Opposition to U.S. barbarism grows

Every day in Bangladesh more people die — mainly through starvation — than the total kill of the Nicaraguan earthquake. Why? Basically, because Bangladesh is part of the “undeveloped” two thirds of the world which has been relentlessly plundered and exploited, and had its economic development mutilated by the minority of rich advanced capitalist countries.

In their fight against this oppression, the workers and peasants of the “Third World” have shown qualities of heroism, determination and organisation which should be sufficient to nail all the lies about
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Tories to set up a new Stormont?

There are repeated rumours that Whitelaw is considering setting up a “representative” assembly for Northern Ireland. This assembly, it is believed, would be elected under proportional representation, but with limited powers. Westminster would retain control over interna- tional security. And there would be a declaration guaranteeing that the Border would stay for a generation at least, possibly longer.

This is a massive concession to the hard-line Orangemen, and will be received as such by the Catholics. It is probable that a definite decision on this question would have to be accompanied by the Army to force them to accept it.

A representative assembly would contain many hardline Orangemen who would gain politically from being elected to it. The Assembly would be a rallying point for the Orange bigots who would see it as the first step towards restoring all their old political dictatorship, removed with the suspension of the Stormont Parliament less than a year ago.

In opposition to such a six County Stormont assembly the left should insist that any such decision is the business of the Irish people as a whole, all 32 Counties.

British imperialism has no rights in Ireland. Democracy must be the right of the whole people of Ireland. Majority rule within an artificially cut off British puppet area is not democracy but a violation of the democratic rights of the real majority of the Irish people.

Meanwhile in the 26 Counties both Sean MacBride and rash O"Briain are now behind bars, and also the Derry Provost’s leader Martin McGuinness. Despite active campaigning by Republicans, the wave of protests over arrests of suspected IRA men seems to have died down. Evidently a more comprehensive attack on Lynch’s Green Tory government by the Irish Labour Movement is needed before it can be toppled.

CHRIS GRAY
WORKERS FIGHT—ONE YEAR ON

With this issue of WORKERS' FIGHT, No. 21, WF (new series) is a year old, having appeared on average once every 2½ weeks since 14 January 1972. In addition we produced a supplement on the miners' strike and two other supplements on the International Movement. Industrilisation papers written by supporters of Workers' Fight in the docks, the machine tool industry, the steel industry, and the hospitals. We produced a pamphlet, *The struggle for the Steel picket line*, and shortly there will appear No. 1 of a new Workers' Fight discussion journal, *Permanent Revolution*, to be quarterly.

For three years the International Movement has been a part of the Socialist Worker, as an organised tendency grouped around a nucleus of the hard core members of Socialist Workers. In *Workers' Fight* discussed by us with IS in 1968. In December 1971 we were abruptly expelled.

In fact, far from disintegrating, the group around Workers' Fight has expanded both in numbers and in influence, both by its activities and by its literature (WP'in the United States and machine tool industries). We have managed to operate a complete propaganda campaign, both from inside the movement to change the basic political tendency which we formed inside IS is a stable, structured, active Trotskyist organisation has not been without problems and difficulties. But these have carried out their tasks to enable us to function in the major class battles of the last year.

MINERS' VICTORY

"It's cold outside" was one of IS leader Tony Cliff's rallying cries to the miners. It was a bitter cold, but it was expected, we would subsequently "freeze". But actually, in expelling WF when they did and in the way they did, they rendered the greatest possible service to us! They ensured the defeat of IS, in time for the events of the most exhilarating year of working class activity. And that is what we believe in for this country: clean, no atmosphere, sustaining and stimulating — at the same time, that we tackled the problems of independent existence.

Miners' strike, the split within the National Union of Railwaymen over the threatened jailing, and the brief jailing, of the dockers: the continuing aggressive war against the miners; the efforts of the tenants to organise in self-defence; these were the events which shook Britain in the past year and to which *Workers' Fight* responded.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

In doing so we had to fight to clarify and re-clarify ourselves politically — and to explain our position to the workers. For the first time there was a mass movement of trade unionists in support of workers' struggles. The new tensions between the CIR, the Labour leadership and the Labour Party.

To explain the need to come out unconditionally in support of those fighting the army of British imperialism in India — and in Britain. (Workers' Fight, in no. 3, was, with the IMG, alone on the British left in explicitly supporting the IRA's attack on the officers' mess at Aldershot). To insist that it is an urgent requirement of working class self-defence, that we treat racism of any kind as a lethal poison for the labour movement. To expose the role of the Labour Party and Labour leaders in ensuring that we did not smash the Industrial Relations Act (and probably the Tory government with it) in 1972.

The central issue of the International Movement is to organize workers to fight and win: the immediate objective is to smash the Tory government's attack on the trade union movement and the miners' strike. To clarify the question of the general strike and to focus the energies of those opposed to and defending the anti-socialist government. This is the task of the International Movement to the Labour leadership and the Labour Party. To explain the need to come out unconditionally in support of those fighting the army of British imperialism in India — and in Britain. (Workers' Fight, in no. 3, was, with the IMG, alone on the British left in explicitly supporting the IRA's attack on the officers' mess at Aldershot). To insist that it is an urgent requirement of working class self-defence, that we treat racism of any kind as a lethal poison for the labour movement. To expose the role of the Labour Party and Labour leaders in ensuring that we did not smash the Industrial Relations Act (and probably the Tory government with it) in 1972.

The central issue of the International Movement is to organize workers to fight and win: the immediate objective is to smash the Tory government's attack on the trade union movement and the miners' strike. To clarify the question of the general strike and to focus the energies of those opposed to and defending the anti-socialist government. This is the task of the International Movement to the Labour leadership and the Labour Party. To explain the need to come out unconditionally in support of those fighting the army of British imperialism in India — and in Britain. (Workers' Fight, in no. 3, was, with the IMG, alone on the British left in explicitly supporting the IRA's attack on the officers' mess at Aldershot). To insist that it is an urgent requirement of working class self-defence, that we treat racism of any kind as a lethal poison for the labour movement. To expose the role of the Labour Party and Labour leaders in ensuring that we did not smash the Industrial Relations Act (and probably the Tory government with it) in 1972.

EXPANSION OF THE PAPER

On the negative side the paper has suffered from a frequently inadequate coverage of both international news stories and the sectional struggles of workers' struggles. It suffered not only from the limitations of our Industrial base, but also from inadequate and often partial publicaion of the perspectives which our members take part in. Our allocation of space to student questions has been less than it should be. Our coverage on the Labour Party has been scanty.

In addition, the paper has often been heavily censored with as much type space as we could fit in, in an effort to fit anything. The language sometimes has been avoidably tedious and needlessly difficult. We have been criticised for too much attention to India. But while we feel we have to be more than is necessary for our purpose. A paper which failed to explain the issues involved in the Irish struggle may indeed reflect the indifference, hostility and complacency of the British workers now. It will be a paper which serves their interests.

