The U.S. is rushing military equipment to the Thai government, and Thieu is preparing to carry out a bloodbath of repression against "suspected communists" in Saigon-controlled areas of South Vietnam. Under the proposed agreement, U.S. troops are to remain indefinitely in Thailand and in the seas off Vietnam, ready to intervene again if the U.S. warmakers think it necessary. This is no peace.

The nine-point "settlement" that has reportedly been agreed to was wrung from the Vietnamese through the most extensive bombing campaign in history and through the threat of years more of the same terrible destruction.

The control of prices and dividends is largely a sham, a worker's gambit. Freezing dividends is no more than putting money away in the bank for the shareholders, whose assets are proportionately increased. Freezing wages is also putting money — extra money — in the bank: the same bank, that of the shareholders. The worker doesn't have a key to that bank. Wages lost like this are never recovered. It is difficult if not impossible to control prices under a market-dominated capitalist system. Heath isn't trying very hard. The wage freeze is just automatic, and with no exceptions. But there are notorious exceptions to the price freeze — basic foodstuffs, for example, not to mention "fair rents".

That alone makes the Tories' game transparent as Salome's nightdress! And, despite the much-publicized show of "waggle-droppers" checking prices, it is left to wholesalers and retailers to ensure that prices don't rise. The Tories' game is transparent as Salome's nightdress!

**IS IT PEACE IN VIETNAM?**

The Vietnamese people have now witnessed the full military pressure of the imperialist power in the world for eight long years. The American bosses have used their strength with grotesque frenzy throughout the years of their large scale involvement. Millions are in "refugee" camps, dyke system on which the life of the North depends — as if their goal were literally, physically and completely to wipe the country off the very face of the earth.

**VICTORY!**

And now they talk of "negotiating peace...and the experts say there is going to be peace. Have the Vietnamese won their war of national liberation, the greatest epic struggle for freedom in human history? Have they been forced into a compromise which is less than the full victory to which they are entitled? Are the announced terms of agreement a "Victory for the Indochinese people" as one leader proudly headlined it, and should we really follow the Morning Star's advice and take it to be our own?" [Page 3, col. 2]

"Force Nixon to sign!" In fact the terms of the agreement so far known are virtually the same as the so-called "point "peace" plan put out by war criminal Nixon last February and accepted by the Vietnamese. Since that time the incessant bombing and growing isolation have undermined the Vietnamese, it is well known to all that both the Russians and the Chinese got more and more help with Washington, both these powers (neither of which gave adequate military aid to the Vietnamese — the Chinese less than the Russians, even in the former's most "revolutionary period") have put heavy pressure on the Vietnamese to compromise.

They would happily see a new wave of the fait accompli in the conference at Geneva which filtered the fruits of the military victory over the French from the Vietnamese. And no one questions the right of the Vietnamese to make a compromise peace if they see no other option. But every socialist and militant must denounce the cynical acquiescence in Peking and Moscow who have betrayed the Vietnamese people.

Withdrawal of US troops is a victory for the Vietnamese. But they are not going any further than Thailand; and the airplane carrying US Seventh Fleet aircraft to Vietnamese bases will continue to hover, around the coast. The US war is not over; it is only now more openly a mainly non-combat war. It's all a matter of time. [Page 3, col. 1]

**SAYS TrotSKYist CANDIDATE**

2 U.S. PRESIDENCY

The Vietnamese are rebelling against a system that allows a few landlords and capitalists to own most of the land and wealth. The masses of peasants must hand over a large part of their crops to the landlords, and be too poor to farm the land. Workers are paid miserably low wages, taxed heavily, and denied all democratic rights. The hated Saigon regime represents the landowners, the capitalists, and the imperialist powers they depend on to protect them from their own people.

The proposed nine-point agreement does not deal with these fundamental problems in line with the needs and aspirations of the Vietnamese people.

The agreement provides for a Communist government.

All out for Anti Internment League march Nov 22

**ASSEMBLE SPEAKERS' CORNER HYDE PARK AT 3pm**
THE PAY TALKS

Meeting of the knuckleduster and the Feather duster

After the release of the five dockers, the Government stood discredited. It was discovered both in the eyes of the working class, which had dealt it a heavy blow, and in the eyes of the ruling class, whose servants it is. All the bosses that were made about in a storm and sorting out the unions who now served to emphasize - after suffering two minor defeats, the Tories could not face another direct confrontation with the working class. But the difficulties of the employers' government should have been the trade union movement's opportunity. The chance was there to "clear the boot in" - that is to turn a serious bargaining into a rout. A rout which would put an end to local changes in the unions; a rout which may have held back government as well. A rout was on for the TUC to rally the rank and file of the trade union movement with the aim of winning the Industrial Relations Act, to reimpose a complete boycott of the bosses' industrial courts; to refuse to pay the fines levied on the Transport and General Workers' Union and to the rest of the unions. Ruling out of that class of all our intervention with the state could have smashed the Act.

