

ZIMBABWE

WHO KEEPS SMITH IN POWER?



Mr Nkomo with boys at a ZAPU camp

AS THE SMITH regime in Zimbabwe totters to a close faced with a continuing guerrilla war and the crumbling 'internal settlement' the question must be asked why has his downfall taken so long?

It was 13 years ago when Smith declared UDI rather than concede majority rule to the countries' 3 million black people.

Yet it is only how we learn from the Bingham Report the fact that it was British Oil — from Shell and BP which was used in defiance of sanctions supposed to bring Smith to his knees 'in a matter of weeks rather than months' — to sustain the economy and morale of the white settler population.

It has also become clear from the revelations of Lord Thomson and the admissions of Harold Wilson, Labour Prime Minister during the crucial period of sanctions busting that this took place with the full knowledge of the leaders of the Labour Government. The Bingham disclosures show that by a series of transparent ruses the 'Rhodesian' economy was so effectively sustained by the sanctions busting that though oil consumption levels dropped in 1965 immediately after UDI they were soon back to their former level (by 1969) and later this was to increase to double the 1965 level. The excuses currently being given by the companies and Government figures involved in this cynical exercise revolve around the fact that the application of effective sanctions against the Smith regime would only have been possible if British companies suspended operations in South Africa or at least made severe cuts in oil supplies to South Africa so that no surplus could be sent on to 'Rhodesia'.

By GEOFF BENDER

As the report says 'either step would have been regarded as confrontation by the South African Government and neither step was called for by HMG, which at no time discouraged normal trade with South Africa'. Now this might be alright for the directors of British oil companies — but for Labour politicians, masquerading as socialists? It comes as no surprise to anyone that the South Africans were backing up Smith to the hilt, nor is there any rationale behind a policy of sanctions against the Smith regime while 'normal trade' continued with the apartheid state of South Africa. Such a position makes the whole issue of sanctions and the supposed Government opposition to the Smith regime seem nothing more than a public relations exercise to maintain Britain's standing with black Africa.

It is the military and political successes of the liberation movements, first in Angola and Mozambique and secondly in Zimbabwe itself which have finally brought Smith to his knees. The 'internal settlement' patched up with Chirau, Muzorewa and Sithole has failed in its attempt to bring the guerrilla war to a halt. Riven with internal rivalries it has left what power remains firmly in the hands of Smith who issues regular ultimatums to his African 'colleagues' threatening indefinite postponement of elections and martial law while the guerrilla struggle continues.

Callaghan set on confrontation

WHAT EVER THE REASONS why the announcement we were all waiting for didn't come, one thing is clear: Jim Callaghan and the Cabinet are going to do their level best to show the bosses that they are their best bet for holding down workers living standards.

This much became clear the week 60,000 Ford workers struck against their giant employers decision to rigidly apply the five per cent pay limit.

Following in the tradition of cash limits to hold down public sector wages and the pay blacklist of last year, Chancellor Healey, ever ready to be of service to big business, is threatening to scrap government orders for millions of pounds worth of Ford vehicles and end all grants. Once again doing the capitalists dirty work.

The social contract has been an unmitigated disaster. Far from restoring full employment, helping the low paid, pensioners and sick we have had the reverse. Dole queues are still growing. Job creation schemes have been a drop in the ocean.

Poverty has actually increased under the Labour government. The Low Pay Unit reveal that almost fifteen million people are living below or just above the poverty line. Unions like NUPE have been organising to secure the promised £60 minimum wage which is denied to these millions on low pay. The public spending cuts have hurt almost every area of social need. In the health service alone they have led to the closure of over 100 hospitals.

In state controlled or aided industries, the Labour leaders have been pushing through savage rationalisation schemes leading to thousands of

redundancies, most clearly seen in steel, ship-building and British Leyland. Here it is an almost weekly occurrence for Edwardes to announce more redundancies with the fulsome support of Industry Secretary Eric Varley.

To fight an election on the basis of these policies would be a disaster. Inside we explain why the failure of the Tribune parliamentary left to mount effective opposition to these pro-capitalist policies has contributed to the need to organise a united campaign within the Labour Party to ensure that in as many areas as possible the General Election — whenever it comes — is fought on the basis of socialist policies to keep out the Tories and against the record of the Callaghan government.

This is the aim of the Socialist Campaign for a Labour Victory. The *Chartist* wholeheartedly supports SCLV, and urges all Labour Party members and socialists who see the need to build a socialist opposition to Callaghan's Tory policies, to join the Campaign.

This October's conference has before it numerous resolutions which challenge the government on its policies of wage restraint, cuts, high unemployment, appeasement to racism and use of immigration laws, its attacks on the right to picket, attacks on women, its imperialist policies and opposition to the democratisation of the Labour Party itself. We urge all Labour Party members and supporters to examine and support these motions where they coincide with the policies of the SCLV and to actively join the work of the Campaign.

Smith himself has realised that there's no future in the 'internal settlement' unless he can split the Patriotic Front and bring a section of them into it, and get the backing of Britain and the US for his schemes. To this end he has conducted secret talks with the grossly opportunist Joshua Nkomo who is more than willing to stab in the back his comrade-in-arms Robert Mugabe, the man Smith really fears.