Finally last June a small meeting of supporters of the paper decided, by a small majority, to try to bring in a new editor. Since the end of July 1973 we have been all convinced that this was in fact a false perspective. A failure to get the priorities right. Not to strain, as we have done, to meet the demands of the period we live in, would be unexcusable. A concentration of our resources on a more frequent paper, to the detriment of developing industrial fractions and deeper political education around the paper, would indicate a failure to understand the necessary preconditions for the expansion of the paper in terms of the development of the group of which we are a part, to the extent of which we are able to.

That development is the primary task of Workers' Fight in 1973.

WORKERS FIGHT AND THE IMG

As readers can see from our regular "WHERE WE STAND" slot, WORKERS' FIGHT gives critical support to the Fourth International. In the past year we have developed an attitude towards the International Group. The British Section of the Fourth International, differences serious enough to necessitate us being organisationally separate from them. The split in the two newspapers in WORKERS' FIGHT Nos. 7 and No.15, and in our pamphlet "The Left and the Crisis".

Naturally, these differences do not stop us engaging in joint action with the IMG where a great basis exists for that joint action. We work with them in the Irish Solidarity Campaign, in the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Student Unions, and in the Indochina Solidarity Conference.

We look forward to further joint action in future.

Recently, however, a state of rumours about relations between the two groups has been spread out by the IMG: that we are about to unite with them; that we broke off "negotiations" with them; that we "have simply dismissed" the question of the International; that we have "been sectarian" in attacking them politically.

We feel that it is necessary to make a public statement to nail these rumours.

Firstly, the IMG was the IIC which broke off "negotiations". Secondly, WORKERS' FIGHT has not "simply dismissed" the question of the International, but, as the IMG know full well, we are engaged in a serious discussion of the question leading up to a special conference. Thirdly, what Trotskyists — as opposed to centrists — understand by sectarianism is not factional hostility, but "abstract propagandist passivity of the Bordiga type". The one thing that the IMG is most afraid of is the IIC: it's political activity.

Open, honest political debate does not seem to us to be sectarian. What is sectarian is the IMG's attitude to us — the rumours they have spread about the state of relations between the two groups. We have our reports from I.S. of a report of "negotiations" between us and them, a report which was a major weapon in the hands of the anti-Trotskists I.S. leadership.

Finally, WORKERS' FIGHT has not made any decision to unite with the IMG. If we look at the major issues of the class struggle over the past year, there is one on which the IMG comes out with solidarity: the struggle in Ireland. We do have criticisms of their approach to that struggle; but we will give them credit for their principled stand against chauvinism.

On every other major issue, however, the IMG has been seriously and sometimes grossly wrong.


2. The engineers' sit-in strikes in Manchester. The IMG confined themselves to servicing the struggle through Clamant's Union work and distributing informative leaflets. They combined with the Stalinist union leadership to attack us, S.S. as "splits".

3. The Industrial Relations Act. When the T&G&WU was fined, the IMG confined themselves to echoing the bourgeois TUC line of "no recognition". They rejected the call for a general strike.

4. The Housing Finance Act. The IMG, apparently, are simply not interested in this.

5. The Uganda Aslan. The IMG proclaimed, in the face of the biggest upsurge of racism for years, "Aslan: Big Chance for the Left".

6. The Vietnam peace negotiations. The IMG's headline "Indochina: victory in sight" looks pretty sick now.

7. Worst of all, in the greatest test for British revolutionaries since World War 2. The IMG struck socially, and only recently, to relate to the working class in agitation, confining itself to abstract propaganda for "the socialist revolution". (See "The Left and the Crisis").

The IMG has also, during this last year, been busy "concentrating" on a number of basic questions of Marxist theory: the imperialist epoch; the revolutionary party: the united front; the fight against repressive; the Transitional Programme in its most militant form in the IMG; and governmental slogans. On every one of these questions their ideas are, in our opinion, fundamentally wrong.

The IMG has been full of teeth through the biggest workers' upsurge in decades without even producing a workers' paper! Their lack of a close relation to the labour movement is shown by the fact that they produced their latest "fusil" the fuses on the AUEW.

If we had general political agreement with the IMG, it would indeed be politically unprincipled to refuse unity with them. Unfortunately, that general agreement does not exist.
**INDIVIDUAL**

On 15 December engineers struck in Newtownabbey, Seagate, Ballymena, Glengormley, and Lagan Valley in the National Union of Public Employees (NUPE), the nationwide union for local government and health workers.

The 24-hour strike involves 15,000 NUPE members working on roads, in training centres, and in fostering services.

**GENERAL STRIKE**

There are three main reasons for the strike: the government's failure to negotiate a fair settlement on wages, the lack of a commitment to training and development, and the threat of redundancies.

The strike has attracted support from several union federations, with plans to extend the action to other sectors.

---

Dear comrades,

In your last issue (no. 20) you called for a national strike, presumably of the AWU, against "further seizure of union funds." Now, as I understand it, this is a step back from your previous position of calling for a general strike to smash the AWU.

You have argued that it is necessary to prepare the immediate problem of smashing the AWU to avoid repeating the Grand Old Duke of York and calling on the working class to fight the decision of the AWU and then that decision, and causing nothing but fatigues.

The general strike may be less "credible" now than it was in July, but that does not mean it is not valid. Some comrades argue that the general strike is the only way to deal with the AWU.

Workers' fight stands for a general strike to smash the AWU.

The call for a general strike becomes a live slogan; a real weapon for the working class to smash the class of the working class, only time to time. Thus, when the Peninsula Five were fired, we rallied for a general strike as our main slogan. Over the AWU fine, we have placed the main emphasis on the responsibility of the AWU leadership to take action.

The call for a general strike is the only way to deal with the AWU. The main risk is the possibility of the AWU breaking up, and the resulting split in the working class. The AWU fine has been a catalyst for this split.

To place the main stress now on the major, class-wide weapon of the general strike could be a letdown for the weak-kneed, especially the AWU executive. There is no point in taking action on our own, they will say, what we really need is a general strike.

The main risk is not the "Grand Old Duke of York" situation, if the heat is put on the Tories, the AWU could almost certainly find a new "Official Solicitor"-type trick to settle the Road case well before action reaches general strike proportions.

The main risk is passive acceptance of the fine, aided by the fact that the T&GWU has already knuckled under when fined by the IRC.

We have stopped stressing the call for Councils of Action because in the actual conditions of today, with the class struggle having temporarily (laboriously) cooled slightly since July, an organised Council of Action is likely to be more than any more letdown groupies holding hands, a sterile discussion circle. There are exceptions, for example Coventry, where a Council of Action plays a useful role. But that is the general situation.

Paul Reed, Nottingham.
June 1970:

"So I took the opportunity to walk into the hall to try to find Lee's bedroom. Mrs. Paget and Mr. Paget heard me and rushed into the hall and pushed me back into the waiting room and locked the door...I thought if they could act so much aggression and unreason to a person, who could have left the home and away to tell what had happened, what on earth could I do under provocation to a child who could not tell me...I had to wait for an hour before he lived, so my thoughts turned to me and although he appeared clean and dry I would judge he had just had a good night's sleep for the whole day. He was also very lethargic but obviously over-dugged!"

