THE BIG BATTALIONS of the trade union movement, representing millions of organised working people, are in full retreat before the onslaught of the Tory government and the employers. Hard on the heels of the TUC's surrender to the Industrial Relations Act comes the warning from the TGWU Transport Workers to pay the £50,000 fine imposed by the Industrial Relations Court over the blocking of container lorries by Liverpool dockers.

The union leaders have backed down from a confrontation with a government hell-bent on destroying the organisations and the standards of working people in order to boost the profits of the Tories' political paymasters. If the TUC had called for industrial action in support of the TGWU and the dockers then the anti-union laws could have been swept aside and the future of the government itself brought into question.

Instead, the union leaders have given the green light to the bosses to fine, bully and threaten every legitimate action taken by workers in defence of their rights and in pursuit of improved wages to keep abreast of soaring prices and rents.

Unless stopped, the retreat can lead to total rout. The logical outcome of paying fines will be full recognition of the Act, complete with registration and 'agency shop' agreements. But one militant section of the movement is standing firm in its determination to fight the Tory anti-union legislation and to support what is still official TUC policy towards the Industrial Relations Act.

On Monday the conference of TASS, the technical and supervisory section of the amalgamated engineering union, voted unanimously to defy the NIRC and to refuse to pay any fines it may impose on the union.

Last Friday, the NIRC ruled that TASS was committing an "undesirable industrial practice" in the dispute at C A Parsons engineering works on Tyne-side, where it is defending its closed shop agreement.

Following the TASS decision, President Mike Cooley, in an exclusive interview with Socialist Worker, said it has taken years of painstaking work to build the democracy of this union. Central to it is that members decide the policies and the executive committee operates them.

It is better to be held in contempt of court than to be held in contempt of the members. We should not order the men back at Parsons and we should not abide by the NIRC injunction.

The policies we are pursuing at Parsons are the policies of our section of the amalgamated engineering union, of the AWU itself and of the TUC. I now expect and demand that the TUC will recall to mobilise support for us. In the meantime we should ignore the injunction, fight on and win all the best elements of the trade union movement will support us.

The TASS demonstration was on the Tories and their laws shows the path that must be followed by all sections of the trade union movement. The leaders can be forced into action only if there is mass mobilisation at work and in the streets.

The demands stated on this page for intensifying the fight against the Industrial Relations Act can be realised if workers in every union and every industry organise now in their branches and workplaces, through mass action and resolutions, to put an end to the deathly retreat by the leaders of the unions.

For its part, TASS is calling for a national protest against the Industrial Relations Act.
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The South Vietnamese commanders in Quang Tri and the American "advisors" who give them orders, find the city to save their own lives, while leaving their men to "pick their own way out as best they can", as one of the American officers put it.

But the Americans are not giving up without a last ditch stand. In a desperate attempt to stem the flood of defeat, Nixon has sent the biggest concentration of naval and air power to the area since the war began a decade ago.

And he is threatening still more. A new round of bombing seems to be an attempt to blackmail the South Vietnamese into a surrender from which they will never recover.

Reports indicate that at least on South Vietnamese regiment has shot its senior officer and surrendered to the liberation forces without fighting. Other sections of the army have deserted the moment they had the opportunity. And it is not only the rank and file who are running away.
ACCORDING to official reports more than 200 Ovromos have been detained without trial in Namibia. The South African government, which is illegally occupying Namibia against the wishes of a majority of the people of the United Nations, is determined to destroy the resistance of militant Ovromos who went on strike last December.

A police report given the South African police arbitrary powers of arrest was passed at the beginning of February. A blank on news has presented reports of continued resistance. Over 10,000 Namibians from reaching the outside world.

The REIGN of terror of the Greek ruling junta continued. The army's brutal police methods of suppressing the five anniversary of the colonels' coup have been described by the Open Society as the "effective anti-junta demonstration." The Athens University staging political song and chanting anti-junta slogans is the new wave of the army's effort to subjugate the country.

The special police批量 political activity and attacked the demonstration, trying to disperse them. There were 15 arrests, though some were later released.

During the recent American tour by the internationally players the party visited the White House. Four of the six tourists players the party refused to shake hands with Nixon in protest at the bombing of theStarted. The Chinese, however, were models of cordiality.

The APRIL national committee meeting of the International Socialists of the United States, the leading group's anti-monopoly, and its industrial activity in developing rank-and-file activism.

The National Union of Egyptian, working class members against the regime of President Sadat is already small. The Taftians Against United Railway Workers, the most important organization, has not achieved many victories. The addition of new supporters to the small programme is still sketchy. The United Chacoum is likely to remain a small force able to disrupt rank-and-file militancy during the coming year, which could easily degenerate to the worst.

The Egyptian government is making another gesture to popular discontent. The government's announcement of an end to the 20-month-long ban on political parties is to be welcomed. There is a need for a political solution to the problems that face the country.

ON MAY DAY, the international workers' day, we wish to send a fraternal greeting to all the hard-working workers of the world. The struggle of the British working class and the class that it has imposed on the whole of the free world, in every country, is an example for us and demonisation of the masses. The working class is the vanguard of the working class and the vanguard of the world.
Socialist Worker

Workers must fight after TUC treachery

The ROT has sat in with a vengeance. As we predicted last week—and is shown in detail in this week’s centre pages—the dominant wing of the TUC leadership has thrown in its hand and abandoned any serious opposition to the Industrial Relations Act.

By dropping the total boycott of the National Industrial Relations Court, the General Council has opened up the road for the registration of the registrars. The conference last weekend decided to register in the confident expectation that no action would be taken against the union. Not so in the minds of those expectations. For example, they know that, though the National Union of Seamen is officially suspended from the TUC for its pro-registration policy, NUS has been gig Hawthorne has continued to sit on the General Council and, it is reliably reported, continued to cast his vote against the policies decided at Croydon and Blackpool. Add to that the advice to the Transport Workers to pay the £5,000 fine imposed on it by the court, the meeting with Heath, the scheme for a ‘National Conciliation and Arbitration Service’ and above all the permission for unions to appear before the NIC and the right wing have the green light to register and to co-operate with the law.

