



UNITE TO FIGHT PHASE 3



Statement on Arab-Israeli War

Statement by the Israeli Revolutionary Action Committee Abroad and the Israel-Palestine Socialist Action Group.

The present hostilities in the Middle East are not accidental. They flow from the long-standing conflict between two sides — on the one hand political Zionism aiming to establish a mono-national Jewish state in Palestine (an objective realised in alliance with imperialism), and on the other hand, the indigenous Palestinian Arab people. The present war, like the previous wars between Israel and the Arab States, is only an extension of that fundamental conflict.

Whatever the circumstances surrounding the opening of hostilities, the basic responsibility for the war lies with the leaders of the Zionist State, who have pursued throughout the conflict, and in particular since June 1967, a policy of territorial conquest and annexation, involving large-scale eviction and dispossession of the Palestinian Arabs. It should be recalled that the present fighting is taking place over territories seized by Israel in 1967.

On the opening side, this war is being fought by the Egyptian and Syrian regimes in order to regain lost territory and prestige, and to salvage their tottering

authority at home. In no way can they be said to represent the Palestinian Arab masses, the chief victims of Zionism, Sadat, the torturer of striking Egyptian workers and students, and Assad, who only a few weeks ago closed down the Palestinian radio station, are in no way entitled to speak for the Palestinian people.

All the evidence suggests that these regimes, which already demonstrated their bankruptcy once in 1967, are aiming only at creating the conditions for a diplomatic settlement under the auspices of imperialism — a settlement which can be achieved only at the expense of the Palestinians' interests.

Whilst by no means placing the Arab regimes and Zionist Israel on the same level, we hold that only a thorough-going social revolution, which will overthrow both Zionism and the Arab regimes, can solve the problems of the Arab East, including the Palestinian problem.

We, Jews and Arabs from Israel and Europe, declare our solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian people against Israeli occupation, and with those Israeli socialists who refuse to take up arms for Zionism and are now being persecuted for their courageous stand.

In opposition to chauvinism, expansionism and racism, we uphold the principles of internationalism and revolutionary socialism.

INSIDE

Suppressed

Times' Story on Army Tapping in Belfast - p.3

First Report from Chilean Left since the Coup p.4-5

A spectre is haunting the Tory Government — the spectre of the Industrial Relations Court. Like a scene from a Punch-and-Judy show, Heath's smiling face, fresh from propounding the 'generosity' of the Tories' new Phase 3 plans, has been pushed aside by the sombre visage of NIRC judge Sir John Donaldson, who proceeds to club the 'non-co-operating' skull of the AUEW with a £100,000 fine.

This sudden resurfacing of the long-forgotten NIRC has come as a timely reminder of the real purpose of all Tory policy. If we look under the flowery words and legal jargon in which Phase 3 has been dressed up by the Tories and the capitalist press, we find the same nasty reality that the NIRC represents: both are part-and-parcel of the Tories' drive to attack the trade union movement and force the working class to bear the burden of the crisis which capitalism has created in this country.

By CHRIS BALFOUR

No one who has gone through the various struggles against the Tory Government over the past three years would have expected anything other than what Phase 3 really offers — more of the same. Few who have had to live in the grip of the tightening vice created by the Tory pay laws on the one hand and spiralling prices on the other will doubt the need to smash these new pay restrictions

However there are certain quarters of the workers' movement where such facts are slow to sink in. Engineer's President Hugh Scanlon has responded to the Tories' slap in the face by offering to rejoin the talks between the TUC and the Government. Such a move would be a double treachery: it would be in direct violation of the express decision of the AUEW Conference, and it would be a crucial factor in injecting life into talks which otherwise would remain pretty meaningless.

The TUC-Government talks simply serve as a diversion from the preparation of the struggle which must be launched if working class interests are to be defended. A vigorous campaign must be mounted within the AUEW to prevent Scanlon trampling on the Conference's decisions. Throughout the trade unions the demand must be raised that the bureaucrats stop the talks and start to prepare for a showdown with the Tory Government.

These bureaucrats will try to squirm off the hook by arguing that the Tory Government cannot be defeated and that some sort of deal must be made or by claiming that the only hope is to start preparing for the next election in order to return a Labour Government.

Such arguments are false: the united power of the working class movement can defeat the Tories — the Pentonville 5 and the miners' strike proved that beyond doubt. To tell the working class that they are powerless and must suffer another 18 months of spiralling prices, frozen

pay, and disintegrating social services is to peddle a lie and sow massive demoralisation. It is the best way to ensure that the Tories win the next election.

The only way forward is to unite the struggles of all those millions of workers who have grievances against the Tory Government and its pay policy. The leadership for this must come from rank-and-file militants. Rank-and-file bodies must be set up in every area to prepare the fight: to organise against the talks, coordinate workers going into struggle, organise the broadest possible solidarity with such workers, take steps for the defence of pickets. The formula for victory which every trade unionist must work to translate into practice is: build the broadest possible *unity in action*.

For example, militants in the engineering and mining industries should start work immediately to build a national, joint strike of the AUEW and the NUM as soon as the new year begins. Joint AUEW-NUM branch meetings, and meetings of stewards' and pit representatives' delegates on a local, regional and national level should be convened to plan the struggle. Other militants could start immediately to make practical preparations for the offensive: plan solidarity strikes and demonstrations, transport and accommodation for flying pickets, propaganda and actions to win support among other groups who suffer from Tory policies.

A massive strike movement against Phase 3 could win the organised solidarity of the whole working class and would encourage millions of other workers to bring forward their claims against the bosses and against the Tories. It would rapidly turn into a *general strike* which could bring down the Tory Government and win a massive victory for the working class.

The aim of all trade union militants at this time must be to unify and generalise all the partial struggles of the working class into a general strike to bring down the Tory Government. That is the only way forward for the workers' movement.

SEE p.4 FOR FULL STORY ON PHASE 3.

WHICH WAY FOR TRIUMPH?

On 14 September the management of Norton Villiers Triumph (NVT) announced that their Meriden plant near Coventry was to be closed, making 1750 workers redundant.

This followed losses of £16 million over the last three years. It also came three months after the NVT group was formed, and received an injection of £4.8 million from the Department of Trade and Industry. According to Dennis Poore, chairman of Manganese Bronze, who took over the old BSA/Triumph group, this money was paid not just to maintain production but to *increase* it.

In fact Poore is engaged in a manoeuvre. He is shifting production to the Small Heath factory in Birmingham, and closing down the Meriden plant, where wage rates are higher.

IMMEDIATE RESPONSE

The reaction of the workers to the redundancy proposals was immediately to stop the movement of all plant and completed motorcycles out of the factory. Round the clock pickets were mounted to enforce this.

On Monday 8 October, Triumph stewards called on workers from major engineering and car factories to march in support of their struggle against redundancies, and 4000 marched through the city centre to a rally. At this rally Leslie Huckfield, the Labour MP for Nuneaton, and the Transport and General Workers Union District Secretary, Bill Lapworth, put forward a dead-end scheme for the workers to buy the factory themselves. As John Fisher, ASTMS representative at Meriden, put it: 'This is our



(Photo: Workers Press)

factory, why should we have to pay for it again?'

It is not 'bad management' but capitalist competition which has squeezed out Triumph. If the workers buy the factory the high powered motor cycles they produce will still have to be sold on the world market, and they will come up against exactly the same problems. In a

couple of years one group of workers would have the tragic task of sacking others. The way forward does not lie through a workers co-operative, but in making the capitalist class, either individually or collectively, pay the cost of preventing the redundancies.

NATIONALISATION

At its national conference last week the Labour Party debated the nationalisation of major industries. This is what MPs such as Huckfield should be fighting for, instead of leading the workers up a blind alley. The fight to save the Meriden jobs must mobilise the widest possible support, around the demand for no redundancies, with the finance to keep the factory open to be obtained from the rest of the NVT group, from a levy on other capitalist enterprises by the Coventry Labour Council, or through nationalisation.

At present the campaign will best be taken forward through meetings and demonstrations around the demand of nationalisation, with no redundancies, and under workers' control. The essential point is that the finance to stop the redundancies has to be obtained from the capitalist class. Fruitless schemes to put up trade union finance to buy the factory will only lead to demoralisation. Provided that a strong campaign is carried out, that delegations are sent from Triumph to every factory and every section of the Labour movement, that the transfer of materials is stopped, and other forms of action are prepared, then redundancy can be defeated.

John Mitchell and Chris Banner

Conference against Phase 3

The fight against the Tory Government and Phase 3 will be discussed in Rotherham on 13 October, at a conference organised by the Action Committee set up earlier this year by the Rotherham Trades Council. The speakers will include Lawrence Daly, Arthur Scargill (NUM), Joan Maynard (Labour Party NEC), and George Caborn (AUEW District Secretary). With delegations attending from trades councils, trade union branches, and shop stewards committees in the Sheffield and Rotherham area, it will be a large conference.