Mrs. B A. Kirke.

November 1970:

"When we had Tara out we noticed red marks on her hands and the backs of her legs like burns. We went to Tara's tent to a field nearby as we had everything needed for a picnic. Tara seemed starved and ate everything she could lay her hands on. She stuffed things in her mouth and was partially open, I saw what looked like blood inside her mouth!"

Mrs. Patricia Nailer.

April 1972:

"I have Katherine at home with me at present as she waits for a bed at Great Ormond Street. She is very weak, unable to crawl or sit up for any length of time, and becomes exhausted at the slightest effort. She is not eating too well and there seems to be some wasting of the limbs. The deep sores on her face are responding to treatment and regular changing; she has sores or marks of previous sores on other parts of her body where pressure might result from being in one position for a long time. During the first two days she was at home she ate ravenously and indigestibly, and now she has severe diarrhoea...She is very stubborn and less responsive to attention and to people playing with her..."

Mrs. P A. Fitchon.

These are all extracts from complaints made by parents who, after the care of their handicapped children in 'The Beeches', Ipswich, W. Suffolk, a private home run by Mr. & Mrs. Paget until June 30th 1972 when the home was closed. All of these complaints were known to the licensing authority responsible for the home's supervision at the time they were made. In fact, within a period of 18 months the home was closed.

One of these was an 8 year old East London girl, Tina Nukler. Despite constant efforts by her mother to get the child moved from the home, Tina was allowed to remain there. In the opinion of the psychiatrist who carried out the post-mortem examination, "the cause of death was bronchopneumonia from haemorrhage."

When the child was admitted to hospital just before her death her temperature was only 26 degrees Centigrade (84.2 F) and a Sunday Times investigation found that the temperature of the home could not have been more than the lower or mid forties Fahrenheit.

HYPOThERMIA

Eight months later another child, Anthony Staines, died in the West Suffolk Hospital after being taken there from the 'Beeches'. On admission to the hospital his temperature was only 34 degrees C (93.4 F). This is within the range of hypothermia.

From the observation of the parents themselves, the following facts emerge:

1. Parents were discouraged from visiting and when they did go they came without notice. They were also discouraged from taking the children out.

2. Parents had to wait to see their children in reception rooms, they were not allowed to see where their children slept, and never saw other parents or children.

3. Handling of children was discouraged. Children were sometimes tied in chairs during visits, and two mothers were actually forbidden to touch up their children while visiting.

4. Mrs. Paget, who ran the home, advised parents for putting their children in it and suggested to them that they had lost their rights over their children.

"VEGETABLE"

5. She seemed to consider that the children required little of the attention and pleasures which are considered a child's right, instead treating the children in her care as vegetables. In fact she told Mrs. Nukler that her child was eating more than a vegetable and was better off dead!

The parents concluded that the children were probably kept in beds most of the time, not taken out of doors, poorly fed, not changed regularly or kept clean, heavily sedated and strapped down when convenient.

None of the parents ever saw more than one member of staff other than the Pagets, although at the inquest on Tara Nuker Mrs. Paget said there were seven staff including part-timers. The parents complained about the ratio in NHS homes, and concluded that such a small staff could not possibly be able to feed, wash, dress and generally care for 26 subnormal children.

The sum total of allegations of neglect and ill-treatment of children in this home (and complaints about the standards of supervision of the licensing authority, West Suffolk) led the parents to demand an inquiry. They were supported by a number of MPs.

Nearly six months later, they were told that the DHSS had "NO POWER TO INQUIRE INTO ANY MATTER RELATING TO THE TREATMENT OF CHILDREN IN THIS HOME". Having carefully examined the DHSS concluded that "THERE WAS INSUFFICIENT GROUNDS FOR INSTITUTING AN INQUIRY". The care of children whose mental and physical handicaps necessitate constant residential care is the responsibility of local authorities and Social Services departments. At present, however, the local authorities do not have the necessary places in residential homes where these children could be cared for. The result is that children are either placed by the local authorities in unacquainted homes in the NHS sector, or in voluntary homes, or in private Homes which the authority finds and pays for, but which are licensed by and under the supervision of their local authority.

In fact, a child can be sent to one of these homes which is as far as 200 miles from its parents.

INADEQUATE

And example of the totally inadequate provisions made for these children can be seen in the case of Islington. Having no provisions at all for these children, there has been a proposal of a Home for 20 children. This will meet at most HALF the needs within the borough. The result of children will go on being placed in privately run homes, although it has been the experience of parents that private homes often afford poor standards of care and that the criteria used by supervising authorities are often inadequate.

COMPASSION

A group of parents have now come together to fight for legislation on this question. They are based in London, and call themselves 'COMPASSION'. They are having to finance their campaign completely out of their own pockets, and they are all far from wealthy families. For them to carry on fighting on behalf of these helpless children against a cynical system which has already involved endless work and personal sacrifice to scrape up the money needed to publicise the case.

At present the burden of these children's plight is falling entirely on their parents. Meanwhile the professional 'welfare' industry hives off the children into privately run Homes that make a profit out of their misery. And the Government shrugs off any responsibility, saying it is up to the local authorities.

There is no existing legislation which adequately covers these child ren.

But the responsibility for caring for these children lies with the governments that present themselves as the custodians of the welfare of the population. In refusing to provide funds sufficient to the task, in refusing an inquiry and in consistently passing the buck, it is they who are responsible for the death of these children. It is they who should be called to account.
Appeal by BERNADETTE DEVlin

Sunday, 28 January 1973, will be the anniversary of Derry’s Bloody Sunday.

On January 30th last, British paratroopers ordered unarmed, peaceful demonstrators against an attack on a mass civil rights procession in Derry. The murder of this thirteen, and of other Civil Rights activists, by the Crown Forces who have died before or since, is part of a calculated policy by the British government to destroy the confidences of the nationalist population in the North of Ireland. Specifically, it was a last desperate attempt by the Tory-Unionist regime at Stormont. It failed. Stormont has been suspended.

But British aggression in Ireland continues. Since the abolition of Stormont, the British propaganda service has attempted to give the impression to the world that Britain is playing the role of arbitrate or between two warring tribes. When the British Gattaker is depicted as a gentle and impartial referee.

DIPLOCK COMMISSION:
MORE POLICE POWER IN N. IRELAND

THE PAST FOUR YEARS IN IRELAND HAVE LED TO A RAPID GROWTH IN the “official reports” industry — Cameron, Scoran, Hunt, Widgery and now Diplock. Despite their pretensions to being “exhaustive and objective” inquiries, each report has been a political document, designed to help the British Government in its war against the Irish people. Widowery “inquired” into Derry’s Bloody Sunday in order to deny the widely known fact that the British Army murdered 13 unarmed civilians and innocent anarchists.

