Striking engineers boost anti-Tory fight

On Monday 1.5 million engineering workers staged an impressive one-day official strike against the Industrial Relations Bill. Big marches were held in most major centres and there were widespread demands for a TUC-led General Strike to force the government to back down. More than 2000 workers joined a march in London (see picture) and 3000 marched through torrential rain in Glasgow.

New landlords' charter will force up rents

FURTHER CUTS in the living standards of millions of workers are likely as a result of the Francis Committee's report on the Rent Act. The report calls for measures that will force up the rents of more than a million families.

If the government accepts the committee's proposals, tenants will be hit in four ways:

1. 1,400,000 families with rents controlled since 1967 will find themselves facing large increases.
2. Tens of thousands of tenants in houses with a receivable value of above £150 (£300 in London) will find their rents rising without their consent under the Rent Act.
3. Rents on houses with a receivable value above £200 will be increased to the full market rent.
4. Landlords will no longer be prevented from imposing an arbitrary increase in those rents that have not been registered with the rent office.

Arguments made to justify the recommendations on the grounds that rent rises are higher than the inflation rate, that there is no incentive for landlords to build houses for rent, and that the housing shortage will grow worse are already being used to justify higher rents, merely exposing the ineptitude of the present system of society in which the basic needs of the majority of people cannot be met unless a minority of property owners make a profit.

Labour politicians will make land owners more profits in opposition to the report. But they prepared the ground for it.

Their own rent control measures actually worked in the interests of landlords, not tenants. In 1969, two-thirds of rent control measures by rent officers served to raise rents.

And finally it was the Labour government that decided upon the composition of the Francis Committee itself.

FOR SIX WEEKS more than 200,000 postal workers have fought alone against the government's attempts to force down the real earnings of workers in the public sector of the economy. They have had to survive without strike pay and withstand bitter attacks by government ministers and the millionaire press.

The strategy of the government has been to force the postal strikers back to work on harsh conditions in order to set an example to the rest of the labour movement. The Tories hope to force the UPW to accept much harder working conditions and a further reduction of the postal service as the price of any pay rise above 8 per cent.

The lessons of the strike are clear.

The postmen's dispute could have been won long ago if they had not been left to fight alone by other unions.

Many unions have given or lent their money but that alone is in no way measured up to the needs of the situation.

Sections of workers whose own wage claims are directly dependent on the success or failure of the UPW should have been fighting alongside the postmen.

WEAKER

The railwaymen's unions are next in line for the wage battle. If they fight, if the government has been allowed to defeat the postmen, their own position will be much weakened.

But the union leaders could long ago have tied their wage demand to that of the postmen and announced that they would fight together against the single enemy, the government.

Such a united policy would have checked the government's dividend-votes plans for once and for all.

The threat that should have been done was for the railwaymen's unions to have placed a complete ban on the movement of parcels while the post strike took place.

Such a ban, especially if backed by the Transport Workers' Union in British Road Services and in the giant building firms, would have strengthened enormously the postmen's position.

ALLIANCE

With the Post Office, the Post Office Engineering Union, whose own wage claims come up in a few months time, should have taken positive action. The minimum
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Mass movement must fight to kick the Tories out

THE MOVEMENT against the government’s anti-working class policies continues to gather strength. More than a million engineering workers took direct action against the Industrial Relations Bill on Monday. And the postmen’s strike, which entered its seventh week, has become one of the longest and bitter industrial conflicts since the war.

The government’s refusal to make any concessions when faced with such pressure shows that their present measures are no passing mistake. They correspond to the deeply-felt needs of the small minority that owns and controls British industry.

An increasing number of militants are beginning to see that the only way to really defeat present attacks on living standards and shop floor organization is to fight the government’s offensive on its own terms. The crushing of the unions in sections of sections of workers but to end the whole big business system for once and for all. It is also clear that the vast majority of organised workers – let alone the millions unorganised – are still a long way from such an understanding. Some still believe that, although political Tory policies are bad, the government is trying to rule in workers’ interests. Many more disagree with its policies, but hope that the TUC’s verbal denunciation and attempts at compromise will effectively elect the situation.

Yet no one can pretend that the mass of workers are content with a situation in which they go on paying unemployment increases, welfare services are curtailed, and the ability of the rank and file to protect itself through strike action is made illegal.

Such a situation forces the trade unions to tell their ordinary workers that they can take action to remove the source of these problems. What is needed is a policy that relates to the attacks on the conditions of ordinary workers and is capable of providing a mass, unified action necessary to begin to confront the ruling class that launches these attacks.

Movement has strength

What should such a policy be?

The first point to be made is that the working class movement has the strength to force the Tories to back down and retreat on living standards. If all organised workers were to take industrial action against the Bill then the present government could not go ahead with the measures.

But the Bill will formally become law, the refusal by major unions to co-operate with it – not only by refusing to register, but also by making official all strikes that broke the law and defying the courts by ordering the blacking of scab goods – could make it impossible to operate.

The trade union movement has enough strength to defeat the government’s offensive against public sector workers. If the unions in that sector – postal workers, railwaymen and so on – were to band together, the Tories would not be able to take them on section by section.

Such defeat of the government’s anti-working class policies could also be the end of the Tory government itself. The ruling class would find that all its previous maneuvers in recent years. As its difficulties multiply and another for the cause, the Tory government could not remain in power.

The working class movement would effectively have shown that it could ‘Kick the Tories out of power’.

But if we say that the working class can, if it acts in a united and militant way, get rid of the present government, we also have to be able to say what would take its place.

The only real alternative to the Tory government at the moment is Labour. But it is not united and unbroken. If conflict, it would be replaced by Harold Wilson. Yet Wilson is no real alternative to the Tories. We had such a government for six years. It prepared the way for the present attacks.

Put demands on Labour

Some people on the left argue that we can reconcile the need for socialist measures with the fact Labour is still the only credible alternative by calling for a ‘Labour government committed to socialist policies’. This demand is not only impracticable but helps to foster illusions in the real nature of the Labour Party.

What we can argue is that workers should use their organised strength in the trade unions to impose upon any future Labour government a programme of anti-working class measures. Such a programme should include:

1. Repeal of the Industrial Relations Bill and of all anti-union measures.
2. No incomes policy under capitalism.
3. Restoration of all welfare services and no welfare charges.
4. Work or full mass unemployment and the demand for rationed employment.
5. Renationalisation without compensation of all industries sold off by the present government.

We have no illusions that a Labour government would actually put such a programme into practice. But the mass of workers who still look to Labour to save them must be prepared to fight through the unions to impose such demands on the Labour Party. In the process they will see how opposed to their interests the Labour leaders are and learn how their strength as a class can be used to implement such demands.

Next week’s Socialist Worker will feature a major article by PAUL FOOT on the Tories’ new Alien Bill. Make sure your workmates read it.

Stormont encourages mood of revenge

by Brian Trench

WHEN EVERY ill-considered move the authorities make in Northern Ireland, they are recreating the conditions of sectarian violence that existed in August 1969. With the declarations of war on the Irish Republican Army and the statement that the forces of law and order can now ‘avenge’ the violence, Brian Trench, Chichester-Clark’s powerful right-hand man, encourages the mood of revenge among the Northern Unionists.

Over a period of several months the idea has been implanted in the minds of the British and of the Irish public that all disturbances in Northern Ireland have been caused by the Provisional IRA. The British public and the Unionists have never believed anything else.

MISFIRED

Among the nationalist population such statements carry little weight. They have been the result of a continued effort by the security forces to brand them down into insignificance.

The British army has tried to engineer what is intended to be a show-down with the IRA. It will not cause massive retaliation. The first phase of the plan has worked, and the IRA will now be the second phase.

For every individual shooting of a fighter in the nationalist areas, the support for the IRA will grow.

The actions of the British army have led to the revival of a traditional republican underground underlined by the idea of defence of the communities – and insistence of the right to bear the symbols for the support of the Irish nation. But political and military conditions in Belfast and Derry block almost completely the development of a political strategy that would bring together the forces of the united Ireland one step nearer.

BANNED

Not able to understand the value of such symbols, the Unionist government banned the wearing of republican uniforms. Even from the point of view of enforcing law and order from day to day, this was quite unnecessary.

It was done to placate the demands of the British army who are offended by such symbolic floating of anachronistic banners.

The result was that women assembled with their uniforms outside a Belfast court on Friday where men were being tried in connection with wearing the same uniforms at an IRA funeral.

Rear-Admiral Constabulary men, playing to a crowd of Protestant women waving Union Jocks, told the women, pulled off their combat jackets and berets, and then pushed them among the loyalist counter-demonstrators.

More than 40 arrests were made, all without exception among the Catholics – 30 arrests in a crowd of little over 100.

Even lawyers who were far from sympathetic to the republicans and who had watched the police action from the windows of the Court House, complained subsequently to the police authority at the RUC’s brutality and discrimination.

Racialism was inevitable. Two policemen were shot late that night.

All the ‘deploring’ of ‘senseless killings’ failed to mention what had happened earlier. If the nationalists accept to terrorist acts if they become entrenched in sectarian views, it is because everything the Unionist government and the security forces do encourage it.

British troops on guard in New Lodge Road, Belfast: their orders are to wipe out the IRA.

Predictably, the call has come for the renaming of the RUC, for internment and the arrest of suspects. This further reinforces the defensive attitudes of the republican community.

While it is understandable that this strategy should have developed, it is clear that unless they are overcome the goals which even ‘traditional republicans’ have set themselves cannot be realised.

STRATEGY

As the economic situation worsens and the workers in the shipyards, engineering and subsidiary plants throughout Northern Ireland are threatened with redundancy, it will become even more necessary for the republicans to develop a strategy to win the support of Protestant workers.

On their own, in their ghettos, they cannot break the vicious circle of the system of violence.

LETTER

Aliens Bill is part of attack on trade union movement

by Brian Trench

G Ginny West’s article on the Aliens Bill (20 February) skipped over the basic issues and deliberately avoided giving any total emphasis on racial discrimination.

G Ginny West said that the Bill’s likely effect of such legislation was to deterr workers from joining trade unions or showing any sign of militancy.

But this article ignores the fact that the ANM’s campaign against the Aliens Bill is directed not only against the Bill itself but against the trade unions.

They are both bosses’ charmers, designed to destroy workers’ militancy as doth labour force.

Measures similar to the Aliens Bill already exist on the Continent, for all immigrants, white as well as black. A ‘laboratory of capitalism’ has been created from immigrants in those countries, where legislation is put forward in nationalistic terms.

It is largely an historical accident of British imperialism that the current Alien Bill is racist.

By the use of permits, the Bill establishes the direction of labour for those whose grandparents were not British or even British-born. By this kindred clause, exceptions can be made for those from the white Commonwealth.

But this device will not cover many from Eire. This means that a large company will have a legal incentive and power to construct a permanent and mobile work force, possibly composed largely of British workers whose opinion will be strike-breaking or repression.

Several thousand foreign workers were deported from France for striking in the May 1968 events. Deportations to Parliament are not enough. The struggle against the Aliens Bill must be linked to trade union branches and localities to the struggle against the IRA.

Bob Kornreich, Bradford.

British troops on guard in New Lodge Road, Belfast: their orders are to wipe out the IRA.
Eric Heffer, with Barbara Castle and Harold Walker, leads the parliamentary Labour Party's attack on the Tories' Industrial Relations Bill, Socialist Worker spoke to him at the House of Commons and discussed his role in the fight against the Bill's savage anti-union proposals — a fight championed by Labour's own record, in particular Mrs Castle's notorious documentary In Place of Strife that set the pace in anti-union legislation.

I am a trade union MP. I have been elected to do a job for the labour movement.

RP: Don't you feel rather irrelevant as a Member of Parliament after the massive demonstration of 150,000 people on 21 February?

The parliamentary struggle and the extra-parliamentary struggle have to be combined. We need to have people inside parliament fighting the Bill in a parliamentary way and the extra-parliamentary struggle to get the Bill defeated. Those things have got to be integrated. I am a trade unionist in parliament who has been elected to do a job here on behalf of the labour movement as we struggle ourselves as irrelevant at all.

RP: But do you think that the Labour Party has any connection with the broader trade union movement in view of In Place of Strife?

Well, we do, but it's ridiculous to say there's no connection. There are certainly instances where the trade union movement and the parliamentary representatives have got together. The best example is M. Castle's recent visit to Strasbourg.

RP: At a price though, because the TUC (trade union council) still need to take steps to cut down on action at shop floor level.

The TUC really means in some terms really. My view is that trade union executives try to begin to discipline their members, they would run into serious trouble.

Rank and file

And quite rightly so. The trade union movement is the rank and file of the movement, it's not just Peterloo people, it's elected people.

RP: Why do you think the Labour Party leadership introduced In Place of Strife?

I think it was introduced because the people who were involved in the Red Book, they felt that the whole thing was going too far. It's not just at a general level that the Labour Party has failed, it's at a specific level.

RP: If you look at the Labour Party's record when it was in office, with such things as the Prices and Incomes Act, In Place of Strife, and the miners' strike, don't you think that the government was responsible for the interests of big business and not the working people?

I wouldn't say they served the interests of big business. The government was responsible for the interests of big business but they did introduce a whole series of measures which were beneficial to the working class which big business would not have liked.

The miners' strike, the wages' rise, the sickness benefits, etc.

They weren't bold enough, they didn't.

CASTLE: Hypocritical role?

Fight big business. They didn't stand up to them.

When they were faced with an outlawed capital, their first thing the Labour government should have done at that stage was to have taken control of the finances. Capital is said to be invested in banks, insurance companies and so on. If we want to get socialism, what a Labour government would have to do...If we are ever to really determine the capitalist system by democratic means we will have to take control of all the finance houses and the banks. Without doing that we can't, without the revenues of real economic and financial power in our hands, build a socialist society. This is where the Labour government failed.

One of the main demands on the 21st February demonstration was the need to get the Call for the General Strike to kill the Bill, do you support that?

If the Hawks mean all-out, continuous industrial protest, then they won't get back before the Bill is killed — I don't think I would be particularly active at that stage.

AUEW lead

But if it was meant that we should have a series of one-day strikes which would include our continuous opposition to the Bill, then I think that the lead given by the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers is one which we could definitely give support to.

RP: Do you think the TUC leadership is fighting hard enough to defeat the Bill?

The TUC leadership is not just one person. Vic Fraser is a trade union official, he has to do what the General Council decide to do and the General Council is made up of people with varying opinions.

It is up to every member of trade union to fight for our ideas within the movement so that when it gets to the level of the General Council they know what their membership think.

If they refuse to carry out what their membership want then we can talk in terms of dropping out. But at the moment we don't think we've done sufficient campaigns within the organisation.

RP: The Finance and General Purposes Committee of the TUC refused to endorse the call for industrial action against the Bill. Do you think that was wrong?

It is a matter for people in the trade union movement to express their opinion within the movement at branch, district and regional level. Their executives to carry out the policies they want.

I believe that every member of the trade union movement at this particular moment is calling for a general strike is not real. There are many thousands of workers, perhaps tens of thousands, who still don't really understand the Bill.

RP: What do you think of the Social Centre's demand that the Prime Minister should not co-operate with the law in any way, should refuse to register?

It is very important that they should refuse to register and that a number of policy of non-co-operation is very essential. It's not as though this Bill in any way evicts the right to meet.

It does the very opposite. Heath said he didn't want what demonstrations there were, what the Labour Party says in the House of Commons and outside it, what industrial action there is — as far as he is concerned the Bill is going to pass.

If it does go on that basis, then the trade union should not register and from that follows everything else.

RP: Would this include policies like the trade union strike declaring every strike within to stop shop stewards being prosecuted under the law?

I am very much in favour. I think it's up to the trade union movement to get the rules changed so that when there is a demonstrative decision taken for strike action at shops floor level, then they should be made official and I think the unions have got to face this.

RP: The Labour front bench which is opposing the Bill consists of Mrs Castle who was the prime architect of In Place of Strife. Do you believe that your presence on the front bench has merely to appease the left by the Labour leadership?

No at all. I'm on the front bench because the Labour Party is in association with the trade union movement, In Place of Strife.

It was never brought in as a Bill and we wanted to show that we are absolutely determined to fight this Bill and it was important that there should be people in such a way were associated with In Place of Strife. When speaking from the front bench I am speaking for trade unionists and workers against this Bill and that's what the whole object of the thing is.

RP: But don't you think that Mrs Castle's role is hypocritically political?

The Labour Party is united in its opposition to this Bill. I accept the fact that there were serious disagreements on In Place of Strife and on the Prices and Incomes Policy. But the thing that has to be stressed is that we won that battle.

RP: But if it opened the door to the Tories. It made it much easier, I've never denied it. It was absolutely wrong and I've said so in the past and I shall continue to say so.

KICK OUT

I objected in Place of Strife. We're not now fighting in Place of Strife. We are fighting this bloody Tory Bill and it's the Tories who've got to be defeated.

The Tories are determined to smash the people's claim and the fight for par- ity in funds. There is growing unemployment. Don't you think, then, that the Government should be adopted as in that the trade union movement should begin a campaign to toss the Tories out?

Of course we should kick the Tories out. I would have thought that the government 21st February was a pretty good indication that the trade union movement does want the Tories out.

You couldn't say that a demonstra- tion of 350,000 against a Tory Indus- trial Relations Bill was non-political. Because all the people were coming to demon- strate against the Bill, they were demonstrat- ing against the Tory party.

The demands that were clearly on the march indicated quite clearly that the overwhelming mass of trade unionists did want the Tories out. Of course I think we have got to fight to get the Tories out.

VITAL READING FOR ALL TRADE UNIONISTS

The Employers' Offensive productivity deals and how to fight them by TONY CLIFF
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RUDI DUTSCHKE: an interview the Daily Mirror, that foresight, radical newspaper, decided to interview the former GDR leader, Rudolf Dutschke, and put him on the front page of their newspaper. The interview was conducted by a former GDR government delegate, and it was published in The Daily Mirror.

Did you ever feel like you were under surveillance by the authorities of the GDR?

Yes, the authorities of the GDR were always present in my life. They were always watching me, and my every move was carefully monitored. They would often follow me, and my conversations with friends and family were also being monitored. This made it difficult to lead a normal life and to have any kind of privacy.

What was your reaction when you found out about the Stasi's surveillance of you?

I was shocked and disturbed to learn about the Stasi's surveillance of me. It was a violation of my privacy and a reminder of the constant surveillance that was a part of life in the GDR.

Did you ever feel like you were under pressure to conform to the GDR's political norms?

Yes, the government of the GDR placed a lot of pressure on its citizens to conform to its political norms. I was often asked to make public speeches and to support the government's policies, which I found to be unacceptable.
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I was shocked and disturbed to learn about the Stasi's surveillance of me. It was a violation of my privacy and a reminder of the constant surveillance that was a part of life in the GDR.

How did you come to be involved in politics?

I became involved in politics as a young man, and I was drawn to the ideas of the GDR government delegate. I was inspired by his vision of a better future, and I wanted to be a part of it. I became active in the student movement, and I was soon involved in political activities.
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including perhaps people from organisations for the protection of civil liberties, women, teachers, students and, just but not least, workers.

I understand that you now dispute part of the Tribunal's summary of the case—for instance where you record that you stood that in July, 1960, you had discussions with some friends about the flying of doves from West Berlin to West Germany.

That was just as the British did not accept the flight of doves, which they said, indeed, had been political activity. But in fact those so called doves, or, more correctly, people who didn't like military service and had therefore moved to West Berlin where there was no conscription were rounded up and deported to West Germany by the West Berlin City Council after spending 24 hours in jail.

But there was no political activity on my part. The British government of the time would have thrown me off if I had done anything dangerous. The mere fact of being in a political organisation in England, it was said, would have been considered to be 'dangerously political activity'.

Today, the workers, the actual producers, are subjects. They are under the rule of Mr Heath's government and are therefore not free to criticise. They are 'subjects' in the true meaning of the word, generation after generation, forced to sit there silent.

Voting was given by at least two distinguished fellow Germans that you did get your best on occasion to decimate students from violence. But are there situations in which you would actively encourage it?

Let me answer by putting two questions to you. First, if you had been a prisoner in an extermination camp, would you have blown up a gas chamber and killed all the prisoners? Would you have killed yourself, shot the guards, or tried to save or average yourself and your fellow prisoners? Second, has the police ever shot anyone for talking to you in a concentration camp?

I think that at least some of your Irish readers who know about CS gas used by the British Army in Northern Ireland can somehow understand why someone threw a sample of CS into the Chancel of the House of Commons. In fact, if you read the speech which those public servants seem to have worked very hard to get the Home Secretary off the hook, it is this.

You have said yourself that you are as much opposed to Stalinism as to Western capitalism. What type of society would you say that you would like to see? What kind of society would you say is 'authoritarianism' which officially some how never counts as violence.

I think the reaction of many ordinary people (or all of them bound to you) to the tribunal's verdict was, 'Why, don't they Real Germans go back to their own country, anyway?' Why don't you?

To recover from brain injuries is not quite like having a broken leg. Even if I can speak again and attend university, I am not yet strong enough to read, let alone to write all the political demands that would immediately face me in my present state. Unfortunately I still need compulsory rest and quiet.

By the way, you can easily be wrong in thinking that Mr Macmillan should consider you a 'security risk' or 'nationalist risk'.

Today, you can often see students who have nothing to do restrictions as a risk to the security of the nation! Even the tribunal found I had not been a risk. As to their prophecy that if I were freed from restrictions I might become a political threat, I think that there would have been no need to free me from restrictions and this kind of prophecy was rightly attacked by several newspapers as being management.

It has been unfair to label you 'Red Rad'. And how much has this led to you being given a very limited amount of work which you may not even do.

People call my old song 'The workers' flag is deepest red' and Rosa Luxemburg who said 'Freedom is only freedom if it has a different opinion'.

The most noticeable examples were Dr Beeching's plans for reorganising the railways and Lord Robin's plans for the civil service. Both proposals were made by Dr Beeching, he set about designing railway sellers in the interests of profitability and complete control of the railways, with no thought of the railway workers.

The plans were met with widespread public protest, with many workers taking to the streets to demonstrate against the proposals. The government eventually had to abandon some of its plans, but the railways were not nationalised on the terms that were originally proposed.

The government had come under increasing pressure to nationalise the railways, and the Labour Party had pledged to do so in its general election manifesto. The government was therefore under a great deal of pressure to act quickly

**Bureaucrats**

In nationalising these industries, the Labour government embarked on a thoroughly bureaucratic manner.

The nationalised industries were seen as being run for the benefit of the state and the people, rather than for profit. The new bureaucracy was seen as being necessary to ensure that the industries were run efficiently and effectively.
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Barber plans to hit strikers and the sick

TORY CHANCELLOR Anthony Barber is considering a new tax structure that could be brought in with this year’s Budget.

It is a crude plan to switch the main burden of taxation further on to the poor, but in particular those unable to take strike or action or are off work through sickness or injury.

The changeover the Tories are contemplating involves reducing the lower basic income tax allowance and increasing the rate of tax on the higher rates of income.

Under the present system, the Inland Revenue have to add up your savings and wages plus any other code related to expected earnings, the result is the rate of tax they charge.

If your annual earnings fall below the expected income for being ill or unemployed or on strike, the tax is reduced to zero at the end of the financial year.

This system needs a large number of codes to fit as many people as possible and so maximise the amount of tax paid at the end of the financial year.

Glorified swindle

The government will have to streamline the administration of the Inland Revenue to reduce the number of codes. And the biggest problem running this glorified swindle shop is that one third of the costs go up on updating the files of people who have already paid their tax.

But this chisel is only necessary for making an annual averaging plan for the tax man to see if any tax rebate is necessary. To cut the number of codes is only necessary because they are planned to end up in the office where they are being processed.

Instead of granting tax allowances, the government will have to do away with them and stop paying out rebates to 1,000s of working people.

Instead of waiting for an annual review, the government will have to start looking at the way in which the tax is handled.

Under the revised scheme, a group of experts will be sent to the country for a low cost of living, it would have to be paid to work as if he was employed for 12 months instead of 10 months under the present scheme.

"Bosses’ evasion"

On top of this, marriage, and child tax allowances would be cut by £50 a year.

A married person or a single person with a dependent child would have to pay £5 a year less, and a married person with two children, £2 a year.

It would be a mistake for the Government to be swayed by the recent report on pay policies.

A married man with two children would have to pay £30 a year less, and a married woman with no children, £20 a year.

It would be a mistake for the Government to be swayed by the recent report on pay policies.
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A married man with two children would have to pay £30 a year less, and a married woman with no children, £20 a year.

It would be a mistake for the Government to be swayed by the recent report on pay policies.
**Police step up attacks on left**

ONE RESULT of the explosion at Employment Minister Robert Carr's house on 13 January has been a series of police raids on the houses of known left-wingers. Police visits have been widespread but haphazard and have included people who have been politically inactive for many years.

Methods used have included dawn raids, ripping up of Hirohito mementos, forcible detention for questioning, taking away of clothes for traces of gelignite or police again against certain individuals.

These developments have been accompanied by a massive increase in general police harassment of known political activists and seem to be the prelude to an ever greater attack on the civil rights of left-wing militants.

The events of recent weeks can only be viewed with grave alarm and concern by socialists. First, three key witnesses at the Miss World trial were forcibly detained for questioning at a key stage in the trial.

**No lawyers**

Secondly, two men were held for questioning for 48 hours by Detective Inspector Habershon, the man leading the investigation into the Carr bombing. The two men were held without access to their lawyers despite repeated requests on their part.

Eventually, one man, Jack Prescott, was charged with causing the explosion at Carr's house while the other was released with no charge having been made against him.

At the same hearing, Prescott was at first again denied access to his lawyer, Mr Bernard Rosen, who said: "Wards fail me to describe this outrage on Mr Prescott."

Prescott also charged Detective Inspector Habershon with having tried to persuade him to charge this lawyer for someone more 'politically independent'. The Inspector denied the charge.

Mr Rosen told the court that 'my instructions are that this is a completely bogus charge'. Since the hearing, Prescott has been further remanded in custody.

**NOTICES**

ALL 15 branch secretaries must phone the National Secretary by 24 March 1971. LONDON: 15 branch secretary school evening, St. John's Gardens, E2.

WINTER CONVENTION: Saturday 6 March, Assemble Hyde Park, 1.30pm, march to Speakers' Corner. NOвеr for this Bill? 125C. An Scotland.

SWANSEA: Liaison Committee for the NPP, 7.30pm to 10pm. 15 March, on the Industrial Relations Bill and how the public should respond. Bishop Grosset School, Sketty.

WINDSOR: Meeting on 14 March: 7.45pm at the Wind, 10.30pm at 14 March at Cato Street Club.

GLASGOW: 15 Day School, Community House Hendon, 5 March, 3rd and the trade unionists, 1030. 20 March, 3rd and the trade unionists, 1030. 20 March, 3rd and the trade unionists, 1030. 20 March, 3rd and the trade unionists, 1030.

"RED SCIENTISTS" London group meeting, 7pm. This is a general meeting on Science and the Crisis.

**Recount**

POSTSCRIPTS to the 21 February monster demo. First an apology to...
THE TUC's plans for opposing the government's Industrial Relations Bill offer no lead to the trade union movement in its fight against the Tories' anti-union measures. The General Council has been forced to move some way from its policy of an all-out strike last autumn, not because of any death-bed conversion but as a result of the rising tide of rank and file determination to kill the Bill.

But there is still a long way to go before the General council adopts a position of outright opposition to the Bill. The council's proposals, published this week, for the recall congress on 18 March, fly any idea of using the industrial strength of the trade union movement to smash the Bill.

The report tries to tuck the tired old argument that strikes would only antagonize 'public opinion' against the unions and play into the hands of the government. Such attitudes only serve to underline the bankrupt ideas of the un-ion leaders, who fail to understand that the 'public' is made up of a minimum of millions working people - 10 million of them in trade unions.

### BINDING

A massive campaign to reassure the entire.lower orders in the mistaken belief the Bill could show exactly whose 'public opinion' it was.

The report stresses that the government is not going to do anything until there is a new register of Trade Unions to impose an alleged system of controls on the internal workings of trade unions. The General Council, therefore, will advise unions not to register. This is a policy for the more near future.

If the council acted as the real leader. She, of the trade unions it would work, a binding declaration from all unions that they would not register.

Such a declaration now would force the government to smash its Bill with the Bill or the entire trade union movement and agreed to stop its own activity. UPRRISE.

### SURRENDER

By merely advising unions not to register, the General Council goes a long way to right-wing-dominated unions like the GWU to surrender to the government, leaving more militant, non-registered unions at the mercy of the law.

The General Council offers an even more spineless surrender than the government's refusal to back the unions. Under Carl's proposals, wage contracts would be legally binding and any union that broke the terms of such a contract is to be subject to an instant cost-of-living increase could be said by the government.

But the General Council again opens the door to right-wing union officials.