What can be done now? Naturally, the fight to hold unions to the policy of non-co-operation must continue. We place no confidence whatsoever in the ability or willingness of the official ‘left wingers’, if left to their own devices, to carry on this struggle.

Rank and file pressure on them must be intensified. The job is important. Dispute at all costs. Call out all national dockers to paralyse the official union machines. To the extent that this trend becomes widespread it will make the work of the right wing easier. It must be resisted.

The TUC’s ‘conciliation act’ will never beat the Tories. Grass roots resistance is the key factor. The whole importance of the fight inside the unions is to make it easier to rally this resistance.

The government, aided by the cowardice and treachery of the TUC bosses, has gained important successes. But it has yet to face the crunch—the enforcement of the law against open defiance. The containerisation dispute on Mersey side is critical here.

‘Face-saving formula’

The government cannot win by simple use of the law. It cannot hope to fine and imprison enough dockers to break a union so determined to keep a principle. The government Secretary Macmillan is willing to talk of ‘solutions’ with Jack Jones. Indeed, provided resistance is sufficiently widespread, the government may well bring about a situation where the dockers will themselves create the conditions under which the ‘face-saving formula’ will come into being.

But as soon as any weakening on the part of the dockers, any concessions to the TGWU leaders’ call to stop blocking, will encourage the government to go all out for victory. And even if the government is forced back, the dockers’ strike will disintegrate, and so will the whole process of unionisation.

The technical staff at C.A. Parsons in Newport are right in the firing line and other groups will be attacked one by one. Co-ordinated resistance is essential. Support by other sections to each group of workers singled out for attack is absolutely vital if we are not to be defeated piecemeal. There will be no co-ordinated resistance from the top. Quite the contrary. Large sections of the official leadership will actively assist the Tories. Co-ordination depends on a rank and file movement crossing all the country lines. To date there has been one serious attempt at such a movement—the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions. Its record does not inspire confidence. Large dependant on the Communist Party for political guidance, it has concentrated its efforts on putting pressure on the trade union leadership.

In itself this is correct but it is only a part and not the greater part of the task. The question now is whether the Liaison Committee can become a force to organise the industrial struggle of the dockers now that the Parsons’ staff are out. A good many Communist Party and other militant unquestionably want it to do this. They must be given every encouragement to attack the Liaison Committee, paying less attention to union electoral considerations and to giving a fighting lead.

The decision of the conference of the LDCU is the place to do it. If this fails, as we believe is unfortunately all too likely, the job will be to build an alternative centre which will really try to lead the fight.
When the dockers smashed union law

HISTORY sometimes repeats itself. Today, while the labour movements of the TUC are in full retreat, dockers in Merseyside and elsewhere are in an open confrontation with the Tories' Industrial Relations Act.

They are taking the TUC's official policy of non-co-operation seriously, and in doing so are making a direct challenge to the Government. Dockers who are spearheading the real fight against the anti-strike laws. Yet it was in 1951 that the Merseyside dockers sparked off a strike that virtually destroyed the then anti-strike law, known as Order 1305.

If today is not like 1951, it is partly because not all working people have absorbed the lesson of what happened in that fateful year; that if the strike was lost, the law would be a means of upholding the conditions under which the industrial might to destroy those laws. Once it is resistance behind a determined, militant front, nothing can stand in the way of the force of the working class.

The 'Conditions of Employment and National Arbitration Order'—Order 1305—was issued by the wartime National Government on 7 July 1944. It set up a compulsory Arbitration Tribunal, the decisions of which were binding on any side involved in a dispute.

Shops were broken up, lock-outs were thereby prohibited and illegal, by a twist of the architect of Order 1305 was the wartime Labour Government—a man who during the 1920s was known as the dockers' KC.

Later dockers were to have other names for him. At the time, the Labour Party committed itself to an 'iron uniform' approach to the government created by the war to balance the economy. Government not only kept 1305, it used it against strikers.

The Labour government was swiped to power on 27 June 1945. At a hustings meeting, then Minister for Labour, William Taft, Prime Minister Attlee and deputy was based on the brotherhood of man.

Five days later, in pursuit of its policies, the government sent 600 armed troops into Liverpool's docks to break a dock strike. This cast the die for the laws to which we are beholden today.

Order 1305 was not once invoked against the employers, yet there were many times when it had been. Dockers in London were effectively locked-out during the 1945 go-slow, while the Government and Merseyside were locked out by strikers in the shipyards during the Canadian summer in 1949.

The TUC and the government hesitate to use the trade union law with any better standard of life. No fewer than seven times, troops were sent in to break strikes in the docks. And in a last resort, Labour turned to Order 1305.

But the government made a fatal mistake when it chose to use 1305 on the dockers. The dispute began in Birkenhead on 2 February 1951.

The main dockland trade union, the Transport Workers Union, had just negotiated a new wage agreement. London strike committees were busy and Merseyside were locked out. The government saw it as a test case for the law order. And for this splendid sum, the union had agreed to mechanise, new manning scales, a purge on 'scabbery' and measures to abridge well-established protective practices.

The agreement was put to and accepted by the TGWU's National Docks Delegates Conference—but on condition the dockers were up in arms and wanted nothing to do with

Birkenhead's 2000 dockers stopped work. It spread rapidly, and within days, 12,000 dockers were out in Liverpool, Manchester and Hull.

Brave-drew up Order 1305.

When the dockers smashed union law

Victory

Still with every appearance of the Seven throughout March and April.

On 18 April 1951, the case was finally heard. Sir Hartley Shawcross, the Attorney General, prosecuted the 'Seven' on behalf of the 'socialist' courts.

TGWU officials gave evidence against their own members. Meanwhile, outside the court, thousands of working men and women demonstrated in defiance to the brothers in the courtroom being hanged high.

Italy, the jury returned a verdict of 'Not Guilty' on the major charge. Discredited, Sir Hartley Shawcross had little choice but to drop the other charges on the grounds of the jury's 'blagged findings'. The 'Seven' were carried out the court as heroes.

It was plainly a victory for the whole working class, but the victory didn't end there. Under this crushing defeat, the government was forced to withdraw Order 1305, and replace it with the much milder Industrial Disputes and Compulsory Arbitration Order. After 11 years, mass action paid. The working class had smashed the shackles of anti-strike laws.

So today, all those who talk of the 'rule of law' and the law of the land must be obeyed or else—should be told to remember what the dockers did in 1951. And let that be a guide and an inspiration today.
Democrats' two-faced challenger to Nixon

SENIOR GEORGE McGovern, victor in the Massachusetts 'primary election' last week, is now the firm favourite to win the Democratic Party's nomination for the presidential election this autumn. He has been endorsed as a 'left-wing' candidate who opposed the Vietnam war. He hopes to win the nomination by picking up the support of the old Kennedy-McCain forces from 1968.

His anti-war reputation has won him the backing of many students and anti-war activists who have promised to boost their campaign in many states. He has helped once more to convince them to give the Democratic Party another chance. But McGovern represents nothing new in the Democratic Party, nor are his politics significantly to the left of any of the other major candidates, except the ex-VP Humphrey.

McGovern claims he is the only candidate who has been consistently opposed to the war, not merely since 1968, but since the early days. There is a wide gap, however, between what McGovern said before the war and what his record has been.

In 1966, McGovern voted against repeal of the Tonkin Gulf resolution which had provided the 'legal' cover for American intervention in the war. In 1967 he voted to allocate extra funds for Vietnam and he has consistently voted in favour of defence budgets which included allocations to pay for the war.

McGovern's position on immediate withdrawal from Vietnam has been at best vague. He has at various times been for negotiations, setting a date for withdrawal, conditional on the return of American prisoners. Now he claims that if elected he would include all troops within 90 days. Perhaps he would—but campaign promises are cheap and his record does not instil confidence.

Bases

More important, however, McGovern's policies do not represent any significant break with America's foreign policy as a whole, with the imperialist foreign policy which is responsible for the war in Vietnam. He is not in favour of dismantling the US military bases or of cutting off military aid to the various reactionary dictatorships the US supports.

McGovern promises to cut back the US defence budget to an annual 50 million dollars from the current 83 million dollars. But such cuts would not be welcome. But the cutback he promises would not have been made had he not been pushed by the policy of US imperialist adversaries abroad. He just disagrees about how much it should cost to maintain American imperialism.

And so, despite his campaign policies, he has changed his past performance. In his statements and in his voting pattern, his record is far from that of McGovern is an anti-war candidate.

His position on other issues is equally mixed. For example, he vigorously criticizes Nixon's economic programme. But when he voted for a Bill giving the president authority to transfer control of the price freeze and has consistently spoken in favour of 'selective' wage and price controls.

Fiction

He also favours controls on profits, calling for an 'excess' profits tax. But he voted against a freeze on profits and it is difficult to tell what he means by 'excess' profits.

In truth, McGovern's controls would be no different from Nixon's because they accept the same analysis of production which is the basis. That is, the idea that working people, especially those in large unions, can be 'price setters' and not 'price takers' as Fordite.

McGovern's selective price controls would be just as fictitious as Nixon's would. They should continue to be rigidly controlled.

Any doubt of this was removed when the McGovern campaign started enforcing compulsory arbitration to end the dock strike. Presumably, however, he too feels that dock workers are being paid too much.

This Bill concerned more than dock workers' modest wages, however. It was an attack on the entire labour movement's right to strike.

It was this vote an isolated mistake on McGovern's part. In 1967 he twice voted to extend the ban on strikes by the rail unions.

His most famous anti-war vote came in 1966 when he voted against stopping a right-wing move in the Senate aimed at preventing repeal of a section of the Taft-Hartley Act that enables states to outlaw the union closed shop.

McGovern has been a strong supporter of Equal Rights legislation for women and this has won him the support of many women's groups. But many women recognise that this legislation would be a mixed blessing. It would be used to abolish all protective legislation, much of which is beneficial to women workers and should be extended to all workers, not simply abolished. McGovern has supported all major civil rights legislation and believes that this qualifies him as a friend of the blacks. But most blacks realise how shallow such legislation is.

McGovern's programme is a bankroll of all the others and offers no real change. Real change cannot be won using campaigns like his.

On the contrary, they have the effect of helping to show up the system by preserving the illusion that change can be won through the Democratic Party.

McGovern's real problem in this campaign is convincing people that he can beat Nixon in November. That is the only real election 'issue'.

That is why the campaign is so dull. It is also why, no matter who wins, the workers will lose.

McGovern's programme is one of 'outside the system' activity, not a programme of change. He demands that everyone else should do the work. That means that the labour movement and all working people will have to do the work.

To BEAT the worker's movement and the community relations campaigns off the back.

RACE SETBACK FOR BOSSES

The Power Game

By Colin Barker

The truth about the power industry, the workers' own class, and the Party's record of leadership and struggle.

McGovern's policies are meant to give a false sense of security to those who are unable to win a real change in the world of work. Gail McGovern's programme is one of 'outside the system' activity, not a programme of change. He demands that everyone else should do the work. That means that the labour movement and all working people will have to do the work.

ONE RESEARCHER, Robin Jenkins, as 'Spying on blacks'.

The biggest example of this was E J B Rose's five-year survey resulting in Colour and Citizenship, which the majority of American workers are an objective fact-gathering exercise and academically reliable. Yet, Rose pushed the book through old Labour's involvement policies and he told Professor John Rax that no one was 'to be put over a bar'.
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BOYCOTT

The imposition of a 14-day cooling off period by TUC unions represented a step towards legal action against the employers. This was a move towards the use of the law to enforce their demands.

However, the trade unions' decision to take such action did not go down well with the government, which was determined to avoid any form of industrial action.

The government's stance was reinforced by the fact that the TUC unions had not consulted with the employers before taking their decision.

On the other hand, the trade unions were determined to press ahead with their plans, despite the government's opposition.

The situation was further complicated by the fact that the TUC unions were in dispute with the employers over a range of issues, including pay, hours, and working conditions.

In the meantime, the situation continued to escalate, with both sides dug in and unwilling to compromise.

---

LAURIE FLYNN writes a blow-by-blow account of the union leaders' surrender to the Tories' anti-union laws.

---

The Norwich union executive (ASLEF) voted five to four to accept the offer.

The Norwich executive's decision was a blow to the TUC and the trade union movement as a whole.

The Labour government, which had been supportive of the TUC unions, was now in a difficult position.

It had to decide whether to support the union leaders or to back down and risk losing the backing of the electorate.

---

TACTICS

The TUC unions' decision to accept the government's offer was a major setback for the trade union movement.

It demonstrated that the government was able to impose its will on the trade unions, despite their efforts to resist.

The TUC unions' decision was also a blow to the Labour government, which had been trying to build a coalition of support for its anti-union laws.

---

The fines will not influence the doing of the TUC, and we are the trade unionists. It will not influence the doing of the TUC.
The best law that money can buy

THE WHOLSTABILITY of society, as our good Conservative politicians tell us, is based on the rule of law. In fact, to be more precise, the edifice rests on one small pillar: the rule of law.

TWO weeks' ago, I pointed out to my London Club how a chivalrous defender of the law (with whom I happen to have no quibbles) had no qualms about disregarding the law to get the same result as the trade unionists who applied to capitalist employers.

Heaton's Transport to St Helens was defied and our entire civilisation crumbles.

Catherine of Alexandria, both praised the press, both noted for their veneration of the law, have been quick to point out the peril that exists. But, alas, many commentaries come from that, ah, that ubiquitous, individual who writes Cotton Yarns in Socialist Worker.

After a Belfast court ruled that anyone who breaks the law, no matter how, might not be the same as a right-wing judge declaring the law no longer effective for them. For the assumption on which our legal pannistone is that the legal profession does not do a good job, whatever people do is usually bad. One side can do no right, the other side is not given the benefit of the doubt.

Refusal

Anybody who has any old-fashioned notions about equality before the law should discard them, just compare what happened over infringements of the law in Britain today with the Industrial Relations Bill.

The Transport and General Workers Union, with an estimated 500,000 members in it, has no need to break the law.

On the other hand, when 22 peaceful pickets outside a workers' house after an employer had broken the law, the Transport and General Workers Union fined the man £175.

On these calculations, it would be possible to raise 3,000 human beings for one clause of the Industrial Relations Act.

Can anybody who thinks that capitalist legal system places greater store on the protection of property than human life imagine that those employers who have been fined for breaking the law—having broken it themselves, have no regard for the law in the first place. You cannot take up a principle and position and stand up to the law and then, when you change your mind, try to break it.

The company simply received a notice that it was being fined for an advertisement of its assets being seized, as a result of its illegal occupation of the factory. The company made the claim in a notice statement which was published in the local paper. The company made the claim in a notice which was immediately seized.

柠lers to lift the blacking. We are not union.

—Jimmy Synes (Chairman of the Liverpool dockers shop stewards' committee), Friday 21 April.
BECAUSE the workers have been taught to view the world according to the needs of the ruling class, even many advanced workers consciously interpret their own struggles in narrow terms.

Workers have been drummed into them that politics and economics are separate, that they may fight in the factory on wage issues, but so-called 'political' questions must be left to the politicians in parliament.

A strike is therefore experienced by most workers involved as being solely in support of the demand (usually raised—say, a rise in wage claim).

But at a deeper level, workers fighting the boss do so to assert their dignity as human beings, to achieve some measure of control over their lives. Only in struggle can workers experience themselves as something more than objects to be manipulated, as independent beings who cannot be pushed around indefinitely.

In 20 years the proportion of strikes over purely wage issues has fallen from three-quarters to a third. Two-thirds of all strikes in Britain today are over such issues as working conditions, discipline or rules.

'There is a growing urge among workers to limit management authority inside the factories, to exercise control over their work (e.g. not to have to break out because a foreman has sworn at a worker, because workers are determined to resist speed-ups, or because they reject the indignity of being told how long they can spend in the toilet). In the case of many strikes fought over purely wage issues, long after the money is won, the workers still fight, though the workers know that it may be nine or ten years before the increases are paid and wages will make up for the money lost.

EXPLOITED

The basic hostility to management's dictatorial power is never far from the surface.

The ultimate logic of such struggles can only be the nationalisation of the economy. But nationalisation is to be carried out not as the result of a workers' revolutionary drive but as the result of a parliamentary victory by the Labour Party when its left wing has become dominant.

In the eyes of the elected 'socialist' government, the workers will then be 'encouraged' to continue running the capitalist world through which, it is hoped, great benefits will accrue to working people.

Reformist leaders have always believed in the need to persuade the employers and the government to expand the economy, so that more reforms will be available to the working class. This inevitably involves collaboration in varying degrees with the bosses so that they can expand.

So reformist leaders can never be relied on to develop a consistent struggle against capitalism.

MACHINE

Today even right-wing union leaders find themselves forced to support some strikes as a result of the growing militancy and an increasingly active work-force. But even these leaders—whether of the right or left variety—have achieved positions of special privilege within capitalism; a privilege which stems from their control over the union.

They therefore come to see the organisation and financial needs of the union machine as more important than the needs of their own members or of the whole working class. To the extent that they do respond to the feeling of their members, they approach their problems in a sectional, narrow, and remotely connected with the problems faced by other sections of workers.

In their wish to retain control of the working-class organisations, the labour leaders believe in acting on behalf of the workers rather than mobilising them to act for themselves. So these leaders are in a barrier to the full realisation by workers of their own potential power.

For the most part, the capitalist class is able to keep control by relying on ideological control of the workers, on the habits of obedience which is instilled into them by those who exploit, and on the collaboration of the reformist labour leaders.

If all this fails, the ruling class can fall back on the full power of the state to prop up its mise. For they have the police forces, the law courts, the prisons and the army.

Of course only in extreme cases, when an increasingly militant working class appears to threaten the whole basis of capitalist power, do the ruling class need to mobilise the full power of the state. But in periods of revolutionary upsurge, the deepening economic crisis, the range of political choices open to both the ruling class and the working class movement becomes narrower.

The ruling class are now exerting increasing repression in an attempt to safeguard their power. And if the working class does not respond with equal ferocity, its organisations will be crushed.

In such periods, when the choice is between fascists and working-class power, only a revolutionary party with deep roots in the working class can both lead its resistance and act as a counter-offensive whose goal can only be the creation of a workers' state.

There is one only example to call to the mind of such successful resistance and counter-attack: that of the Bolshevik Party in the Russian Revolution.

URGENT

In all other cases of working class up-rising, Germany 1918/19, Italy 1919/20, Spain 1936, the labour movement was destroyed by counter-revolution. Only in Russia was there a mass revolutionary party which was therefore able both to withstand the right-wing threat and lead the workers to power.

The working class today does not yet face the choice between fascists or workers' power. But confronted with the offences from employers and the state, it is not only urgently necessary but increasingly possible to build a mass revolutionary party.

The Tory-employer offensive means that different sections of workers are more and more often facing the same sort of problems. A fighting organisation uniting the most advanced socialist militant leaders would mean they could exchange ideas and information about their different struggles.

By pooling experiences, they could reach common policies on crucial questions affecting the labour movement. Because of the failures of reformist leadership, it is only through a revolutionary party that militants from various industries can transcend the barriers of different struggles from one section of the movement to another.

A revolutionary party also preserves the lessons, historical traditions and heritage derived from working class struggles of the past. It is the 'memory 'of the working class.'

One constant disadvantage to the working class that they are far less united than the ruling class.

Conflicts and debates do take place within the ruling class, but when they occur, they do so as a united body, through the state or another of their organisations. By contrast, the working class acts in a fragmented way, each section taking on the ruling class on its own.

In this, one in particular, in a general strike or a revolutionary situation that the working class can be completely united. But the task of a revolutionary party today is to begin to forge the links that can create within the working class the same unity that exists in the ruling class.

CRISIS

Because of the decline of international capitalism, workers can no longer achieve reforms by local action or by relying on their national officials. The state-employed offensive against the working class demands conscious political organising by workers if they are to defend themselves effectively and, in the longer term, launch a counter-attack.

At no time since the 1920s has the opportunity to build a revolutionary party been greater. If this opportunity is not seized, then the crisis of capitalism will lead once again to barbarism instead of socialism, this time with nuclear war as its probable outcome.

But if the opportunity is seized then the result can be socialism and a workers' state. The purpose of the International Socialists is to seize that opportunity.
IN THE aftermath of the spy films a wave of cops and robbers films are pouring round the circuits. Dirty Harry, directed by Don Siegel and starring Clint Eastwood, is out on ABC and The French Connection, directed by William Friedkin and starring Gene Hackman, is out on the Rank-Odeon circuit.

Donald Harry is a San Franciscan, where a psychopathic killer who signs himself simply "Harry" is on the loose. The task of tracking him down is assigned to a bemused and dedicated detective known simply as Dirty Harry, played by Clint Eastwood.

Siegel, the director, is a medicated and pedantic but sometimes a cult figure among critics. They found the film familiar, a bit hammy and paradoxical. It isn't.

The hero is a typical Siegel creation. A single man with no family and little interest in the drudgery of a police job, he is surrounded by inadequates. Siegel's Invasion Of The Body Snatchers was seen by many as a comment on McCarthyism and 'UFO' hunting; in fact it was a celebration of Siegel's dovernticism.

In all his films we come across Dirty Harry, fighting for something clean and real in a world of people who never understand.

Characteristically Dirty Harry's superiors in the bureaucratic and city administration don't understand him any more than the self-serving liberals inside, who disapprove of tough police methods. So Harry is job-hopped. Throughout Harry is thoughtful, unemotional and implacable. He is theoden (a word used by Harry), a typical Harry, a hero capable of anything.

He catches Scopio—only to lose him through a legal loophole. When he finally gets his man he intends to shoot him, but, rushing away, he will be wounded, he will try to reach for his gun.

The people he works for would never understand. They have no time for League and the police badge in the pond behind the dead Scopio.

Few films have ended more dramatically. In the final scene, Dirty Harry doesn't throw their badge away—they get them back and use them.

The American ruling class, just like our own, understand and sympathise... who does Siegel think he's fooling? But despite its opening tribute to the San Francisco police force the film is not a hard-line story in the terms of law and order.

The miserable Siegel is no Hawk or Samuel Fuller, and so instead of rough defence to dodge the issues and make an implausible and patently dishonest movie,able to show the police as they are and defend them he wins up with gross distortion and conclusions.

The French Connection looks at the French police. James Fox is naturally portrayed by Gene Hackman a hand-worked cop based on Edie Fagan, until recently a controversial member of New York's police department.

Egan had been involved in a very similar affair. Using New York as the background, the film traces Doyle's attempts to break a heroin smuggling ring with connections in high places.

Doyle, like his opponents, is aghast and profoundly intolerant. He differs from his colleagues in his unselfishness, his quality of person. He hates Hacks, stands out against the police. In ruthless and dislike all other police departments.

The film, using the vehicle of a fast-moving thriller, illustrates the corruption of the whole system. There are no 'good' characters, the film moves right across the spectrum from the police force, the black ghetto, petty crime, the mafia, big business, against the background of the huge human waste of the big city.

The end of the film, which I can't reveal without spoilng it, is entirely inappropriate. It offers us no solutions, but gets close to showing what we are up against. Make sure you get to see it.

PHILIP EASTMAN

Sedgwick and Laing (continued)

THOSE readers of REVIEW Page who were outraged, disappointed or cheered by Peter Sedgwick's articles on the film, have noticed his name leaping out of the commentary of the psychiatrist R.D. Laing will be only too well pleased, disappointed  or cheered to know that he is returning to the subject on Radio 3 next week.

JILL BRANSTON

On Wednesday 10 May Peter Sedgwick will appear on R D Laing, Doctor For An Epoch at 8.45pm. The following Sunday 15 May Sedgwick will appear with David Mercer, the marxist psychiatrist who wrote Family Life, under The Politics Of The Imagination. This is to be broadcast at 1.50pm.
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Donald Harry is a San Franciscan, where a psychopathic killer who signs himself simply "Harry" is on the loose. The task of tracking him down is assigned to a bemused and dedicated detective known simply as Dirty Harry, played by Clint Eastwood.

Siegel, the director, is a medicated and pedantic but sometimes a cult figure among critics. They found the film familiar, a bit hammy and paradoxical. It isn't.

The hero is a typical Siegel creation. A single man with no family and little interest in the drudgery of a police job, he is surrounded by inadequates. Siegel's Invasion Of The Body Snatchers was seen by many as a comment on McCarthyism and 'UFO' hunting; in fact it was a celebration of Siegel's dovernticism.

In all his films we come across Dirty Harry, fighting for something clean and real in a world of people who never understand.

Characteristically Dirty Harry's superiors in the bureaucratic and city administration don't understand him any more than the self-serving liberals inside, who disapprove of tough police methods. So Harry is job-hopped. Throughout Harry is thoughtful, unemotional and implacable. He is theoden (a word used by Harry), a typical Harry, a hero capable of anything.

He catches Scopio—only to lose him through a legal loophole. When he finally gets his man he intends to shoot him, but, rushing away, he will be wounded, he will try to reach for his gun.

The people he works for would never understand. They have no time for League and the police badge in the pond behind the dead Scopio.

Few films have ended more dramatically. In the final scene, Dirty Harry doesn't throw their badge away—they get them back and use them.

The American ruling class, just like our own, understand and sympathise... who does Siegel think he's fooling? But despite its opening tribute to the San Francisco police force the film is not a hard-line story in the terms of law and order.

The miserable Siegel is no Hawk or Samuel Fuller, and so instead of rough defence to dodge the issues and make an implausible and patently dishonest movie,able to show the police as they are and defend them he wins up with gross distortion and conclusions.

The French Connection looks at the French police. James Fox is naturally portrayed by Gene Hackman a hand-worked cop based on Edie Fagan, until recently a controversial member of New York's police department.

Egan had been involved in a very similar affair. Using New York as the background, the film traces Doyle's attempts to break a heroin smuggling ring with connections in high places.

Doyle, like his opponents, is aghast and profoundly intolerant. He differs from his colleagues in his unselfishness, his quality of person. He hates Hacks, stands out against the police. In ruthless and dislike all other police departments.

The film, using the vehicle of a fast-moving thriller, illustrates the corruption of the whole system. There are no 'good' characters, the film moves right across the spectrum from the police force, the black ghetto, petty crime, the mafia, big business, against the background of the huge human waste of the big city.

The end of the film, which I can't reveal without spoilng it, is entirely inappropriate. It offers us no solutions, but gets close to showing what we are up against. Make sure you get to see it.

PHILIP EASTMAN

Sedgwick and Laing (continued)

THOSE readers of REVIEW Page who were outraged, disappointed or cheered by Peter Sedgwick's articles on the film, have noticed his name leaping out of the commentary of the psychiatrist R.D. Laing will be only too well pleased, disappointed  or cheered to know that he is returning to the subject on Radio 3 next week.
Papers silent over censorship protest

JOURNALISTS publicly denounce censorship by their own bosses. Examples big and small are cited, complete with those little extra points of information which are the authentic complaint from the general, unsubstantiated grouse.

The conference, declare that censorship in future will be met by strike action.

All this, apart from a vague men¬tion in the Daily Telegraph that it "shied away from the details," was ignored by the country. Readers are not to be "allowed" to see the systematic suppression and distor¬tion of the news in our "free press" pumps out to them each day.

Ironically, however, the National Union of Journalists has been given a lot of space by the "heavies"—the Telegraph, Times and Guardian. Following the conference decision by a large majority to denounce the National Press and Related Relations Act.

The Telegraph in particular, fresh from its public crucifixion of the student scandal, is trying the same tactics with the NUJ. The conference, taken by the NUJ elected and mandated by branches of the union, is naming the newspaper as a racket because it ran counter to a referendum of members which showed a clear majority in favor of "walking on the papers" in favor of staying on the register.

The Telegraph, rejoining in thecombative tradition of the NUJ executive, published an inaccurate and muddled leader in an effort to convince readers that Britain's journalists were being politically bullied by a minority daily.

Journalists have now seen the treatment meted out to themselves and may be better able to understand future why other groups become furious over the twisted and selective facts that are published about them.

Mind you, the Telegraph cannot be accused of suppressing the Protes¬tant cause in Northern Ireland. On Saturday it published a suitably el¬eptive list of supposed facts under Nigel Wade's byline. Among these, 10,000-strong secret Protestant militia had been established as the para-military wing of the Vanguard movement.

Sickening

It was the kind of "exclusive" available to any bored reporter, but only a paper prepared to accept un¬checkable, half-baked theories, destined to publish it. Perhaps it is a sign of the Telegraph's desperation in face of the government's pathetic inability to secure any foothold of working class Catholic sympathy in the Six Counties.

But the most sickening feature of press coverage in Northern Ireland over the recent period was the treat¬ment of Dr. Ian Paisley, of the Democratic Unionist Party. According to Minister McSharry's release from internment after his wife, Elizabeth, approached Whitelaw personally.

He may, like all internees, have been under arrest without being charged, called to trial, or asked to face any recognizance legal procedure. He was simply whisked away to a camp.

Without exception Finnis streeted his release as something for which he should feel personally grate¬full to Whitelaw. The fact that McSharry had been denied his freed¬om for six months under a system of non-judice that civilised society would tolerate was totally ignored by the press.

Chapman Finnis and the Daily Express had their own Concordia scoop on Thursday. And they were welcomed by the press.

The Finnis paper, appearing under a headline IT'S A ROYAL FLUSH OF CONCORDES, claimed that Air France and BOAC were each going to order five Concordes. The announce¬ment would come when the Queen arrived at Heathrow.

Finnis referred to the "inaccurate propaganda" of the many faults listed against the Concord project.

In addition to Finnis's front-page rubbish the Express found space inside for a nicely "objective" rating of the "Tremendous sale" by Geoffrey Knight, whose ability to maintain an optimistic line was doub¬ted at the slightest bit affected by the fact that the Daily Express was the official aircraft division of BAC, makers of Concord.

Like Finnis, he reassured without putting forward any further form of evidence. Nor was the Express a world-beater which will sell and have no deterrent effect on the public. The qualities of life, the price of houses, their level, the level of non-married couples, television reception in the provinces, or the mediocre of ChiCha in old age.

Vive l'Entente Concordia!
DUBLIN—People in Southern Ireland vote next Wednesday in a referendum on the future and deep impact on the political situation. The issue is one that Ireland should join the Common Market.

The campaign has become really urgent only in the last few weeks. The movement will, if successful, drive the Fianna Fail government to seek a referendum. It is getting worried about the outcome. Ministers are preparing to be on the spot in every town and city in the country next week.

One of the main reasons for the referendum is that the country, large numbers of workers see the issues in a revolutionary class conscious light. The reference will make the issues to the left the last real opportunity.

Thousands of Dublin Corporation tenants went on rent strike on Monday, joining 20,000 other tenants throughout the country. The previous Thursday 10,000 tenants had marched to the city hall, where they burned notices of rent increase and called for a new day of protest.

The workers in Ireland's power supply industry returned to work last week after 15 days on strike. They still showed signs of defiance, although they were badly beaten by the combined efforts of the employers and the Irish Congress of Trade Unions, which told workers to return to work.

The shift workers, which organized the strike, has said that it will resume the work of the workers through the issue of new notices and has stated that the workers who opposed the strike and to form a new union.

Belfast: In a long series of street conflicts last weekend the young Protestant workers of East Belfast found themselves for the first time in recent years in a position to get behind the national issue at last. The police in Belfast have the people on their side, the Protestants in the south and the historians are saying that the issue the state machine belongs to the people and the British state.

But this does not mean an immediate change of heart within the Protestant working class. This is a much more complex and drawn out process. But it means that the people are having the issue of their frustrations on their own terms. North and South of Belfast, the working classes and the industrial workers are struggling to find its way.

The attitude of the Protestants is that this is a struggle and a people are able to do a terrible job in attacking them. They have a deep-seated feeling that the Catholic community is not loyal—of its profits.

Protestants are also rethinking their alliances with ICJ and the RUC. A new group is being planned to include Protestant workers more than Catholics. Negotiations for an engineering pay claim that is feared the relationship between the Protestant workers and the Catholic workers could be further strained.

Labour pledge to tenants

Gardiner—500 delegates at a protest meeting last week against the Fine Gael bill on rent control and mortgage foreclosures. Labour councillors from Waterford and Cork said that the government would refuse to put rent up.

Mr. Michael Wilson, leader of the Workers' Action Committee, which also has a Labour council, had already said that the government was opposed to the bill and that if it goes through, the government would have to refuse to put rents up.

Mr. Wilson said that the government was given a mandate by the tenants in the area. A total of 200 tenants in the area were reported to be involved in the dispute, and more than 100 of them were reported to be involved in the dispute.

They were to be told that the government intended to repossess the houses in the area and that the government would not put up rents.

HALSTEAD, Essex—150 tenants packed the first tenants' rights meeting in the town on Tuesday night to demand that if the council refused to agree to a rent strike, they would refuse to pay.

The tenants' rights movement in the town is organized by the Tenants Action Committee and consists of several groups that are trying to get the council to recognize the position.

The decision it takes at Bournemouth on the union's attitude to the Industrial Relations Act will have far reaching consequences for the whole of the country. The union is already in a position to influence the government's attitude to the trade unions, and the union leaders are likely to use this position to change the attitude of the government and force them to change their policies.

There will be no true class-conscious action in the country until the government can show that there is a genuine desire to bring about a change in the way the country is run. The government's attitude to the trade unions will be decisive in determining the future of the country.

The tenants in the area are not likely to be defeated by the government's attempts to defeat the Tenants' attempts to force the government to agree to a rent strike.
No compromise on hours and pay say sit-in workers

by Bob Light (TGWU Royal Docks, London)

HISTORY is being made in Britain’s dockland. In the past week alone the temperature has been brought to boiling point.

There was the news that Liverpool was maintaining its black on containers locked inside the dock labour board scheme. Then the employers announced that they were going to the courts.

Southern Stevedores, the third biggest employer in the London docks.

Hull, Manchester, Preston, London and Southampton decided to follow Liverpool’s lead.

Finally, the Transport and General Workers’ Union decided to pay the Tivy fines levied against the union for not keeping the dockers’ fight to keep their jobs.

It is no exaggeration to say that dockers are now engaged in the most crucial battle of their history. They are fighting for their very existence, and to survive they are prepared to put the Tivy union and its Industrial Relations Act in the face of a top level ‘tit-for-tat’.

The threatened closure of Southern Stevedores and the battle against the half empty fleet of Tivy’s and its kind are clearly reflective. Both conflicts the battle for jobs.

Southern is owned by a consortium of their huge shipping and stevedoring firms: Ocean Stevedores, Furness Withy and British and Commonwealth Steamship. The employers say that Southern must be shut down because ‘trade has been driven elsewhere’.

DIVERT TRADE

What they mean is that they want to drive jobs out of the dockland boarddepots outside the scheme. Where they are much lower, than dockers can command, and where they can be employed by employers who can get only a minimal basic wage.

Southern’s official leadership of the Transport and General Workers Union is now perfectly placed. A massive job losses and closure of docking yards is a means of productivity dealing it has co-operated with the employers and successive govern-

ments in running down the ports industry. It has committed its fate on getting better average pay and the like.

Where work has been transferred to the designated subsidiary consumer firms, the TGWU has gone ahead and obtained closed shop agreements. As a result a serious official has been allowed to grow up in the union between the road transport and docks trade unions.

