Feather’s talks with Tories spells danger for unions

by JOHN PALMER

A FREEZE on real wages—that is what the Tory government is aiming at behind the smoke screen of Barstard’s ‘Give-away’ Budget. The trade union movement has been warned: already talks have been held between Vic Feather, General Secretary of the TUC, and the government about a so-called ‘voluntary’ wage restraint policy.

In order to win the co-operation of the trade unions, the government is using the TV series ‘Are You Being Served,’ which has won an unprecedented audience, and is promoting the image of the working class shopper as a person responsible for the economic crisis. The aim is to create a climate in which the government can appeal to union leaders to support the policy.

The government has been trying to create a climate in which the government can appeal to union leaders to support the policy. The aim is to create a climate in which the government can appeal to union leaders to support the policy.

BIBLICAL

BRIDES

Barber’s Budget makes a further £150 million of public money available to invest in brides and big business. In comparison the working class shopper gets a few daffodil garlands. HF contracts are being abolished, but the finance houses will still be free to charge the full rate for credit cards (up to 30 per cent a year on loans). Purchase tax is to be reduced on women’s clothes, but not for clothes and furniture.

In the case of London & Roller event, the purchase tax cut will not be passed on to the consumer, and the assever that this means the full purchase tax cut is passed on to the shops and not kept to boost profits.

In any case the Treasury’s action on the rate of increase of prices will be offset by the increase in the cost of food and milk charges and increased fares and welfare payments. Without a doubt, working class families will feel themselves worse off as the months pass by.

SILENT

Barber’s Budget is a kick in the teeth for the unemployed. At best it will slow down the rate of unemployment. At worst it will likely to be close to one million. In fact if the figures for women workers made redundant last year who have not signed on at the Labour Exchange are correct, the figure is already far over a million.

Yet Barber’s Budget statement has left the Labour leaders strangely silent. The Tory Chancellor has pulled their economic policy ‘lock, stock and barrel’.

One suspects that the labor movement is afraid to play it cautious. Barber is hoping that it will go on as an uneventful year.

But the bosses already have so much plant and machinery idle that they are going to think twice before adding more productive capacity. They know that economic growth follows ’growth’ as right follows day.

They are suspected that Barber’s mini- Turn to back page

Jailed – for being poor

AN unemployed Bradford man went to prison on Wednesday for the first time in his life. The man has been out of work for more than a year and could not pay £3 a week maintenance money to his former wife out of the £124 she was paid for his support of his wife and child.

The case was brought up by Joe Kenyon of the Claimants and Unemployed Workers’ Union. Mr Kenyon said on Tuesday that the man had a bad injury and suffered from nerves. He has a young child by his present wife and a son aged 15 who lives with his first wife.

When the man was instructed to appear in court to pay his wife or face a six-weeks’ prison sentence, he did not fully understand and failed to turn up. A warrant was issued for his arrest.

Mr Kenyon is now attempting to arrange a fresh hearing of the case.

Arab guerrillas face eign of terror from Hussein’s army

by Chris Harman

THE REGIM of terror against the Palesti- nian guerrillas in Jordan has reached a new peak. King Hussein’s army is deter- mined to ‘deliver them to the last man’.

The guerrilla movement in Jordan grew into major significance after the Israeli-Arab war in Lebanon four years ago. Its mass base was among the hundreds of thousands of Palestinian refugees who had been driven out of their homes in the 1948 war but who have lived ever since in precarious conditions with the hope that Israel was an artificial creation. West- ernly to stop the guerrillas and to intensify the desperate situation of European Jews in Israel, deport them to Jordan and leave West Bank areas open for ‘frontier’ activities.

This provided the Western oil com- panies with a natural ally to back up their exploitation of the wealth of the Arab nations, and to weaken the hold of imperialism to break the guerrillas and to weaken the hold of imperialism to break the guerrillas.

The basis of the Palestinian guerrillas and the weakness of the guerrilla movement in Jordan and the West Bank areas is the power of the guerrilla movement in Jordan and the West Bank areas.

Collaborate

But the guerrillas and the guerrilla group, AI Fatah, refused to recognize the new Jordanian government, as well as by the Arab regimes in Syria and Egypt.

Now the rank and file of the guerrilla movement are going to have to make a decision. The alternatives are to accept them—impris- onment, torture and death in Jordan—and undermine the guerrillas, or to support the guerrillas and work for the overthrow of the existing Arab regimes in Jordan.

The Social Democratic Labour Party, which led the walk-out from Stor- mont, is an amalgamation of individuals who were previously contained in the Republican Labour Party, the Northern Ireland Labour Party, the Nationalist Party or were independent (Celtic MP’s).

Like the proposal of alternative govern- ment, the walk-out was not based on economic arguments. It has succeeded in gaining support, mainly in rural areas with a Catholic-Nationalist majority. At the same time it is not a complete success, but it does have the potential for success. The free election of representatives with the approval of the government and the right to initiate legislation is one of the new administration.

The SDLP has gained some momentum from its decision to leave Stormont. It will have to be seen if this is the case. But the political ideas of the SDLP leaders will not restrict the measures taken.

No longer ‘impartial’

In a press statement the SDLP com- plained that the role of the British troops had changed from being impartial keepers of the peace to protecting the Unionist regime. The party called on the British government to return power to the people of Ulster.
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THE WALK-OUT by Opposition MP’s at Stormont is one more nail in the coffin of the Northern Ireland state. This ‘parliament’ has rarely been anything but a machine to ratify decisions taken in the Unionist Party, the Orange Order, and Westminster.

In the past two years if has become even more irrelevant than before, and has been bypassed on all issues. British impatience had waited to make it appear to be a more democratic body.

Under instructions from London, Prime Minister Faulkner proposed the for- mation of a multi-party committee. That task is now impossible without the Oppo- sition.

Look to Dublin

Only weeks ago they greeted Faulkner’s proposal as a serious attempt to reform Northern Irish institutions. Now Eddie McAtear, the leader of the Nationalist Party, looks rather a fool for assistance from Dublin, at a time when the Southern Irish government is so anxious to app- ear the imperialist and Unionist establish- ment that it is again considering the possi- bility of introducing intervention for re- publican and socialist militaries.
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Much binding on the Market, but not a glimmer of socialism

THE LABOUR PARTY's special conference on the Common Market was one of the most farcical, as well as the most boring, events of the year. The organisers made sure that no binding decision would be made by the delegates. The trend of recent years for Labour Party conferences to pass resolutions that the leaders then ignored seemed to have returned. The logical conclusion with the decision not even to bother with the formality of taking a vote!

Another trend was equally marked at the conference. The number of genuine working-class activists there was smaller than ever. Of course, the trade union delegates were much as they have always been—men and women from working-class backgrounds, although usually with several years as service-riding, full-time officials between them and the shop floor. In any case, the delegates were quite different in character. Dalliance and despair were the record of the last Labour government and seemed to have weeded out the ageing hand of working-class activists who used to keep the local Labour organisations ticking over.

In their place is a new breed of activity, right wing in politics and springing over-whelmingly from the better off section of the middle class. Symbolic of the change was the sight of delegates arriving, not by train and bus, but by taxi, or even chauffeur-driven cars.

No reference

A third feature was also noteworthy—the almost complete lack of even the semblance of socialist policies. In the past the Labour leaders used to claim that they wanted socialism, or at least social reform, and that it could be obtained, slowly by parliamentary methods.

Now even the rhetoric of socialism is about.

This was not only true of the right-wing defenders of the Common Market. It was just as true of the left-wing opponents. Speakers like Michael Foot treated the issue as if what mattered was a loss of the "sovereignty of parliament". You would never have guessed from his speech that for many years all major governmental decisions have been made by ministers after private consultations with top businessmen and financiers, with no reference to parliament at all until after the event.

Would you have known then that last Labour government carried out a whole series of measures—welfare cuts, increased unemployment, wage freeze, and direct opposition to the wishes of the people that it had won the election on?

The Labour "left" have so much retreated from socialist policies that they are prepared to go along with many of the ministers who introduced the anti-working class policies of the Wilson government. Both Tribune and the Morning Star have been pressing in the strongest terms the speeches of Peter Shore, who was a wholehearted supporter of the last Labour government.

The special conference has revealed once again that it is a complete dream to believe, as a diminishing number of people still do, that the Labour Party can somehow be "worn" for socialist policies. It has also underlined the inability of the official spokesmen for the "left" to engage in a real battle with the other parties, with added harshness by the Tories, that are going into working-class living standards—welfare cuts, attempts to hold down wages, rising unemployment, the Industrial Relations Bill.

The Common Market, as one more attempt to solve capitalism's problems at our expense, is putting London and the north of the country in opposition to all the other measures as well. It is not only a genuine alternative to them all it is a socialist transformation of society.

Our expense

A real fight against Tory policies can never succeed on such a basis. What is needed is a struggle for policies pioneered by the Labour government and now imposed, with added harshness by the Tories, that are going into working-class living standards—welfare cuts, attempts to hold down wages, rising unemployment, the Industrial Relations Bill.

China's trip attempt to use Peking to end the Vietnam War and preserve US imperialism

by Nigel Harris

So President Nixon is to visit China. You can almost hear the grinding of teeth in Moscow and in Chiang Kai-shek's Formosa. Supporters of Moscow everywhere will start talking of the unholily alliance of Chinese 'bogomats' and American imperialism.

Didn't they always say Mao was basically rotten? They forget that US presidents have for a long time been meeting Russian leaders without all this fuss.

The visit is less important as a sign of change in Peking than as a change in Washington. The slight warming of the Cold War between America and China is almost always the third member of the triangle, China, if successful American and Russian leaders had wanted it.

It suited the book two superpowers against the third. When they forced China into isolation, as so often, the role of necessity it could not change.

It was not always so. Towards the end of World War II, relations between the Americans and the Chinese were not amicable. If the US government were free of the corruption of America's official ally, China, the US government would have been more friendly to the war on the Japanese by the Communists. After World War II, Nixon was hoping to break the US-Canadian friendship, and help the Chinese to get to their feet. But Nixon had to do it from within.

Willing to compromise

Again, the situation was not of China's making. At the Korean peace, the Chinese government had been asked to support the compromise. It was the same in southeast Asia the French withdrawal and to the shock of the French was the immediate success of the Chinese in Indo-China. At the battle of Dien Bien Phu in 1954, French forces were completely defeated. On the Chinese side, the forces had been well equipped and trained. It was Chinese pressure to compromise that forced the French government to support its triumphant armies and accept much less than China had hoped for. The French agreed to end the war in Vietnam by 1954 and to agree to the agreement of the Chinese.
Orange backlash forces
Northern Ireland Tories
further to the Right

EVERY NEW clash in the streets of Northern Ireland and each further day in the existence of the Faulkner government appears to widen the gap between the extreme 'loyalists' and the mainstream of the Orange Order and the Unionist Party.

The speeches and, especially, the heckling at last week's rallies on 12 July—the Protestant celebration of William of Orange's 1690 victory over the Catholic King James—showed how rank and file Orange feeling was fired by those new in power at Stormont.

The Rev Ian Paisley has expressed his dissatisfaction with the present regime by calling for a general election on the ground that the party had failed to deal with the 'terrorist' threat, in a plan to ban Orange marches. Along with William Craig, the former Home Affairs minister, and others even closer to the leadership of the Unionist Party, he has contributed to calls for the re-arming of the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the re-forming of the 'S' Specials.

These right-wingers are doing no more than re-echo the traditional message of Unionism. That 'Union is a Protestant province and its defence is the responsibility of a Protestant police and that there must be no compromise on terrorism. But this attitude—at least in its latest upsurge—has been rejected by those in the ruling class in the North who recognize that to maintain the co-operation of international capitalism they must attempt to normalise political and social relations.

NINE COUNTRIES

This is where the attempts to do this has gone further than even the extreme loyalists. The Rev William McCrea, who led last month's Orange rally at Craigavon, and who is a candidate for Channel-Clay Castle's seat in South Down, has spoken of the need to win back the 'historical Ulster'—all nine counties. Paisley has also announced that he intends to build one of his Free Presbyterian churches in Newry, across the border into Monaghan.

The demand for the recovery of those counties 'lost to the South' is articulated among extreme loyalists, but largely by members of the Orange Order, who have campaigned for that cause. But now certain of those ideas are being popularized by the extreme loyalists adopted by the 'centre' of the Unionist movement.

Paisley's rise to prominence has shifted the Unionists as a whole to the right. There is every sign that support for his anti-Irish and anti-socialist policies will be growing, if not moderating enough for him to be seen as a possible unionist candidate for next year's general election. The Protestant Unionist Party, of which Paisley is leader, is the key group on the main Unionist Party. Some leading members of the Unionists 12 Specials are also members of the Unionist Defence Regiment. Some loyalists have joined to receive a firearms certificate, and then resigned.

The announcement that one unit of the UDR is to be full-time is clearly a conclusion to the loyalist right. While the control of the regiment is formally with the Officer Commanding of the British Army in Ireland, a full-time unit might very well steer on its own path.

For many of the extreme loyalists, Paisley's dedicated advocacy of irrational religious doctrines are fairly ridiculous. But the Orange Order is also divided. But its leaders are clearly trying to regain the ground lost to Paisley and others like him.

For this year's 12 July the Orange Order circulated a Covenant to be signed by all Ulstermen, declaring the will to resist any attempt to change the constitutional position. It contains many of the phrases and terms of Carson's 1912 Covenant, signed by nearly half a million people. The idea of a Covenant for the present-day has been canvassed for many years by Paisley.

Officially, the Orange Order denies that it plays any political role but increasing in recent months its leaders have been making directly political statement and those are predominantly anti-government. Nothing the strains of the extreme loyalist movement are certain common features. One is the widespread use of this time of the Ulster flag in preference to the Union jack.

THE EDITOR REPLIES: One good reason for demanding the withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland is to stop the anguish felt by mothers like Mrs McCauley's. Northern Ireland police as well as defence forces are new to a task that is not unfamiliar to the British Army in Ireland. It is to be hoped that what was learned in Ulster police and law enforcement agencies has been transferred to the British armed forces.

But in the way we go about it matters. The reason for the violence and disorder that is happening on the streets today in Ireland is that there is no political solution. It is there to be seen in the way that peacekeepers are being used to defend the interests of Ulster Unionists, who have been the beneficiaries of the British armed forces in Ireland.

The IRA is a force that has been growing in strength and influence over the past few years, and has been responsible for a number of attacks on civilians in the past. It is supported by a range of groups, including some members of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA.

The question of who is responsible for the violence in Ireland is a complex one, and it is difficult to pin down a single cause. It is clear, however, that the British government has a role to play in ending the violence, and it is important that all parties work together to achieve this goal.

The end of the British armed forces is not a solution to the problems of Ireland. It is important to find a political solution to the conflict, and this will require the commitment of all parties involved.
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Workers' militia leaving for the Madrid front.

WHAT WE WILL DO

The International Socialists is a democratic organisation whose membership is open to all who accept its main principles and who are willing to pay contributions and work in one of its organisations. We believe in independent working-class action for the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by a classless society with production for use and not for profit.

We work in the mass organisations of the working class and are firmly committed to a policy of internationalism. Capitalism is international. The giant firms have investments throughout the world and no allegiances except to themselves and the economic system they represent. In Europe, the Common Market has been formed for the sole purpose of increasing the trade and profits of these multi-national firms. The international power of capital can only be overcome by international action by the working class.

A single socialist state cannot indefinitely survive unless workers of other countries actively come to its aid by extending the socialist revolution.

In addition to building a revolutionary socialist organisation in this country we also believe in the necessity of forming a world revolutionary socialist international independent of either Washington or Moscow. To this end we have close relationships with a number of other socialist organisations throughout the world. We believe in the necessity to unite socialist theory with the day-to-day struggles of working people and therefore support all genuine demands that tend to improve the position and self-confidence of the working class.

We fight for the right to control the trade unions and the right to a fair wage for all workers. Against secret negotiations, we believe that all settlements should be agreed or rejected by mass meetings.

For 100 per cent trade unionism and a fair deal for shop stewards.

Against anti-trade union laws and every curtail on the right to strike.

For equal pay and a better deal for young workers.

For a minimum wage at least £26 a week.

Against unemployment, redundancy and layoffs. We support the demand: Five days' work or five days' pay for all workers in struggle. We seek to build militant groups within industry.

Against capitalism and police violence against black workers.

Against immigration restrictions.

For the right of coloured people and all oppressed groups to organise in their own defence.

For real social, economic and political equality for women.

Against all nuclear weapons and military alliances such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

Against secret diplomacy.

Against all forms of imperialism.

We unconditionally give support and solidarity with all genuine national liberation movements.

For the nationalisation of the land, banks and major industries without compensation and under workers' control.

We are opposed to all ruling class organisations and organisations we work to build a revolutionary workers' party in Britain and to end support the unity of all revolutionary groups.

The struggle for socialism is the central struggle of our time. Workers' and peasants' potentialities are today greater than human solidarity, on the increasing of men's power over nature with the abolition of the power of man over man, is certainly worth fighting for. It is no use just talking about it.

More than a century ago Karl Marx wrote: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, the point is to change it. “If you want to help in changing the world and build socialism, join us.”

TORTURE

This really worried the government. Then something happened that was more than a bit of a plan: if the Spanish troops and workers were not defeated, the government would send for Morocean troops and the Foreign Legion under General Dailly.

Terrorist tortures and massacres of our people. Terrorist groups were set up for 10 days. Then 40,000 prisoners were sentenced to a death sentence before 300,000 years in jail.

From this time on, both sides saw each other as real enemies. The potentialities on one side, the one hand, fascism; the other, the revolutionaries and the organisations, on the other—revolutionary socialism.

In the 1936 elections a coalition of liberal, conservative and left elements came together under the Popular Front pact. This was no surprise, since the government had also been a coalition of the so-called “left.”

STRIKE

It had been powerless to carry out even the most essential reforms, and had lost even a bit of a repressive legislation. It is clear that in 1936 many workers had precious few illusions in such a parliamentary manoeuvre but still kept it up to keep the right, and for a promised amnesty to release some 300 political prisoners. Moreover, they didn’t wait for an amnesty. They went and opened the jails in February 1936. A huge wave of strikes erupted, and the government then again swept every Spanish village that spring. Even a mild liberal government was too much for Franco and his backers in such an atmosphere, and they were forced to go further. He assumed command of the Armada and the Foreign Legion on 17 July and most of the big industrialists, financiers and landowners as also the Church and the Catholic press, rallied to his side. The whole of Europe, the USSR, France, Germany, Britain, Italy, etc., became involved. The struggle for the day-to-day struggle was carried on through the night and the hard battles of the night made complete the march of the fascist forces towards victory.

By JILL BRANSTON

Terror in the streets, in the factories, in the fields, in the homes of those who were workers. Everywhere, the same story, the same actions, the same atrocities. Workers who were not fascist sympathisers were hunted, tortured, killed. The government’s forces, the Blackshirts, the Blue Shirts, the Red Shirts, the White Shirts, all worked together.

CONTROL

While the power of Spain, including the most heavily industrialised parts, came quickly, splendidly, under workers’ control, which, considering the size of Spain, made it a bigger act of power than even Russia had seen in 1917.

It happened that, in 1935, workers took over large factories and closed hundreds of small plants to concentrate production in those with the best equipment. In many cases when the original owners had been taken over, they found the plants in better running order than when they had been.

George Orwell, who was in Barcelona in December, wrote “It was the first time that I had ever been in a town where the working class was in the saddle. Practically all the streets were whitewashed, and not one was marked with the red flag or with the red and black flag of the Anarchists.”

Churches and here there were being systematically demolished by the hands of workers. Every shop and cafe had an inscription saying it had been collected by shop workers and shop workers looked you in the face as equal. The revolutionary party had a flourishing. The Anarchists’ blue and red flags were not surprising masses.

The land was taken, and all mineral resources as also been used to the point of absolute exhaustion.

In the villages, the existing system of collective farm was abandoned and the people took over the land.

The revolution had been won by the Spanish workers, peasant farmers, the anarchists, the communists, and all those who opposed the fascist forces. The Spanish Revolution had been a great victory for the working class.”

NEXT WEEK: THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY
Gerry Dawson argues that the attack on 'obscenity' is a threat to radical ideas and the growing revolt of young people.

**The politics of...**

Both Oz magazine and The Little Red Schoolbook have been on trial for their 'obscenity'. They were accused under the Obscene Publications Act of 1964, an Act which, according to the Solicitor General in parliament, 'is to strike at and to hit what I might call the Sobo books, and the importers of prurient pornography'.

Yet under its clauses, Spacker's Monthly, Mother and News and the Sobo catalogues that are used to peddle for sadism and self-hatred boom, while publications confront real political with sexual frankness are continually persecuted.

The living standards of hungry need for masturbatory excitement, as they say, what for, and people is attended to, but school children whose revolt exactly scaring rulers must stay in sexual ignorance.

The Little Red School Book puts a full side of a child's mind that plain and honest English. In sexual matters it argues moral respect and gives unvarnished facts about masturbation and contraception.

There is no more moralistic moralism and no more prurient decency which puts so many kids off reading anything at all written for them about sex.

**Crime**

It explains drugs as a straightforward and factually, avoiding the sensational obviously exaggerated slander that causes so many drug warnings to children to go unsold.

But its real crime is the eyes of the authorities is not its 'obscenity' but its outline of children's, pupils' rights and its suggestions for classroom democracy. The police are a lot less revolutionary but educational liberation, put plaid and taken to its logical conclusions, is quite enough to move many of those who run our authoritarian school systems.

In this case 'obscenity' means little more than enabling people to distend teachers.

The whole absurd issue concerned unwarned by a team of mainly London schoolchildren's editor which decided to warn the editors of a teacher to grant an issue of a student underground magazine. The issue that they produced diverted on the school system with articles from various points of view on the need for education.

It includes a brilliant account of the work of a Schools Action 'guerrilla theatre group' presenting a play on the ground various North London schools.

The teachers and support and kids of schools, were not expected to throw the premises, the teachers, unable to deal rationally with the slightest threat to their authority.

Many deals which could have the power of the Social Action's initiative, and school kids were just one more example of the regime's system and distorting views of decency in the draft of the front pages of the newspapers.

In Spass itself the method was tried with some success in Botswana where the workers were the first in line against Franco and won over the soldiers of the artillery, as comrades in arms, putting against them lines of strikes and mutinies against the Basque mountain.
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MR BRIAN FAULKNER, the Northern Ireland Prime Minister, has been on again about the 'evil men who will not hesitate to use violence to gain their ends.' A visitor to his office hearing him might suppose that Faulkner was one of those politicians who believe in the use of violence, 'in resist not evil but whoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' There are several people, however, who are not to be found in the Orange Order or the government of Northern Ireland.

Mr Faulkner, as a Tory politician, is in favour of the British and US governments manufacturing hydrogen bombs, the most extreme instruments of violence, and indiscriminate violence at that, in the whole history of mankind. He is a supporter of US intervention in Vietnam with all the bombings and napalm attacks on the Vietnamese. The regime that for 50 years has practised violence against the Vietnamese population.

In short, Mr Faulkner is a hypocritical sycophant. He is for violence when it is used by the large and well-armed forces deployed to defend his nasty little government. He is only against the violence of the IRA Provisionals who, with few and primitive weapons, are attempting to resist it.

This kind of hypocrisy is common and more so than in British politics. Our rulers seem to be tire of denying the existence of violence in international political affairs. This from the very people who, not so long ago, were fond of singing of 'dominion and peace and people of 'wider still and wider shall thy bounds be set' and of boasting that their flag flew all the world's a stage. It had been there planted, no doubt, by the exponents of peace and goodwill.

The pertinent reply to the next Tory or Labour or Faulkner's way is : has his government done to ask if he voted against the military像s interests. Of course, armies, navies and air forces are necessary and intrinsically instruments of violence. They exist to use violence in the interests of their like in in.

It isn’t small-scale violence either. A recent book called The Science of War and Peace by Robin Clarke contained the following statement: 'The human race has now accumulated sufficient nuclear explosive to eliminate itself 50,000 times over. If present trends continue 400 million people will be killed in wars in the next 50 years. One fifth of world population in scientific military and political circles are prepared to risk the whole lot at a cost of over 200,000 million dollars a year.'

In other words, they are only wogs—or only Irish. These ideas of national and racial superiority are one of the most important weapons used by the ruling class to divide and rule. They are poisonous.

The 'constitutional methods' argument is rather different. Marxists are not in favor of the indiscriminate use of violence. They are in favour of utilizing all available legal avenues for propaganda and agitation. But, as Rosa Luxemburg said, 'every constitution rests upon a revolution.' It was the English revolution of the seventeenth century— and its violent imposition on Scotland and Ireland—that made possible the development of British capitalism. It created the basic legal framework for capitalism to flourish.

The corresponding framework for a socialist society cannot be built up piecemeal. It has to be created in the same way—by revolution. How much violence is involved depends on how effectively the ruling classes are able to organize minority violence against the majority. For socialism can only come, in Marx's words, 'as the conscious movement of the immense majority'.

This is why we are not subject to individual terrorism. Blowing up Mr Robert Carr does not help to develop class consciousness. It is not a moral question. Mr Carr is a supporter of NATO, of the H-bomb, of war against the people of Vietam. He is a supporter of violence for political ends. He has no the slightest moral right to object to opposers use these methods and science to solve grievances. Violence is built into capitalist society. We wish to abolish violence. It can only be done by abolishing capitalism. By peaceful means! Peacefully if possible, and James Connolly, 'fearfully if need be. That is our position too.'
Barren look at American desert...

FOR some amazing and unknown reason, the phrase publicity for Diary of a Mad Housewife (Plaza) has linked the film with the women's liberation movement. I can only presume that, in the eyes of the film's publicity agent, any film that deals in any way with housewives must be identified with women's liberation. In any event, Diary is a film any woman's liberation movement could well do without. It is about the alienated life of a New York housewife, lost amid a bewildering array of consumer goods, a boring social climber of a husband and a pedestrian lover who is a best-selling author.

More sensitive

The trouble is that it has all been done many times before and much better. American middle-class women are sensitive and undoubtedly do feel alienated from any kind of meaningful life. But simply to state this fact is to give the film a certain neutrality of tone. Certainly it adds to the film's generic appeal, but it is of very little help. Benjamin, the director, is a very sensitive man and main form of communication is declarations of how he is acting on his orders and is so completely stylized as to be almost completely unreal.

More credible

Carrie Snodgress is marginally more credible as the heroine of the film, for her character is so riddled with contradictions that it is hard to take her seriously. Her relationship with her man, husband and lover, are basically so one-sided that it is even difficult to sympathize with her dilemmas, presumably the point of the whole exercise.

Saute is a double-edged weapon. At times, Diary seems to be moving towards a parody of all the films of its type. But then it revives itself by having all the seriousness and pompous and as bad as anything of its kind.

Diary of a Mad Housewife bears about as much relationship to the problems of women's liberation as a Bob Hope joke and is only marginally funny.

Martin Tomkinson

SKEGNESS RALLY

International Socialist autumn weekend Derbysire Mines Holiday Centre, 19-21, 17 October Perspectives for Western Capitalism Towards a Revolutionary Socialist Party The International Movement New book now: With Jerry O'Connell 6 Cottons Gardens London £2 60 BN, all £1.50, children's at reduced prices

NEVILLE SMITH wrote and played the elder son in After a Lifetime (ITV, Sunday). But just as important is that Ken Louch directed and produced it.

The film launched us up the Junction, Cathy Come Home, in which a credit (to a schizophrenic girl) the film Ken was and more recently The Rank and File, with a number of actors who were also in last Sunday's film. The film After a Lifetime was made first and rather suspiciously delayed for release.

The Lifetime in the title was lived in Liverpool by Billy Scully—a militiaman and revolutionary and a great fighter. Yet he dies in a story. In his lifetime the working class suffered many defeats and Billy's memory is kept alive by the 'General Strike' which was made into the "General Defeat" by the sell-out of the rank and file by the TUC General Council and the activities of Winston Churchill (then Home Secretary). Churchill's arguments for cutting back on welfare were more elaborate than Billy's.

But the point is that Billy has preserved the tradition of fighting the bosses on his own side. His death shows that the Georgia of the younger son and intensifies the fighting resolve of the elder son.

Billy's poverty, the lost opportunities, the working-class power over society in his lifetime, suggest that there is no cure for disillusion that capitalism can be overthrown. And that within the working class, the working class turns his considerable wit on his own side and practically makes him a 'bloody idiot' can use his humour for better purposes. That real respect for the ideals of the dead can replace conventional correctness, like Bill's. That the real understanding of capitalism can be substituted for Catholic dogmas and Graseness and so on.

Louch's TV plays combine documentary with fiction. The actors are encouraged to interrupt each other, which suggests real interplay rather than one man's mind. Dialogue often sounds unclear, again to make it approximate to the idiom of the working class.

Many of the camera shots, with Billy's passionate eyes, include the back of the head of the international, the mass character. The impression is that he is talking to you directly, that you are one of the talking.

This kind of style is very good for giving a natural context for showing how people behave.

Louch's anger and point of view is a danger, however, of just serving up loads of detail and ignoring the details of people's lives. With his semi-documentary method they often highlight the issues that people face, in this case how to assess Billy's lifetime and what lessons to draw.

Individual characters necessarily tend to be presented more as types, though much less so in After a Lifetime than in Cathy Come Home, with its background information on homeless families like Cathy's, or the Rank and File. The semi-documentary method to combine the drama of fiction with the reality of information plays are designed to expose vital social issues as well as the strength of their socialist ideas and a compelling reality of their own.

Other sorts of plays, with different sorts of social aim, use the emphasis towards the individual.

In the semi-documentary style, the social scene is a vehicle for the development of individual style, Loach and the others have the advantage of television as well as the communicative force of the medium.

REPEAIS of Ronnie Corbett's superbly funny No That's Me Over Here (BBC, 7.30 p.m. then 6.15 p.m.) provide another chance to see the extraordinary contradictions of middle-class life.

Phil Hall

REG GALE, chairman of the Police Federation, your cheerful buddy's apology for a trade union, came over all truthful when he spoke to Young Police at the weekend. The law certainly favoured the rich, he told the YPs at a summer school in York, and people with property tended to be considered more important than people without.

Gale blamed it on the 'Tealul social system' that dictated that police would listen to complaints from the 'squares' rather than from poor people.

"If you misjudge your character and use the wrong sort of language to squire officiail, they will complain and the police service takes note of these complaints," he said.

He added that the police were not good at judging the character of people with black skins and that rich men did not need to worry about the kind of car they had as the police were more likely to stop a youth on a scooter or a student in an old banger.

And he concluded that there was more risk of breaking the law if one was poor. It might be, he said, because poor people do not have the education and did not realize they were committing an offence.

Our fashion correspondent adds: Trendy burlnergans, anxious to avoid arrest, are wearing door-stoppers, tweeds and plus-fours this year and drive to work in Rolls-Royces. If apprehended by the Hombani Brigade assume a polished voice and say: "My pater is the Squire of Hoxton, don't you know? You will be released immediately."

SPEAKING of burglars, one of our acquaintances is complaining that he broke into Ted Heath's library and found only two books there. And one of those hadn't been coloured in.

Share cropper OUTRAGE and indignation last week
Rebel airman flown to US
by R.K. Nelson

SOFTLY, SILENTLY, American Air Force authorities enabled rebel Captain Tom Culver out of Britain on Tuesday. Culver, found guilty at Lakenheath court martial last week for taking part in a G.I. anti-Vietnam war protest, was placed on a flight to his home—on his own expense—for his 'disturbance' during it from military service.

A few hours before his flight, Captain Culver told me: 'I have fought, fought, and I won't fight any more. I'll be back here in a few weeks' time."

Meanwhile, American GIs in Britain are arming up for a head-on confrontation with the US Air Force authorities and the big clash could come in the next few weeks.

Members of PEACE—the USAF anti-Vietnam war movement—planned secret presentation of petitions to the US Embassy in London. It will be a repeat of the 31 May 'demonstration' which led to the arrest of Captain Culver. Culver, a 33-year-old lawyer working in Federal Judge Aldrich's office at Lakenheath, was reprimanded and ordered to be discharged from the service and fined a thousand dollars (£416) for his part in the protest.

Culver took part in a gathering of about 500 GIs in front of Aldershot Barracks on 31 May, went with them to the front of the US Embassy on 1 June, and then attended an open-air concert in Victoria Park, which resulted in a short arrest pending trial next week.

On 16 July the government's advisory committee—a merchant banker, a shipping executive and Lord Robens—anounced that they would be making their first report at the end of the month. They are investigating the position of GIs in the USA and Britain. They are looking at the question of the GIs in Britain not being allowed to demonstrate, and at the possibility of American GIs in the UK joining a protest in the USA if that happens.