Turn protest into general strike

18 ARRESTED FOR Picketing

The SPECIAL T.U.C. CONGRESS TO DISCUSS THE WAGE FREEZE could have decided on one of two courses. Either to plan the detailed organisation of a national and solidarity action to gas men, hospital ancillary workers, civil servants and other sections taking on the Government. Or to organise a full scale confrontation with the Government, pitting the giant strength of the working class against it.

In its "decision" to "await" a day just before the Congress, Feather had this appeal to make: "Mr. Heath should jettison the worst features of the Industrial Relations Act, and get us all back to work. Calm down the哇言 authorities and the police. They want to shut down the TUC. We should rouse public opinion to back the TUC..."

The resolution is not binding on any of the member unions — as Vic Feather carefully pointed out. Moreover, the "suffering workers'" call to the TUC is being ignored. As Sunday, people are on strike in the coal fields and Nationalised Industries. And meanwhile, too, the Industrial Relations Act remains on the statute books — to be used when and however the Government desires. The TUC has in fact accepted it.

18 BUILDING WORKERS, OP THE TEGWU AND UCATT, ARE BEING charged with 'offences' relating to incidents which occurred while picketing during the building strike last September. The Contractors' Shop Stewards Committee at RSC Swinton are calling for a strike to support the 18 on March 15th, and are preparing for a longer stoppage if necessary. A meeting of the Building Workers' Charter in Liverpool decided to support the call, and the builders' union UCATT is being urged to add its support. The Committee has produced a special leaflet, which we summarise below.

As in the past, the TUC is being used for dealing with law-breakers. But this time, the TUC is the instrument of the law for dealing with those who are breaking the law. The TUC is the police force of the working class. The TUC is the instrument of the law for dealing with those who are breaking the law. The TUC is the police force of the working class. The TUC is the police force of the working class. The TUC is the police force of the working class.

THE CASE FOR A GENERAL STRIKE

"Well, the government is fixed, you know. They either get this policy off the ground or they pack up as a government. The period of running away, taking holidays, is over now. It really must get its policy going."

That was Harold Lever, millionaire right-wing Labour politician, talking to the Observer, Sunday 4 March.

Naturally, Lever wants the country to be 'governed' — even if it means by the Tories. That means making the wage freeze stick.

Why do the Tories have to get their policy off the ground? Because intense pressure from international competition gives them little room for movement, and a strike of the working class, to hold down our wages, shake the Trade Unions to the melting point, and destroy the middle-class union and civil rights.

All the great victories of the working class in the last ten years have not smashed the Industrial Relations Act, and have not stopped the Tory offensive in its tracks. And now Phase 2 faces the working class with the need for a general mobilisation if it is even to maintain its living standards.

THE CASE FOR A GENERAL STRIKE

If the TUC was seriously concerned to even pretend to be 'leading' the working class, it would make preparations for a general strike to smash the Industrial Relations Act and all government attempts to interfere with the affairs of the working class movement.

But it won't. It prefers instead to allow sectional struggles against the Freeze to proceed and then to look to a Labour Government to remove, at least partly, the Industrial Relations Act.

Vic Feather and Harold Wilson enact a public comedy in which they both pledge eternal peace between the Trade Unions and any future Labour Government — a pledge which no one takes seriously.

Instead of fighting against this government now flapping capitalist Britain, they serve up all the fantasies of a blissful peace — with the next (they hope) Labour Government, which will also, like the last Labour Government, be running capitalist Britain.
If the leaders won't lead, the rank & file must

Continued from p. 1

In fact they play a very dangerous game if they try to view the rank and file of the unions, and that the rank and file of the unions is a sort of a part of many would like to do with the Tories. But they refuse to be approached. They won't go forward and can't go back. In this situation, the government cannot miss the great deal of support against the apparently pointless anxiety of strikes and can refuse to allow it to be mobilised on our side if there was a clear, decisive, consistent and united front against the private employers. There is a possibility, however, that the Tories might gain an elec-

tive, with the massive indifference to the Labor Party's decision to hold recent by-elections. So if the election did not take place it would be in the interests of all workers to return Labor. But waiting for an election means giving in now.

The Trade Union leaders shuffle uneasily andumble ex-

cuses. They are unable to face up to the prospect of a stand up fight, relying on the direct industrial struggle to keep the working class to beat back the government and save the employers. Masses of working class militancy in the streets and the factories, wages and living conditions are close tied to the normal way of life and the attempt to keep down or stop the rank and file movement is being tied to the State.

GENERAL STRIKE

When we first started to campaign for a general strike in Work-

ers' Defense, last May, We said: "We ourselves - the militants, the socialists - must organise at local level now. A General Strike will be won by the network of working class committees and organisations, most of which exist already as the outcome of the political drive and socialist activities of the working men's movements, socialism through the political action of the workers', committees, etc. We must translate these bodies into the unifying force of a mass struggle for a general strike against the State and the Tories."

This is the third time that the working class has come out in action, but the mass of workers is still caught up in the capitalist system. It is the major actual preparation of workers' strength. The movement must be ground to a halt in order to make a general strike. It is the only way to be ready for immediate direct action, without waiting for an official call. (Which may never come - last July was the militants who called the general strike after the law to beat down trade unionists - whether or not the Tuc/Unions support the Tories. No call for a general strike as the rank and file response to the Tories and the law to beat down trade unionists - whether or not the Tuc/Unions support the TUC on the Tories. No call for a general strike is also an attack on the spirit of the campaign. It can be a weapon for militants to use against the union official bureaucracy. If the TUC calls a general strike, it will probably only do to keep the initiative or to "let off steam" from the working class anger. But if, last July, a Five Day (called by the TUC to keep control of the movement) had occurred, it would have deepened and accelerated tremendously the experience of almost the whole of the working class in a struggle that linked them with the majority that acted - self-defence, decentralised and self-dependently - to free the Five.
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The ‘UNION’ VERSUS ASCENDANCY

The Tory Government’s imminent ‘solution to the Irish problem’ (in the form of a White Paper expected shortly) has given rise to a flurry of political activity, especially in the Loyalist camp.