Diplock is just another in an ever increasing list of “legal prostituted and respected” judges who use their reputations and supposed belief in “justice” to give more weight and to proposals such as the above, which seriously restrict the individual’s just rights.

When Direct Rule was imposed last March, Whitelaw then promised the “speedy ending of internment” — a promise he made, based on the assumption that the IRA would be defeated in a matter of months, if not weeks.

But even with 20,000 troops and the enthusiastic support of the IBA, the government cannot afford to have any qualms about civil rights and legal and judicial processes. So Diplock was chosen by Heath and Whitelaw to solve the problem of how to maintain internment when the Government had promised its speedy ending. He did a good job.

In the Report he produces “arguments” (albeit contradictory ones) justifying in the nicest possible manner the continuation of internment and the strengthening of powers to deal with the IRA.

But, any even slightly careful reading of the Report reveals the shoot之情 of this piece of window dressing.

JURIES

These new “extra-judicial processes” are necessary, says Diplock, because of the “intimidation of witnesses”. But since the measures are almost solely for use against Republicans — a fact the Commission itself admits — the powers of generalities — the assertion he is making is that the IRA indulge in fairly widespread intimidation of neutrals.

But, as anyone living here knows the IRA still adhere to the tradition of “non-recognition” of both Northern and Southern courts, one the grounds that these are not “public” institutions. This is a major aspect of the Republicans’ political thinking and part of the “Bole” that Republicans can be disciplined for infringing.

Republicans refuse to defend themselves in Court Realising that they can expect little justice in the courts they resign themselves to continuing the fight in prison by attempting to escape. And, given the history of the use of internment in Ireland, it is not surprising that this attitude has survived for so long.

Since members make no effort to defend themselves in Court, even when the police indicate (in an extremely flimsy [if not a downright lie]) it is most unlikely that the IBA would attempt to free its members by intimidating juries.

The truth (though it is so unsatisfactory that Diplock cannot say it in black and white) is that without any intimidation whatever, Catholics will freely acquit Republicans who appear in Court, because of their hostility to the Orange state that oppresses them, and their distrust of police evidence.

So much for intimidated juries! Diplock also finds himself in a bit of a mess when he attempts to decide whether or not the proposals go against the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

“None of the proposed changes”, he claims, “run contrary to the requirement of the European Convention”.

But, perhaps just to be on the safe side, he then goes on to state that the Convention was drawn up on the assumption that “witnesses to a crime will be able to give evidence without risk to their lives, family, or their property”, otherwise, “the only possible reason why the judges can be mentioning this fact is to justify not adhering to the Convention on the grounds that Northern Ireland is not a public institution” — something he claims they are not doing and therefore have no need to do so.

This Report proves exactly what the Tories’ use of the law to bludgeon the trade unions in Brit­ain proves — that the “law”, supposedly above politics and social struggles, is no more than a tool in the hands of the ruling class. And they will bend it, twist it, reshape it or simply ignore it when and how it suits them to.
EUROPE: THE NEW ARENA FOR WORKING CLASS STRUGGLE

by Dave Spencer & Colin Oliver

A quick glance at the table shows how soaring in numbers the British trade union movement is compared to our brothers in the EEC. Another thing that’s striking is the continuing erosion of our trade union movement. The figures for the United Kingdom show a steady decline in membership, with a marked increase in the number of strikes. This is reflected in the declining level of industrial action in recent years, which has been largely confined to a few large-scale disputes.

1. In 1967, metalworkers at Phillips (Holland) forced the company to recognize the metalworkers’ Union at its plant in Chile.

2. Ford workers in Germany, Belgium, Holland and the U.K. acted together in the 1989 Ford Belgium strike and 1971 Ford Dagenham strike which work was blocked and overtime banned.

3. In 1989, workers in all Saint Gobain Co. (French glassmakers) plants in France, Italy and the USA, struck to raise wages in the lower paid plants.

4. On June 9th 1972 workers at Dunlop-Pirelli plants struck in protest against redundancies resulting from the merger. In October (see WF 18) support was given to the sit-in at Pirelli’s Milan Bacaro plant protesting against threatened redundancies.

5. Workers in the Akzo combine (Dutch chemicals and synthetic fibre manufacturers) forced the company to withdraw their proposed restructuring scheme – involving the closure of 5 plants in 3 countries and the sacking of 5,000 workers. A Common Market inquiry following the affair in fact went so far as to criticise the “social implications of closures” and suggested that workers’ interests be put first! (see WF 17).

6. Workers at Zanussi, Italy’s largest domestic and electrical appliances manufacturer, visited West Germany for talks with workers from AEG-Telefunken (based in Frankfurt) which is rumoured to be ready to take over Zanussi. The discussion ranged over possible action in face of closures, sackings, etc if the two companies merged. So far, Zanussi and AEC are keeping quiet!

SOCIALISTS & EUROPE

West so-called revolutionary socialists groups have not helped in this matter. By opposing Britain’s entry into the Common Market (without, incidentally, trying to build up a fierce campaign based on their views) they have pandered to the racist backlash and victim-misers who have emerged over the years in many British towns.

To do this workers’ militancy is channelled into opposing entry - which means, in fact, supporting the alternative of “national sovereignty”. It is channelled into accepting the propaganda of “national interest” and not the necessary task of building up working class internationalism, effective resistance to international capitalist attacks. We are told that the EEC is a capitalist conspiracy with the implication (intended or not) that Britain is somehow less capitalist that other European countries and the EEC.

WORKERS’ FIGHT has always insisted that the real question for workers is not whether to go in or stay out of the Common Market.

SOLIDARITY

Either way we live in a world dominated by international capitalism. It is not the job of socialists to address the issues on alternative policies. Britain as part of the EEC - Britain as the 51st state of the USA or Britain as an isolated capitalist backwater - there’s nothing in the choice for us.

By opposing Britain’s entry into the Common Market, will bring with it a serious attack on the working class, through strikes, mergers, closures, and redundancies, Value Added Tax. Staying out would not have stopped the merger - they would simply have happened at a different tempo and in a different form. What about the opposition? That is a world-wide attack on the working class, international working class solidarity.

Solidarity action has taken place. But, as yet, international working class cooperation is far less developed than international capitalist cooperation.

There are international trade union organisations, but they are usually ineffective. And the reason why they are ineffective is that they operate entirely in their own national, official level. Each bureaucrat is only really concerned with his own, “gate-keepers”, his own nose, his own membership, his own comfortable offices. International solidarity is all right for him as a pious wish – but no more!

INTERNATIONAL

So the responsibility for looking further than our own backyards comes down to the rank and file. Links must be forged on a rank and file level - not just national, but international combine committees. We must demand international negotiation and international parity of wages and conditions (French family allowances, Italian holidays, German worker’s clubs) to prevent the employers taking advantage of the weakness of organisation in one country to undermine the well-organised plants.