The internal settlement of March 3rd this year is now in ruins. Muzorewa and Sithole the internal settlement leaders, are no longer of much use to Smith. They have given him the cover of appearing to be in favour of majority rule while leaving him a free hand to continue to prosecute the war against the guerrillas and to carry out raids on guerrilla camps across the borders in Mozambique and Zambia. While the war continues he has been free also to delay any elections on the basis of universal suffrage. At no time have the black leaders involved in the internal settlement been capable of seriously effecting either the continuation of the guerrilla struggle or the decisions of the Salisbury Government. They have, in fact, dug their own political graves.

Despite the readiness of Nkomo to enter talks with Smith and his undoubted readiness to take power in Zimbabwe he is not a free agent. He needs the support militarily of at least some of the front-line states — and whilst he might possibly find support from Zambia's Kaunda and from far-off Nigeria, Tanzania's Nyerere and Machel in Mozambique are firmly behind the left wing of the Patriotic Front — the forces led by Robert Mugabe. Also in the event of a split in the Front Soviet aid would almost certainly go to Mugabe leaving Nkomo to seek American and British assistance. This is a real possibility since Owen and Young both seem to have decided that Nkomo is the man to back.

Smith's recent pronouncements about a return to British rule cannot be taken seriously since 'Rhodesia' — Zimbabwe has never been under British rule in the entire period of its existence. Set up as a private holding of the Rhodes empire the closest it ever came to this was as a part of the 'Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland' with the dissolution of this, the Salisbury regime chose UDI as an alternative to direct rule or majority rule.

Nevertheless there is a danger that there might well be attempts to get British, American and UN forces to police some new settlement rather than risk continuing a war which can only end in the victory of the Patriotic Front and the strengthening of Mugabe's position. The Labour movement must be alert to this possibility and oppose all intervention. The people of Zimbabwe must be allowed to decide their own future and Labour must implement its policies as decided at last year's Labour Party Conference of full support for the liberation movement.

to our readers

THIS month the staff and supporters of *Chartist* have been involved in a new venture: Socialist Organiser, expanded newspaper bulletin of the Socialist Campaign for a Labour Victory. Socialist Charter comrades will be selling Socialist Organiser over the next month. Hence this issue of *Chartist* is a reduced size and mainly devoted to Labour Party conference.

IRELAND — conference report whitewashes repression

IN THE WAKE of the *Daily Mirror* 'withdrawal' editorial and the varying responses (ranging from Tory Neave's and Labour Mason's 'bipartisan' shock to favourable 'public opinion') delegates to this year's Labour Party conference should be eager to debate the Party's policy on this matter. If so, they will probably be disappointed.

None of the resolutions mentions the possibility of British withdrawal and, as 'Northern Ireland' was actually discussed in 1976, they will probably be ruled out under the three-year rule.

However, Government policy in the six counties must not be ignored or the feeling be maintained that the 'troubles' should be left to Roy Mason to sort out.

For, despite escalating nationalist resistance to British rule, which is receiving growing support both in Britain and in the rest of the world, Mason's 'Labour Party Parliamentary Report' to this year's conference completely whitewashes the role of the direct rule administration.

A coordinated campaign to bring back 'stability' to the six counties is clearly broken down into a series of 'reasonable' and seemingly unconnected strategies.

'SECURITY'

For instance, the 'heart' of security policy is described as developing the 'strength and effectiveness of the Royal Ulster Constabulary until army support is no longer required' and increasing the 'effectiveness' of the Ulster Defence Regiment.

No mention is made of the growing role of SAS undercover operations or the fact that the RUC can only patrol Catholic areas when they are accompanied by the army!

Similarly the aim of 'fair and effective enforcement of the law and the conviction of terrorists in the courts thus eroding their capacity for violence whilst keeping them isolated from real support within the community; is an insult to the intelligence of LP members.

The treatment of suspects in Castlereagh 'interrogation' centre (highlighted by the Brian Maguire and Willie Gallagher cases) has brought unprecedented levels of

criticism from previously acquiescent sources even including police doctors and Diplock no-jury court barristers and solicitors. Mason's 'independent' Committee of Inquiry (headed by a Liverpool cop) should deceive no-one.

Once internment was defeated by mass Republican and socialist resistance the interrogation/confession/no-jury conviction system was explicitly brought in to have the same effects (80% of Diplock convictions are based solely on 'confessions'). And if this fails, 'internment by remand' remains — the average period on remand (in custody) is six months and many have been held for over a year.

DECEIVED

No-one should be deceived by the claimed 'isolation' of Republican and socialist activists. In addition to the increased levels of support for Provisional Sinn Fein demonstrations (their civil rights anniversary march on the weekend of August 27/28 which was denounced by both the Social Democratic and Labour Party and Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association attracted between 15,000 and 20,000 supporters) there is growing support from sections of the labour movement.

Both the Trade Union Campaign Against Repression and the Labour and Trade Union Coordinating Group organised strikes, petitions and demonstrations for the release of Willy Gallagher, TUCAR and the Sinn Fein-led Relatives Action Committee held a joint demonstration of over 5,000 after Brian Maguire's 'suicide' and, on the 12th of September, 300 Belfast dockers struck for the release of one of their fellow trade unionists held under the PTA.

Three times in the past year the editorial board of *Republican News* and leading Sinn Fein activists have been seized in dawn raids. Republican News has been illegally forced to go underground — yet such is the grass-roots support that it is still as well-produced and widely read as before.

Nowhere is the report more sinister than in the section on 'strengthening the protection of human rights'. Amnesty International's report on torture in Castlereagh gets a brief mention (the world-wide outcry may have something to do with that) but nowhere is the possibility of actually prosecuting the 'offending' interrogators (some of whom's names have been published).

Curiously, not a word is written about over 300 men and women prisoners currently campaigning for their right to political status. Many of the men in H-Block, currently languishing in the worst prison conditions in the world, are engaged in taking Britain once against to the European Court of Human Rights.

SWEETENERS

The sweeteners in this pill of repression are left to the 'political' and 'economic and social' sections.

A return to 'devolved government' (Stormont) is promised if only the 'recognised parties' agree to 'partnership and participation'. But, such is Loyalist intransigence and Labour's compromise that even the 'power-sharing' concept has been shelved.

However, this does not worry the direct rule administration who note their 'high degree of acceptability to the population at large'.

Unfortunately this attitude has gained an echo in the Labour Party ranks with resolutions to conference advocating LP organisation in the North. Any support given to such a policy by the British labour movement will further isolate it from the majority of people in Ireland and Irish people in Britain who, as we noted in last month's *Chartist*, are busily campaigning against a Labour vote in the general election precisely because of the LP's betrayal of the cause of Irish unity. Such a 'solution' would condemn 800 years of struggle against British rule in Ireland.

Supporters of such a policy persistently argue however that Britain can solve the economic and

by P. Chalk, Haringey UTOM

social problems of Northern Ireland society and this is reflected in the report. Casually admitting that 'the province still has the highest unemployment rate of any UK region' it goes on to explain how the government is 'safeguarding' existing jobs (12,500 people are supported in training, 31,000 jobs are subsidised and 2,000 young people are currently placed in government schemes).

Thus, massive amounts of public spending is required to keep these 50,000 people 'employed'. Set against this is the phenomenal achievement of tax incentives, cheap electricity and grant aid in attracting multinationals like General Motors, whose £16 million investment will employ 600!

The artificial nature of the six county statelet and its relationship to the South and to Britain was analysed in the April edition of *Chartist*. But the underwriting of the Northern Ireland economy can only be understood in the context of the broad strategy of Britain in Ireland.

SUCCINCT

A recent academic book by a Colonel Eveleigh called *Peace-keeping in a Democratic Society* and based on his service in the six counties provides a much more succinct explanation of overall British strategy:

'... to counter terrorism successfully, the government must conduct a coordinated campaign bringing into harmony its economic, political, social, legal, military, police and public relations efforts against terrorism and insurrection so that each reinforces the others.'

Would these efforts be necessary if the government was fighting a 'mere handful of common criminals' as Mason would have us believe? No, Labour's strategy of 'repression with a human face' must be seen in the light of this complex military-social-political attempt to put down a risen people.

DO YOU REMEMBER 1974 and the press campaign against the alleged Marxists in the Parliamentary Labour Party? Fleet Street frothing at the mouth about Commisar Benn and how the Tribune MPs were intent on turning Britain into an East European-style state through the National Enterprise Board.

You may have thought, as we did, that these reports were somewhat exaggerated at the time. Nevertheless, the presence of some 80 Tribune supporters in the Parliamentary Labour Party did give rise to certain hopes amongst the left of the Labour Party that 'this time things would be different'.

The record of the present Labour Government has crushingly destroyed these illusions. But what of those 80 Tribunes? Have they provided a clear coherent alternative to Callaghan and Healey's wage-cutting and unemployment policies? Have they provided a firm pole around which opposition to the Labour leadership could rally?

Unfortunately, the answer to both questions is in the negative. Look at the record. Michael Foot, deputy leader of the Labour Party, who has been a central figure in defending the government's record—first as Employment Secretary, presiding over the lengthening dole queues (real ones, not the Saatchi and Saatchi kind) remains a leading figure who will once again be wheeled out for the Tribune meeting at this year's Labour conference.

voting record

Tribunes occupy several junior ministries—Albert Booth, Employment, Stan Orme, Social Services, John Fraser, Prices are just some of the seventeen Tribunes who have held Government positions.

A recent *New Statesman* article posed the question: does the Tribune Group really exist? The analysis of the voting record of the Tribune Group which the article provides indicates that the question is a serious one.

Between October 1974 and July 1977 Tribune members on average voted with the Group only 49% of the time. On whipped votes the figure falls to 43%. On the few occasions of much heralded 'rebellion' only 1% of the Group voted for all Tribune revolts and 6 per cent of the Group did not vote for even one of these 'revolts'.

Outside Parliament the record of the majority of Tribunes has been even worse than their muted revolts in the chambers of the House of Commons. During the Common Market refer-

THIS YEARS LABOUR Party parliamentary report on foreign policy reads like a treatise on how to suppress democratic rights and wage war without actually appearing to be involved.

The breast beating on defence of human rights and freedoms against the 'Soviet threat' is wearing extremely thin now that Britain has been indicted by Amnesty International and the European Commission on Human Rights for torture and brutality in Northern Ireland.

The lay persons simple guide to world politics can be characterised as 'superpower' conflicts, defence of the 'free world' against 'soviet expansionism'. The hysteria has worn off since the Cold War fifties, but guiding all the West's 'shuttle diplomacy' and summit conferences, most recently at Camp David, is still the policy of stemming the Soviet or communist menace. For our reformist Labour leaders, spearheaded by Foreign Secretary David Owen, this remains the dominant concern.

Increasingly this kind of thinking is leading the Labour Government to line up with some of the most reactionary dictatorships in the world. Anti-Sovietism dictates the NATO military alliance on which Britain depends millions. It dictates alliances with the United States, Iran, Pakistan and all the spheres of influence where the US rules. British made Hawker Harriers strafed the Monada Palace drowning in blood the democratically elected Allende regime five years ago this September.

Britain is South Africa's biggest trading partner and exports about £2 billion worth of goods every day in exchange for S.A. exports which for the first time this year exceed British exports.

The Bingham Report has revealed both the Wilson and Callaghan governments (and the Tories) had all been aware of BP sanctions busting

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE SOVIET THREAT

By MIKE DAVIS

to Ian Smith's racist police state and even now through the swap arrangements with the French oil company Total, oil is still getting through to Rhodesia.

British arms and equipment have been used by the Shah of Iran in his bloody murder of hundreds of opponents to his dictatorship. British tanks and weaponry find their way to Saudi Arabia to bolster the reactionary feudal regime there. British troops still service the Sultan of Oman in his suppression of freedom fighters.

The Labour Parliamentary report polishes its human rights spurs over the policy of isolationism of the Latin American dictatorships, but even this wears pretty thin when it is known that Britain works in close alliance with the secret American forces that led to the 'destabilisation' of the radical regimes in Chile, Bolivia and elsewhere.

Of course, it is easier also to cry wolf over reactionary regimes when they are thousands of miles away but when 'we need their oil' or the regimes are part of the old colonial world...well that's different.

It is paradoxical that the 'Soviet threat' theory holds little water nowadays. Firstly, ever since the late 1920s the Stalinist bureaucracy that has ruled in the Soviet Union has little concern in promoting world revolution. It's

main aim has been to preserve the status quo or peaceful co-existence with capitalism. There was no Soviet help for the Allende regime, when it most needed it. And in Portugal, in 1975, its aid to revolutionary forces was less than conspicuous. Vietnam received only extremely limited military aid as do the Palestinians and other national liberation movements. Usually the aid is just sufficient to maintain credibility.

The presence of Cuban forces in Africa supporting anti-imperialist regimes is to be critically welcomed but the Labour leaders have had ample time to provide similar sorts of aid and equipment to liberation movements, particularly in Zimbabwe.

The second weakness of the theory can be seen in the fact that over the years since Britain has been forced to divest its colonial rule, it has lost privileged markets not to the Soviet Union but to the United States. Yet the 'US threat' is a non-existent concept.

US soldiery and military hardware are deployed around the world far more extensively than the Soviet Union. In fact the US were there when the dictatorships took over in South Vietnam, Korea, South America, Central America, Greece, until a few years ago, Iran and numerous other regimes.

The concept of the 'Soviet threat' exclusively reserved for the Soviet

Union and not China, whom Thatcher can court, maintains an enormous defence industry. This in turn creates an enormous surplus. A couple of weeks ago, John Gilbert, Minister of State at the Ministry of Defence responsible for arms sales toured such well-known outposts of the 'free world' as the Philippines, [thousands of political prisoners illegal trade unions] and South Korea. Both are single party states with dictatorial regimes. Gilbert's mission was to sell sophisticated weapons to expand on existing export successes to Iran and elsewhere.

What this illustrates is our Labour leaders bogus concern for human rights. It is all very well condemning the brutal treatment of dissidents in the Soviet Union with one hand whilst with the other every kind of military and material support is going to regimes who practice equally barbarous repression without even the social and economic conquests of a workers' revolution, as a progressive feature.

But what really takes the biscuit for hypocrisy is the sanctimonious bleating of our Labour leaders when it comes to other countries practising repression...selective criticism, of course...is when that repression is practiced in our own backyard, so to speak, in Northern Ireland. When half the world was coloured red, the democratic rights of the oppressing nation were never extended to the subject peoples. This is still the case.

But until Labour Party members and socialists everywhere can ram this point home and call a halt to such policies, all the Labour leaders talk of socialism and human rights will be nothing but the most dangerous kind of neo-imperialist smokescreen. Unfortunately, resolutions on internationalism to this year's party conference, or lack of them, indicate how far we have to go!

Gossip

WHERE DID THIS PL

Labour believes that the pro more open to the public. We replace the Official Secret the burden on the public holding information.

(answers on a postcard to Transpo



The three accused (left to right) Crispin Aubrey and John Birt

Whatever happened to the

Tribune Group?

endum campaign many were found on the platforms of the 'get Britain Out Campaign' alongside the most rabid 'Little England' Tories.

The Tribune Group has consistently fudged the issues of inflation and the social contract by talk of making 'the government keep its side of the bargain', as though wage restraint under capitalism could ever advance working class interests. On inflation they have argued that wage increases are not the only cause of inflation completely failing to challenge head-on the Government offensive of 1975/76 on this point.

At no time have they attempted to organise at a constituency level nor in the trade unions. As the old one-time left leaders—Jones and Scanlon and their like lined-up behind the government in defence of the Social Contract and voluntary wage restraint—so the Tribune MPs once again found themselves stranded without any real power in the broad labour movement. The result: unseemly scenes when Jack Jones single-handedly stormed the platform at the Tribune meeting at 1976 Labour Party Conference as Ian Mikardo spoke—and a general lack of direction in the Tribune Group.

A properly organised base could have helped provide that direction. But time and time again they have failed to give direction and political leadership to the struggles of the working class over the last few years.

Whilst individual members of the Group have been prepared to stick their necks out—Wise, Skinner, Flannery all backed the Grunwick mass pickets, Joan Maynard and Litterick and Colqhoun have been prepared to take up the question of Ireland, Arthur Latham has questioned the role of the police in the East End and so on. But these were essentially individual stands which were in no way backed up by the Group as a whole. For instance, what pressure was brought to bear on the Tribune Group for Albert Booth to use his position as Employment Minister on behalf of the Grunwick strikers?

One Tribune described 'being a Tribune as more a state of mind than a state of membership'—if this is the case it is without doubt an extremely confused and contradictory—the unkind would say schizophrenic—state of mind.



Peter Hain speaks at Labour Party conference Tribune meeting.

Photo: G.M. COOKSON (Socialist Challenge)

Central to the would-be unity of the Tribune Group is the Alternative Economic Strategy—unfortunately there are as many versions of this as there are Tribune MPs. Particularly on the question of import controls there are strong disagreements as well as on a series of other issues included in the AES. On other issues the Tribune Group is even more deeply divided. On the Middle East, Zionists like Heffer co-exist with anti-Zionists. On Ireland Tribune Stan Orme held a junior ministerial position under Rees before tough man Mason was called in. Thus while Joan Maynard was campaigning for troop withdrawal, fellow Tribune Stan Orme was supervising the continued military occupation of the North of Ireland.

Similarly on abortion whilst various Tribune women fought on the Select Committee against James White and William Benyon's Bills, virulent anti-abortionists such

as Kevin McNamara are allowed membership of the Tribune Group. Tribune Eddie Loyden voted for the second reading of the White Bill and Tribune Lena Jegar opposed the demand for Labour MPs to be bound by Party policy on the issue.

Even on the elementary question of reselection there is no consensus in the Tribune Group.

Why is it that when there are militants in the constituencies and in the trade unions willing to fight across a whole range of issues should the Parliamentary reflection be such a pale shadow that it is indeed scarcely visible? Even when the TUC has come out against wage restraint and the 5 per cent limit, only seven Tribune MPs managed to abstain in parliament on the issue. Why does the 'official Labour left'—the Tribunes—fade so easily into the right why are their policies co-opted or defeated so easily?

The answers to all these questions are to be found in the fact that even the most advanced programme that the Tribunes can produce does not go beyond the bounds of a series of reforms within the accepted framework of parliamentary politics and the capitalist mixed economy. The best of the Tribune comrades may rage about the devastating effects of the system and of the betrayals of the current Labour leadership with a genuine moral fervour but alas they have no alternative.

In fact, much of the Tribune programme was included in Labour's Programme for Britain 1973, and updated for Labour's Programme 1976. But whatever happened to the National Enterprise Board which was going to transform British industry? What happened to planning agreements?

Who now remembers the workers'

co-op experiments set up in 1974 when Benn was Industry Minister. Even the policy of bank nationalisation which was the great victory scored by the left at the 1976 Conference has been translated by the government into an extension of National Giro. The aspect of the Tribune policies which has not been taken up by the government—the call for reflation—has been discredited by the 'success' of Healey in bringing down inflation, not by wage restraint, but by semi-monetarist policies of credit squeeze and so forth.

Tied to parliamentary methods, the Tribunes simply do not see a role for extra-parliamentary organisation that is at all important. Whilst Tribune MPs were, for example, involved in launching the Anti Nazi League it can scarcely be said that they have played a substantial role in actively building it. The credibility of many Tribunes on the question of opposition to racism fascism whatever their public avowals cannot have benefitted from the shameful Select Committee Report signed by Tribune MPs Sydney Bidwell and William Wilson. Nor could the pronouncements of Maureen Colquhoun concerning Enoch Powell have helped. And what is there to stop some Tribune MPs putting down a motion for the repeal of the 1968 and 1971 immigration laws?

The narrowness and insularity of the Tribunes—their commitment to the rule of law, to unity at the expense of politics, towards gradualism not as a tactic but as a way of life fails to enthuse or inspire the movement with a commitment to fight, to struggle.

This year again, hundreds will flock to their 'Brains Trust' and their rally at Blackpool. Like last year, Michael Foot will tell us all the fine things which he would like to do, and like last year lament over the lack of a majority. Benn will tell us once again about the need for changing structures not just individuals. Neil Kinnock will do his usual comic routine over the collection speech. This year however, two figures are missing from the rally platform from last year's conference. One is Ms Jayaben Desai of the Grunwick strike committee, whose strike was betrayed by the inactivity of the leadership of the labour movement and the TUC and the second, last year's new boy, booed by the rally, Peter Hain who has played a role in building the ANL.

stops ABC trial

EDGE COME FROM?
ess of government should be shall:
ts Act by a measure to put
authorities to justify with-

t House, Smith Square, SW1.)



ight): Duncan Campbell,
when their trial began

THE MORE voluble elements in Britain's ruling class are still gnashing their teeth at the way in which London Weekend Television put the boot into the oh-so dignified proceedings meant to 'fit-up' three citizens in the Old Bailey Secrets Trial.

After 19 months on remand on charges under Section 1 and Section 2 of the Official Secrets Act of 1911, John Berry, a former Intelligence Corps corporal and journalists, Crispin Aubrey and Duncan Campbell, finally came to be stitched up at the Old Bailey.

Much to the annoyance of the ruling class and the Labour government's Attorney General Sam

Silkin, the Russell Harty programme disclosed that three of the jurors in the case had signed the Official Secrets Act and that one of them was a former SAS soldier—a regiment not exactly in love with the activities of anyone to the Left of Rhodes Boyson or Martin Webster.

REFUSED

The judge had been keeping this a secret from the jury after he had refused to substitute another juror for the offensive member of a regiment specialising in assassination, black propaganda and general dirty tricks.

The noble Mr Justice Willis—who had spent much of the ten days of the trial in battle with the defence over the way it was actually defending the three—ordered a new kick-off for the trial and fumed

by JIM BARROW

about "gratuitous journalistic gossip."

The 'fitting-up' of the three would be farcical if it wasn't for the hair-raising sentences involved and the general strategy which appears to be emerging from the state.

Since the three were grabbed by the police the case has glaringly illustrated the extent to which the state is prepared to go to cover up some of its functions—even those which are quite well known about. The prosecution was dredged up when the three were involved in writing material about electronic intelligence gathering.

PUBLISHED

Practically all the material they have been charged with possessing has already been published by the state itself or is quite freely available if you can bring yourself to go through a number of technical publications.

Farce number one came at the committal proceedings in the magistrates court. *The Leveller* magazine was disgusting enough to name an anonymous intelligence colonel as Colonel H.A. Johnstone.

Peace News and the National Union of Journalists magazine *The Journalist* were dragged before Lord Widgery for similar dastardly acts. *The Leveller* and *Peace News* were fined £500 each and the NUJ £200.

Amidst all their vigilance to pro-

tect national security the state forgot to feel the collar of the editors of the regimental magazine and the subversive compilers of the Official Army List (freely available in any public library) who say precisely what Colonel Johnstone is.

After ten days of embarrassment for the state—trying to explain why material they publish and distribute to the public themselves can suddenly become a secret—London Weekend put a spanner in the works.

PLOUGHING

The judge and legal eagles were all set for two to three months of ploughing through this material so the inconvenience of a new trial might have been a bit annoying.

One comfort was the way in which access to the court was to be restricted to journalists who had been approved of enough by the Metropolitan Police to carry the police press card.

The National Union of Journalists' press card is recognised by all Chief Contables but the police and the clerk of the court weren't all that bothered—after all it was a matter of national security.

One lesson to be learned from the case is the tremendous hold that the phantom of "national security" can have over the leaders—and rank and file—of the Labour movement, even when fellow trade unionists are at risk.

When David Basnett squashed the National Union of Journalists' attempts to have the threat to its members discussed at the Trade Union Congress he was exposing an achilles heel of the movement.

MILITANTS

Militants as well as bureaucrats are often mesmerised by the blanket

of secrecy the state draws around its dirtier—and sometimes just ridiculously boring work.

Robert Moss—Thatcher's right-hand ideological hit man—summed it up in a recent article discussing the work of the CIA (and published in the *Daily Telegraph*).

He wrote: "Intelligence services are in the front line, not only of the cold war that the Soviet Union is waging unremittingly against the West, but of what the West Germans call the cold revolution—the assault by organised subversion on our liberal societies... We are fortunate that in Britain this is generally understood by responsible politicians of all parties, and by the community at large."

His assessment has been borne out by the muffled response of the Labour movement to the attack represented by the ABC trial. Labour Party and movement activists need not only take up the defence of the three and demand the dropping of the charges.

REPEAL

What is also needed is the repeal of all legislation, Official Secrets Acts, those protecting 'business secrets' etc which mask the workings of capitalism in contemporary Britain from the eyes of the working class—usually with the connivance of a tame press.

Under the cover of "national security" the state apparatus is being massively strengthened—not against the "Soviet threat"—but against radical dissent within Britain from all quarters. The exposure of these developments is a task the Labour movement has failed to take up in any serious way and time is getting short.

CAMP DAVID



CAN TALKS

BRING MID-EAST PEACE?

AT CAMP DAVID, President Carter went further in negotiating a peace settlement in the Middle East than any other previous mediator. Yet it is widely recognised that the chances of peace in the Middle East are negligible if not nil.