Craig’s ‘Dominion of Ulster’ speech, in the aftermath of the Loyalist one day general strike, and his approaches to the SDLP, gave rise to flood of “new breakthrough” type headlines in sections of the British press.

Two events seem to have led Craig to make his Ulster speech in which he put forward his “Dominion of Ulster” idea - independent, but linked (though in different ways and degrees) with both Britain and the Irish Republic. He proposed talks with Catholic politicians.

First, the general strike. Craig has always seen himself as the successor of Sir Edward Carson, who, in the period 1912-14 threatened and organised for armed resistance against the British government. (The Unionists of the North East of Ireland wished them to remain as part of the UK and not come under a ‘Home Rule’ parliament in Dublin). Fifty years ago all sections of Protestant opinion supported Carson - he received full backing from big business, the Protestant churches, the Press and the British Conservative Party.

DREAMWORLD

Today, Unionism is a poor shadow of its former self. The middle class elements are now virtually line up behind the British government and are willing to accept what is being imposed. This is the position of both Faulkner & Paisley - the most popular unionist politicians.

Craig’s dreamworld of 1912 was revived, shaken after the strike he supposedly called. (He had in fact attempted to get the Unionists to back him, but was forced to support it in order that he might not lose face with the Protestant political groups such as the UDA). After Faulkner’s strike, Craig was for the first time really lashed out by the major unionist politicians.

Faulkner declared he had no longer thought of Craig as a “Unionist”. The British Eastering paper ran the headline “British could cost £2 million” and the rest of the press and unionist churches attacked him for doing more harm to Ulster in one day than the IRA did in three years.

CONTRADICTION

Fundamentally this expressed the contradiction between the methods of action, like striking, which are organic to Orangeism’s mass working class social base, and the interests of the bourgeois and middle class leaders of the movement.

Secondly, for several months John Taylor, a former hardline Unionist, had been talking to political leaders attempting to find a “solution” - without the help of the British government. Taylor’s activities posed a threat to Craig’s position as leader of militant unionism. Taylor (left) and Craig (right) look out over the mainly working class Loyalist crowds.

Craig had in fact seen where Craig’s policies were taking him some time before Craig himself had realised the implications of his Loyalist opposition to the British government. Thus Craig came up with the “Dominion of Ulster” idea at the Vanguard rally in the Ulster Hall, four days after the strike.

Craig’s motives and the actual social content of his independent Ulster are clear. His opposition to trade unions and his general right wing Tory views are well known. His proposal was nothing but an attempt to restore the old Protestant ascendancy. Knowing the British government would not give it to him, Craig realised he had to do it alone. (Protestant Sinn Feinists, as Paisley calls it).

What was novel in his idea (and positively revolutionary within Loyalist political thinking) was his recognition of the Catholic minority community and its aspirations for a united independent Ireland. Craig seemed to suggest a common Ulster loyalty for both Catholics and Protestants, to be radically attacking the main pillar of Unionism — the British connection.

Craig is willing to sacrifice the Union if it will restore the Protestant ascendancy. His carefully worded speech was an attempt to woo the Catholics, in the form of the SDLF, onto his side. He was part of the way in accepting the SDLF’s fundamental thesis that a 6 County state is inherently unstable because of the refusal of the Catholic minority to be ruled by the Unionists — only to propose a new 6 County state which would be distant from both the Republic and Britain.

Despite the source of the “Dominion” idea and its politically reactionary and economically retroactive nature, which further widens the gulf between the British and the Loyalist rank-and-file opens up new opportunities for the anti-

BRITISH ARMY MURDER GANGS

Dear comrade,

With regard to the article on the Six Counties which appeared in no. 22 of your paper, let me first say that your reporter Austin Morgan gave a pretty fair analysis of what is happening here.

I would just like to point out that the Orange murder gangs have not alone been responsible for the assassinations of Catholics. British army murder squads in civilian clothes have been guilty of some of the most vicious atrocities committed against innocent civilians. It is the wish of the British army terrorists to blame the Protestant population for all of these murders, but the recent massacre on the New Lodge Road in which three unarmed Provisional volunteers and three defenceless civilians died leaves no doubt as to British involvement in sectarian murders.

Their strategy seems to be two-fold:

1) To eradicate the IRA as a threat through the use of internment and murder.

2) To force support for themselves among the Catholic people by putting themselves forward as the only force capable of preventing the assassination they themselves are carrying out under cover.

To help this process along, the British army have encouraged Protestant fascist organisations to murder Catholics (by turning a blind eye) and have done so themselves when the Protestants have not instilled enough fear in the Catholic population or when they have felt that another unsolved murder would serve the purpose of their imperialist masters in Whitehall.

Yours fraternal,

M. McC.

Andersonstown, Belfast.
‘REMODELLING’ IRELAND

BOTH SIDES OF THE BORDER

Irish politics north and south of the border is dominated by the British government’s search for a new political ‘settlement’ of the Irish question. The British Government’s white paper is due shortly, with proposals for a settlement in Northern Ireland, and the political parties are busy regrouping and reorganizing in an effort to win over the support of the mass of the people. The British government no longer wants the Orange Ascendancy. Britain has a strategy of pushing Irish nationalism into the Common Market. But this cannot be achieved without a major transformation of the economy and society of Northern Ireland, into which the British will pour millions of pounds.

There is a major contradiction between the interests of the Protestant Ascendancy with a 6 County state dependent on Britain, and the interests of the British government. Britain no longer wants the Orange Ascendancy. Britain has a strategy of pushing Irish nationalism into the Common Market. But this cannot be achieved without a major transformation of the economy and society of Northern Ireland, into which the British will pour millions of pounds.