The call for international solidarity is dictated by the immediate defensive needs of the working class. But international solidarity, once formed, can and will be turned to the purpose of an offensive against the bosses. The ruling classes of Europe are closely interlinked in their military economic, and political organisation that “national roads to socialism” is a utopian dream.

Even if the working class action against the bosses’ system in the French May events of 1988 had won workers’ power, it would have had to spread internationally – or the French workers would have been defeated. For socialists, the immediate implications of the effects of Common Market entry must be linked to the perspectives of the United Socialist States of Europe.

CUTS IN STEEL

On December 21st, Peter Walker announced in the Commons the Government’s intention to spend £4.5 million over the next ten years in an effort to bring British steel up to European and Japanese competitive standards.

Having exaggerated previous production targets for the early 70s (of 42 million tonnes, the new investment is still only expected to go towards producing 33 million tonnes by 1980). It is not expected that 38 million tonnes will be reached until at least the end of the 1980s. Production is to be concentrated in five main centres (Ravenscraig, Linthorn, Newport, Billingham, and Teesside), using the latest Basic Oxygen techniques and the economics of mass import of iron ore in bulk carriers.

In order to do this, massive redundancies are on the way for the next ten years. Walker has added an extra 30,000 to the 20,000 previously announced, admitting that these will take place mainly in the next 5 years.

However, even these figures - likely to be underestimated. An additional 4,000 layoffs have been declared at Chardif. If the Scottish figures for redundancy projections are anything to go by, the overall figure will be nearer 100,000. And if BSC is to have similar changes rates to the British Steel, the largest Japanese steel producer, which has a roughly equivalent capacity, then up to 150,000 would be nearer.

In any case, whether the figure is to be 60,000 or 100,000, 150,000, the steel workers must prepare an offensive strategy against the capitalist state.

So far the government have laid off and plan to lay off workers in...
British industrial supremacy in the 19th century was built on the basic industries of iron, coal, and cotton. As British trade expanded all over the world, bringing in its massive investment and super-profits from colonial labour, the iron steel, and heavy engineering sectors were no exception. Profits overseas were superabundant; investment at home was relatively low.

By 1900 the US and German steel had surpassed British production. Yet, the enormous overseas and colonial market, whole areas dominated by British imperialism, assured a continued massive profit for the British steel bosses. In 1900 the British employers exported about 3 million short tons — over half the total world-market. This figure was not to be reached again until 1920, when it represented just 5% of the market.

The post-world-war period saw Britain ousted as the main exporter of steel. New technologies were already underway, amongst the European and American competitors, while the British steelworkers relied on their colonial investments and colonial profits.

In 1913, Britain was still the main exporter of semi-finished and finished steel products, behind Germany. By 1938, the US, Germany, and Belgium had surpassed the British steelowners and France was very close behind. British exports had slumped by 50% in absolute terms.

**NATIONALISED**

At the time steel was nationalised, at the end of 1967, investment rates were down dramatically and profits had declined practically to nothing, in 1966, having been at an all-time high of 15% return on capital at the end of the 1950s. In fact, if the old jungle has taken place, over had been written off to the extent that it was by the British Steel Corporation in 1967. This would have been an overall loss of £50 million.

The steel bosses were nationalised in order to bail out its former owners, in order to carry on at all, and the old individual owners didn’t have the resources to manage themselves. The steel bosses were nationalised in order to bail out its former owners, in order to carry on at all, and the old individual owners didn’t have the resources to manage themselves. The steel bosses were nationalised in order to bail out its former owners, in order to carry on at all, and the old individual owners didn’t have the resources to manage themselves. The steel bosses were nationalised in order to bail out its former owners, in order to carry on at all, and the old individual owners didn’t have the resources to manage themselves.

**JAPANESE**

The 1960s saw a sudden drop in the British steel industry. New processes have revolutionised steel production, mainly the use of basic oxygen plants. Also, the Japanese employers led the way with the mass export of steel to Europe and the US.

**CUT-BACKS**

The decline of the British steel industry is due to the supposed increase in “efficiency” and “nationalisation” that has replaced the supposed “laziness” of British workers. It does not mean that the British workers have not been working hard; it means that the British workers have not been working hard enough. The British workers have not been working hard enough.

The cut-backs are not due to the supposed inefficiency of the British steel industry. The workers have not been working hard enough. The British workers have not been working hard enough.
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ROSA LUXEMBURG

ON TERRORISM

FIRST ENGLISH TRANSLATION by Andrew Hornung

1916 —
A CLARION CALL

On 21st October the Prime Minister of Austria fell victim to a bullet from the gun of Friedrich Adler. We should be surprised more than anything at the fact that it didn’t happen earlier than it did.

Austria — half oriental despotism, half Russian military, police and money rule; Austria — the cradle of World War; this Austria has become a hell. Its real rulers are dungeons, rifles and gallows. And everywhere the cry of the oppressed is stifled by the strangulation of tyranny. Even the Duma in Russia was not completely liquidated — but in Austria there is only the stillness of the grave. Even the Tisza estates in Hungary convened, while in Austria... just a cemetery-silence.

And a fresh breeze to relieve this suffocating stench. The Social Democracy nowhere to be seen; that “liberator of nations” nowhere so pusillanimous as in Austria. Whereas the official leaders of the Austrian labour movement could not plumb the depths of renegacy of the official German Masmakers, there has been in Austria no dynamic and conscious opposition to the false leaders by the working class. There is still not so much as the beginning of a mass movement against the war and the government. As far as the eye can see stretches the unbroken shadow of suffering and hopelessness.

Like the famous assassinations in Russia at the beginning of the ’80s of the last century it was this “semi-Asian” atmosphere created by the betrayal of the working class and the leader immobility of the masses, that gave rise to Friedrich Adler’s action. While millions of innocents were going to the scaffold for the sake of foreign debts and other allied interests, he shot down the representative of an accursed regime.

Friedrich Adler’s hand was that of the avenger and the judge: he who admonishes and he who warns. The flashes from his revolver lit up the abyss of horror of the Austrian people for the whole world to see. It was not an attempt to wake up the Austrian Parliament that cheap imitation of the servants’ quarters of some Reichstag representative. It was a cry to the people, the long-awaited clarion call to the Austrian proletariat summoning it to independent initiative, to decisive action, to socialist struggle.

1905 —
TERRORISM

The killing of Sergei Romanov, the Vampire of Moscow, has been followed by political revolusions like the of which have not been seen since the assassination of Count Alexander II. Every decent and right-thinking person will feel a real moral satisfaction at this act of liberation. From this point of view, the assassination of Grand Duke Sergeius is of the same order as last year’s assassination of Plehve. It is literally easier to breath now. The air seems less polluted now that one of the most repugnant and offensive beasts of Czarism has met his dismal end and been shot down in the street like a mad dog.

These responses are so natural to any civilized person that our press generally and unanimously saw this deed as a fitting act of vengeance, a settling of accounts. But in expressing this obvious response of moral satisfaction we have not exhausted commenting on the significance of this important incident in Russia’s revolutionary struggle. We must go further and come to a political judgment of this most recent of terrorist acts — one that is independent of our immediate impressions and emotions.

Seen politically, terror must receive a qualitatively different appraisal in the present situation from before. The terrorist movement as such, which propagated and practised terror as a systematic method of political struggle, was the historical product of pessimism. It grew out of a disillusion in the possibility of a mass political movement and a real revolution of the masses in Russia.

Terror as a system, which is directed against certain individuals responsible for the absolutist regime and which thus involves certain individuals from amongst the ranks of the revolutionaries, was considered to be the opposite of the mass action of the working class by its very nature. Whether the terrorists know it or not, whether they admitted it or were deluded on this point, this was the case.

From this standpoint and for this reason the Social Democracy has for some time and particularly in recent years fought against terrorist tactics. Because for all the deep moral satisfaction we feel every time we hear of such an incident, the result of this strategy as far as the working class was concerned was always that of inducing passivity and paralysis rather than exciting people to action. In fact, terrorist activities properly carried out inevitably had the effect of awakening vague expectations and hopes for the minimalities that were born of the terrible “avenger”, particularity for the unclear and unstable elements in the movement. It therefore unmasked the
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vital understanding that mass participation by the revolutionary proletariat is both absolutely necessary and the sole decisive concrete factor.

The incidents of 22nd January and the following days show how real the armed struggle is in the situation. The proletariat has already stepped on to the battlefield and the whole world can see revolutionary armed activity breaking out in the framework of the revolution. And no amount of terrorism can minimise their successes.

The real challenge is quite possible to find those political weather-cocks whose whole enthusiasm and expectations once again turn towards the form of armed struggle - as long as they were a long way off. Suddenly the British revolutionaries are everywhere and it was "British" first and "revolutionary" second. The only thing to be said is as well as their reaction to the bombing of the Aldershot barracks last May....

Aldershot

Not only was this an absurd blooper but it could have been a real one at that, but it did not tackle the real matter at hand. Whole workers movement in England, an anathema to Aldershot was not terrorism at all - it created a serious rift between the community with its milita and imperialism. To confuse this with terrorism is putting the cart before the horse. To the point - the political matter of the point. Was a systematic use of terror the answer? The answer is no. Terror is not a class or community against another. Systematic terrorism is a line of struggle of oppressed within a society against the oppressor members of that society or their agents. Marxists believe that effective and successful mass movement must depend on the activity and consciousness of the masses. It must be encouraged and conformed to terrorism if it substitutes for mass action. To confuse war, simply because it is of an urban or rural guerilla type, with terrorism is only an effort to identify the character of political strategy by the techniques. The Russians in the Ukraine did not become a serious - and it is in - it is nothing more than the confusion of groups like BS on Aldershot. This group, always eager to "free Marxism from sectarianism" and its consequent end free reporting from all truth. The Aldershot bombings were described by them as "individual terrorism" or a reply to a so-called "socialist absence." More like collective assasination of it's leaders part. How can the attack in a detachment of one army on the barracks of another in a way be thought of as "individual terrorism?"

The translation of these articles by Rosa Luxemburg (which will appear shortly as a pamphlet given her writings on terrorism in Russia) would help to set the record straight on the question of terrorism - particularly for the bourgeoisie and the Bolsheviks of Rosa Luxemburg in 18.

PESSIMISM

On 21st October 1916, Friedrich Adler, son of Victor Adler, the leader of the Austrian Labour Party, and himself a prominent member, assassinated the Prime Minister of Austria. In her brilliant article on this event, Rosa Luxemburg looks at what she calls the "ineluctable law of cause and effect." The assassination could not, she argues, be seen outside the context of the "unbearable shadow of suffering and hopeless ness" and that "everywhere the cry of the oppressed is stifled by the stronghold of tyranny."

It was this semi-Asiatic atmosphere with the utter betrayal of Western civilisation that led to the event.

Similarly, in her two articles on terrorism, "Terror" and "On the question of terrorism," she points out that once the mass movement has gone under way - the second of these articles as part of "From a później already great march on the Winter Palace of 1905 that marked the beginning of the revolution, but it is also in this case that the matter must be considered.

As "terror" is a systematic method of political struggle it was the historical law of priesthood and there were no longer grounds for any pessimism, it was at best an unavailing combat - and one no longer suited to the situation and the times. But this unanticipated today no amount of successful assassinations to this one can possibly change this fact. This doesn't mean of course that individual acts of terror are neither useful nor significant any more. It is neither a matter of raising terror to the skies nor of denouncing pacifism. Rather the point is to understand its right position and its role in the present situation.

A further feature of the masses have begun to participate in the revolutionary process, terror is - and today only can be - a subordinate moment in the struggle. This is true from two points of view: geographically it is the lightning flash of a single though brilliant scar of the vast battlefield of the revolution, historically it is an episode that is by its very nature bound to one specific phase of the revolution.

Terrorists act make sense politically so long as absolutism has made no decisive move toward concessions and will only find a sympathetic response in the broad layers of society on this basis. As an answer to brutal absolutism, revolutionary forces, terrorist acts have an uplifting effect on the mood of the masses. However, when neuropathy of the regime is decoupled and begins to make constitutional concessions, even if they are weak and insignificant - to that degree will terror inevitably lose both its base and its favourable response.

Its role will be played out as this second phase of the revolution unfolds. This happens quickly or not.

The revolution, on the other hand, an uprising of the masses will not be over then. Nor is it at that point that we will see the ever more exclusively proletarian violence. Further alone the line of thought leads to the liquidation of absolutism, and so doing bring about a broad participation by the working class. So we see against the inevitable ebb-tide and reversion to reaction on the part of the liberal-democratic elements after the first victory of the movement for freedom. In short, between the future proletarian revolution and its present the line all the battle phases of a class uprising leading to the final battle for the proletariat's freedom.

On the basis of this great revolution by these and within this framework individual acts of terror like individual blazes of bushwood in a forest fire. The avenging hand of the terrorist can speed up the disorganisation and demoralisation of the absolutist regime here and there. But to overthrow absolutism and establish freedom is the task of the revolution by means of the masses. Terror is one of the conditions. Marxists support the line of mass terror as a necessary and inevitable ultimatum on that question. We cannot say that we only support it and make it mass terror even or that we always criticise when it isn't. After all after the defeat of Napoleon we say that war could have won more. We do show a total indifference to and an essentially imperialist disdain of the difficulties of struggle in the context of bloody reaction.

And the well-publicised "argument" that Marxists put about against absolutism because it gives the ruling class and the contrary to this line of thought. Marxists say repression is nonsense. Does it advocates suppose that the ruling classes and not the organisations agents provocateurs?"
TERORISM
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within the Catholic/Nationalist
population, rather than the British
workforce. That is a fact. When one nation oppressors another, as Britain
oppresses Ireland, or a French oppresses Algeria, as the "Israelis" oppress the
Palestinians, the oppressors are not
required to scrupulously respect
the sensibilities of the oppressed nation. After all, what is the "sensibility"
for them to scruple over? They offer the
Algerians in their inscrutable
manner of struggle? Were it not
for the guerrillas and armed Algerians to take care not to disturb the
"sensibilities” of the French? No. Of
course not!