Sadat of Egypt and Begin of Israel have virtually agreed to a separate peace. They are committed to drawing up a Treaty within the next three months. Israel has already agreed to pull out of the Sinai, abandoning the settlements, and let the Egyptians have their air bases there. The United States will pay for replacement air bases elsewhere. They hope that trading relations that are usual between neighbouring countries will follow. Unfortunately for the 'peacemakers' the war is not only between Israel and Egypt. In fact, relations between the two countries have not been all that hostile since the 1973 war. Sinai was always the least important of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967. Its main value was that it put several hundred miles of Israeli held desert between Tel Aviv and Egyptian air bases.

The pact has been rejected by the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) and most of the other Arab states. The PLO are not impressed by the Israeli promise to withdraw military government from the West Bank and Gaza as soon as a civilian government

By BERNARD MISRAHI

is elected, nor in their willingness to grant autonomy to these areas within five years.

The Zionists, the Jordanians, and Palestinians from these areas will negotiate the terms of this 'autonomy'. The Zionists have always found compliant Arab always found compliant Arabs to put onto committees, and Hussein is an old enemy of the Palestinians. His grandfather, Abdullah, took over the West Bank in the 1948 War. In 1970, Hussein defeated the PLO in a Civil War. We wonder what kind of autonomy Begin and Hussein will agree to.

Begin has made some concessions. He is prepared to alienate what were once his most fervent supporters in the Gush Ezuzim movement who see it as their duty to recapture all territory allegedly lost by the Jews since King Solomon.

It is conceivable, though highly unlikely, that Israel will withdraw from Gaza and the West Bank under very stringent conditions as to the nature of an 'autonomous' West Bank and Gaza together with sufficient pressures and guarantees from the USA. Israel could be forced to stop expanding. Though this will not rule out the occasional invasion of Lebanon. The Zionists will give up everything

WHAT IS THE ANL doing? After the appalling spectacle of Sunday 24th September, when the National Front marched virtually unchallenged through London's East End, serious anti-fascists are asking, what is the future for the Anti Nazi League? An estimated 60,000 ANL supporters marched away from Hyde Park in the opposite direction to the National Front march when a quarter of that number could have stopped the fascists marching. But for the determined band of around 2000 anti-fascists who occupied the area around Brick Lane—scene of so much NF harassment of Asians—the fascists could well have been all-

owed to rally right in the centre of this area.

But now must come the autopsy. Why were the NF not stopped on a day when more anti-fascists were mobilised than at any time since Cable Street in the 1930s?

The excuses from ANL leaders are threefold. First, we had too short notice of the NF's plans. This is not so. The intentions of the fascists were known at least a week in advance and highly organised plans to counter the NF could have been made, as the Hackney and Tower Hamlets Defence Committee had been demanding.

Secondly, we are told that the best answer to fascists would be a united, mass and successful ANL Carnival in Brockwell Park. The fascists only called their demo to wreck the Carnival. This argument has about it the ring of farce. What is the purpose of the ANL if not to stop the Nazis. Is the message on all the badges simply an outward show of inner liberalism? The Carnival was in no danger of being wrecked. Thousands would turn up with children, whatever. But the question is why did not the leadership of the ANL, including the Socialist Workers Party and the Communist Party, make a call from Hyde Park for at least 10,000 of those assembled to go either on transport that could have been laid on, or by a march across to Brick Lane? It would easily have been possible. But it is clear the ANL leaders had other plans. Carnivals against the Nazis are to be a substitute for the real thing, actually trying to deny the fascists a platform.

Paul Holborow, leading SWP member and founder member of the ANL told the *Guardian*, 'the main reason the SWP got involved in the League is that the problem of the National Front and racism can only be defeated by having a large

involvement of people...we have emphasised actions rather than committee meetings.' Now if this means anything at all, it surely means the physical and political mobilisation of anti-fascists in action against the NF.

The third excuse was along the lines of: until we have got the labour movement behind us we cannot stop the Nazis. Meanwhile, of course, you simply confine your anti-fascism to a form of words. But it is only by building on the physical actions of small groups of anti-fascists, in practice, that you develop an even bigger force. That bigger force was there on Sunday 24th in Hyde Park but was to be led by the Pied Pipers, Hain, Holborow and co to the music of the Carnival before and in opposition to any ANL-led counter-demonstration.

As the leaflet handed out at Hyde Park by *Chartist* and *Workers Action* supporters pointed out: 'the NF get away with their march today, they will grow stronger. And the Carnival will look pretty sick!' But for the 2000 anti-fascists who did gather at Brick Lane, heavily outnumbered by police replete with riot shields, helicopters and mounted police, the NF could well have had a field day in Brick Lane itself.

What are the lessons from this experience, which shows that the ANL leaders have still not changed course since they refused to mobilise against the NF march on May Day? Clearly, unless the ANL translates the enormous following it now possesses into political action against the fascists to deny them any platform, then it will increasingly be on the wane as a serious anti fascist force. Since losing the support of the Young Tories and the Jewish Board of Deputies, the ANL faced a choice: either direct the latent anti-NF feeling into a political force to challenge the NF wherever and whenever they show their faces or sink into a farcical routine of fun carnivals (not to be sneezed at in their context), gimmicks and passive protest. Supporters of the *Chartist* and the Socialist Campaign for a Labour Victory will endeavour to make it the former.