House-trained

The attempt to square this circle (for the Protestant ascendancy) has led former fire-eating professional bigots like Ian Paisley to turn, overnight, into moderate centrist leadership and spin doctors. This has been a success for the British Government, which has been able to use the Orange Ascendancy as a tool in its struggle against the共产党 in Northern Ireland (such as Billy Craig to become a member of the British government, and now a member of the Protestant Ascendancy). It has led to the formation of new parties, such as the Ulster Democratic Party, which has proved to be an effective vehicle for winning back popular support for the Orange Ascendancy.

Remodelling

In the South, the borgirise has made no economic and political progress with Britain. This is now in all its sections ‘reconciled’ to a perspective of national unity and the British state at the end of a process of drawing together within the EEC. Nonetheless, Britain relies on Britain to remould the Northern Ireland society so that eventually they can be ‘reunited’ at reunification.

They have once again undertaken to hold down even that minority in the South who are eager to join or aid the fight to drive the British out of Ireland in a revolutionary way, rather than wait for the British government to use their ‘convenience and the convenience of the government’ to drive the British out.

That was their contribution to the ‘peace’ in the previous period, when they were able to use the British government’s attempts to complete its ‘reconciliation’ policy to achieve their ends. The British government now wants to use the ‘peace’ to achieve its own ends, by remoulding the society and the economy in the British pattern. But this cannot be achieved without a major transformation of the economy and society of Northern Ireland, into which the British will pour millions of pounds.

IRISH POLLS

At Britain at the end of last century, with an independent structure because of proportional representation and its own traditions.

It too will have a hard line in repression of the Republicans. Its spokesman on the North is in a gentleman called Chris O’Brien, one of the most committed (and sophisticated) pro-imperialist spokesman in Ireland.

Struggle

The tragedy of the Irish working class was shown, when, after decades of struggle, the government agreed to the creation of a Labour Party to fight for its interests in parliament. It failed, however, because of the ankle-deep in the British government.

North and south of the border the Irish working class is still paying in blood, disease, and political and social isolation for the failure of a whole series of groups of socialists and republicans to build a revolutionary socialist organisation of the Irish working class – to face both the struggle for national independence and for workers’ power with that class.

Any socialist in Britain who uncritically accepts the ‘coercion’ of the Republican struggle, or an appreciation of its limitations, as a socialist, is serving the British. The role of the Irish working class is now to build a revolutionary socialist organisation, to help perpetuate the sterile separation of socialism and Republicanism. Active solidarity with the fight for self-determination for Ireland is a hundred times more useful to the Irish working class than any number of lectures on unity and non-sectarianism.

CEASEFIRE SHAKY IN LAOS

On 22 February, a cease-fire agreement was signed for Laos. On 24 February, BS2 were bombar dung Laos. On 1 March, truce was re-established and negotiations continued. But there’s no doubt that, if the US wishes it, they can at any time resume bombing on the pretext of ‘aggression’ by the liberation forces.

In this respect, the situation in Laos is similar to that in Vietnam. There is an important difference, though, between the cease-fire agreements. Both agreements are supposed to elect members of the political regime. (Whether the elections are themselves free is another matter.)

But, whatever the agreement for new, we have been told the government and the Communist government is controlling the areas they presently occupy. The agreement involves the formation of a coalition ‘government of national union’, before the elections. Now clearly a revolution can be carried out in conjunction with the very people you are fighting against ! It is thus doubly necessary for the faction to condemn the agreement and to condemn the faction of the Liberators and to condemn the ceasefire, to condemn the agreement.

ON 22 FEBRUARY, A CEASEFIRE AGREEMENT WAS SIGNED FOR LAOS.
by ARYE BEN SHEMUEL

There once were (as confirmed by the Sunday Times [of 10 P.M.]) that an Israeli shipping line, Mar-
line Fruit (run by two extreme right-wing Zionists), had purchased 600 million worth of ships.

The most interesting of these orders is the six tankers to be built by Harland and Wolff. The
carrying capacity of the six 330,000 ton super-tankers is never-
to times greater than Israel’s current oil production (excluding-
that extracted from the occupi-
cated zone). It may be inferred from this that Saudi Arabia has already reached agreement with
Israel on the use of the pipe-line which connects the two countries.

Sadaqet is not ignorant of this—but at present he cannot do like-
wise. The whole shift of policy
within the Egyptian ruling class has been in the direction of circles of opposition to Zionism inside Israel.

Shaliv Avivi, for instance, was a student at Haifa University at the time, a university whose union
was dominated at its last election by a Jewish-Arab left grouping, called "Yesh." He and Dan Vorel, a
teacher from Tel-Aviv who has been arrested, are said to be the founders of the "Red Front," a tiny
society which was founded, the frag-
ent but dominant anti-Zionist group, in Israel.

So, of course, the Israeli govern-
ment are trying to use this springing story to discredit all the parties to the left of the government, and to
stop up arrests of socialists and other repressions, consensus and the like. Such repressions would
suit Golda Meir, of course, in trying
to cut off the extreme right bloc for electoral allegiance.

PATRIOTIC-IMPERIALISM

This renewed terror by Israel comes at a time when Egypt’s
President Anwar el-Sadat has proclaimed his "world-wide disar-
mament offensive." The stated ob-
jective of this policy, according to Sadat’s successor, Mr. Hafiz Ismaiel, who has been touring the
capitals of the super-powers of the world, is to find a peaceful solution to the Middle East situation.

When this policy was officially announced at the end of January, wide sections of the Egyptian
people reacted against the plan—
foremost among them the students and certain intellectuals within the
Army and the Arab League (ASU is Egypt’s only legal party).

Sadat’s reaction was to launch a mass campaign of repression against them and to back this up with
rampant police and 13 civilians, in-
cluding women and children. In
the jail and hospitals were also destroyed.