Any such generalised confrontation would have taken the working class into the scene as an independent, political force. Workers could have learned of their own strength - not just on the industrial field, but in the political spheres as well. But the short time span of the power of the working class had been devastated and their timing of the five was quite enough for the "generals" at the TUC. Instead of "putting the boot in" they "opened the door".

Make no mistake about it, the incomes policy was not a "government initiative" but a TUC initiative, and it came in its clearest form at the Brighton conference, where the General Council resolved to oppose compulsory pay restraint and uphold the incomes policy which is "an integral part of an economic strategy" which includes control of rents, profits, dividends, and prices and is designed to secure a redistribution of income and wealth. So rather than meeting the government head on over the Industrial Relations Act, the TUC leaders thought they could bungle it away, by offering to cooperate on incomes policy. Not that this "redistribution of income and wealth" means that the TUC was driving a hard bargain, either. In fact the dividend control they proposed would be a positive asset to the employing class - one which the American capitalists recently asked Nixon to preserve!

TORIES FOLLOW TUC

In any case the gesture at Brighton did not go unnoticed. On the following Monday, 'Times' said that: "The Government should not ignore the TUC's conference resolution yesterday on pay restraint" - and neither did they. For both the Industrial Relations Act and Incomes Policy rest on the same foundation. They both rely on implementation of the Trade Union official leadership. When the bosses brought in the Industrial Relations Act, they said it was intended to "strengthen the structure of industrial relations and to strengthen the trade union movement". They meant by this that they were aiming to strengthen a particular type of "trade unionism" - the "trade unionism" of Chapple and Lord Chilver. In other gain at Chrysler the ordinary, and not achieved with

wants to strengthen the power of these right wing leaders so that they could act as policemen against the self-reliance and fighting confidence of the rank and file. More important it was to change the structure of industrial relations so that left wing union leaders such as Jack Jones and Hugh Scanlon would also be pushed into stifling the militancy of their members in the same was as Chapple and Cooper.

But the 'Times' plans went astray. Instead of strengthening the union bureaucracy they were hared with a massive upsurge of grass roots militancy which threatened to sweep right over the heads of the Feathers. But if it was the mass roots trade union movement which threw a spanner in the TUC cogs it is now the bureaucrats who are trying to patch up the damage. By presenting Incomes Policy as the 'Trade Union Alternative to the Industrial Relations Act', the Union leaders have indeed given the Government an alternative, which is very much as dangerous as the Industrial Relations Act.

Not that we should suppose that we will get the repeal of the Act as a reward from the 'Times'. If we accept Incomes Policy it is quite clear that the TUC will put an end to the chance of getting union leaders to accept both Act and Incomes Policy - if not openly, then by virtue of their refusal to fight either one.

COMPULSORY

In the same article quoted above, the 'Times' states "We adhere to the view we have taken over the past two years that a government decreed incomes policy is necessary, and we doubt now whether it can be postponed before this winter. But it does not at all follow from this that a Downing Street conference should be abandoned. Indeed, they are an essential prerequisite to a comprehensive national incomes policy, initiated not by 10000 tuc, but by 700 engineers working on 16 October's raid to strike to further their claim for danger money for working in the hostile environment.

In other words, by accepting Incomes Policy the government has done the working class any favour whether it be TUC-supported or not. The 'Times' goes on to say that the success of the compulsory policy when it comes will depend above all on the political atmosphere at the time. And could the 'Times' or the government have hoped for a better 'political atmosphere' than the TUC talking with the government with the advantage of a clear record taken as given.

The Industrial Relations Act and Incomes Policy both attack the trade unions - to increase profits at the expense of the working class, by stifling the militancy of the rank and file trade unions. Both are part of the general strategy - the trade union leaders - to bow down before the bosses' state.

The crunch on the issue of Incomes Policy lies in deciding whose claims over one of the major pay claims - over pensions - local government, over the wages and standstill of all manual workers, miners, railworkers, New Zealand. The Socialist should not be the first to accept Incomes Policy. Instead, we need to organize a Courageous front to fight this time, for the rights of the workers.

The TUC will act in accord with the major capitalist" incentives. But the TUC can only be broken if the working class is control of the TUC. Only then can control - not the words of the bosses - not the words of their employers. This solidarity must include financial aid from the leaders of the big union to strikers, the aid that was lacking in the past year or so.

The demand for an Alliance of Public Service Unions is a crucial in view of this need for solidarity.

Finally, let us remember, the demands of the Industrial Relations Act is still on the books. To enforce Incomes Policy the government has to defeat any pay claims significantly bigger than £2. To fight the real wages they must defeat the workers. To do this they will use any weapon of the bosses. If they think they need the Industrial Relations Act, they will use it. The slogan of the new Alliance of Unions is valid for all of the Industrial Relations Act, the Housing Finance Act, and any attempt at Incomes Policy - remain relevant.
from p.1

VIETNAM

the US air power that actually counts.