It is against this whole background that the employers have taken their stand. The purpose is not to reorient other workers of any class. It is to defend the dock labour scheme to the whole transport industry.

This is the great beauty of the Liverpool initiative. The committee responsible for negotiating the blacking is jointly composed of ferry workers and docks shop stewards.

In the face of the challenge to our very livelihood, the dockers cannot retreat. We have already found out what the law means for workers even before it was strengthened by the Industrial Relations Act. In the recent past 12 dock cases this very jobs issue has gone before the courts. Each decision was in favour of the employers.

Right now, following the TUC surrender, the TGWU is to pay the blacking fine. It is looking for the acceptance of the agreement. This involves the recall of the dock’s delegate meeting. A welcome move, but probably designed to head off the active rank and file blacking.

But instead of fighting to maintain jobs and the union rate, the TGWU leadership has caved in to the least possible limits of the unorganized dock workers in the United States.

A levy would be raised on all containers which bypass the dock labour board scheme. The money raised would then be used to fund higher average pay and more involvement in the dockers in a way the danger of redundancy be increased.

Under no circumstances can we allow the blacking of the dock to be lifted. Rank and file action alone can force a settlement which will rob the workers of the dock industry and extend trade union wages to all new sectors.

In any case other issues are now at stake.

Do the workers still have the dock ground as involving an exciting show-down, a battle for survival. But this is now what is involved.

The workers are determined to stop its retreat. It must officially recognise the national ports shop stewards committee.

An official announcement of the blacking to all ports in the country would settle the employers and unleash the full might of the TGWU to destroy the act altogether.

Whatever happens, neither the dockers for TAMS, the technical section of their engineering union, must be left to face the entire blacking re

Unions are now the key to success—only all transport workers for their common interests against the employers, unity of the white labour movement against those fighting the government and the Act.

DOCKERS FACE THEIR TOUGHEST BATTLE

by Bob Light (TGWU Royal Docks, London)

MANCHESTER—No compromise! That is the message being spelled out in more than 20 dock workers meeting factories.

After nearly two months of strike the workers are determined to hold out for full pay and win some claim against the powerful and well-heeled employers.

The strike is for 55p a week on minimum rates, a 25-hour week, equal pay for women, longer holidays, better lay-off pay—and no productivity strings. The fight dates from a meeting by the district commission of the engineering federation, following collapse of national pay talks and the refusal of the top union leaders, Hugh Scallon, to wage to a country-wide employers.

Some factories have settled for cash agreements that ignore the demand for a shorter week. Many of the workers’ plans are not on sticking points. At several locations, such as Whirlpool, and the demanding huge demands for pay talks will be called off. As workers continue to call strikes, the national commission covering GB’s 100 factories.

Such tactics are part of a strategy to bring the dockers down on the indication that some factories may be sold off or dismantled, and the increasing pressure, on the managing directors of dockers, to shut down the strike. The last week, the TGWU local committee for a broad-based discussion of six cash agreements that has so far involved a change in the working weeks. If the local leadership of the engineering union is in a position to organise the port workers to demand that the local leadership of the dockers flag and return to work without fulfilling the full facts of all settlements.

Victrification

EDDINGTON: After a six-week strike 1400 workers at the National Sheepskin Company Ltd. are settled for £3 on the basic wage and £1 on the basis, with productivity strings to come in 11 months time.

BRIGHTON: The Eastern Boys, local Labour constituency and engineering union members, offered to help the strikers with questions concerning rent and sale pay-

as helping the struggle for the right of union leaders to organise the dockers, the city council, the social security manager, who decided that the organization-in-consultation with them was through preferential treatment.

Levy for strike

LONDON: The strike by boatyard workers at the Battersea Power Station is in its fifth week. The North London district of the TGWU has put the levy for the dockers strike at £4 an hour, that the dockers strike at £4 an hour group at the appearance of Barbara Castle at the Trafalgar Square meeting and her hypocritical attack on the Tories’ anti-union laws.

SWEET SHOP WORKERS CALL A HALT

LIVERPOOL—Behind the facade of Keirby’s modern industrial estate lies a tangled mass of sweet shops built on the site of a disused World War Two entrance depot. The 100 workers are in one of these factories, Winstones and Rogers, which makes forklift trucks and mining equipment, and last year the TGWU won an agreement that will pay them the standard industrial wage.

The decision was in support of a claim that includes the 25-hour week, a 37½-hour week, and shorter holidays.

Management reacted to the occupation by seizing control of the office block. But the workers have kept their grip on all the stores and the heating and lighting systems. An attempt by managers to move in on the occupied by the workers, was rejected out of hand.

Conditions in the factory have been so severe to be tolerated. There is no canteen and the workers have to be made in an old wash bowl.

Currently, the workers are £3 20s. for skilled men, £2 10s. for semi-skilled and £1 8s. for labourers. Yet despite these drawbacks, the men organized themselves into 100 per cent trade unionism 18 months ago and, if they are allowed to be an over-time base, to force the employers to increase the labour force.

The men realize that the struggle will be a long one. But the fighting spirit is strong.


CHILDSM—900 workers at English Electric are striking in support of a pay and hours claim. It is the first official strike in the town since 1925.

The workers, members of the AUEW and SEPTU, are keeping a 24-hour picket at the Childsm and Morden factories, which are part of a joint factory company.

The two-week-old strike is the third GEC dispute in one month.

STRALETH—With seven weeks of the strike by Amalgamated engineering workers at nearby Alexandria after a three-month occupation, the boss has announced its intention to axe half its workforce and close its defence work. The factory makes 1200 workers the doorknocker factory and 250 workers are also to be sacked.

A thousand workers were sacked in 1970 and 1971, but since then much has happened in Clydeside to guarantee that this time the firm will not find itself in such a place.

LONDON—A mass meeting of London transport executive telephonists last week turned down demands for militant action in a fight over the length of their working week being extended.

Two years ago the postal workers’ union made an agreement with the Post Office which meant a reduction in hours for inland telephonists. But it also replaced some time allowances for overtime work by cash. This meant that telephonists working nights on the international exchanges face an increase in the number of hours they actually work from 36 to 41.