The 1,000 students demonstrat-
ing at the Athens Polytechnic Eng-

The move was yet another

The police were not being consulted over the rules regulations of the college, which was further seen as a pha-
sical embodiment of the US’s domination of Greek affairs.

Quite soon the slogans of the demonstrators changed from pure-
ly academic in their aims to more-or-less the same as the students of the Greek colonial and student en-
vironment with them—roots whose roots really go back to 1967 when the NATO and US
helped junta took power was

"Thus far the police have arrested twenty Israeli Arabs from the north-
ern part of the country and four
youths, some of whom are mem-
bers of Matzgues. Further arrests of Jews and Arabs are ex-
pected.

This was the announcement of the Israeli newspaper Haaretz on December 4th last, under the head-
line "Arab-Jewish spy ring unco-
vered. . . . They trained in terrorist
base in Britiah.

And in one thing it wasn’t ex-
aggerating: within a short time the
number of arrests grew. By the be-
inning of January regular sweeps by the Shin Bet (the Israeli secret service) had traveled another
46 Arabs and two Jews into "deten-
tion.

Although many have speculated that this alleged breaking of a Syr-
ian agreement was a face-saving coverup of the Shin Bet’s disastrous "failure" in the Munich affair, and their fear to break the Black September

"This new wave of demonstrations and protest meetings are required
to bring home to workers and students here the situation in Greece. It is important for revolutionaries to take part in these actions, which are now being directed by liberal spokesmen advocating a return to the "normality" of pre-

But that was only "normal" in that there were not trade union elections, a notoriously reactionary police force and a removal of the Prime Minister with his place taken by a

The angry storming of the ship shown here, by Israel of a Lybian airliner over an Israeli
occupied port in Egypt has led to the attention of hundreds of milli-
ons to the blunt fact of Zionist aggression. At the moment the airline was
heading for Lampedusa, the last major airport on its route—about 100 miles

"This mass action by students in Greece will, as everyone is aware, be supported by the students throughout the world and will be reflected in the organs of the labor movement in every country."
The Scapegoats Fight Back

As the hospital workers' struggle moves forward, the Tories' concern for the lower-paid turns into hard-handed meanness. NL AL SMITH spoke to JOHN J. TON, a Manchester hospital porter, about how the hospital workers can win, with solidarity from other workers.

Jack Sutton is secretary of his union branch and secretary of the National Alliance of Stewards in Health. In the last 2 years his branch has increased union membership from 150 to 850 and organised shop stewards and branch meetings which didn't exist before. Jack Sutton is also a member of Workers' Fight.

NS: Could you firstly just outline the stage the claim has reached in negotiations?
JS: The last offer made by management was £1.68 per week for men and women, or £2 for men and £1.68 for women. This was to become operative on March 14th and the next stage of equal pay for women (30p per week) was to be introduced in October.

This offer was rejected by the four unions involved (NUPSE, TACWU, GOMARU, and CODES), who decided to campaign for means of industrial action for the full claim of £4 a week, a 35 hour week, and four weeks' holiday.

The unions decided to pursue this claim by means of selective strikes, a ban on overtime, non-co-operation, and other forms of industrial action.

NS: Is the claim adequate?
JS: A £4 a week won't even bring us back to last year's living standard, for the price rises are. A number of branches, such as London and Bristol, have called for a straight £4 claim. But obviously we must join in a united fight for the existing claim.

NS: Did the ballot of union members call for all-out strike action?
JS: December 13th strikes and demonstrations showed tremendous militancy. 
And yet all we got in places was a no, a pat on the back, thanks for the impressive turn-out, and still no leadership.

After the announcement of the NUPSE and CODES ballots, people thought that this was a chance to say what action we should take. In reality, the leaders' aims were quite different. The ballot was an attempt to upstage the other unions and an attempt to play for time.

They've been dragging on negotiations - probably in the hope of getting some exemption for hospital workers as a 'special case'. The ballots called for all-out strike action - but there has been no action since December 13th. All this confusing and delay has led to disorganisation and the ballot has been repudiated by the union leaders.

NS: Selected grades, such as laundry staff, are to be called out. Recently, a decision has been made to call for 1 to 3 day strikers in as many hospitals as possible. In the ten major hospital regions, one large hospital was called out on a full strike. For example, in this area, is it to be the United Manchester Hospitals?

These selective tactics will confuse the members. Some will argue "why should we strike when others don't?". It certainly cuts into the union's solidarity with us.

Hospitals in Raftersheath, United Manchester Hospitals, London NUPSE, and Bristol have called.

Colin Simm, a Nottingham cook, states his case at the mass meeting in Nottingham's Old Market Square.

"IT'S NOT US ENDANGERING LIVES IT'S THE TORIES" all called for all-out action.

In any case, UMI will be called out on March 1st. This was decided by the branch committee, and we will hold a mass meeting and call for a solid all-out strike lasting at least a week. We will also ask for strong pickets to be maintained and for solidarity from trade union and student bodies.

NS: What has been the role of the National Alliance of Stewards in Health?
JS: NASH and its local alliances have always held to the tactic of an all-out strike. At the last national conference of NASH, the original claim of £6 per week, a 35 hour week, 4 weeks holiday, plus equal pay for women now was reaffirmed.

We called on the unions involved to fight now for the claim. In addition, we called for the setting up of public sector alliances on a region-wide basis. This has already been achieved in Manchester at the February 13th freeze conference, in London, and, I think, East Kent.

We also hope to produce a NASH leaflet for hospital workers outlining our position.

NS: Here in UMI, you were one of the two hospitals in the country to come out in support of the Dirty Johns strike, and the Ethelton Hospital to have a mass meeting to support the Bristol hospital workers, with a half-day strike and demonstration. In Pontefract, you held a mass meeting in the yard to hear a docker explaining the issues.

What do you have planned right now?