Electoral objects mostly to the North Vietnamese - 130,000 of them - remaining in the South. Agreement. In fact, the New York Times reports that the main purpose of the agreement is to force the North Vietnamese to agree to withdraw the troops. Vietnam.

The Third regime has one million soldiers, as well as poli

The Americans have spared no expense to build a military bureaucracy machine land, and its ability to replace its equipment which controls 90% of the population of Vietnam.

its power will be used intensively in the final struggle for control of the country, which will certainly continue after a ceasefire, it will continue becas because the demarcation line of dual power continues ... conditions which the agreement makes more favorable to the Third regime of the landlords and the capitalists.

In short, this situation cannot be changed; they can only create a need for increased American military power. According to Amnesty International, there are 200,000 American soldiers in the South, and that number will increase as the situation deteriorates. It is clear that the end of the war in Vietnam is not in sight.

The political future of Vietnam will undoubtedly be determined by these elections. But any elections organized under the capitalist/socialist government in Sichuan and with the blessings of the U.S. imperialists can be assumed beforehand to be a fraud.

History shows that the imperialists only allow elections that are rigged in their favor.

The U.S. government under President Johnson and President Nixon underestimated the strength of the people. The people have demonstrated their determination and tenacity.

In Vietnam, on the other hand, the U.S. made sure that the elections set for 1965 by the 1964 Geneva Accords were never held. President Eisenhower later admitted that the U.S. fears the Viet Minh would win the votes.

If even the proposed agreement leads to a coalition govern

ment in Sichuan, it will still be a capitalist government. Despite the long years of struggle by the Vietnamese people, the peace talks in Paris have been a great victory. The Vietnamese have undergone the horrors of war for 30 years. In the last 15 years between 1965 and 1971 alone, the U.S. has killed 600,000 Vietnamese civilians in 450 Hiroshima bombs. Since May the North Vietnamese faced U.S. attempts to cut off their supplies through a blockade.

It is not only Nixon who must be condemned, however, for forcing the Vietnamese to agree to terms dictated by Washington. On top of the exhaustion of war, the Vietnamese liberation fighters have faced isolation and be

tral threat by the bureaucratic regimes in Moscow and Peking. While the Vietnamese have been making enormous sacri

fices and providing an unparalleled example of heroic re

sistance to U.S. aggression, Moscow and Peking have been entertaining Nixon and making deals with him to strangle the Vietnamese revolution.

They refused to provide the Vietnamese with the most modern fighter planes and anti-aircraft weapons needed for defense against U.S. bombing attacks.

While giving substantial aid, including fighter planes, to capitalist regimes like Egypt, they did not give Vietnam the same type of modern weapons they needed.

The Moscow and Peking blocs have joined the U.S. efforts to stop the Vietnamese from fighting and to make them accept the terms dictated by the United States.

In the chaos of change for Nixon's nine-point agreement is my Democratic opponent George McGovern. This so-called peace candidate says only that he would reserve the right to "negotiate" sections of the settlement if he is elected.

By applauding the nine-point terms for U.S. withdrawal, McGovern helps legitimize U.S. aggression in Vietn

am for the first time. He lends credence to Nixon's claim that the U.S. had to continue its bombing campaign until the Vietnamese accepted his terms for a "honorable settlement."

I say the United States has no right to negotiate anything whatsoever about the future of Vietnam. And let all those who war Americans to speak out against any terms the U.S. tries to impose as a condition for its withdrawal.

At this time, however, the U.S. military presence has been signed, and the bombing and shooting continue. Moreover, even under the proposed "settlement," the U.S. plans to maintain 39,000 troops on the Sukhoi, the fleet surrounding Vietnam and another 45,000 troops in Thailand, ready to intervene militarily anywhere in Southeast Asia.

The demonstration called for Nov. 18 by the National Peace Action Coalition will be an important step in the U.S. government's policy of attempting to impose its will on Vietnam. The action demands: U.S. get out of all Southeast Asia immediately! No conditions!

Furthermore, self-defense must be organized against the capitalist and social imperialists of the type recently seen in Brazil, Mexico...

The people of North Vietnam are ready to defend their country, their freedom and their way of life.
Lessons from the Past for Builders’ Charter

by Len Glover

With the sell-out of the builders’ strike still fresh in the minds of many, it is worthwhile to look back, not only at the lessons of the strike but also at the lessons of history.

The detailed history of the working class is dotted with accounts of rank and file movements very similar to the Charter, the building workers’ rank and file movement.

The Charter started in Liverpool and London back in 1969. Since then it has grown into a national organisation and a well-organised body. The Charter was solely responsible for the left swing of the building industry.

The strikers were defeated by union officials, always looking for a chance to sell out the working class to the right and to get back to a quiet life, and the tactic of individual settlements, by which workers who settled with the National Union of Construction Workers returned to work, thus splitting and weakening the strike.