Leading figures in the local Communist Party have attempted to take the organisation of the conference out of the hands of the Action Committee, and are trying to prevent resolutions from being discussed on the floor of the conference. There is a real danger that the

conference could become nothing more than a jamboree of Tory-bashing speeches from the platform. Due to domination by the right-wing Trades Council Executive, aided by the CP, a similar conference held in April failed to set up any permanent body which could co-ordinate the struggles of rank-and-file trade unionists, limiting itself to the organisation of a one-off - if sizeable - stoppage and demonstration in Rotherham on May Day.

The conference on 13 October could establish a meaningful Action Committee, able to respond quickly and vigorously to local and national struggles, but the Communist Party's ties with the 'official' leadership of the Trade Unions makes them shy away from such a practical extension of working class unity. Recent events have shown the need for such

a body. At Footprint Tools in Sheffield, strikers have been supported in face of violent police attacks by hundreds of other workers, but not in sufficient numbers to close down the factory: an essential prerequisite to winning the strike. At nearby Clay Cross, the determined stand against the Housing Finance Act can only be maintained if it is extended, with wide support from the whole working class.

With the experience of the last conference in mind, the left will have to make a determined effort to raise the question of an effective Action Committee, and the need to work towards Councils of Action to mobilise the working class against Phase 3 in preparation for a General strike to bring down the Tory Government.

HARRY FERGUSON

Sussex students win

At Sussex University students struggling for adequate provision of accommodation have won a decisive victory through militant action. Their occupation of the administration block won support from the local labour movement and tenants associations, and forced the University to provide emergency accommodation at subsidised campus rates. The authorities have also agreed to publish their accounts to show that the cost of the subsidy will not affect the future provision of accommodation, but will be drawn from central funds.

The occupation at Sussex provided temporary accommodation for homeless students and an organising centre for two simultaneous campaigns. The first, in the local labour movement, was directed at the housing problem in Brighton. The Trades Council has supported the students' initiative and pledged itself to organise a campaign in conjunction with local tenants associations and a rank-and-file committee of University students.

Part of a letter from the Trades Council runs as follows: 'Since this area has a grave housing problem already, it has been suggested that a joint statement be drawn up by the Trades Council, the Students Union and the Federation of Tenants Associations. It is felt that student pressure for housing must worsen an existing local crisis, and it is important that local people see who is truly responsible for this situation. Such a statement could be issued to the press and on our part circulated to local trade union branches and workplaces. This clear statement by the Trades Council that the responsibility for the situation lies not with students but with the State is a big step forward in the campaign.'

At the same time a national campaign on the problems of student accommodation has been launched. The Sussex students are to organise a national conference for 27-28 October, both to organise solidarity action for the struggles against the cuts in housing which affect both the students and the working class, and to thrash out an action programme for the National Union of Students and students unions based on the political lessons of the struggles that have taken place.

The conference should be supported by all students unions and the NUS should give full publicity to it; this conference represents a genuine attempt to achieve a united fight for more homes by students and the homeless.

For details of the conference, contact: Steering Committee for Accommodation Conference, University of Sussex Union, Falmer, Brighton, Sussex.

RAY BURNS

Setback at Footprint

The struggle for the reinstatement of a sacked engineers' shop steward at Footprint Tools in Sheffield, is still deadlocked. Apart from a formal meeting between the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers and the General and Municipal Workers Union (whose members are continuing to scab on the strike), the only new development has been the decision by a special meeting of 250 shop stewards from all over Sheffield to call for a district stoppage on Friday 12 October.

The Footprint strikers had a right to expect a serious attempt to mobilise engineering workers in the district for an all-out strike. The Footprint Strike Committee considers this kind of action to be essential, if the struggle is to be won. Although a few speakers at the meeting called for a district strike including Pete Wilson, (the sacked Footprint steward) - their hopes were dashed by the CP-dominated District Committee.

The leading CP stewards and convokers denounced a district strike as 'unrealistic'. They counterposed a one-day stoppage and demonstration on 12 October, to coincide with the court appearances of the eight pickets who were arrested in a clash with the police on 21 September. Yet another mass picket was called for that morning, outside Footprint, to remind the strikers that they had not been forgotten.

The biggest threat to the fate of the struggle is the deliberate attempt by the CP to suppress any moves toward a district strike. It is imperative that militants in the district continue to agitate for an all-out stoppage, despite the CP's sabotage. This perspective is the *only* 'realistic' one: it is those who think that the struggle can be won by one-day stoppages and occasional pickets, who are the dreamers.

TERRY CRAWFORD

CURRENT ACCOUNT

Wages under Phase 3

The complexity of the wage regulations in Phase 3 of the Tory government's attack on the working class is no more than a facade designed to conceal their essential content. The stark fact is that the basic increase in pay permitted in Phase 3 is for most workers 'little different than under Phase 2.'

For anyone getting the average wage, the £1 plus 4 per cent formula of Phase 2 gives almost the same as the basic 7 per cent formula of Phase 3 or the alternative of £2.25. This cash alternative is designed according to the Tories to give larger increases to lower paid workers. What in fact it does is to allow increases higher than 7 per cent for workers in industries (or negotiating groups) where average wages are well below the national average. For lower paid workers in industries where the average wage is equal to or greater than the national average it offers no benefits whatever. They can only get more than proportionate increases if other workers in the same industry take less than 7 per cent.

The net result of the alternative formula is that workers in industries where average pay for male workers is £31 or less can get a little more than under Phase 2. For workers in industries where the average wage is between £31 and £33 Phase 3 will offer less than Phase 2. Above £33, Phase 3 gives a larger increase, but the major beneficiaries from this will be the higher salary earners who will gain considerably from the increase in the permitted maximum from £250 to £350 a year.

Among the additional complications of the regulations is the possibility of threshold agreements allowing a 40p (or less) increase if the cost of living index goes up 7 per cent, and a further 40p for every further 1 per cent rise in the index. Thresholds are by no means automatic and have to be negotiated. So do the other permitted 'extras', like the additional 1 per cent in the total wage bill to cover 'special circumstances', as well as productivity deals, of which it appears very few will be admitted as genuine.

All this 'flexibility' in comparison with Phase 2 will make very little difference to the total permitted increase for most wage earners. Its political purpose, however, is clear. It is put there for the benefit of the trade union bureaucracies so that they can appear to be doing plenty of real negotiating for the membership. But the truth is that over basic pay, which is what matters, Phase 3 maintains state control of wages as much as Phase 2 and the only bargaining which is permitted is over pettifogging and insignificant details.

In terms of money wage increases then, for most workers Phase 3 will be similar to Phase 2. What happens to real take home pay depends in addition on taxation and inflation. There is as yet no end in sight to the unprecedented world inflation and so every reason to expect that inflation in the next year will be at least the 7 per cent necessary before any threshold agreements are activated. This means that virtually the whole of any money wage increases will be swallowed up by inflation. Worse than this almost all workers pay a higher rate of tax on any increase in wages than they pay on their total existing pay, so the rise in take home pay will be markedly less than the 7 per cent rise in nominal pay.

In spite of Heath's claims that price control would be much tighter under Phase 3 the regulations remain exactly the same as under Phase 2. The insignificant difference is that 1200 firms have to notify price increases to the Price Commission as they are made; they do not require permission to raise their prices.

So when all the jumble is cleared out of the way the essence of the Phase 3 proposals is that for the great majority of the working class the Tory government is planning another year of stagnant or declining living standards.

Michael Price

WHAT LIES BEHIND THE MIDDLE EAST WAR?

The latest round of fighting in the Middle East is only a consequence of the unresolved political crisis which the area has been living through since Israel's resounding victory in the 1967 war, in the course of which the Zionist state seized parts of Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian territory, and evicted thousands of Palestinians.

Since then various peace proposals drawn up by the Big Powers have failed to gain the consent of the protagonists themselves. This 'diplomatic settlement', embodied first in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967, and then in the State Department's Rogers Plan, foresaw Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for Arab recognition of Israel.

ROOT OF PROBLEM

But it in no way tackled the root of the problem, the existence of a racist, pro-imperialist power structure, inevitably antagonistic to its Arab environment. The Palestinians, the direct victims of Zionist colonisation,

have persistently resisted an imperialist sponsored 'solution', which could only be achieved at their expense. The Arab regimes, fearful of the radicalisation which accompanied the rise of the Palestinian resistance movement, did their best to weaken and control the fedayeen, before giving the go-ahead to Hussein's crushing blow in September 1970.

But the Palestinians were not the only factor preventing a 'just and equitable peace', in reality a consolidation of the reactionary status quo in the Arab East. The Zionist regime in Israel has never had the slightest intention of relinquishing the conquered areas. It has quite shamelessly established large numbers of Jewish settlements in the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank region, despite claiming that 'everything is negotiable' if only the Arab regimes would hold direct talks with Israel.

LIMITED OFFENSIVE

In the period leading up to the outbreak of hostilities, Egypt and Syria were faced with an intransigent Israeli adversary, a United States administration which, for all the talk

of the oil crisis was only very slowly beginning to revise its policy of unconditional allegiance to Israel, and a domestic public opinion which was growing increasingly restless at the impotent verbiage and broken promises of its rulers. Everything suggests, therefore, that they chose to risk a limited offensive in order to regain some of the occupied territories and obtain a better bargaining position for an overall settlement.

But whoever fired the first shot, the responsibility of the war rests squarely with the Zionist rulers. The Arab states, frustrated by Israel's determination to hold on to her territorial gains, were left with no choice but to take up arms; they did this unwillingly, and aware of the fantastic risks involved (the Army being the principal means of social control in these countries, and the repository of the ruling class's power and privilege).

CEASEFIRE

Sadat and Assad have no intention of overthrowing Zionism, or even of forcing Israel back to the pre-1967 borders. For these bourgeois Arab leaders, limited gains followed

by an American-imposed ceasefire would constitute a significant political victory.

Such an outcome is unlikely, as Supermen Dayan has announced Israel's intention to 'annihilate' the Arab forces. Nixon, too, is conscious that an Arab victory would have incalculably harmful consequences for Western interests, and is clearly in favour of a return to the positions occupied prior to the fighting.

This would mean the definitive annexation of the lands snatched in 1967, and an enormous strengthening of the chauvinist, militarist, bible-toting Right opposition to the Labour Party Establishment in the coming elections.

UTOPIAN SOLUTION

The war, whatever its outcome, has also shown up once again the Utopian nature of the Zionist solution to the Jewish problem. The Zionist State is an imperialist outpost in the Arab East, a 'colon' state and a fortress of counter-revolution. Under the lying cover of giving persecuted Jewry a 'national homeland', it has driven out and evicted hundreds and thousands of Palestinians, and transformed the survivors of Auschwitz, Belsen, and Dachau into frenzied chauvinists. Zionism has created for the Jews a gigantic ghetto in a sea of hostile Arabism, whose continued existence is dependent on the goodwill of American imperialism.

For the Jews in Israel as for the Arab workers and peasants, peace can only come through the revolutionary overthrow of all the regimes in the area—the Zionist State of Israel, the traditional monarchies, and the demagogic pseudo anti-imperialist regimes—and the establishment of a Socialist federation with full rights for national minorities (Kurds, South Sudanese, Israeli Jews). Support for the Egyptian-Syrian war effort is obligatory for all socialists, even if the aims of the Arab ruling class are not the same as ours, and they themselves will have to be toppled before the problem of Zionism can be effectively tackled.

Bob Sarsky

Egyptian forces crossing the Suez Canal into Sinai



The story Rees-Mogg won't print

Army phone-tapping in Belfast

The editor of *The Times*, William Rees-Mogg, is currently refusing to publish a story which reveals the extent of British Army interference with telephones and mail in the North of Ireland.

The story was submitted over three weeks ago. Since then not only have changes been made to it by the D-notice committee, but it has twice been re-written on Rees-Mogg's instructions to give it a less anti-Army slant. Nevertheless it is still being held back as being too embarrassing for the Government.

HUNDREDS TAPPED

The story alleges that over the past five years hundreds of telephones have been tapped at the instigation of the security forces. According to sources inside the Post Office, the lines of such men as Paddy Devlin (SDLP Chief Whip) and even Tom Conaty (a Roman Catholic member of the Advisory Commission set up by Whitelaw) have been 'adapted' at the Balmoral Exchange in Belfast to enable them to be tapped. Apparently not even a Roman Catholic priest described as an 'outspoken critic of the IRA'—Father McNamara of St. Theresa's Church in Glen Road, Belfast—has escaped such attentions.

Other prominent figures whose phones have

reportedly been interfered with in this way include Westminster MPs Bernadette McAliskey and Frank McManus, and leading politicians in the Social Democratic and Labour Party,

By JOHN MARSTON

Vanguard, and Ian Paisley's Democratic Unionist Party. Leading Republicans such as Mrs Maire Drumm and Mrs. Mary McGuigan have had their phones tapped, along with UDA leaders like Jim Anderson and the late Tommy Herron. Phones in clubs, public houses and known meeting places also apparently receive similar treatment.

TWO SYSTEMS

The centre of these tapping operations is reported to be at Churchill House in Victoria Square, Belfast, where according to Post Office sources more than 150 phones are tapped on a 24-hour a day basis. Two systems are apparently used for this.

One method is to record telephone conversations onto a 35 millimetre multi-track magnetic tape with a time strip attached. Codes are used to indicate the tapped lines, and some can be monitored by earphones as well as recorded.

Telephones are also modified by the security

forces using the 'Trunk Offer Facility' (TKO), which is built into the exchange system. This was originally designed to allow the operator to cut into a call to warn that a trunk call was on the line, and by using this the security forces can quickly and simply overhear conversations and monitor phones in a particular area of the city.

SORTING CENTRES

The security forces also reportedly interfere with mail passing through the three main Belfast sorting centres, located in Bath Place, Beerbridge Road, and Royal Avenue. After letters are sorted into street destinations by Post Office employees, selected mail is taken aside and checked by members of the Post Office's special investigations branch. The method used is that of inserting a needle-type device under the flap of the envelope: this is then turned to wind the letter round it, after which it can be taken out, inspected, and then replaced.

Since Direct Rule the orders for tapping and inspection of mail have apparently been signed by William Whitelaw. Before Direct Rule was introduced in March 1972, it is understood that such activities were authorised by the Governor under regulations established after the Birkett Report in 1957.

new books from Red Books

Writings 1932 Leon Trotsky / £1.65 + 20p p&p

Writings 1939-40 (second enlarged edition) Leon Trotsky / £1.65 + 20p p&p

Problems of Everyday Life Leon Trotsky / £1.45 + 15p p&p

Speeches to the Party (1952-54) James P Cannon / £1.65 + 20p p&p

Cash with order to: RED BOOKS, 24 Boundary Road, London N.W.8.

We are open some Mondays and every Tuesday to Saturday from 10.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. Late opening: Friday to 8.00 p.m.

CHILE: MIR CALLS FOR A REVOLUTION

In an exclusive interview given to our French sister paper *Rouge* on 1 October, leaders of the MIR for the first time their perspectives following the coup.



Chile's new military junta - they came to power over the bodies of 25,000 socialist militants

Had you expected this coup d'etat? What are the first lessons that you would draw from it?

The coup d'etat which took place on 11 September was politically on the cards. We were prepared for it both politically and organisationally.

And we prepared the sections of the working

class and the peasantry whom we directly influence.

We continuously exposed the illusions of the reformist strategy, illusions which could only disarm—in the full meaning of the word—the Chilean masses. In this sense, the coup of 11 September only confirmed in the most tragic fashion our perspectives and analyses.

It was clearly on the cards, in the short term, after the abortive coup on 29 June. On that occasion it became clear that a section of the army was prepared to do anything to halt the growing popular mobilisation.

From that time onwards, the main concern of the military chiefs and of those installed in the government was to maintain the discipline and

cohesion of this last bulwark of the bourgeois and imperialist order. Most of the officers were in favour of a coup.

At the same time, there was in these last months a mobilisation and growing political consciousness among the Chilean workers which was completely new, which was qualitatively different from that which had previously been seen. In practice, in their concerns and in their enthusiasm, whole sections of the Chilean working class began to break with the orientation laid down by the reformist leaderships.

This mobilisation not only made the coup inevitable; it made a *confrontation* inevitable. It is important to stress this: a widespread and massive confrontation.

Were there any important splits or examples of resistance in the army at the time of the coup?

There have been continual rumours of this since 11 September. Indeed, even if there was not a decisive split in the ranks of the armed forces as a whole, one would have to be blind not to notice the differences between the services. In the junta which has seized power, there is no doubt that the representatives of the Navy and the Air Force represent the extremist elements.

But a more important illustration of the situation in the ranks of the armed forces is the fact that certain regiments have not played any real part in the daily repressive operations. That is not to say that they have mutinied. But it is, shall we say, a tactical precaution on the part of the junta to prevent any aggravation of the potential divisions.

To reply to your exact question, I would say that the scattered bits of information we have on the situation in the army suggest that at the start there was a not unimportant refusal to obey orders by certain soldiers and NCOs. All

A MILITANT'S GUIDE TO PHASE 3 ON WAGES

The wages side of the Tories' Phase 3 proposals have been presented by both the Government and the capitalist press as a better deal than Phase 2, full of all kinds of provisions for 'flexibility'.

The Tories' plans are quite complex, and it is necessary to study them carefully in order to see what is really being offered. But a close examination backs up what we have been predicting for some time: Phase 3 basically dishes out more of what the working class has had to put up with under Phase 2.

WAGE RISES

The old formula of £1 + 4% restriction on wage rises has been replaced by two formulas from which trade union negotiators can choose: £2.25 a head, or 7%. These formulas are used in the same way as under Phase 2—to work out, for every company, a pool from which all wage rises for its employees must come. The exact way in which this pool is distributed among different sections of the workforce is not regulated by the Government.

On average, the new 7% formula and the old £1 + 4% work out at about the same. The alternative £2.25 a head would provide a somewhat larger sum for wage rises in those industries where the low-paid are concentrated.

Another 1% of the wages bill can be negotiated in exchange for reorganising pay or grading systems, taking steps to increase efficiency, or to extend holidays, or increase sickness or holiday pay. Many workers will undoubtedly obtain the benefits of this provision, but it is almost certain, with retail prices up almost 9% over the past year, that even the resulting wage rise of 8% would be totally eaten up by rising prices over the next 12 months.

SHIFT BONUSES

One important provision allows for shift bonuses, over and above rises under Phase 3, to be paid to workers who are on shifts that require them to work weekends or nights. The total amount of such shift payments—including the amount of bonuses already in existence, or consolidated into basic rates since the start of Phase 2 (6 November, 1972)—can be as much as 20% of basic hourly rates for those hours that fall on Saturday or Sunday, or between 8 pm and 6 am.

The purpose of such a concession is to make it possible to attract labour into areas such as public transport and hospitals, where awkward hours at present discourage people from taking up these jobs.

The existence of this provision has led many commentators, such as *The Guardian* newspaper, to suggest that it could permit massive

wage rises for some groups—such as the miners—thus avoiding the danger of an industrial show-down. *The Guardian* argues that the application of the shift bonus would allow the Coal Board to offer rises of £6.50 to £7.50 to the National Union of Miners. The problem with this argument is that it assumes that *all* miners are working, *all the time*, during 'bonus' hours: clearly ridiculous.

Even if we were to assume that all workers in an industry were on a shift system that operated 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, they would still only be working at bonus rates for 60% of the time. So rather than getting a 20% rise in basic wages they would only get 12%—assuming of course that they are not getting any shift bonus at all at present.

What this means in the case of the miners—who already receive a shift bonus of about 4%—is not pay rises of £6.50 to £7.50, but £4.50 to £6 at the most. The majority of workers who work these hours can not expect any more than another 5-6% on the basic rate, over and above the ordinary Phase 3 increase.

THRESHOLD AGREEMENTS

Another important part of the Tory proposals which has received much praise and publicity is the allowance for the negotiation of 'threshold' agreements which would supposedly provide 'protection' against rising prices.

Under such agreements a rise of 40p a week could be paid out if price rises over the next year reach the 7% mark, and another 40p for every full 1% rise above 7%.

It is obvious that under this scheme the entire 7% rise which the Tories propose to allow is to be eaten up by inflation before a penny more can be claimed. Even then, the 'relief' they grant is miserly.

The 40p is to be treated as a 'special payment' and will not affect the amount of overtime or bonus payments (in other words it's 40p—take it or leave it). Since this extra 40p will be subject to a full 30% tax deduction for most workers, it is only enough to keep up the real buying power of those who are *at present* earning less than £30 a week *gross* (including overtime and bonus payments). Thus the

vast majority of workers will find themselves falling further and further behind as inflation spirals upwards, despite Phase 3's threshold 'protection'.

Some of the low-paid—for whom it is claimed the 40p will be a veritable windfall—may end up even worse off, after they pay tax, extra National Insurance contributions, and take into account the loss of various social security benefits.

PRODUCTIVITY DEALS

Provisions are made for wage rises to be made in exchange for increased productivity. But no one should think that this will be an easy loophole through the pay regulations. The ground rules are very strict. Any proposed scheme must be cleared with the Pay Board and tried out for three months before any payments can be made.

The extra production achieved under the scheme must be sufficient to cover all costs of setting it up (including purchase of new machinery), the cost of all extra wage payments as a result of the scheme, and *still* reduce production costs.

Even then, extra wage rises made on this basis cannot amount to more than 50% of the amount of wage rises granted under the main body of Phase 3 rules; so even if a group of workers do sell their souls for a productivity deal, they cannot get more than another 3½-4% of their regular weekly wage (excluding overtime).

HOLIDAYS AND HOURS

Extra money can be made available to reduce hours and lengthen holidays—but only to the point of a 40-hour week and three weeks holiday. So, a century after the working class movement launched the struggle for the 40 hour week, the Tory Government has given it the green light.

As for workers like the engineers and the miners who are a bit more up-to-date in their claim for a 35 hour week and 4 weeks holiday, it's no go. These benefits can only be received *instead* of pay rises under Phase 3.

If a group of workers agreed to be nice to management (to get their 1% 'flexibility' allowance), entered into a productivity deal,

REVOLUTIONARY FRONT

The Chilean MIR - Movement of the Revolutionary Left - explain



MIR militants demonstrate before the coup

these were immediately shot! At least a dozen incidents have been reported, directly or indirectly. There must in that case have been many more.

This makes work in the army exceedingly difficult, indeed almost impossible in some cases. On the other hand, if there was a political and military offensive by the revolutionaries,

and accepted a shift system that required them to do all their work at night and on weekends, then they could get a 35 hour week and 4 weeks holiday: but only in exchange for agreeing to *no wage rise at all* over the next year.

EQUAL PAY

Agreements can be made for extra money to be paid out to reduce the differential between men and women by up to 50%. Since this differential was supposed to have been reduced by a third already under Phase 2, this involves no stepping up of increases.

Moreover, Phase 3 sows up an important loophole which some workers tried to take advantage of under Phase 2: money available under the pay limit could be used to give bigger increases to the men, and then money could be claimed for the women under the equal pay provisions to narrow the differentials back down again. Under the new regulations, if any of the money from an increase within the pay limits is used to widen the differentials between men and women, then *no money at all* can be granted under the equal pay clauses.

FLEXIBILITY

The 'flexibility' of Phase 3 is a smokescreen: a little leeway is being allowed in order to tighten up the provisions of the pay laws overall. There is little that workers can get under the new 'flexible' Phase 3 that they have not been able to get under Phase 2 by exploiting various loopholes.

If the working class movement does not organise immediately to smash Phase 3, the working class will fare no better in the next twelve months than they have in the past nine months. At the best that will mean a stagnant standard of living. Many will suffer a decline. All around there will be bitter in-fighting within the working class movement to decide who will lose out and who will just stand still.

Chris Balfour

NEXT WEEK—A MILITANT'S GUIDE TO PHASE 3 ON PRICES AND PROFITS

which really seemed to provide an alternative, there can be no doubt that a considerable number of NCOs and soldiers would be on our side. On several occasions, during the searches, soldiers, NCOs and even officers have, let us say, closed their eyes to the discovery of arms: 'all we ask is that you don't use them against us'.

In this particular situation, we therefore intend to avoid in the coming period actions which could help to strengthen the unity of the armed forces; and we will work to multiply the number of modest but significant examples of resistance in the ranks of the army.

You talk about the perspectives for work, of a political and military offensive by the revolutionaries, but one of the most striking features is the lack of any visible sign of such an offensive....

That's true. At least at the level of visible evidence, as you say. But we must be clear on this point: because of the weight of reformist illusions, above all because of the short-sighted policies of the reformist leaderships, the Chilean workers have lost a battle, and paid a very heavy price for it.

On the day of the coup, the workers gathered in large numbers at the places of work which had been occupied in many cases for several weeks. In many factories they put up an heroic resistance, retreating step by step in face of the military's determination to 'take back the factories'. But the balance of forces was too much against them. The military were armed to the teeth with modern equipment, often using tanks and sometimes air raids. Against this the workers were very poorly armed, hardly at all in some cases. The military were a co-ordinated and centralised force, carrying out a detailed plan prepared in advance. The workers of the different factories, of the different *cordons*, were not centralised—there was not even any co-ordination among them. Nevertheless it took almost five days, sometimes more to put the Santiago industrial *cordons* out of action.

In the provinces, events generally developed in much the same way. This explains the large number of deaths during the first days. In certain places there was a virtual massacre. In one of the most important factories in Santiago, they removed more than 200 bodies. In such a situation, a retreat was inevitable.

You would describe the present situation as one of withdrawal rather than of defeat?

Absolutely, for in spite of the extraordinary number of victims, the repression was not exactly selective in most cases. That is something which you should be aware of, and which should be publicised abroad: a large number of militants, trade union and political leaders, died fighting at their posts.

But the revolutionary organisations, and our own in particular, were not crippled. Despite heavy losses, our main structures, the main body of our apparatus, are absolutely intact. In this we simply acted in line with our analysis, and the measures which we took have borne fruit.

How about the other organisations of the left, particularly the parties of Popular Unity?

Although I have been in contact with militants of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, and MAPU [the Movement for United Popular Action], I will speak cautiously and, let us say, in a personal capacity.

As far as MAPU is concerned, and although it is only a small organisation, I think one can say that it too has escaped with relatively little damage to its organisational structures.

As for the Communist Party, it seems that many local leaders have disappeared or have been arrested. One thing is clear: the party, particularly in Santiago, is completely disoriented; at a single stroke all their illusions in the possibility of a peaceful road to socialism have been shattered. What is more, the structures of the Communist Party seem to have been severely dislocated, and although the leaders of the CP took part in the fighting in the *cordons*, a large number of militants are today without any precise directions and have been left entirely to their own devices.

With the Socialist Party the situation is relatively complicated because of the very complexity of the currents running through the party when it was in power. The structure of the Socialist Party did not prepare it for this kind of situation. But many militants, and revolutionary currents in the ranks of the Socialist Party which had their own organised structures and leaderships, have survived the repression and are preparing for the struggles to come. There again, we have a very great responsibility.

How does the MIR plan to shoulder these responsibilities?

We are for the establishment of a Revolutionary Front which we think should consist of the Popular Unity parties and ourselves. The task

of this front should be to prepare the counter-offensive as quickly as possible against the present regime, a political but above all a military counter-offensive.

We hope that this front will see the light of day very soon. We will make every possible effort in this direction. We also intend, after the necessary discussions and debates in our own ranks, to propose a proper political and military plan for the front which can help to make this counter-offensive successful. But such a front must have a clear orientation and draw an adequate balance sheet of the past period.

In this sense, such a front for us will be the framework in which, while maintaining the greatest possible unity of action, we will continue to struggle more than ever against the reformism whose consequences the Chilean workers have just so tragically experienced.

As it is, even the establishment of such a front challenges reformist-type conceptions. The Communist Party members with whom we have had some preliminary discussions on this topic may agree with us on the idea of unity, even of unity with us (which is something new); but while they may agree on the need for a rapid counter-offensive to prevent the present confusion among numerous sections from turning into a thoroughgoing demoralisation, the members of the Communist Party are not in such agreement on the aims and character of such a front.

Some of them defended and will always defend the idea of a larger front including certain other layers opposed to the military. Concretely, their perspective would be to include sections of the Christian Democracy, if not the whole Christian democracy, in such a front. It is an old approach, classical, which flows from the policies always advocated by the Communist Party in the Popular Unity government: an alliance with Christian Democracy against the right and the fascist extreme-right. Today it would appear that the Communist Party, under pressure from many of its militants including almost all those in the Communist Youth, has changed its mind in the last few days and will agree to take part in the kind of Revolutionary Front we are proposing.

But further upsets cannot be excluded, and in any case we have no illusions; the struggle against reformism, in the framework of such a front or some other structure, remains and will remain for a long time one of our main tasks. We are optimistic on this score.

In any case, without indulging in too much speculation, it is obvious that after the experience which the Chilean masses have gone through, there will be big upheavals on the left and a significant regroupment. And as far as we are concerned, we are decidedly optimistic on this level. It is true that these upheavals will not take place as a result of spontaneous conclusions drawn by the masses from the experience of the coup. They will depend essentially on the ability of the vanguard sections to provide a response, in practice, in action, and as quickly as possible, to the situation. They will depend on the vanguard's ability to strike blows at the enemy.

But there again, what I have said about our organisation leads us to be optimistic.

WHAT HAPPENED AT BLACKPOOL?

Now that the Labour Party Conference is over a debate is opening up within the ranks of the left as to the significance of what took place in Blackpool.

Was the Conference a victory for the right or the left of the Party? Is Labour's 'new programme' the dawning of the age of socialism or a dangerous diversion for the working class movement? Is the Labour Party's 'turn' a decisive event in the development of the class struggle in Britain or an irrelevant manoeuvre by a handful of bankrupt bureaucrats?

TWO GROUPS

There were two groups for whom the Labour Conference appeared an enormous success. The first was the Wilson leadership. In place of the old rows with the constituency left and the 'left' trade union bureaucrats, Wilson received a rapturous standing ovation. Furthermore, he succeeded in getting his way over the proposed nationalisation of 25 companies, and most other issues.

This was produced by a new line up between the various layers of the Party bureaucracy. In the period of the mid 1960s the dominant sections of the Party had been those who were connected to private industry, or who aspired to positions in the state apparatus or the nationalised industries: Marsh (British Rail), Thompson (EEC Commission), Gunter and Brown (private industry) were of this type. Their main representative today is Jenkins. This section of the Party hardly got a look in at the Conference. The debate was totally dominated by the 'left', and by those sections based on the Party machine itself—in particular the Wilson team.

BUREAUCRACY

The second group for whom the Conference was very successful was the trade union bureaucracy. Jack Jones in particular has emerged as the main strategist of the trade union bureaucracy in relation to the Labour Party. It was Jones who decided on the combination of left-wing noises on foreign policy and radical proposals on social issues such as pensions, while failing to make any concrete preparation for waging the industrial struggle against the Government's incomes policy. At present this is the basic strategy of the TUC. It is designed to divert the attention of the working class to the electoral struggle to return a new, 'left' Labour government.

Whether this policy will succeed or not is, of course, a very different question. It appears most likely that the rapidly growing discontent in the working class will explode despite the manoeuvres of the TUC. Nevertheless, the bureaucracy got its way at the Conference in extracting sufficient radical rhetoric from the Party leadership to be able to project some idea that the next Labour government will be more radical than the last one.

RELATIVELY RADICAL

The triumph of Wilson is that he has been able to buy the support of the trade union bureaucracy, and thus create a semblance of unity in the Party, without committing himself to any positions which completely close the door to an alliance with the ruling class. There is a difference—and not just one of numbers—between Wilson's nationalisation proposals and the original proposal of the NEC to take over 25 top companies. The NEC proposals for nationalisation would, however inadequate and confused, be a definite blow against the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie. Wilson's proposals are qualitatively different: the machine tool and aircraft industries are bankrupt; nationalisation of north sea oil and gas will only provide cheaper fuel for industrial capital; and land nationalisation will only affect property speculators and so on.

But, within the framework of avoiding a sharp break with the immediate interests of the ruling class, the Wilson proposals are relatively radical. They propose the nationalisation of just about everything it is possible to nationalise without attacking the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie and they would definitely hit certain other, less important, sections of the capitalists hard. They are—if you like—the most left-wing right-wing policy it is possible to have. The fact that it remains a policy which does not break with even the immediate interests of the industrial bourgeoisie suggests that Wilson still intends to go for a re-run of the 1964-70 Labour government, although, in typical bureaucratic fashion, he has not completely closed the door on the prospect of a government which would take certain partial measures against the interests of the industrial bourgeoisie in order to win mass, working class support.

POLITICAL BANKRUPTCY

Wilson was able to carry through his manoeuvre because of the complete political bankruptcy of the Labour left and the trade union bureaucracy. On the two key questions which had been billed as the questions facing the Conference—the nationalisation proposals and the control of Conference over the Parliamentary Party—the left gave in. It was the direct intervention of Jack Jones which produced the agreement which allowed Wilson to dictate the proposals on nationalisation for the next Labour election manifesto, and it was the bureaucracy's votes which forced this through the Conference and defeated proposals for nationalising the top industrial and financial companies.

An even more right-wing resolution rejecting any specific list of companies to be nationalised was also passed. And on the question of Conference control over the Parliamentary Party, it was veteran left-winger Michael Foot who was put up by the Parliamentary leadership to read the riot act to Conference. In essence he said that while the Conference which represented the millions of Labour Party members could pass resolutions to its heart's content, the real decisions would only be taken by the 300-odd people in the Parliamentary Party.

FALSE VIEWS

If we wish to seriously evaluate the meaning and significance of the events at the Labour Party Conference there are two false views which have to be rejected. The first is that of the Labour left—notably that of *Militant*—and, in a different way, the Communist Party. They believe that what we are about to see is a mass revival of the Labour Party with thousands of militant workers pouring into the Labour Party to demand 'alternative left leadership' (*Militant's* version) or an 'anti-monopoly alliance' (Communist Party version).

This interpretation completely ignores the facts. There is not the slightest indication that large, or even significant, sections of the working class are moving back into the Labour Party—whether to look for alternative leadership or anything else. The traditional bastion of a left-wing, the Labour Party Young Socialists, is in open organisational decline. The elections at Conference for the constituency section of the National Executive showed, if anything, a swing to the right. All the traditional spokesmen of the left got less votes than last year: Michael Foot lost 47,000 votes, Wedgwood Benn 32,000. But not only did arch-reactionary Healey stay on the executive, but he increased his vote by 28,000. Nothing could show more clearly that it is not the constituency left which is driving Labour on its present course.

The second false view is that of the International Socialists, who hold that what is

happening at present in the Labour Party is unimportant. Having falsely decided that 'the Labour Party is no longer a reformist Party in the sense that it still was in the fifties and even early sixties' (editorial in *International Socialism* 48) they are now forced to stick to this position through thick and thin, and write off almost everything happening in the Labour Party. For example, their report of the Labour Party nationalisation debate was tucked away in page 15 of their paper *Socialist Worker*. They declare that nothing of note has taken place: if Labour has apparently moved to the left this is because Labour always moves to the left in opposition.

NONSENSE

This view is nonsense, produced by a fundamentally economist and syndicalist view of politics which has disastrous consequences for IS's political line. Firstly, it is simply not true that Labour always moves to the left when in opposition. This is a myth erected by the ruling class which has nothing to do with a real analysis. The last time Labour was in opposition, from 1951-64, it quite obviously moved to the right. As a result, Labour's positions by the early 1960s were clearly to the right of its position in 1951. The 1964 manifesto was to the right even of the 1959 one.

Secondly, the IS position is completely shallow because it does not place the developments inside the Labour Party in their international context. In the same way as Labour moved to the right when in opposition in the 1950s, so did every other social democratic party in Europe. The German SPD openly abandoned any pretence of a socialist programme at the 1959 Bad-Godesberg Congress, the Italian Socialist Party broke with the policy of alliance with the Communist Party in the late 1950s and entered a coalition with the Italian Christian-Democrats in 1963 and so on. Now, in exactly the same way, the Labour Party is moving to the left along with every other European socialist party—some of them far further than Labour. The Italian Socialists are accused by the Italian CP of being 'Maoists', the French Socialist Party has signed an electoral agreement with the Communist Party, and even takes part in joint actions with the revolutionary left. By not understanding these international developments the IS fails to grasp the dynamic of the present situation.

WILSON'S PRICE

While the Wilson leadership were able to tighten their hold over the Party as a result of this conference, it was only by paying a heavy price. They have had to carry out their own variety of 'left turn' in order to prevent a sharper turn being carried out by the forces of the constituency and trade union left. These left-wingers share with Wilson—and with the right-wing of the Party—a belief that socialism can be achieved within the Parliamentary system and that other activity must be subordinated to the needs of getting a Parliamentary Majority. They are therefore prepared to compromise with Wilson—and even to defend him from the more 'extreme' elements in the party rank-and-file—in order to protect the short-term Parliamentary hopes of the Labour Party.

The importance of what took place at Blackpool does not lie simply in the intentions of Wilson & Co., or the cowardly compromises of the Lefts, but in the effect that even the mild words of Harold Wilson will have on the millions of workers who will be going into struggle over the next year. That effect will not be determined primarily by what took place inside the Labour Party, but what will take place outside—in the class struggle.



Wilson carried the day...



but Jack Jones made it all possible

The new Labour programme does raise the question of nationalisation as a solution to the problems of the working class—even if the specific proposals it puts forward are totally inadequate.

WHY NOT THE WHOLE LOT?

Many workers will now ask 'If nationalisation is an answer for some companies, why not my company? Why just nationalise bankrupt firms, or even just 25 firms, why not take over the whole lot?'

The same is true of Labour's talk about 'workers' control'—by which the Labour leadership mean workers' participation in management. The mass of workers fighting the power of the bosses will be encouraged by this to discuss the possibility of fighting for real workers control. Even feeble left-wing stances on foreign policy questions—like the Cartano visit or the Chile coup—can lead to hundreds of thousands of workers taking up these questions and discussing the lessons which can be learnt from them for the struggle in this country.

TASK OF REVOLUTIONARIES

The task of revolutionaries is to use these new opportunities for political discussions within the working class movement, and to develop working class action—not simply on economic questions, but on every question.

The important struggles for the working class movement in the period ahead will not take place inside the Labour Party but outside it. But the task of revolutionaries is to utilise the impact of Labour's left turn on the working class to take up every issue of foreign, social and industrial struggle that it raises.

ALAN JONES

WHAT'S ON

IMG RED FORUM: Series of introductory discussions for those in the London area on the politics of the Fourth International. Every Tuesday at 8.00 p.m. in the General Pictos pub, Caledonian Road (5 mins. Kings X tube).

FIFE SOCIALIST FORUM: N. Brownlee on 'Indochina—lull before the storm.' Wednesday 24 October, at 7.30 p.m. in the Bath Meeting Rooms, Dunfermline.

ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: Joint IMG-Workers Fight public meeting, Monday 15 October at 8.00 p.m. in the Euston Tavern pub, off Euston Road (opposite to Snow Library).

HULL RED FORUM: 'Repression,' speaker John Ross. Thursday, 25 October, Rose pub, Beverley Road, Hull.

NEWCASTLE RED FORUMS: Wednesday, 17 October—Steve Whitley on 'What is the Fourth International,' Wednesday, 24 October—Linda Smith on 'The Current Situation in Ireland.' Both at 8.15 p.m. in the Bridge Hotel, Newcastle.

'THE GRANTS CAMPAIGN': IMG meeting with Steve Potter in Leeds Polytechnic Union at 1.00 p.m. on Monday, 15 October.

SHREWSBURY 24: The Next Step—public meeting in Vanbrugh College, University of York at 1.00 p.m., Friday, 12 October. Speaker: Bob Pennington.

LEEDS IMG PUBLIC MEETING: Brian Grogan on 'The Politics of the Fourth International,' Wednesday, 17 October at 8.00 p.m. in the Trades Council Club, Upper Fountains Street, Leeds.

AGAINST ISRAELI AGGRESSION: Demonstration Sunday, 2.00 p.m., Speakers Corner, organised by General Union of Arab Students.

MANCHESTER RED CIRCLE: Every Thursday at 'The Ancots,' Great Ancots Street, Thursday, 18 October: Steve Cohen on 'Racism.'

BIRMINGHAM IMG PUBLIC MEETING: 'Phase 2 and the way forward for the engineering pay claim,' Monday, 22 October, 8.00 p.m., Digbeth Civic Hall. Speaker: Ron Thompson (Sheffield AUEW).

CEYLON SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN: Public meeting, Friday 19 October, 7.30 pm at Conwy Hall, Red Lion Square—The Chilean experience and its significance for revolutionary movements in all continents.

NOTTINGHAM RED CIRCLES: Wide-ranging series of discussions based on the politics of the Fourth International. Every 2nd and 4th Tuesday in the month, 8.00 p.m. at the Lion Hotel, Clumber Street.

LEAFLETS, PAMPHLETS, COVERS, ETC: Quality electrostencils by return. Only 30p! (plus 5p p&pl from 56 Park Road, Lenton, Nottingham. All proceeds to Red Weekly fund drive

Lip Compromise rejected

The striking Lip workers in Besancon in eastern France, who occupied their watch factory in June against the threat of redundancies, and who have continued the struggle unabated since their eviction by 3,000 police in mid-August, face their most decisive test yet.

The Government's negotiator, M. Giraud, is almost certain to break off talks and refer the whole business to the liquidator if his latest proposals are not accepted. These would involve 169 redundancies, and contain no commitment to maintain the wage levels and benefits previously established through struggle. A deadline of midday on Tuesday was originally set by M. Giraud, but extended once it became clear that some of the trade union organisations were inclined to go along with the proposals.

EMBARRASSED

Chief among these is the Communist Party-led CGT federation. It was clear even before the 100,000 strong 'march on Besancon' on 29 September that the CGT had become embarrassed by the continuing struggle at Lip, with its militant methods of struggle and challenge to capitalist 'legality'. Having only grudgingly agreed to endorse the march, it then did everything possible to play down its significance and limit the size of the delegations which travelled from workplaces all over France to demonstrate their solidarity with Lip. And the CGT representatives at the final rally stressed the need to be 'realistic' and reach a compromise solution with M. Giraud.



The march on Besancon

The CGT is now openly at loggerheads with the local leaders of the other main trade union federation, the CFDT, who have rejected M. Giraud's proposals. The differences in approach have also become apparent in a number of other ways—through, for instance, the CGT's opposition to the continued 'illegal' manufacture and sale of watches while the negotiations go on. Since the workers depend on the proceeds from this to finance their struggle, the CGT position implicitly amounts to calling off the struggle.

It is at this moment, when they are under tremendous pressure from the bureaucracy of the CGT and the Communist Party, that the value of the democratic organisation of the struggle through the daily general assembly of all the workers has been most apparent. The collective solidarity which has been maintained in this way has been more than enough to see off the CGT's attempts to end the struggle—at Monday's meeting, for example, the CGT's proposals got a mere 14 votes out of more than 700. An attempt by the CGT to secure a secret ballot on the proposals—which again was calculated to weaken the workers' collective solidarity—was also overwhelmingly rejected.

SOLIDARITY ACTION

It is clear that the Lip workers cannot now expect any further help from the trade union leaders in carrying forward their struggle. The march on 29 September, when no less than one-third of the 100,000 demonstrators marched behind the banners of the revolutionary left (including 20,000 in the contingent organised by *Rouge*, paper of the former Communist League), showed which forces were really concerned to advance the struggle of the Lip workers. The task for militants now must be to build on the broad-based support committees created to mobilise for the march, to prepare for the further solidarity action which will undoubtedly be called for if the negotiations break down.

At the same time, it is undoubtedly also necessary to break down the dangerous tendency for the negotiations to become the property of a few representatives, who alone are conversant with the details and their implications. As an article in *Rouge* points out: 'Every worker has something to say Commissions should already have been organised to look in detail at Giraud's proposals, as well as those of the trade unions: commissions which would also consider means of enforcing my agreement—workshop by workshop as well as at the level of the factory as a whole. It is clear already that Giraud will try in every possible way to go back on any concessions he is forced to make. The only real guarantee is to maintain the mobilisation of the workers through forms of organisation which can impose their control.' John Marston



Pierre Rousset, a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist League (French section of the Fourth International) until its dissolution in June, was the main speaker at a packed meeting on Monday in London's Conway Hall, organised by the IMG as part of the campaign against the ban.

Held in prison for more than two months following the anti-fascist demonstration which was the pretext for banning the League, Rousset described the context in which the Government took this action—one of growing class struggle in which revolutionaries were playing an increasingly significant role. He outlined in particular the importance of such recent struggles as the school students' campaign against the conscription laws, the Lip occupation, and the fight of immigrant workers against racism.

He also stressed the urgency of stepping up the campaign to lift the ban, pointing out that one leading member of the former League, Michel Rezanati, is still in prison awaiting trial.

In Britain, further support for the campaign has come from playwright Arnold Wesker, Comrie branch of the National Union of Mine-workers, and Alfred Rae (secretary, Albion Shop Stewards Committee). The National Council for Civil Liberties has also associated itself with the campaign.

Ukraine: Internationalism or Russification?

The following article has been submitted by the Committee to Defend Ivan Dzyuba and Vyacheslav Chornovil. Dzyuba and Chornovil are two Ukrainian socialist oppositionists recently sentenced to long terms of imprisonment and exile by the Stalinist regime in the Soviet Union. As part of an international campaign the Committee will be circulating a petition shortly, demanding their immediate release.

Internationalism or Russification
by Ivan Dzyuba (Weidenfeld and Nicolson, £2.75)

With the intensification of social and economic contradictions in the Soviet Union, the nationality question is taking a vital place in the programmes of those in political opposition to the Soviet bureaucracy.

To date the most concise and extensive statement on this problem is found in *Internationalism or Russification* written in 1965 by Ivan Dzyuba, an oppositionist from the Ukrainian S.S.R. A prominent figure in the Ukrainian dissident movement, he fell victim to the massive arrests sweeping the Ukrainian Republic in 1972. Dzyuba, held in solitary confinement for nine months until his secret trial, was sentenced last March to five years imprisonment and five years exile.

The central thrust of *Internationalism or Russification* is an unmasking of the myth of the Soviet 'friendship of nations'. Dzyuba does this by documenting extensively the reality of ideological and national oppression caused by the present Soviet treatment of nationalities.

He argues that in its ideological form, Russian Great Power chauvinism, historically rooted in the Tsarist empire as the ideology of the Russian bureaucracy and Russophile petty bourgeoisie, was later resurrected by Stalin.

The term 'Russian people' is now being used in place of a class analysis of complex historic, economic and social developments. The glorification of the 'Great Russian' is being accompanied by the denigration of the other Republican national cultures and languages.

Dzyuba argues that the unrest growing among the young workers and sections of the intelligentsia in Ukraine is due to national oppression, a result of the abandonment of Leninist norms. Real oppression began when Stalin sent his men into Ukraine in 1932 to repress the process of Ukrainisation. 'Lenin and the Party always stressed how important it was for the proletariat and for socialist construction

to resolve the conflict that exists in Ukraine between the Ukrainian speaking peasantry and the predominantly Russian speaking proletariat, between the Ukrainian village and the Russified city. This in particular is the meaning of the policy of 'Ukrainisation'. (p.193). This programme, by which the proletariat was to be given the basis to strengthen their alliance with and leadership over the peasantry, was negated by Stalin. The Ukrainian Communist leadership was liquidated and certain respects of Ukrainian culture were declared counter-revolutionary.

For militants concerned with the struggle for national liberation, *Internationalism or Russification* is important because it extensively outlines and carefully documents the real effects of applying this policy of inequality, which results in Russification and colonisation of the other Republican cultures. More importantly for revolutionary Marxists, Dzyuba analyses the instances where the national question develops into a social one. He points out how the national divisions in Ukraine exacerbate the social divisions and emphasises the consequences of national oppression for socialist democracy. He reaches the conclusion that the present implementation of the nationalities policy impedes the cause of socialist democracy and is objectively reactionary. Dzyuba's attempt to come to grips analytically with the nationalities problem is of central concern to those interested in revolution in the Soviet Union because he points out the continuing importance of the democratic revolutionary potential of this question.

He starts his analysis from an essentially Leninist position, subordinating the national problem to the general proletarian cause, expressing the belief that this adds to, rather than detracts from, the importance of this question. Arguing that today's Soviet nationalities policy is basically Stalinist, Dzyuba points out that its basic theoretical positions are falsifications of Leninism. Attacking the present policy's basic assumption that the nationalities problem was solved by the October Revolution, Dzyuba correctly draws attention to the fact that for Lenin the October Revolution solved only the problem of formal equality. Actual equality could only be achieved after a period of national socialist construction.

Dzyuba correctly analyses the error in a nationalities policy which equates the amalgamation of nations with the assimilation of nations. Lenin spoke of amalgamation as the organizational and political union of the proletariat for the class struggle. When speaking of assimilation, as opposed to political internationalism, Lenin saw the former as being spontaneous and occurring only after the achievement of world socialism. This comment on the future can in no way be used as the theoretical

guideline for today's policy of state-planned assimilation of nations, within what is a Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, in order to synthesize a single Russian-speaking nation. Dzyuba states: 'In effect we are already setting ourselves the task of amalgamating nations within a single country now, long before the victory of socialism on a world scale and long before the victory of communism in that very same single country.' Dzyuba argues that a policy based on the exclusiveness of one language and culture impedes the path to national equality which is indispensable to true internationalism.

Ideological and real national oppression, fifty years after the October Revolution, is a phenomenon more complex than a simple remnant from pre-revolutionary days. This oppression is maintained in the interests of a definite social formation. The analysis of this crucial aspect of national oppression would have inevitably led Dzyuba to a revolutionary position which he

stops short of. Despite such points of criticism it is profitable to look at this book for its importance lies in focusing our attention on the vital role the national question plays, and therefore, the necessity for its correct formulation in revolutionary Marxist theory.

As a document of opposition Dzyuba's book raises fundamental questions of organization for opposition in the Soviet Union. Dzyuba's imprisonment is practical evidence dashing the naive hopes of those oppositionists who believed that the Soviet bureaucracy would take heed of, or even allow, independent political debate. It has become obvious that reformist tactics have served only to provide socialist victims for KGB interrogations and Soviet prisons. Public appeals to the bureaucracy have proven fruitless. It has become obvious that the immediate task of Soviet oppositionists is to formulate a correct theory for political organization as a basis for revolutionary change in the Soviet Union.

GREEK STRIKE VICTORY

The Trolley-bus Union in Athens last week won the first strike in Greece since the military coup in 1967. Recent elections had turned out the old right-wing leaders, replacing them with militants, and the workers put in a claim for a rise of 31% on their pay of 3,300 drachmas (about £40) a month plus demands on safety.

Anti-strike legislation makes legal strike action in Greece almost impossible. For example, a 98% majority by secret ballot is required. The police arrested and beat up the leaders, but they were not deterred and a one-day strike took place on 27 August. The strike was almost 100% solid. Out of 750 workers only four scabbed, and of the 150 trolley-buses only 17 ran, manned by non-union inspectors. The employers gave in and agreed to meet their demands, but later tried to back out on the question of pay. After further strike action was threatened the bosses finally agreed to meet their demands in full, and an agreement to this effect was signed on 5 October.



International Marxist Group

(British Section of the Fourth International)
182 Pentonville Road,
London N.1.
I would like more information about the IMG and its activities.

NAME

ADDRESS

FIGHT THE REPRESSION!

Two members of the Coventry branch of the International Marxist Group were arrested in the early hours of last Saturday morning, and held for 22 hours before being charged under the Criminal Damages Act, and released on £100 bail.

One of those arrested, Will Reese, is well known as the main organiser of the Coventry Prisoners Defence Committee, which has been supporting the seven Irishmen from Coventry, currently on trial in Birmingham on charges of conspiracy to cause explosions. Will was punched in the face before being taken into custody, and subjected to intensive questioning. The two comrades were not allowed to contact a solicitor, and other members of Coventry IMG were denied access to them.

Police questioning centred on the recent bombing incidents, the work of the defence committee and the politics of the IMG. The police have raided the premises of the Coventry IMG on two occasions, taken away documents, and questioned IMG members. The two were held in an undisguised attempt to harass Coventry IMG and to disrupt the Defence Committee rally in Coventry on Saturday afternoon, which, despite this, went off successfully.

The arrest of these militants is closely connected with recent raids in London, which led to a 500 strong

demonstration last Saturday, involving tenants and squatters groups, Irish and left-wing organisations. The secretary of Colchester Trades Council described to this demonstration how a bus-load of trade unionists and left-wing activists, returning to Colchester from the demonstration in Shrewsbury in solidarity with the building workers on trial there, was stopped and held for questioning in connection with the bombing of Woolworths in Colchester.

The intensity of the repression is indicated by a rash of trials; the Belfast Ten at Winchester, the Coventry Seven at Birmingham, and the Blackburn Three trial to open soon in Lancaster. Although arrested on the Mozambique demonstration, Tariq Ali, NUS secretary Steve Parry and the others whose trial for police assault takes place this week, have been victimised as part of this generalised repression.

The left should not fail to note that although a vigorous defence succeeded in discrediting much of the police evidence, the trial of four of the leaders of the Bloody Sunday demonstration in London in February 1972, resulted in suspended sentences of eighteen months for John Gray, and nine months each for Bowes Egan and Michael O'Kane. John Flavin was acquitted.



Part of last Saturday's demonstration against the police raids in London

The British left has sunk into silence and inactivity on the Irish question in recent months, but these events show that this will not protect them from harassment. Only a vigorous political counter-attack exposing the reasons for the violence in Ireland and Britain, and the mobilisation of the potential support for the withdrawal of the troops can turn back the wave of repression.

Fortunately, Irish activists in Britain have not joined in the rush for cover. Sinn Fein organised a 1000 strong

demonstration in Birmingham on Sunday, starting from Small Heath Park, where a meeting was addressed by Will Reese on behalf of the Coventry Prisoners Defence Committee and IMG militant Gery Lawless. It marched to Digbeth Civic Hall where Brendan Magill and Maire Moore, of London and Belfast Sinn Fein respectively, spoke.

There must be an immediate campaign to hammer home the lessons to the trade union movement: Belfast and Derry were the testing grounds

for the repressive techniques which are now being used in Britain. Only immediate mass resistance will prevent the extension of this repression, and its integration into 'normal' police methods.

Gavin Robinson

THE BLACKBURN THREE

Solidarity demonstration, Saturday 20 October, Assemble 2.00 p.m. in Dalton Square, Lancaster, march to prison and courthouse. Rally at prison with speakers from Sinn Fein, Clann and IMG.

T.U. BACKING FOR ANTI-FASCIST DEMO

We publish below the text of a letter further bodies to pledge support in-circulated to the left press by Brian include Todmorden Trades Council, Nicholson of the Transport & General Highgate AUEW, and Central London Workers Union. Support for the demo AUEW (TASS).

Dear Sir and Brother,

It is a bitter thing, in this day and age, to have to warn the Labour movement about danger from the fascist forces on the extreme right of British politics. The following facts, however, demonstrate that this problem needs serious and urgent attention — and that the working class movement must take steps to deal with it promptly.

The largest extremist organisation of the far right, the National Front, which already has over 10,000 members, is holding its annual conference and rally on Saturday, 13 October in London's Conway Hall, near Holborn. This is intended to be a prestigious occasion for the Front, to set the seal on two major developments concerning this fascist organisation.

Firstly, its recent electoral advances (5,000 votes in the West Bromwich by-election and high votes in several local elections) obtained largely by anti-immigrant propaganda — the Front admits to being 'racist' — will be emphasised to argue that the NF is now an acceptable 'national' party.

Secondly, the Front's agitation aimed specifically at winning support from members of trade unions will be stepped up. Recently, letters from the NF have appeared in some union journals, and the Front's own journal *Spearhead* (March 1973) boasts that they 'have made barely any impact at all among the upper classes' but 'great gains' are possible among the 'working classes.' The articles in this paper increasingly and openly discuss how the NF can influence trade unionists in particular.

Recognising this danger, the Transport and General Workers' Union Executive recently endorsed a motion calling for a campaign to expose the fascist NF. Now, it is time for the rest of the movement to face this problem. I therefore urge your readers to give maximum support to the demonstration against the NF on the day of their conference, which will assemble at 12 noon on 13 October at Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2 — to help show that the Labour movement is opposed outright to fascists and their propaganda.

Yours fraternally,

Brian Nicholson,
T.G.W.U. Region 1.

SUBSCRIBE!

Rates £4 per year,
£2 for 6 months
Foreign £6 per year,
£9 airmail

Chile Solidarity

An international campaign in defence of Chilean Communist Party leader Luis Corvalan, a prisoner of the military junta, has succeeded in halting his threatened execution.

However, Corvalan's life remains in danger as long as he is in the hands of the military butchers. More than 5000 other socialist militants are being kept prisoner in Santiago's notorious stadium, or in one of the other concentration camps that the new government has set up.

Meanwhile, the solidarity movement in this country continues to grow. In addition to the vast number of resolutions and messages in support of Corvalan, resolutions against the coup and in solidarity with the Chilean workers and peasants have been carried by the following bodies:

- *Transport and General Workers Union 1/690 branch;
- *Austin Motors Shop Stewards Committee;
- *Tube Investments Walsall SSC;
- *Blackheath Stampings SSC;
- *Birmingham District Council. ASTMS;

*South-Western District Council, NUR;

*Dagenham Trades Council.

The London South-Western General Branch of APEX has called on the TUC to sponsor a boycott of Chilean goods, and the New Malden No. 3 Branch of the AUEW passed the following resolution:

- 'That this branch resolves in light of the bloody military suppression of the Popular Unity Government of Chile that:
- 1. Recognition of the Military Dictatorship be withdrawn;
- 2. All aid to the Junta be ended;
- 3. All Chilean trade be blocked;
- 4. The two workshops undergoing refitting in this country must be kept out of the military butchers' hands.'

As part of the build up for the national demonstration called for 4 November by the Chile Solidarity Campaign Committee, IMG militants Tariq Ali and Robia Blackburn have been speaking in many parts of the country. They have stressed the need for international solidarity with the resistance to the reactionary junta, and have discussed the important lessons to be drawn from the Chilean events. Meetings have already taken place in



The military at work

Brighton, Cambridge, Newcastle, Nottingham, Coventry, and Hull where Peter Gowan spoke. Further meetings are scheduled for Oxford on 17 October, Stoke on 24 October, Canterbury on 25 October, and York on 29 October. Requests for meetings are coming in all the time.

Any organisation in solidarity with the fight against the military junta wishing an IMG speaker on Chile should write to: IMG, 182, Pentonville Road, London, N.1.

FIANNA FAIL MONEY CLAIM

Cathal Goulding, a leading member of the Official Republican Movement, was the contact man who took back to Dublin 'every penny' of Fianna Fail money which was transferred to the IRA.

This claim was made by Brendan Magill, National Organiser of the (Provisional) Republican Movement in Britain, at a Sinn Fein rally in Birmingham last Sunday. Referring to an interview in the Irish language paper *Comhar*, reproduced in the previous day's *Irish Press*, in which Goulding made a bitter attack on the Provisionals, Magill said: 'Let me tell you that every penny of Fianna Fail money which was collected for the IRA was handed over in my house in London to Cathal Goulding.'

Since the split in the Republican Movement in 1970, the Officials have consistently claimed that the Provisionals came into existence as a result of payments made by Fianna Fail. Magill's statement is the first direct refutation of that charge to have been made by anyone connected with the Provisional Republicans.

Magill also attacked the Officials over the death of Staff Captain Jim Bryson, of the Provisional IRA. He said: 'Jim Bryson and his comrades were shot by British Troops, but those troops were firing from the premises of an Official Republican Club, and they had been in the club for two days. Nobody from the NLF (Officials) passed on the word to Jim Bryson.'

Next week

Pierre Rousset on the class struggle in France

A militant's guide to Phase 3 on prices and profits