JS: I've already mentioned coming out and picketing. In addition to this, we will issue leaflets. One will call on local trade unionists to support the gas and hospital workers by participating in the united front committee that has been set up.

Suddenly we will distribute our open letter in reply to Keith Joseph. In the last pay packet, a letter of his was sent to all members advising them not to disrupt hospital services and calling on them to accept the offer.

The reply will reject the notion of an incomes policy, and describe the £6 as nothing more than a wage cut. We will condemn the hypocrisy of Tory claim in being concerned with the lower paid.

NS: How will you counter the hostile press propaganda which you must be expecting?
JS: We must make it clear that it's not us endangering lives, it's the Tories. If they are genuinely concerned for the lower paid and for the patients, let them pay us the full claim.

We have agreed to let into the hospitals during the strike food, mail, flowers, and blood supplies, etc. However, if there is an attempt to bring in 'volunteers', then further sanctions will have to be considered.

We are prepared to assist in any emergency providing that representatives of the strike committee are allowed into the hospital to assess the situation for themselves. We are also permitting one telephonist on each switchboard.

In behalf of the bosses and their plans to cut our wages, the Tories are trying to stigmatise the people making up the scapegoats for the death of the sick, the gas and hospital workers for the death of the elderly, and no doubt the car workers also for any failure of the economy. But they are the real criminals, not us workers.

NS: What about the 'special case' commitment?
JS: We must reject the idea of being a 'special case'. The freeze is directed against all workers and affects all. It is in the interests of the whole of the working class that the gas and hospital workers smash the freeze.

If this doesn't happen, we are allowing the Tories to make up pay for the present crisis, their crisis.

We should campaign for a united front of all workers against the freeze, the setting up of united front committees, and raise the call - both at rank and file level and at the TUC - for a general strike. If we use the full strength of the working class, we can win.
FIGHT AGAINST THE FREEZE

WHO'S A GREEDY PARASITE?

In the week of the big fight-back against the Freeze, a company that raised its prices four times over the last year and a half holds up itsicky piccies and shrugs: "We can't afford to pay your wage increase!"

In April 1971 listed prices of Fords cars went up 6.6%; in December of that year they went up another 3.3%; with the purchase tax reduction of the following April not being passed on, Ford cars in reality increased by a further 4%, which was overcharged by 5% more last November. In that period, as the Trade Unions' Joint Claim at Fords makes clear, output at Dagenham, the main production centre, was up 25% on 1971.

With all this evidence of their ability to pay thrust under their greedy moutis, the management of Ford of Britain still hold the livelihoods of about 33,000 workers to ransom.

And this is Fords, the firm whose sales receipts for 1972 are expected to reach £1,500 million (that is, £12,000 per employee), whose profits in the second half of 1972 increased by £12 million due to the flotation of the pound alone. The struggle, though, is not to prove that Fords have got the money - the point is to get it from them - everyone knows it's there. Not that one should hold back on a claim if profits were lower......

DANGEROUS

The official claim says: "We ask for a price rise clearly and specifically for a commitment by Ford of Britain to a major sales effort in the Commonwealth, including a substantial emphasis on car exports."

Now, to back up a claim by reference to profit figures or possible production figures is OK - but it can be dangerous. Here it clearly implies a policy which is already evident: car workers - German, French, Japanese, American, etc - out of a job, and thus weakens the working class solidarity which is the Ford workers' essential weapon against the bosses.

The other danger of this line - immediately present - is that you are saying that if the firm did not have the money you wouldn't be claiming. Thus you give priority to Fords' 'right' to make a profit.

SOLIDARITY

The one thing that Ford says they won't shift on is the question of the other workers' wage. But this demand is both a real improvement in itself and a blow against Fords by itself.

The press has been hooted up with a sign of weakness with this move. Like the decision of the 990 Jarrow men not to strike but to go on an overtime ban and indeed small talks with the management have appeared. But much of this is a lack of confidence in the ability of the men to assert through Fords into the Freeze. Determined tactics of mass and flying pickets will help to ensure some of those.

What is vital though is that the union leaders do not employ divisive tactics. The lack of uniformity in the time of the strike is bad in this respect. Also, the lesson of 1971's disastrous ballot must be made absolutely clear - the ballot divides, mass action unites.

One trade unionists have indicated that this claim is the one to watch. The fact is that it is the one to have active solidarity with - and not just watch. The fact is that if Fords are forced to concede on this - as they are quite capable, as the extension of a huge multinational empire, of scumbolously tearing up Heath's Green Paper and all the other Freeze-type recommenda-tions - then a massive breach will have been opened in the policies the Tories are alighting on for the class.

The most immediate task in solidarity action is not allowing any of this 'greedy bugger' rubbish to go unanswered. Higher paid or low paid, the working class has now more than at any other time an immediate vital need for unity against the Tory freeze.

How would you like to be a Battery hen?

"The lower paid, I can see they've got a case; but these carworkers... I wouldn't mind getting their wages". That's the sort of argument that's often used to justify indulgence or hostility to carworkers' wage claims. And it's true that carworkers do have higher wage rates than most workers. But the ones who are really doing well are not carworkers - or workers at all. They are the top managers, the shareholders, the money-lenders, the stock market speculators. With them, it's not a matter of perhaps £40 or £50 a week got through long hours of overtime and gruelling work. It's £400 or £400 a week, for producing absolutely nothing.

If the carworkers held back on their claim, would it help the salary-pair? No, it wouldn't: it would help the rich parasites. For the carworkers to go ahead with militant action is the best way to help the lower paid. That is the way to smash the Freeze and open the road for lower paid sections to obtain their demands.

And how did the carworkers get their higher rates? By fighting for them. The way you go about movements for all is by other sections fighting side by side with the car-workers, and not sitting in the sidelines or going along with the speculators.

Men at Fords Dagenham vote to strike: 1 February 1971.