It you oppose terrorism within a
single community and warfare, between communities or nations then it follows precisely whose response it is in that is being sought. If it is an act of terrorism it must relate to the
sensibilities of the oppressed of the community.

One hardly asks for acts of war-
fare to be sympathetically received by the enemy army or government of the
oppressed state. The mind boggles at such a concept. And yet... Socialist
Worker on March 11th 1972 writes: "We have to be critical of the [Balkan] terrorisms when they attempt to substitute indi-
vidual assassinations […] for the political assassination of a mass movement in Britain" (our emphasis). Truly a
gone of confused idioms.

MILITIA

In a frenetic attempt to treat the event as "individual assassination" (1) we went on to say that even the very army officer killed in Britain, the "army officer, who would spring up to take my place." Is, having about theory and reality on their heads, now you will con-
sume the sentiment; totally in-
volving it, Socialist Worker gives us the very dynamics of pathetic, demoralised defeatism. Where forces of occupation, or, even more, settler-societies are in
volved there does seem at an ex-
tremely superficial view with a ca-
rinciple of descriptions of war against oppressor states.
The truth of the faith of the revolution-
ary has always been expressed in the
line "If I die, a thousand others will spring up to take my place." Is, having about theory and reality on their heads, now you will con-
sumate the sentiment; totally in-
volving it, Socialist Worker gives us the very dynamics of pathetic, demoralised defeatism. Where forces of occupation, or, even more, settler-societies are in
volving there does seem at an ex-
tremely superficial view with a ca-

LUNACY

After September 1970, however, such was the declaration of the Palestinian forces at the hands of Hunkit that subsequent actions were no longer in the context of a war. They became cour-
ageous and effective actions of liberation in the main. The extent of these was the sheer lunacy of the Lodd airport
massacre. Only the blackest des-
pondency can give rise to the event of such irrational and aim-
less fury. Indeed the fact that it was a group of Japanese "revolutionaries" that carried it out was perhaps the most convincing sign of the upsurge of the defeat
suffered by the Palestinians and the national liberation movement. The atrocity prevailed in a part of a once vigorous movement.

Here there has been a tit-for-tat and usually the freeing of prison-
ers held by the oppressor. There have been many successes for this tactic which is valuable given its limited aims. It has not been put forward as either a tactic to win a war or overthrow a govern-
ment. Many of the reports of the activ-
ity of the "terrorists" in South Africa, however, show a strange interpretation of the idea of successful and mass participation.

ORIENTATION

An Argentinean group, for instan
cio, recently kidnapped the execu-
tive of a meatpacking factory, agreeing to free him if they were
given money and meat for the
people.

In Britain, precisely it is precisely this final touch, this "imitation to the workers" which is wrong. The whole point of the attacks of the "terrorists" is to an in-
fluence of the proletariat to the
cause of terrorism and war.

Looking at a case like Cyprus. There the British press spelt all of cries about the "terrorists." In fact there was simply a drift going on between the force of occupation and the popular militias of "irregu-
larites." What was being weighed was not the overthrow of a state but the existing of a force of occupa-
tion. If serving under the banners of the army, like teachers at the army schools, or, the families of the occupation
men, get killed, it is because they are part of the garrison of occupa-
tion in a war.

In Algeria and Kenya we saw
wars of liberation against a geno-
drically armed plus local settler
class. This settler class in each
case was organically tied to imperi-
lism as a "community" and was opposed by the people demanding
freedom.

In the case of Israel we see a society steeped in the ax for the exhaus-
tion of their own population, In relation to the Palestinians, a distinct and organic community. Of course there are a courageous few revolu-
tionaries and we should sympathise with the Palestinian cause, but the cent-
ral determining reality is that of a united people against the occu-
pansion forces and not the division.

The tactics of the warfare used by the Palestinian refugees and those groups within, may have appeared to be techni-
cally similar to terrorism between the middle-class conventional
war, as in June 1967, but were in fact episodes in an orga-
nising guerrilla-type war.
Labour from tenants' candidates is now the new way forward for the tenants' movement?

**SINGLE ISSUE**

Because many tenants' activists are new to politics of even trade union activity - particularly housewives - it often appears that a campaign on the single issue of the Housing Finance Act is likely to be most effective. In fact the great weakness so far of the fight against the Government loan scheme has been the failure to fuse with the other major battles of the working class in practical act of against the Tories.

At the beginning of the campaign trade unionists marched as trade unionists against the Act - but they have not acted as trade unionists. Campaigns to strike against it, the struggles against the Industrial Relations Act and against the British working class, the Housing Finance Act are parallel but have remained separate.

And an election is something different from a single issue campaign. A tenants' candidate effects effort towards activity which would last past an election that would place an elected powerless individual on a council where non-elected officials usually have more power than elected councilors.

Tenants would have no possibility of recalling 'their' councillor so they would not have the slightest assurance that once they elected him he would keep his word. They would lose the interest of any condition, even the housing question. Tenants would elect a men to council only now to be more militant than his Labour opponent, the biggest problem is that in offices he will be just as bad.

**INDUSTRIAL**

The willingness of many tenants to mobilise and fight back themselves, without waiting for the official 'leaders' to organise something for them is part of the new militancy of the working class. There is increasingly explicit revolt against the stodgy, gutless accommodation approach of the Labour councilors.

The fact is that the one time that tenants acting as their own councilors won a major victory was in Clyde-side, in 1912 - when their action was linked with industrial action. This is the way forward, not to 'no-go areas', and so on. It is to recognise that we need to have, and do have, a much more open war against the government.

The way forward is not through a 'tenants will go it alone' and then through a campaign to mobilise tenants, but through a campaign to mobilise the tenants' candidates cut across this perspective. They are inevitability linked with the campaign of the Labour Party, which Labour militants - particularly in a city like Liverpool - are prepared for or worse, as their party. Tenants would campaign to get shop stewards' committees to discuss industrial action, against evictions, against rent strikes, against the next round of increases in April. The elections can be used against the Housing Finance Act, through demonstrations of various sorts at Labour election meetings, but the main stress should be on lines with the industrial 'move' 

**EXCEPTION**

In fact, tenants candidates cannot split the movement. They split off the movement and lock it into a narrow struggle. They can split off tenants activists from militants loyal to the Labour Party. The movement must be attacked politically by focussing on local, single-issue politics to make sure that most tenants do not feel the pressure to split off.
NEW THREAT TO RENT STRIKERS

The two areas on total rent and rates strike - Tower Hill and Over the Bridge - are still very solid. The council monopoly is seeing a serious threat to Tower Hill. The last council meeting received the first batch of attachment of earnings orders. The council monopoly hopes that this threat will serve to check the tenants' solidarity - but if it doesn't they will plan action to get these orders. This tactics by the council will be more difficult to deal with than the evictions they tried previously, as they can be stopped by the simple weapon of a mass picket. The crucial, necessary weapon now will be support through industrial action.

Meanwhile, the movement has been weakened by the fact that the 21 councillors who resigned from the Labour Party on Liverpool council have returned without their demands being satisfied. It's clear that the Labour Party is not serious in its attempts to deal with the housing problem. This is a clear indication of the need for radical housing action.

Vietnam, from plow to plough

In China, Cuba and Vietnam, the people have won victory and driven out imperialism. Today they continue the same struggle in the southern tip of Vietnam.

And what is the response of the heroes of democracy and prosperity in the 'advanced countries'? It is the most vicious, murderous, intensivo war in human history.

In November Nixon pulled in an extra big election majority, the prospect of peace is in sight. That promise was just another example of the sick hypocrisy of dirty capitalistic politics. The USA - aided by pressure on the Vietnamese from Moscow and Peking - forced the NLF into accepting terms which practically nullified the capitalistic relationship in South Vietnam would remain intact: no definite victory had been won, and therefore, peace was no nearer than assurance that it was even possible. The 1965 Geneva Agreement.

Having pushed the NLF that far, the US and the South Vietnamese dictator Thieu have kept on pushing, for more and more concessions. This has been covered up with the usual lies, to the point where a journalist of the US millionaire press declared after an official press conference that "we were looking out for our information from Radio Hanoi."

If it was just a military struggle, the Vietnamese would be certain of victory. But, however, is also political. Nixon may gain militarily from his devastation of North Vietnam, but he will not bow to political-ideological demands that he withdraw from South Vietnam, where he would like to see American companies controlling the economy. He would like to see the Vietnamese once again be able to work in open competition.

The Vietnamese people have shown that they are not afraid of hard work, and they have proven that they can achieve their goals. They have shown that they are not afraid of the challenges that lie ahead.

BY JACK SUTTON

The National Union of Public Employees (NUPE) has just sent round to all its branches ballot forms to find out what action the membership want to take in support of their local claim.

The claims on behalf of National Health ancillary staff were put in nearly six months ago, on 28 July. The unions, NUPE, the Transport and General, and the General and Municipal, and COHSE (Confederation of Health Service Employees) put in a claim for £24 a week for men and £18 for women; 35 hour week compared to 48 hour "summer" hours; and 12 month's service; an unconditional lead-in period of 31 weeks for all those staff not on bonus schemes; and a "threshold clause". Militants in these unions complained that the claim should be for £35 and lead-in or threshold.

Still, this Tory government can't see its way through the mists of ideological treacle for the "lower paid" to settle even for the union's official claim.

The ballot, however, will solve nothing - neither was it intended to solve anything. The ballot is: firstly, to buy time; secondly, to give the lie to false allegation that the government has not sat down to the table; and, thirdly, to hold out in order to do anything.

The real point of the ballot, though, is not the choices of the ballot, but the fact that the ballot, in a way, is the only realistic one - but the timing of the action. The union sees the ballot as an attempt to divide the union as a whole, which is the last thing any union would do.

The ballot as a whole, as an attempt on the part of the union to come to an agreement with the unions, is no more than a charade. The union with themselves, LASH and the other unions, are the only realistic choices - but the timing of the action. The union sees the ballot as an attempt to divide the union as a whole, which is the last thing any union would do.
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Still, this Tory government can't see its way through the mists of ideological treacle for the "lower paid" to settle even for the union's official claim.

The ballot, however, will solve nothing - neither was it intended to solve anything. The ballot is: firstly, to buy time; secondly, to give the lie to false allegation that the government has not sat down to the table; and, thirdly, to hold out in order to do anything.

The real point of the ballot, though, is not the choices of the ballot, but the fact that the ballot, in a way, is the only realistic one - but the timing of the action. The union sees the ballot as an attempt to divide the union as a whole, which is the last thing any union would do.
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50% of what you ask for - and the least stable 50% of that, the half most vulnerable to inflation is "satisfactory".

NUPE members should demand a full national strike until the demands are met. If the membership are to be consulted on the methods of the strike, they should be consulted on the contents too. Don't let the leadership call off any action until mass meetings of members have approved the settlement.

"BREAK AWAY"

An example of this should be set right now. Just as mass meetings should decide the final outcome, they should also decide the methods. No secret ballot, but mass meetings in work time with voting by a show of hands.

NUPE has been partly forced into this gesture of the ballot. The mass pressure from below, expressed in the big half day and one third strikes on December 13th. The development of the London Alliance of Stewards in Health and Education (LASH) and its help in organizing the National Alliance of Stewards in Health (NASH) and local Alliances, has been the most significant development in the growth of militancy within the health unions.

And all union leaders are constantly seeing that they are a "breakaway" group, "counterposing itself to the slur". The fact is that the union bureaucrats already identify the union with themselves. LASH identifies itself with the members and the members with the unions. Its opposition is to whatever is against the members' interests, even if that means - and it almost always does mean this - opposing the officials.

THE LATEST GADOLIKE RACKET to be bagged up by the Tories' scalps for the industrial relations Act is Mr. Joseph Langston. The only line hunter has been suspended since October 30th on full pay (£44.77 a week) after his workers went on strike and met with resistance when he resigned from the Union (the AEUW). The incident, which is the Industrial tribunal in Birmingham ruled that he had a right under the Industrial Relations Act not to belong to the AEUW since the AEUW is not a "closed shop" union.

Langston says he objects to the closed shop system which operates in all car factories. To nearly all workers however, there is a simple and clear connection between 100% trade unionism and the £44.77 Langston collects every week.

It is for this reason that, when he turned up at 10.30 on Friday morning (Dec. 29th), together with attendant camera crews, pressmen, make-up girls and the like, on his way to a TV studio, he was met by a spontaneous demonstration of over 100 workers who had left their machines to show him what they thought of him. They did not like his "right to be very angry" - a threat to the closed shop is a threat to their livelihood - and the struggle against the police, the struggle against the state, the struggle against the police, the struggle against the police.

"Go home!" was the clear right to be very angry - a threat to the closed shop is a threat to their livelihood - and the struggle against the police, the struggle against the police, the struggle against the police.

Note: Incidentally, that Langston keeps to where the "good" money is, accepting the result of the Union's right without wanting to sacrifice anything in return. If he hated it so much his colour was burned, he would have to get in the back street shops where no Union membership is required. But Joseph Langston wouldn't have been too popular there either: there is nothing like the backstreet workers would like more than a closed shop and £44.77 a week.

The case of Joseph Langston and Langston must show trade unionists the nature of the Industrial Relations Act and why they should do away with shop floor organisation and militancy and the very principles and traditions of the trade union movement.

Good claim the right to Union membership. Langston repudiates his membership. What is crucial is that all trade unionists themselves should decide democratically whether they should be a member and whether they should work with a Good or a Langston.