‘Ginger Group’

But probably the greatest single factor was that at the crucial stage, when the sell-out came, there was no unified alternative leadership to show the way for the rank and file.

That was the role that Building Workers’ Charter should have taken. It did not, and a great deal of responsibility for the outcome of the strike lies with the Charter, which was initially conceived as a ‘ginger group’, to pressure the trade unions on the question of the struggle to force Smith to hold out against any dished settlements.

This is the lesson to be learned by those in this right up to the sell-out.

Pressure tactics can force bureaucratic leaders to the left. But is there always a gap between the rank and file militancy which is the source of the pressure and the response of the top leaders? And the gap becomes greatest - and most critical - when the rank & file moves forward most rapidly.

Demoralisation

Then the leaders stall, sell out, and dissipate the militancy gained, and so the power of the Charter came to an end.

The only way this can be fought is by an alternative leadership stepping forward. But the Communist Party leaders of the Charter continued to confine themselves to pushing the Trade Union top leaders to the left.

“It is clear from experience that many militancy is still alive and that we can face the leaders to head a real fight. In actual practice mass pressure forces the leaders to manœuvre and to head strikes in order to re-establish the authority of the Charter.”

Where does this quotation come from? Not from the lips of a disaffected worker, but from the ‘Communist Review’. It was published in 1953 after the subsequent demise of another rank and file organisation, the Minority Movement.

The Minority Movement was probably the most important, but not the last, rank and file movement in British building class history. For a detailed history of the Minority Movement, see ‘Workers Fights’ (no 11).

Revolutionary

Very briefly, it was formed by Communist Party militants after a series of initiatives by the Red International of Labour Unions. Over a period of years they forged a rank and file movement embracing many sections of industry. By March 1932, 35,000 workers were gathered under the banner of the Minority Movement.

The politics and tactics of the Minority Movement were based on the need for an alternative leader of the Trade Union bureaucratic hierarchy, and on the need for a revolutionary outlook. The Minority Movement was not conceived as a ginger group and did not function as one.

Leadership

Before the General Strike in 1926, there was, however, a shift in the policy of the Minority Movement, following an overall change in the Communist Party policy as directed by Moscow. In those days all the Communist Parties followed the Moscow line, far more so than today.

The Minority Movement changed its tactics and its politics, from revolutionary politics to a reliance on ‘progressive’ forces (i.e. the Trade Union bureaucracy). The working class, in an absolutely new situation, was deprived of a revolutionary leadership. The only leadership it was left with was the bureaucratic, and any industrial militant knew what followed from that - sell-out and defeat! The failure of the Minority Movement in 1926 was one of the reasons for the defeat of the General Strike and the acute demoralisation which followed right through to the 30s.

Between the Minority Movement and the Charter - both rank and file movements, one multi-industry, the other being confined to one industry - both involved in a period of critical and intense struggle - both posed themselves as ‘ginger groups’, pushing Trade Union bureaucracy to the right (the Minority Movement by changing to the wrong line, the Charter by not seeing the need to change its line).

Both movements were unable to prevent sell-outs.

Progressive

It can be seen from this that there is much to be learnt from this past. The Charter must reorganise along the lines of posing itself as an alternative leadership to the minority movement.

Savage Sentence for Rebel Soldier

Like many other soldiers at present serving in Ireland, Michael Hurkins joined the British Army because of unemployment. He did so against the advice of his mother, in whom he always very close. He never settled down to Army life and became increasingly disgusted at the role the British Army plays in the six counties. Michael Hurkins was the last straw for him and his friend Colin Demet, and they turned themselves and their weapons over to the Irish Republican Army. When his mother fell ill some weeks later Michael returned to Liverpool to see her. He was picked up, sent to rejoin his regiment in Belfast, and transferred with them to Germany where he received a sentence of five years.

His mother ... is frantic with worry that she may never see her son again before she dies. According to the best available advice the fastest way to find out Michael’s whereabouts is through one H. Wilson, the MP for that constituency. Mrs Hurkins has recently written to him appealing for help. A couple of days ago, Michael’s mother, Mrs Anne Hurkins, received a visit from a Special Branch man who told her that she would hear of Michael’s whereabouts Smith to suffer the same fate as the Minority Movement. As an immediate rallying cry the Charter could mobilise its members around the need to kick out Smith and the rest of the scabs and tailors who support to lead the building workers.

In this way the Charter could motivate vast numbers of men who are too demoralised to act on anything else. From this a whole new alternative leadership could spring. Unfortunately the Communist Party leaders of the Charter do not see things this way. It appears that some of them want to get a place in the airships and plush offices of Smith and Co.

The Charter plans to hold an extraordinary National Conference soon. This meeting may hold the key to future Charter policies - militants will watch with interest.

"It would be some time before she heard". Presumably this is the section of the letter which was sent to Harold Wilson. We repeat, it is about six months since Michael was arrested. Mrs Hurkins cannot be expected to wait another six. Exactly what is going on there we will not tell Mrs Hurkins of Michael’s whereabouts? There is something very peculiar going on and we demand to know what it is. "Committed from the 24 Oct 1942 issue of Rose Catha, published by Clenna na Med (the political organisation of the Official Republican Movement in England, Scotland, and Wales)."
A FOUR PAGE ANATOMY OF LOYALISM

There are two main distinct evemptions of trends within Protestant loyalist politics - trends which have, since 1968, resulted in the breaking of the Orange order.

The second, the Unionist Party was very different from its British Tory sister party. Although like the Tory Party it served the aristocracy, it was also the party of the mass of the Protestant workers in Northern Ireland. From landed aristocrats to underpaid "unskilled" Protestant workers, reactionary class unity was the norm in the Orange state.

Now that unity, and the organisation which expressed and fostered it, is shattered beyond repair, AUSTEN MORGAN describes the Protestant political factions and military organisations that have emerged as a result of the disintegration of Ulster Unionism.

The first major assault on the Unionist Party came from Ian Paisley - a religious bigot, a figure who might have stepped straight out of the early 19th century. Paisley reacted violently to the overtures of Captain O'Neill to the leaders of the Catholic minority and the Southern government. This he saw as a betrayal of traditional Unionism. Christian ecumenism was as much a threat as Republicanism, as the Ballinlough boat-thumper saw it.

Paisley was able to mobilise the most backward and biggest Unionist supporters on the streets, and he and his followers became the major opponents of the Civil Rights movement.

Wherever there was a Civil Rights demonstration the Paisleyites with their Union Joes and Lantock drums could be heard "braying and haranguing" the "rebels". Paisley on the streets, set the pace for the right wing of the Ulster Party. As he continued to demand "no surrender", the Unionist party, at all levels up to the cabinet, followed him in order to maintain popular support.

Since his election to Westminster, two years close to the corridors of power in London have mollified the Reverend Doctor. It has also, however, taught him something about middle class politics. Paisley, along with Enoch Powell, is now peddling "total integration with the United Kingdom" around the Loyalist grassroots. Through his friends on the right, the Tory Party, he reckons he is in tune with political reality.

Of Craig and his "Independent British Ulster" he has said "The voice of Mr. Craig and the advice of Mr. Craig are the voice and advice of folly. Anarchy cannot be answered by more anarchy. Lawslessness cannot be answered by more lawlessness."

Paisley, by shouting about on the Shankill and outing Craig in saying verbal war on the "terrorists", is attempting to re-recruit the Loyalist following he has lost. Despite his "integration" ideas, Paisley is still the most popular Protestant politician, and has
October 5th 1968 he banned a small Civil Rights march due to take place in Derry, a predominantly Catholic town, on the grounds that it would offend the Loyalist minority in the city. The march took place and the RUC, under Craig's control, viciously beat the marchers into the ground.

Pressure from the Wilson government had forced O'Neill on the road to reform. But while O'Neill might get away with pretending to be a liberal, Craig never could. This meant that Craig, who wanted to treat the Civil Rights movement in the traditional manner - label it an IRA plot and then throw the Special Powers Act, B Specials and the RUC at it - was soon sacrificed to O'Neill's 'liberal' image.

While Paisley hit his bit on the streets, Craig started on the rounds of the Unionist Associations letting the grass roots hear what they wanted to hear. Craig led the opposition within the party to both O'Neill and Chichester-Clark, articulating the cut-off reaction of traditional unionism. But when he stood against Faulkner for the Premiership he received only four votes.

While still a member of the party, he was unable to cast his leadership which responded reluctantly to the dictates of the British government. Then, earlier this year, Craig made his bid for power when he founded Vanguard.

Vanguard was launched to a fanfare of martial music, with motorcycle escorts for the 'Leader' and inspections of troops at the march. Craig began to threaten civil war and incite violence against the Catholics.

On 13th March he told the assembly faithfully, "We have an organisation that covers every part of this land. It must be used to identify the real enemy and build up auxiliaries... One day it may be our job, if the politicians fail, to liquidate the enemy..."

The Independent British (Ulster) Vanguard, which Craig advocates, is a call for the restoration of the Protestant majority at the expense of the Union. Little does he realise that the former was only achievable because of the latter. Craig's own lifetime politics for "Protestant Sinn Feinism" (as Paisley calls it) will obviously receive the support of those who have most to lose - the Protestant workers - now that the Thatcher government is carefully moving against the Protestant Accordinance in an attempt to reform Northern Ireland society.

But their problem is that a 'UDI' Ulster would slump economically and Protestant rule standards would plummet - even though keeping always one notch ahead of the Catholic workers.

Along with these there is also a fairly stable larger element in the Vanguard movement.

But like orthodox Unionism, Vanguard is still under careful middle class leadership, even if as yet money has not been forthcoming to it from big industrialists, who for the moment are basking in their gravy.

Craig likes to invoke the days of 1921, while at the same time appealing to "democracy"! But the Loyalist "majority" he continually refers to was only the creation of the Boundary Commission of 1925, which drew a gerrymandering border across Ireland.

The 1912 Ulster Unionists made no pretence to this leadership, their main argument was on the rights of a minority to veto the wishes of the Ulster majority of Ireland. The Ulster League and Covenant signed by 471,000 Loyalists in 1912 made quite clear that they had no notion of "democracy". "Being convinced in our conscience that Home Rule would be disastrous to the material well being of Ulster... we will use all means which may be found necessary to defeat the present conspiracy to set up a Home Rule Parliament in Ireland."

Today as in 1912 the Ulster Catholics are a minority in Ireland. Now, as then, they still seek to frustrate their enemies - if the means for a United Ireland ever found..."

LAW

Loyalist Association of Workers

LAW is an association of Loyalist trade unionists and farmers at what they consider to be the 'sell-out' policies of the oficial trade union movement. (Wants Stormont restored.)

LAW is led by Billy Hall, a shots-winger in the Belfast shib- yard and a former member of the N. I. Labour Party. That Hall lacks political ideology he makes up for in political audacity; and the rest of L.A.W.'s leadership is made up of Loyalist politicians vying with Hall for a place at the top alongside Craig.

Hall has not so much organised L.A.W. as put himself at the head of a more or less spontaneous movement. For years Protestant workers in certain key industries in Belfast would rally forth to do put down any trouble coming from the Republican areas. They could always be relied upon to go back to work after they had done the employers' dirty work.

Hall has no interest in leading his followers in struggles against their employers over issues such as pay and conditions. Such actions would alienate him from other Loyalist leaders such as Craig who would accuse him of letting down the Loyalist side.

L.A.W.'s greatest event was the two-day Loyalist General Strike which Vanguard called in the introduction of Direct Rule last March. Since then Hall has not been able to pull off anything so spectacular.

The day after the Parns murdered two innocent people in the Shankill Hall called out the North's power workers in protest against the Regime, which was also guarding the power stations. "(Through the power workers' policy to rule the Loyalist power workers refused to raise part.) Whiskey held firm and would not concede to L.A.W.'s demand for the Parns' withdrawal from the power stations.

Hall gradually backed down and the men went back to work after four weeks without having paid anything.

Craig has threatened that the province's industry will be brought to a standstill if the British government does not give the Loyalists back their Stormont. Though L.A.W. has not made the same threats.
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Ulster Volunteer Force

Though the UDA may not have history on their side, they should not be underestimated in the immediate future. They are armed. Army searches have uncovered weapons and explosives in Protestant areas. Belfast’s engineering factories have become part time munitions factories, as in 1913.

The UDA is close to and probably has a common membership with the UVF (Ulster Volunteer Force) an illegal Protestant terrorist organisation modelled on the Ulster Volunteers of 1913. The UVF hit the headlines in 1956 when Gusty Spence and others were convicted of the murder of two Catholic nuns. Spence was a former member of the British army in Cyprus. This was two years before Civil Rights, and four years before the present IRA offensive.

Recently a sergeant in the UVF, Sinclair Johnston, was killed in Lene in a gun battle with the British army. 3,000 men in para-military uniform, many of them wearing UVF insignia, were marched behind the coffin. The funeral was allowed to proceed and the army did not interfere. The UVF had also organised two jail breaks from Crumlin Road in recent weeks.

Many unexplained murders and several bombings have been attributed to the UVF. Along with the British army’s Staff (undercover) arm, the UVF has been waging a "counter-terrorist" campaign against the IRA and the entire minority population. One of their more heinous tactics has been the planting of car bombs outside crowded Catholic pubs without giving any warning.

Despite the fact that the UVF has been in existence for several years and has been involved in "subversive" activities both north and south of the border, the British army has made no attempt to move against them. Paulkner claimed that intervention was introduced to remove all counteractivities from the scene. Yet out of over 1,000 men interned, not one was a suspected member of the UVF.

Present British government policy is still directed against the Republican population in Ireland. There has been no consistent attempt to move against the Loyalists. On the contrary, the troops have been encouraging the Loyalists in their war against the IRA.

Professor K.S. Lyall, in a UDA publication, "Dominion of Ulster" admitted that the British army had trained the UDA.

While the Loyalist population may not be as organised as the Republican it is as strong as it appears at first sight. It should not be underestimated. The politics of Imperialism and the legacy of the British domination of Ireland has left the anti-imperialist and socialist movement with the problem of the Orange monster still yet to be solved.
IN 1972 SUBSCRIPTIONS WERE RAISED IN Ulster to help the French Revolution to fight off invasion by the British. In November 1798, the Volunteers welcomed the declaration of war against the British. The Volunteers were primarily dedicated to the maintenance of the Protestant community. The Order of the Orange, as we know it today, was formed in 1788, after the French Revolution. The Order was to use the authorities to suppress the suppression of the French Revolution. The Order only began to be well known after the 1798 Risings, when some Orange bands were armed by the ruling class. Clearly the Irish landlords were not unaware of the potentialities of this new movement.

There was some consternation in the Irish and French press when the Act of Union was passed in 1800. It was believed that the French Revolution would grant Irish civil rights and that Ireland would be kept separate from the central government in Dublin. However, the Act of Union was passed in 1800 and it remained in power for the rest of the century.

Even more interesting are the cultural ties of the Belfast radical movement described by the same writer: "The Belfast radicals drew much of their inspiration from the French Revolution, but they had a quite revolutionary sense of tradition; they were interested in Irish antiquities and folklore, and they were influenced by the thinking of the French Revolutionaries. Their ideals were connected with the ancient music and poetry of Ireland. The idea of an 'Irish nation', indifferent to the English, was in its infancy, but enlightened by the Revolution, it was raised to the height of the Irish nation in the 18th century."

How was it then that Republicanism was eradicated among the Belfast Protestants?

PARLIAMENTARY POWER was the real issue for the Orange Order, which began life in 1735 as an Arbroath peasant movement.

GRATTAN

Despite the moderate degree of prosperity brought by the establishment of "Grattan's Parliament" in 1782 and the passing of Pulteney's Corn Law, conditions in the rural areas remained bleak for the poor. Rents rose and so did the population. Rural terrorism against the landlords appeared in Munster around the mid-1760s. In the north there was also unrest. There was a rising of the mistreated Catholics -Catholic population, such as those in Armagh, conflict flared up between the two sections of the population. Protestant tenants, claiming they were being curtailed for holdings by their Catholic landlords, who were ready to pay a higher rent, formed themselves into an armed secret society called the "Peep o' Day Boys", whose aim was to aid Catholic tenants in evicting the Protestant inhabitants out of the neighbouring Manors.

The Catholics retaliated by setting up their own society known as the "Defenders". This led to the encounter between these two factions, known as "The Battle of the Diamond". There arose an "Orange Society" which was political in nature and dedicated to the maintenance of the Protestant Ascendancy. The Order of the Orange was used to suppress the suppressed. Some Orange bands were armed by the ruling class. Clearly the Irish landlords were not unaware of the potentialities of this new movement.

There was some consternation in the Irish and French press when the Act of Union was passed in 1800. It was believed that the French Revolution would grant Irish civil rights and that Ireland would be kept separate from the central government in Dublin. However, the Act of Union was passed in 1800 and it remained in power for the rest of the century.

Even more interesting are the cultural ties of the Belfast radical movement described by the same writer: "The Belfast radicals drew much of their inspiration from the French Revolution, but they had a quite revolutionary sense of tradition; they were interested in Irish antiquities and folklore, and they were influenced by the thinking of the French Revolutionaries. Their ideals were connected with the ancient music and poetry of Ireland. The idea of an 'Irish nation', indifferent to the English, was in its infancy, but enlightened by the Revolution, it was raised to the height of the Irish nation in the 18th century."

How was it then that Republicanism was eradicated among the Belfast Protestants?

Despite this, however, the movement went into decline after O'Connell's campaign for "Catholic Emancipation" revived it, but the Irish authori- ties responsible to Lord Liverpool had the movement banned in 1825 (apparently as a sop to O'Connell) and although it surfaced again in 1826 it was unable to prevent the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Act in 1829.

Naturally enough the Orange Order, which had supported the Tories in the struggle against the 1832 Reform Bill, and likewise Peel's 1834 minor- ity government. It then got itself involved in a conspiracy to cut Queen Victoria out of succession to the throne and put either her husband or her son Duke of Cumberland, but this at- tempted coup d'etat failed and in 1839 the movement was banned and stayed that way until 1865.

Perhaps one of the main reasons was to make headway again in the late 1840s - 1850s in response to the growth of Fenian- ism. Disestablishment of the Church of Ireland in 1869 was felt, of course, as a grievance, and so was discontinuance of the royal bounty paid granted by King Billy to Presbyterian ministers.

However, it was the issue of Home Rule and the rise of Parnell which contributed most dramatically to the political power which the Order now enjoys in the Six Counties. To understand how Home Rule transformed things we must go back a bit and look at the development of capitalism in Ulster.

Capitalism in the North did not become fully developed until after 1950, but was already making progress before that date. The linen industry became particularly concentrated in the North East by the middle of the 18th century. The introduction of machine spinning around Belfast, cotton declined, but iron- making and mining were relatively declining, and in Derry shirt manufacture began around 1840, pioneered by master linen weaver William Scott.

This industrial growth was marked by a liberal tendency in politics, represented for example by the newspaper "The Northern Whig", which supported parliamentary reform and repeal of the Corn Laws, and opposed the rack-renting landlords. The paper also supported the campaign for Catholic Emancipation, but vigorously opposed O'Connell when he went on to demand the repeal of the Act of Union.

It is not hard to see why: Ulster manufactures were aimed at the British Empire market rather than the Irish home market, and by 1860s were becoming established. Also the land question was still far from being settled, and there were dangers in that quarter against which Union was a form of insurance.

As time went on, supporters of the British Liberal Party began to win seats in Ulster - four in 1868 and nine in 1874. Unfortunately the Catholic middle class masses, whose economic interests were somewhat different, inevitably chose to butt in at this point, "Great Capitalism, less securely established, required protective duties against competing British goods, which would helpely help Belfast. As Irish stop the unruley "Tait's" from getting out of hand yet again and forcing a somewhat weakened British Empire to consider granting Ireland her independence. But something was salvaged from the wreck: a six-county statelet in which Unionists outnumbered nationalists by a ratio of 6 to 4. However, it was necessary to deny the minority a number of accepted democratic rights in order to maintain the British connection, which two fifth of the population found unpleasant.

This being so, it followed that the Unionist masses had to be controlled too, to make sure there were no "Uteens Prades", opponents of "Ulster" who do not come from a Catholic background.

The Orange Order is an effective means of doing this, and with the massive patronage of "His own" county statelet at its disposal, it functioned as an employment agency, social welfare agency and club, in addition to its more obvious role.

The Order has room for all classes and at the time of writing appr. 2,000 members only, while Unionism, its long-established political expression, is in disarray.

CHRIS GREY
The Red Mole on "Trotsky, Warts and All"...
Solidarity for Fine Tubes

“"Our dispute has been going on for two years and four months" Hemmann Walsh, chairman of the Fine Tubes strike committee, told nearly 400 delegates to a conference in Birmingham on October 28. The conference, organised by the National Council of Trade Unions and Fine Tubes workers in agreement, was the first major national conference of the Fine Tubes dispute. The report below was written by a delegate to the conference on the first day of proceedings.""
**Dundee - 25,000 Against Rent Act**

The overall tendency of the tenants movement over the long night appears to have been a swell off. The movement has been weakened by the confusion of the Wallace council, who have given in to the Government's threats and fines, and to press against the Act. The main rent strikes, however, remain solid.

The next big struggle may be moving to Scotland. On 30 November 25,000 workers, tenants and house owners in Dundee took action against the Act - a one hour stoppage of work, public meetings, and demonstrations.

Dundee council is implementing and rent increases are due during November. Already many tenants are refusing to pay the increases.

Meanwhile the Tory Secretary for Scotland has ordered police inquiries into the actions of the Dundee, Stobswell, and Falkirk - four major local authorities which are not implementing the Act.

The traditionally local council "in Scotland mean that the government's rent rises would lead to massive increases, even bigger than in England and Wales."

On 29 October members of the Rents Action Group attended a Trades Union Congress and pressed for legislation for a full stop against the Rent Act and a pledge of industrial action in the event of eviction. The chairman, Communist Party member Francis Sheehy, ruled the resolution out of order, so the proceedings were continued with a speech by Labour MP Frank Allan.

By and by, she said, there will be an election, and tenants can vote Labour; by by and by, perhaps. Labour will repeal the Rent Act; some time, perhaps (but not too hastily!) they will nationalise building land. In the meantime - don't look to Frank Allan for any help!

Tenants, however, will continue to press their resolution on the Trades Council. The Rents Action Group also decided to send a delegate to a Direct Works stewards' council. And Droylsden tenants action is holding a public meeting to be addressed by speakers from the Transport and General Workers Union (dockers) and the National Union of Public Employees (hospital staff).

Greater Manchester conference on the Rent Act is to be held on 26 November, and trade unionists are being pressed to attend.

Tenants are also considering taking action against the Manchester Evening News coverage of the rent strike, which has been scanty and distorted.

**KRONSTADT**

The official figure for non-payment of the increase in the Strike is 6%. However, about 20% of the tenants are refusing to pay in Newcastle, nearly as much as 40% of tenants. The Newcastle area is solidly committed to a tenants association, whereas in the rest of the country, where strike is already precarious.

**Clay Cross**

The Labour council has firmly committed itself to refusing to implement the increases demanded by the Housing Finance Act. This is massive support for the council in their stand. Even if a Housing Commission is brought in by the Government, many tenants have already said that they will refuse to pay the increases. The council itself has put out leaflets urging tenants to refuse extra payments.

The one weakness is that there is no tenants association in which people can organise themselves for the necessary rent strike action. Although some councillors are in favour of an association, prominent local left-wing Labour Party figures such as MP Denis Skinner oppose the independent organisation of tenants.
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