Men coming out of the Halewood plant in Liverpool.

"People seem to go mad about the conditions of battery hens, but they don't seem to care about work conditions. You go to Fords, we've got our battery hens there, except they're human beings".

FORDU official working on the Ford cars produced described the work conditions there. He was referring in particular to men who have to work in a glass dome. This dome, which protects against lead poisoning, is completely closed, air being passed through a line. Men work in the glass dome on an 8-foot space on 10 weeks out (on some other part of the line) out. Those are the battery hen conditions. But how would you like to be working on the overhead camshaft section, with engines coming at you every 28 seconds, that is, 128 per hour for eight or nine hours. Or perhaps you'd prefer the paint-spraying section where 38 cars an hour are sprayed. You'd certainly have to be athletic because, covered entirely in protective clothing, goggles and boots, you would in the course of at least 72/F have to touch your toes about 1400 times in a shift.

These are just a few of the facts that come out of any survey of work conditions at Ford production plants. These and worse conditions were most completely documented during the "269 dispute", which was brought about by management trying to increase the piece
The Ballot Before the Storm?

Gaulicism after de Gaulle

FRANCE 1960s: ten million workers on strike, workers’ councils in some areas, barricades in the streets. The French ruling class has still not recovered from the blow of 1968. They have not been able to dampen the workers’ continuing militancy, expressing itself in strikes and factory occupations. The ruling class is looking for a changed political solution. From post-war to 1968, France operated under the representation, parliamentary 4th Republic constitution. With the Communist Party out of government after 1947, there was serious political instability as the numerous parties based on various layers of French society, middle class produced a series of government combinations. These weak governments could not settle the independence war in Algeria and in 1958 de Gaulle came to power on the basis of a revolt by the Army and the racist, violently anti-independence French settlers in Algeria.

The constitution was brought in – the 5th Republic – giving almost absolute power to de Gaulle as president. The popular base of de Gaulle’s regime was not a normal political base on the basis of the demagogic Gaulist movement, based on loyalty to the leader and a vague ideology of nationalism and corporatist states.

The French ruling class faces two main problems:

France has probably the most outdated social structure of any major country in Western Europe. A few big industrial giants, more small firms, hundreds of thousands of small shopkeepers and small farmers. As would be expected from competition, it is vital for French big business to modernise. And there wants to modernise the political structure. They want to junk the mystical personal politics and the delusions of France being a great power. They want to restructure the Gaulist political bloc, the Union for the Defence of the Republic, and get a more rational, flexible political party system, within a presidential constitution. In 1969 de Gaulle went. Later that year, the government proposed a new programme including various social reforms, but centred round industrial rationalisation, and ‘contrats de progrès’ (a sort of productivity deal). They aim to get the bureaucracy of the workers’ movement, better integrated into the state and used to police the working class more closely.

The French Elections

Promises and workers’ expectations fueling a rise in workers’ militancy beyond bureaucratic limits.

So it is only as a last resort that the bosses have the CP in Government. Pompidou has said that he will not recognise a Left government even if the Left has a majority. Thus he hopes to scare people off voting for the Left, and, if it comes to a majority, to provoke a crisis which will split up the Left and open the way for a non-CP government.

The Common Programme

The Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and the Left Radicals have come together on a Common Programme of weak reformism. The Programme is similar to the promises the Labour Party makes while in opposition: 11 nationalisations (with compensation), ‘progress towards’ a 1000Fr (about $20 per month) minimum wage and a 40 hour work week, more monoplyistic democracy; meanwhile the new Left government will remain within the 1958 constitution and within NATO.

The programme is supposed to lead, not to socialism, but to an ‘advanced democracy’, where the power of the monopolies has been broken and the transition to socialism is easier. Just how big the chances are of the Union of the Left breaking the power of the monopolists, is shown by their reaction to Pompidou’s defiance. They have issued no call for working class action; instead, they complain that Pompidou should obey democratic legality. If it comes to a serious showdown with the monopolists, they will do no better than they did in 1958, when the only action they organised was a demonstration two weeks after the coup.

Besides, the Common Programme is not even adequate for the immediate needs of the working class. 1970 figures showed three-quarters of French workers under 1500 Fr (410 per month) – and food prices are higher in France than here. Half a million are unemployed. The 40-hour work week and the 1000Fr (about $20 per month) minimum wage are immediate necessities. The French working class is heavily split by racialism directed against 15 million immigrant workers, many of whom are illegal immigrants and thus have no legal rights at all.

The Common Programme proposes maintaining curbs on immigration, thus inevitably perpetuating this racism.

The French police are notorious for their brutality – as are the armed guards employed in some factories, one of whom was recently sentenced to just two years for killing a young Maoist worker. If the Union of the Left were serious about breaking the power of the monopolies, they would not propose the disbarring of the armed police and the arming of the workers.

POMPIDOU

Politics is jockeying for position in the forthcoming regroupment. The crucial stage looks like being the 1976 presidential election. The ruling class don’t want to change too much, and they want to change it gradually, carefully. The worst fear of the ruling class is that the workers’ wish to get rid of the old regime will erupt, beyond electoral limits, into a repeat of 1968. The bosses do not fear that the CP leaders will destroy their power. In France, in 1945–47, and more recently in Finland and in Ireland, CP leaders have shown themselves able and willing to serve as loyal ministers of the ruling class.

But the employers do not want to give even the limited reforms promised by the Left. And they do not want to take the risk of Left

MITTERRAND

The Parties of the Left

The Socialists suffer a disaster in the 1968 presidential elections – their candidate gets just 2% of the vote. A new turn was necessary. Under a new leader, Mitterrand, the party repudiated itself to 1969, dropped even talk of ‘class struggle’ from its programme, and clearly aims to make the cor-

It is up to them to think that the Left Union could grant the 40 hour week & retirement at 60 immediately.

Or could nationalise just anything...?