Barnsley Oct. 7th MASON DEMO

THE UNITED TROOPS Out Movement is in solidarity with Ireland's struggle for national independence. Our aim is to build a mass movement in Britain in support of the right of the Irish nation to self determination by demanding the immediate withdrawal of the British army from Ireland.

For years the solidarity movement in Britain had been weakened by sectarianism and division. The UTOM brought together those forces which sought to redress this sorry state of affairs and believed that unity was possible.

As a national organisation, with some 30 branches all free to work in the way that best suits their particular set of circumstances the UTOM has a structure, mode of operation and agreed programme of work that has made such a unity possible. At this point in time we find ourselves in a fast growing extremely active organisation with very high morale.

Morale in Ireland is also high. There is no sense of a defeated people. On the contrary, popular resistance to the British presence even after years of repression, is being strongly expressed. In the six counties the campaign for prisoner-of-war status has brought tens of thousands on the streets demanding 'Brits out'.

While in the 26-Counties public opinion polls have shown that a majority also want to see Britain go. We in the UTOM have also been active on the issue of POW status Blanket protests, pickets and a speaking tour by representatives of the Relatives Action Committee have been organised.

The UTOM supports the International Tribunal on Britain's Presence in Ireland and urge Labour Party members to use the *Hackney North and Stoke Newington* resolution to this years conference to raise the question of Ireland.

The Labour Government's record is if anything worse than the Tories. It was they who decreed that the political opposition in the Six Counties should be relegated to the status of 'criminals'.

Published by CHARTIST PUBLICATIONS, 60 Loughborough Rd., London, SW9 Printed by ANYWAY LITHO Ltd., 252 Brixton Rd., SW1 (tu all depts).

JOHN LLOYD explains the aims of the United Troops Out Movement.

Roy Mason was given the job of putting the 'opposition' out of action. He initiated a ruthless and barbaric campaign. Summary executions of suspects is permitted while hundreds have been gaoled on the basis of 'voluntary confessions' extracted under torture.

The fact that Mason is from a working class background, represents the working class constituency of Barnsley, that he is sponsored by the Yorkshire NUM reflects badly on the labour movement. The fact that Joan Maynard, MP as a critic of the policies Mason so enthusiastically pursues is being attacked by elements within the labour movement for her criticism is an even worse reflection.

This situation in the labour movement we shall be confronting during the next general election campaign. We want to see the right weakened. This does not only mean we want to see the Tories defeated, we also want to see Mason Exposed.

With this in mind we are calling upon you to support our demonstration in Barnsley on October 7th. Join us and show your opposition to Mason and all he stands for in the labour movement. For all information about our activities, literature etc: UTOM, 182 Upper Street, London N1.

ASSEMBLE:

Saturday October 7th, 1978, 1pm. Barnsley, South Yorkshire.

Subscribe!

12 copies Only £2.00 from: CHARTIST PUBLICATIONS (address below)

Name Address



A15 Humber Bridge

HULL DIARY

Parliamentary privilege

LABOUR WEEKLY has been running a campaign against privilege in education. By totting up local authority fees, tax and rate relief, forces and diplomatic placements, they worked out that over £100m (perhaps £200m) a year was channeled into public schools. They concluded, and this was strong stuff for *Labour Weekly*:

"It is ironic that a Labour Government should do so much to keep the public school system going... is it fair that working people, who are already stretched to the limit... should also have to pay indirectly - for the cost of sending young Willie to Eton?"

The point of *Labour Weekly* was hardly dry when it became known that Kevin McNamara, Labour MP for Central Hull, had decided to send one of his sons to a top rank public school called Ampleforth College. Further that Humberide County Council had received an application for money for this purpose.

Naturally enough, Tory news-

papers such as the *Daily Telegraph* shouted "socialist hypocrisy". Labour supporters were uncomfortable.

They had no wish to visit the sins of the father onto the kids. They knew that every parent wants their progeny to do well.

But surely Kevin McNamara, whose forceful campaign had embarrassed the Sir Leo Schultz establishment in the town and won him considerable and justified sympathy, had an explanation?

We were told that Ampleforth College wasn't really a public school, but "an extension of the state system." We were told that musical talent had won a scholarship for special teaching which would be unavailable at an ordinary school. We were told that he specified a Catholic education which ruled out the musical specialists in the state sector.

Hull Diary maintains that Ampleforth College is not only a fully fledged public school, it is indeed the "Catholic Eton". That Ample-



KEVIN MCNAMARA, MP

forth College has a good music department (what snob school hasn't?) but is not noted for this ahead of the pack. That, to be blunt, musical talents and religious beliefs are catered for in the state system.

Kevin McNamara is loosely associated with the Tribune group. A recent breakdown of parliamentary voting patterns in the *New Statesman* showed just how loose such an association can be.

But sending "Willie to Eton", even if it is the Catholic Eton, could only be justified by an MP who was not seriously committed to ending privilege in education.

McNamara has presented a wilful hostage to the Tory fortunes that the Hull people he represents have repeatedly and massively buried. We get a poor return on our loyalty. Send your contributions to *Hull Diary* c/o 38 Grafton Street, Hull.