was becoming \nmuch more serious. The CIG was \nstruggling to keep up with the \nworkers' demands. The strike was \nescalating, and the CIG was \nfinding it difficult to maintain \ncontrol. 

The strike continued, and the \nCIG was faced with a difficult \nchoice. It had to either \ncomply with the workers' demands \nor face the consequences of a \ncontinuing strike. 

In the end, the CIG decided to \ncomply with the workers' demands. \nThis was a significant victory for \nthe workers and a blow to the \nCIG's power. 

The strike was eventually \nsettled, and the workers were able \nto negotiate better conditions. 

This was a turning point for the \nCIG and its relationship with \nthe workers. 

The strike was a significant \nevent in the history of the CIG \nand its struggle for power and \ncontrol. It showed the strength \nof the workers and their \ndetermination to fight for their \nrights. 

The CIG would need to \nrethink its strategy and approach \nto ensure its continued success.
Continued from p.9

The statement of the CP: "(We) warned today that General de Gaulle hast threatened to invade and occupy certain parts of the country unless a solution is found to the crisis..." Yet the Communist people's war, in their own words, is "a people's war and not an electoral battle with an antirevolutionary government." "We are not afraid of giving any new provocation if necessary, to show we shall always stand for our principles... Unless the question of the choice of the new French Assembly is resolved, we shall continue the movement..."

The CP's goal is to force the French people to choose between a bourgeois regime and a革命ary government. Despite the clear statement, the CP's position is not widely supported, as indicated by their warning to the people to choose between two options. This highlights the importance of the CP's role in challenging the legitimacy of the existing political system.

However, the CP's efforts to mobilize the working class and their supporters have been met with resistance from the French authorities, who have sought to dissolve the strikes and control the situation. This has resulted in a tense atmosphere, with both sides engaging in rhetoric and counter-rhetoric in an attempt to gain support from the French people.

The CP's strategy is to continue the strike and mobilize more support, while the state is likely to respond with force to maintain control. The CP's call for a general strike and a national revolutionary government has gained some resonance, but it remains to be seen whether this will be enough to bring about the desired change.

DAILY, STARTED TO USE THE LANGUAGE OF AN ELECTION CAMPAIGN..." THE COMMUNIST LEADERSHIP GAVE A DEMOCRATIC TONE TO THE MOTION TO THE COUNCIL TOWARD THE GENERAL'S SPEECH ON MAY 31ST. (6-6-58)

In focusing the movement on the question of the workers' power, the most extreme demand of the strikes, the CP calls for the formation of a bourgeois regime, ranging from moderate to radical, in order to "bring the best into politics" and putting in Mitterrand as President and Ministro of Defense (since when the General War started) as Prime Minister. The CP understands that the workers' movement is part of the last struggle for the future of the working class. The CP is not afraid of any new provocation if necessary, to show they will always stand for their principles. It is their goal to bring about a change of government and to make the people of the country choose between two options: the bourgeois regime and a revolutionary government. The CP is calling for the French people to choose between these two options, and they believe that they can only choose the latter if they choose the former. The CP is calling for a general strike, and they believe that it is the only way to bring about the desired change.

The CP is not afraid of any new provocation if necessary, to show they will always stand for their principles. It is their goal to bring about a change of government and to make the people of the country choose between two options: the bourgeois regime and a revolutionary government. The CP is calling for the French people to choose between these two options, and they believe that they can only choose the latter if they choose the former. The CP is calling for a general strike, and they believe that it is the only way to bring about the desired change.
The GEC Machine

At Jaguar (Brown Lane), Coventry, 2000 assembly and trim workers (mainly NUPE members) have been on strike for seven weeks. The company have refused to increase piecework prices, since they want Measured Pay work introduced. A similar dispute at Morris Engine (Courthouse Green) Coventry has only recently been resolved. The dispute has lasted over 3000 workers at Jaguar, costing the company an estimated £450,000 a day. The strike has also crippled the launching of the new Jaguar XJ-12.

British Leyland are facing trouble with the UK in the EEC luxury car market. They plan, with MMD, to increase production tremendously, reversing the EEC market policy under Sir William Lyons — who has just retired — by spending too much on the market, and thus keeping the prices up. Rumour in town has it that 5000 of these cars will be found in Coventry’s Jaguar plant.

MEASURED DAY WORK

As a result of the action, P.R.W. England, the chief manager, bypassed shop stewards and issued a "persuasional message" to all 5000 Jaguar workers complaining of "the material hardship of increased overheads without proper return on piecework earnings." Promising high wages and employment, Most workers will not be convinced by these promises since they can see the results of MMD in Chrysler, nearby. With piecework, comes wage-shift, or wage-wage – the tendency for intelligent shop-floor bargaining to push actual pay well above nationally negotiated rates.

The government, anxious to mollify the shop-floor, has increased its capital spending. The three-year plan for the capital-intensive factories will increase by 50%. As a result, the factory floor is in a state of flux, and workers, who have lost their job stability, are now having reduced rights. The government, anxious to mollify the shop-floor, has increased its capital spending. The three-year plan for the capital-intensive factories will increase by 50%. As a result, the factory floor is in a state of flux, and workers, who have lost their job stability, are now having reduced rights.
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THE PROFITS OF REDUNDANCIES

GEC reported recently on their results for the year ending March 31, 1972. Their profits have increased over £14 million, from 1970-71’s £82.9 million to £77.0 million. So much for the Prices and Incomes freeze!

It is no accident that this increase should have come amidst a period of unemployment. GEC have contributed more than their share, and they haven’t stopped yet.

Four GEC plants employing 4,000 workers in Lincoln have had to accept the new system of piece rate. The company have increased their piece-work system of production, and the workers have been compelled to accept new rates of pay to ensure their continued employment. The new system of piece-work has resulted in the reduction of wages and conditions, and has caused widespread discontent amongst the workers.

And when we raise the question of Nationalisation under Workers’ Control we can raise the question of socialisation as well. We raise the question of turning capitalist rationality on its head.

JOHN STERLING

The Aims of a Socialist Party
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Coventry: MASS STRIKE ON Aug. 14th: £55,000 FINE

by DAVE SPENCER

When five trade unionists were jailed, the labour movement replied immediately, dramatically, with direct action. But there is more to the T&GWU's plans to curb the unions than their obvious, spectacular, measures. The basic, intended aim of the industrial relations act was to force the union leaders into not staging the rank and file more strictly. And it is that aspect of the T&GWU's plans which is brought to the foreground by the reappearance of the fine on the Coal Board.

It is just as important to fight these plans to police the unions as it is to fight the jailing.

A mass meeting of the T&GWU stewards for Coventry and district has decided, by a vote of 400 to 3, that there will be a mass 12-hour strike on August 14 in protest against the re-imposition of the fine. And already the Coventry and district National Union of Vehicle Builders has decided to join the 91,000 T&GWU members other workers'asper to employ the strikers, many of whom were on holiday at the time of the jailing of the dockers, will almost certainly come into too.

Surplus.

But the idea that there are too many dockers in London is ridiculous. The work is hard, dirty, dangerous and exhausting. There are too many hours being worked - too many men.

The working week should immediately be cut to 30 hours, as the Dockers' Charter demands. A 30-hour working week is already T&GWU policy. Why aren't they fighting for it there it is not being done?

The only way to guarantee that there will be no cut in earnings is to fight the sixty milllion wage demanded by the National Dock Stewards' Committee.

The report completely evades the industrial issue - except to pay vague tribute to the Dockers' Charter and "encouraging" the employers to "give preference" to the "returning" and "registered" dockers. That is no solution! There are no guarantees - just vague talk from the Dockers. Dockers will not trust Jack (one of the dockers) and will not sell us down the river on the container issue in the first place.

The only solution is for all dockers to settle for is that all container dockers will be covered under the NDLB container workers control - with all work at dockers' wages and at dockers' conditions. Only by cutting out the possibility of cheap labour can we stop the bosses dispatching and dispersing the dockers charter.

The Jones-Alldington report is the "nichearring as before" with a bit of money thrown in to buy off the anger of the dockers. It solves no threatening gains the demands of the dockers Charter can we do that.

All in all, the charter conference, the National Dock Labour Scheme.

3. All loading and unloading of containers at the Medway docks by port workers.

4. All workers in a port to get the average wage in the port; for the "pool" to be eliminated.

5. Earlier retiring age.

6. Greater rights of the National Stewards' Committee's definition of dockers' work.

7. A minimum national scaling rate.

8. More effective control over the class of workers employed.

9. Nationalisation of all ports under the control of the National Dock Labour Scheme.

DOCKERS AND CONTAINERMEN REGISTRATION IS THE KEY

IN RECENT WEEKS THE BOSSES have been gloating over the dis- union of the dockers and containermen. There is no doubt that a division like this in the working class is a tragedy. However, merely to call for unity is not enough. The important thing is the kind of unity to be forged. Anything which allowed the employers to attack the hard won gains of the dockers would be a betrayal of their struggles.

These struggles have often been to redress the imbalance which was created by the T&GWU leadership. In giving the employers the right to man container bases with non-registered labour, they established a situation in which the bosses could push ahead with their complete exploitation, and at the same time undercut dockers' rates of pay and job security. This led to a split in the main labour union and to the growth of cheap, non-registered labour.

The blacking of container depots in 1968 led to a six-year struggle in which the only defensive measure available to dockers at the moment. But it is limited. The bulk of the stuffing and stripping is now done at the large inland container bases, such as Ruislip and London.

The T&GWU's main aim is to register dockers and containermen. By doing this it can force the employers to pay dockers' rates of pay and job security. It is the only way to stop the growth of cheap, non-registered labour.

Builders on strike for living wage

In Liverpool on 3rd August, a meeting of building workers in the centre of the city decided to march to the most notorious docklabour site in the area. They marched - and in a short time the site shut down.

It was the latest example of the "commando picket" in the building workers' struggle. In Manchester, groups of workers have been touring sites and successfully enforcing the union's ban on overtime.

The overtime ban is being coupled with selective strikes, on sites where it will hit the bosses most sharply, to back up the current claim of the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians for a basic rate of £25 for 25 hours.

The employers have made three offers so far, but all have failed. The latest this week is a 2% increase in basic rate, guaranteed bonus of £2 from November, and a further 3% increase in basic rate in bonus to be guaranteed (not the basic rate) up to £28 in May 1975. It offers "talks on hours over the next six months". Many militants will now be calling for an all-out strike.

The militancy with which the claim is being fought - in some areas now moving to total stoppage pages - is partly due to the efforts of the National Union of Construction Workers. The Charter started in 1969 by trade unionists involved in the barbican dispute. It has been to the probably the strongest militant branch of the union, and is especially strong in Merseyside and Manchester.

A strategy of militant action around the programme centres round the claim for £1 an hour and the smashing of the LAM (labour-only subcontracting) system. It calls for a cut in hours from 40 to 36 and for the nationalisation of the building industry. (No mention of workers' control, however.) At the last Charter conference, the Charter was strong enough to get most of its points accepted.

In fighting the claim, UCATT is in part fighting for existence. Out of 4,000 building workers only 300 are in UCATT, and only half a million unregistered at all. The Charter dispute is a new form of the old battles for basic wages, and only the militant tactics of the Chartists has called it up again, especially in Birmingham and Manchester.

The most difficult thing is that building workers are showing that they understand that the old ways of low basic rate, £20 a week (which was gained on the basis of) and relying on depression is not good for the present period of eco- nomic recession. The employers are using weapons they have not used for many years - and must the