That would disorganise the economy.

And it wouldn’t encourage the anti-monopoly inside class to vote for it.....

Could we keep the police?

Besides, we’ll keep the police.
for a while. Some weeks ago, the Ligue Communiste organised a Vietnamese solidarity demonstration—which ended in clashes with the police. The CP was furious... at what could be described as an organisation "within six weeks of the election!"

The 'Revolutionaries' Unity and The Union of the Left

The ruling group and the Union of the Left are not only the forces on the field. Since 1968, there is a growing revolutionary movement in France.

The two Trotskyist groups, Lutte Ouvriere and the Ligue Communiste, are fielding candidates. They differ

The Mitterrand operation indicated an attempt to correct its substantial organisation shortcoming, this development, with the CP probably playing the role of a new big centre-left."

The LEFT RADICALS are a small parliamentary group, few have because they can be used for position in the coming bourgeois reexpansion by hitching their late fortunes to the passing bandwagon. The Small Communist Group without changing a word, and it has put up a common slate with the CP.

The COMMUNIST PARTY certainly is a working-class party. Its politics do not reflect the interests of the working class; and its hold over the relatively poorly organised French working class is nowhere as solid as the major working party's hold over the British working class. But it is the only political party in the working class - 80% of its members and 70% of its voters are workers, and it controls the major trade union federation, the CGT.

It is the working class activists of the CP who make up the grass roots strength of the CP. Yet, it is only a remnant of a Big Party. Working class enthusiasm for the CP has dwindled because of its leadership's mismanagement of the party. They call on you to demand that the CP submit its actions to your government.

A revolutionary vote for the CP only at the second round would be a vote for independent working class action against the subordination of the Communist party to the CP/Left Radical Parliamentarists.

Taking this approach, we have to be critical of the positions of the various French revolutionary groups. The numerous Maoists and anarchists are simply boycotting the elections, thus depriving themselves of an important opportunity for political intervention.

The OCL, a wretched leftist group calling itself the "CP", concentrates its main effort on the CP in the Left, and this "great workers' parties"! Of worker.
TEESIDE POLYTECHNIC SIT-IN

AS PART OF THE NATIONAL UNION OF STUDENTS GRANTS CHARTER design, on the whole 1975-76 academic year, the Sit-ins by students have been continuing, with varying degrees of success, throughout the country.

On 27th February, with the full support of the National Union of Students, a sit-in took place at the Teesside Polytechnic, which resulted in the closure of the college for three days. The sit-in was supported by students from several other institutions, including the University of York, the University of London, and the University of Liverpool. The sit-in was successful, and the college was closed for three days.

The sit-in was a response to the government's proposed cuts in funding for higher education, which would have had a significant impact on the quality of education at the Teesside Polytechnic. The students were also protesting against the government's decision to increase tuition fees, which they felt was a further burden on students already facing financial pressures.

The sit-in was a significant event in the history of the National Union of Students, and it highlighted the importance of student activism in the fight for improved education and better living conditions for students. The sit-in was a catalyst for further action, and it helped to galvanize students across the country to join the struggle for better education and fairer funding.
The Steel White Paper: Nothing to offer but the dolce que!

by Andrew Hornung

The Government hopes that output can be increased and labour cut by a massive injection of around £100 million of capital investment over the next ten years. In order to accomplish their objectives, the Government has been heavily supported by the whole of the steel industry's front line, the executive of the Steel Compensation Board, the trade unions and schools, thereby making the scheme politically viable. It could be.

Andrew Hornung

FIGHTING AT TEACHERS' MEETING

The militant mood of London's teachers was in evidence on Wednesday 27th when over a thousand attended the ILTF Action Meeting at Chelsea Arts Centre. Right from the start, it was evident that feelings among those attending the union executive meeting were intransigent, and speaker after speaker took from the floor spoke of local NUT branches' proposals of militant action which had been squashed by the executive. Instead of bringing the whole of London's teachers together, the executive had chosen to support a cut in the number of schools, thereby making the scheme politically viable. It could be.

In the course of the meeting, one of the speakers asked "why hadn't other workers involved in struggle been invited?" Blackwell, Lambeth, Hackney, and Southwark NUT Associate Branches had submitted a motion to the executive a week before, with a 5000-strong petition calling for the right of union members to discuss the issues.

The resolution called on the NUT Executive "in association with other workers who have been directly affected, to evolve a joint plan of action to break the freeze". It was accepted.

The overwhelming majority of the meeting showed it was a show of hands and an outcry from the floor, that it wanted the NUT to make a stand, to call a national meeting platform, led by Communist Party member Max Morris, refused, with no explanation, to have it read or debated.

At this point, Eric Porter, editor of the left-wing teachers' journal 'Bank and Flute', got up and started reading the motion. He was given a loud hailer, a few minutes later an attempt was made to snatch it from him, resulting in an epidemic of blows.

The meeting broke up into total disorder, people walking out, others rushing down from the galleries into the Main Hall.

The platform walked out, lights were turned on, and the meeting went on, with the police that had been called.

But, with at least 800 remaining, the platform was readied by candle-light and overwhelmingly supported.

After this shameful behaviour by the NUT leadership and the Communist Party, the whole NUT's credibility is being lost.

An essential next step is to assemble a conference of workers and students. Join the ILTF at our meeting on Friday 29th of February at 8pm in the East London Teachers' Association building for an all London Conference of workers and students.

MARION KAVANAGH

REAL STEEL NEWS

Militant Steelworkers' Paper

Available from

3, Hanter Close, Stockton on Tees

Nothing to offer but the dolce que!

In one simple sentence free of statistics and technical jargon, the Government summed up what it called the "steel strategy" for the modernisation and expansion of steel production in the Steel White Paper: "The BSC estimates that full implementation of the new development and closures in the strategy should more than double average labour productivity and reduce manpower by about 50,000".

The Government hopes that output can be increased and labour cut by a massive injection of around £100 million of capital investment over the next ten years. In order to accomplish their objectives, the Government has been heavily supported by the whole of the steel industry's front line, the executive of the Steel Compensation Board, the trade unions and schools, thereby making the scheme politically viable. It could be.

Andrew Hornung

for some communities dependent on the smaller works which have to close. These problems might be lessened by redevelopment of some smaller works so as to attain the same total capacity with less concentration.

In other words, some plants will be scrapped altogether, some will have certain sections scrapped, and some will be "rationalised" and have production cut. Any fight back must be able to unite workers and be based on all three kinds of development.

Decay

Firstly, we have to define our attitude towards technological developments. There's nothing very wonderful about the present conditions steelworkers work in; and, in any case, socialists should aim to increase labour productivity as one of the most important development factors in the material basis of socialism.

It is clear from the White Paper and the debate in the House that the government's aim is to preserve, capitalise and, if possible, increase steel production as the material basis of socialism.

It is clear from the White Paper and the debate in the House that the government's aim is to preserve, capitalise and, if possible, increase steel production as the material basis of socialism.

The White Paper puts it in plain and pat: "In considering these factors, the Government, like the Corporation, recognised that BSC operates in a World Market: its prices will be determined by international prices. Attempts to change money would result in loss to market share... Government subsidies to offset poor performance are included in the budget... ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community) rules.

"Viability"

So that's it! All the arguments about 'viability' hinge on the all-pervading influence of the World Market which exists as long as capitalism exists. The price is to force the dictates of that capitalist World Market, or to accept them.

Arguments about the viability of single plants just don't come near the point.

We can at least thank the White Paper for making that clear. Perhaps now we will hear the truth about making plant on demonstrative and constructive advances in discussion, instead of the clan of alienated chains of office and the petitions of middlemen and MPs more concerned about the material interests of the local small business community than the general interests of working class people.

But by the same token a real challenge is thrown down to steel workers: this National Plan for steel demands a reply in the form of a National Steel Council set up by the NUT and BSC (with the emphasis on the action rather than just discussion). What is the general line of the Government's and BSC's attack on us? - "The concentration of bulk steelmaking at a few main sites will reduce total manpower and increase difficult problems..."

by Andrew Hornung

planes are to be closed down. There we have to say - not a single reduction in redundancy payments - so the Government accepts that we get no other work.

We must reject all talk of redundancy payments to "side over" until a new deal is done. While other jobs are there in North Wales, Colne and Washington, in the South Wales valleys and Hartlepool? We need nothing short of full pay, as against the struggles of steelworkers for wages up.

If the Government can provide the jobs to go with the pay, then we'll talk. If not, then we'll just take the money. BUT WE WILL NOT TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THERE NOT BEING WORK. WE WILL NOT BE THE SCAPEGOATS FOR THE BOSSEY'S SYSTEM.

So, fighting talk and blazing resolutions are not the slightest use unless we know how to act. Because the problems can not be solved, nationally, a National Steel Action Committee must be built.

This call has been put out consistently by the steelworkers' paper RE the NUS and RSN does not have the power on it. In many places workers are framing specific resolutions as our comrades round RSN, and the steelworkers action committee. It has put out a call for a national conference on APRIL 13th (not 30th, as wrongly stated in W.F.T.U) to set up such a committee. This call must be supported - the more so as since the unions will do nothing - they have already accepted the redundancies on their members' behalf!


CIVIL SERVANTS CHEER THE NEWS

Civil Servants held a rally, 3000 strong, on February 27th in Central Hall.

The audience was made up of pickets from most central London government departments and large contingents from Glasgow and Newcastle central offices. It was the culmination of a one-day national strike.

Back the sniping speeches of the top union officials, doubts of the success of London Airport were announced. It was greeted by spontaneous cheering of all people jumping up and down on their seats.

When a speech from the floor asked: "What about future action?" there was a rapturous response. "We don't let's destroy the unity we have forged this day."

What is needed in an alliance at both local and national levels. In the Council of Civil Servants, The Government's Phase 2. Unions to campaign for the CPSA for an all out national strike in the other unions against the other unions confronting the freeze. And if the other unions won't support, then it's up to the CPSA. Steve Wooding.

Civil Servants
DOCKS: For a 30 hour week OPEN THE REGISTER

15 March, ctd.

Since the end of the strike the police have been making intensive inquiries into the strikers who were involved. Many have been taken to police stations at various times and questioned, often for hours at a time. One classification statement made to one of our members by a guardian of the law was that his charge sheet would read the same as that of the Emy TWs, i.e. "Demanding money with menaces". This was because we collected money during the strike!

The TWs have also been charged with intimidation, some have also been charged with assault — a vague term which can mean anything a policeman wants it to be. These charges have been trumped up. Nothing of the men ever committed such offences.

No one was arrested or cautioned at the time of the so-called incidence. Why did the police take 5 months to bring charges? There are many of them looking foravenues of attack against the strikers, i.e., "Demanding money with menaces".

The TWs and the London Dockers' Committee had a meeting this week to consider the problem of the dockers and the strike. The meeting declared, in agreement with the Freeze and other mass meeting, that there would be only one tactic to try and divide the working class and make an attempt to cover up the real nature of the "offence".

The TWs and the London Dockers' Committee had a meeting this week to consider the problem of the dockers and the strike. The meeting declared, in agreement with the Freeze and other mass meeting, that there would be only one tactic to try and divide the working class and make an attempt to cover up the real nature of the "offence".

We are therefore calling on your support. We are calling for a nationwide stoppage on March 15th when the men appear in court, and for as long as may be possible to get to show themselves at Shrewsbury to demonstrate their solidarity. Should the charges not be dropped on this date, we ask you to prepare for further action.

The case will cost us money and we are in need of funds. Please call in all donations.
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DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS:

DOCKS: