Support grows for Ossett sit-in

by John Charlton

OSSETT (Yorkshire):—When workers at Jonas Woodhead occupied their factory a month ago they stopped the machines, they froze the movement of 250,000 car coil springs and ejected the management from the factory.

The Woodhead Group is doing rather well in the current Tory bonanza. The 1971 profits of £150,000 showed an increase of more than 40 per cent on the average for the previous eight years.

The order book is big. The group already has a massive share of the British and European markets for coil springs, supplying Ford, Chrysler, Vauxhall, Volvo and Ssangyong. It has recently invested several millions in plants at Ossett and Newton Aycliffe and purchased two further factories in Coventry. They are producing plenty of grey—enough it is rumoured to allow a leading director to spend only one day a year in the English sunshine.

Understandably workers earning less than £22 per week, working in conditions of excessive heat and moisture, have come to feel that they should have a rather better share of the fat they produce.

So far the management at Jonas Woodhead have been unable to agree. They have offered to date is an average of 62½ a week on the bonus.

In response to a local claim lodged in January for 'a substantial increase', in line with this claim was caught up by the national engineering claim. Still the workers were unwilling to make an improved offer—despite a promise to do so. Fewed by a strident and dehumanised public.
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Angela is free but fight goes on...

by Mike Cafoor

THE RELEASE of Angela Davis by a California court this week is a victory for black people in the struggle against racism. Her acquittal is not of the alleged impartiality of the American judicial system but to the volume of protest on an international scale against the attempt to frame her.

The state was aware that she had been jailed a mass movement of black students demanding her freedom was presented and an American public to the rout on the streets of the South Vietnam.

For since sections of the black community abandoned the middle class Civil Rights movement and chose to form much more militant organisations, such as the Black Panthers, the state has run amok in intimidating and physically harassing its leaders.

Many were killed in ambushes by the police, others murdered while they were all the time the state's terror tactics were to wipe out the entire leadership of those organisations.

Meanwhile, the Investor's Chronicle is able to write of the 'record profits' of Anglo American, the firm that owns Wankie and which dominates the whole mining industry throughout Southern Africa.

These profits are obtained, as the same paper has pointed out, 'only because they can draw on a vast pool of cheap African labour. African workers in a pit like Wankie are recruited on a one-year 'contract basis'. During that time they lose all rights and have to live in all-male compounds where they are fed on a meagre diet of maize, dried fish and a gallon of African beer a day.

In return for their labour most of them receive a wage of £3.50 a week. At Wankie the only union they are allowed to join is run by white workers who earn 10 times more.

The Rhodesian government viciously smashed their attempts to form an independent black union in 1964 and 1965.

In their drive to boost their profits still more, the men who run Anglo American and Wankie pay little heed to the welfare of those who risk their lives in the depths of the earth. There are indications that more than two years ago the immense dangers of the mine where the disaster occurred were known about.

Under the system which Wankie 'hired' to boost its profits even higher.

Among the directors of Wankie are Sir Frederick Crawford, former British governor of Uganda and then of Kenya, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, former British governor of Rhodesia—portrayed as a hero by the British press of the time—and Sir Keith Acourt, of the multi-millionaire company Charter Consolidated, the British partner of Anglo American.

These are the men on whose hands lie the blood of those who died there. This is a simple word to describe them—Murderers.

But the press will not make a great fuss about the wanton destruction of these killers. It will reserve its venom for those alleged to be members of the 'Arygry Brigade', who committed the crime of blowing in the front door of Robert Carr's house.

For we live in a society in which murder of the Wankie sort is taken for granted, in which killing workers in the pursuit of profit is an activity engaged in by all the top people. Not until workers in Rhodesia, South Africa and Britain take action to smash that system will a humane set of priorities come into being.

Mine disaster: profiteers' bloody hands

by SW Reporter

MORE THAN 400 men were killed in the world's biggest mine disaster for 10 years in Rhodesia on Tuesday. The press has spoken of a 'tragic accident' but the truth is that the Wankie deaths were no accident.

They were the inevitable by-product of the Southern African mining system, organised on the basis of slave labour by massive business interests in London and South Africa.


Meanwhile, the Investors Chronicle is able to write of the 'record profits' of Anglo American, the firm that owns Wankie and which dominates the whole mining industry throughout Southern Africa.

These profits are obtained, as the same paper has pointed out, 'only because they can draw on a vast pool of cheap African labour. African workers in a pit like Wankie are recruited on a one-year 'contract basis'. During that time they lose all rights and have to live in all-male compounds where they are fed on a meagre diet of maize, dried fish and a gallon of African beer a day.

In return for their labour most of them receive a wage of £3.50 a week. At Wankie the only union they are allowed to join is run by white workers who earn 10 times more. The Rhodesian government viciously smashed their attempts to form an independent black union in 1964 and 1965.

In their drive to boost their profits still more, the men who run Anglo American and Wankie pay little heed to the welfare of those who risk their lives in the depths of the earth. There are indications that more than two years ago the immense dangers of the mine where the disaster occurred were known about.

'RESPONSIBLE'

The South African Mining Year Book for 1970 reported: 'Number 2 colliery... increased faulting in the seams was worse, causing low efficiency. Reorganisation of the mechanised sections was necessary, resulting in the withdrawal of certain units and operations were confined to smaller units.'

In other words, the mine was dangerous, but this was not going to stop the search for 'efficiency' and the drive for profits.

The men who preside over the company that made that crude calculation are usually presented as the most respectable of businessmen. Men like Harry Oppenheimer, head of Anglo American, who is said by the press to be a 'liberal' because he objects to the way in which some features of the apartheid system of South Africa prevent his profits from being even higher.

Among the directors of Wankie are Sir Frederick Crawford, former British governor of Uganda and then of Kenya, Sir Humphrey Gibbs, former British governor of Rhodesia—portrayed as a hero by the British press of the time—and Sir Keith Acourt, of the multi-millionaire company Charter Consolidated, the British partner of Anglo American.

These are the men on whose hands lie the blood of those who died there. This is a simple word to describe them—Murderers.

But the press will not make a great fuss about the wanton destruction of these killers. It will reserve its venom for those alleged to be members of the 'Arygry Brigade', who committed the crime of blowing in the front door of Robert Carr's house.

For we live in a society in which murder of the Wankie sort is taken for granted, in which killing workers in the pursuit of profit is an activity engaged in by all the top people. Not until workers in Rhodesia, South Africa and Britain take action to smash that system will a humane set of priorities come into being.
Shipyard threat to Franco

In THE early morning of Thursday 1 June police armed with machine pistols and supported by a tank surrounded a house in a respectable area of Frankfurt.

After the obligatory shoot-out in front of the television cameras, summoned to record for posterity the "greatest victory" in the fight against the 'most dangerous criminals in the Federal Republic', three of the leaders of the Red Army Fraction were taken prisoner.

The fraction (popularly known as the Baschen-Storch gang after the names of two of its leaders) claims responsibility for recent bomb attacks, including those on American Army buildings which killed three American soldiers.

If the fraction didn't exist, it would have to be invented—it is just what the doctor ordered as far as the German ruling class is concerned.

The group was an off-shoot of the more anarchistic tendencies of the West German student movement. From the violence of the capital system in all its aspects, from the war in Vietnam to the conscripted peasantry under the facade of prosperity in the Federal Republic itself, the fraction denounces the moral impotence of violent action, now to make clear to the masses the necessity of violent revolution.

Branded

Of course what this forgets is that violent action, no matter how cleverly mounted, faces unending difficulties over the Eastern Treaties allows foreign intervention by the working class, while the treaties themselves have been repeatedly denounced by the old bourgeois of the Danger in the East. The East German press reports on the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic, and the workers are fighting to protect their interests in the East. In Frankfurt, for example, lawyers try to force the police to produce evidence, and in most cases against members of the police force who have been involved in police violence. The police force is not only never successful, they resist any initiative on the part of the workers. The workers are signs that the private forces of the rich are very dangerous (arms in this case can mean small tanks).

Dramatic

All of this, of course, could lead to a false picture of the situation. We must start thinking that perhaps the police force is in a state of crisis and that the solution lies in a civil war against even a few isolated anarchists.

Yet if the "public" can be persuaded that there really is an enemy, what is the reality in this that they really are an "Enemy Within"? And when the Red Army Fraction actually threaten to bomb explosions and bloodbaths in the middle of city centres that becomes more credible? all this arming for civil war can civil war for civil war.

The series of dramatic television appeals for the Red Army Fraction and control points and identity checks all on the public police are really on his side. The anarchists have done their work well.

BRIEFING

WITH the US troop withdrawals from Vietnam many war veterans are facing unemployment. Much publicity was given to job fairs organized last month in Chicago by the American Servicemen's Union.

A massive advertising campaign persuaded ex-servicemen that VOA companies were offering 5000 jobs. But the 10,000 veterans who turned up found that jobs were not just too easy. They found that jobs were not even available. Many were not even qualified, or they were already committed to a trade.

In anger many ex-servicemen started turning to a new form of support and driving away the employers' representatives. In the meantime the jobs fairs were driven to the former home of Mayor Daley, but this was prevented by police.

As the US presidential election campaign has begun, it's worth remembering that you have to have a very rich friends ($2,000,000) getting himself nominated, as the right of the rich and famous to be on the ballot, is clearly worth $2,000,000. Even Tumpane had to be released from prison in order to have a chance to run.

The Ugandan urban parlialemente, the so-called "people's parlialement" is a serious setback of their 10 year existence. Last year Ugandan police discovered an underground "people's prison" in which two hundred people were imprisoned. At one time the Tupamara had been forced to release kilo's victims. The authorities had been launching a big campaign against the Tupamara during the last months.

Against the British bargain, socialist and workers' parties have been actively towards a marxist analysis of the situation, and have made more contributions has come from a Yugoslav pamphlet.

Last summer an article published an American look into the role of Phenomenology and the intellectual and political role within the "People's Class" in the philisophical journal Prax. The article points out that "People's Class" is not just a label, but a label for the British bargaining process. The British government "is so dependent on the threat of the class that it is prepared to give up a lot of the gains it has made in recent years. The policy is now being advocated in Yugoslavia and the rest of the Eastern European countries.

US-backed crackdown snuffs out democracy

This article is based on a document issued by Salvadoran revolutionaries and students, together with Central American students living in England.

LAST March the press reported armed conflict in the small Central American state of El Salvador. What was not made so clear was that the real force behind the armed intervention was quite different. It was a gross violation of human rights and the principle of non-interference of one country in the affairs of another.

The intervention was actually carried out by the Sandinistas for Central American Defence, which unites the armed forces of Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua and Cuba.

At day-break on 25 March a military coup took place in El Salvador. The coup leaders were a group of individual politicians supported by the US-mercenary, General Oscar Banister. They were supported by the government of Honduras and Chilean forces from the CIA.

The coup was welcomed especially by the political opposition which had been chased of victory in the elections. It should be noted that the El Salvador constitution allows the right of intervention of imperialist governments.

The centre-left Colonel Carlos Gustam Aguilar, head of the Salvadoran Military Intelligence, was also on the U.S. military training. The Sandinistas in 'anti- insurrection' techniques.

Heavy bombing

A column of armoured cars and artillery, with Guatemalan air support, set out from the military zone for the capital, San Salvador. It was led by General Pedro Torres, the El Salvador Minister of Defence and president of the Council for Central American Defence.

Before it set out, numerous cargo planes from Nicaragua, Guatemala and elsewhere had landed at the military base.

Bombers from Nicaragua and Guatemala dropped huge air bombs on the city and dropped heavy bombs, not only on military centres in the hands of the deposed government, but also on the civilian population of San Salvador, Civilian hospitals, including a religious orphanage, were bombed.

Another armoured column advanced from the west, with Guatemalan air and helicopter support. The Sandinista regime was rapidly restored to power. At least 2000 people were killed and another 10,000 injured.

The presidents of Nicaragua and Guatemala have attacked the intervention and co-ordinated the intervention of their own forces. The co-ordination of the two interventions was carried out by the London weapons dealers, using headquarters in the National Guard barracks and the US Embassy.

When the rebellion had been crushed, the head of the Nicaraguan radio, adding that the restored President, Somoza, in contact with President Somosa of Nicaragua.

The government was safely restored to power, the Sandinista government has been replaced by the government against all opposition forces. The leaders of the rebellion to jail are full. Many democratic and revolutionary militants are reported killed.

It is feared that Sanchex plans to massacre the leaders of the rebellion and activists of the opposition.

The government is facing a strong challenge on its left from the Movement of the Left and the Sandinistas, who have been active recently in organizing mass meetings in demand of the calling the municipal workers to demand the lifting of the ban from the Sandinistas, which forces have already covered more than 200; these are demands of abrief situation and are inefficiently farm in any case.

The ruling class's own internal
Naked truth

The respectable civil leaders of Leed have spent a great deal of energy of late reassuring the more cynical elements of the local population that the moral fibre of the Leed police is quite intact. This exercise in public relations follows in the wake of the convictions over the death of David Olliffe, a Nigerian-born tramp who was found dead by two members of the force, now on a short rest in one of Her Majesty’s penal institutions.

Further evidence that such incidents are but slight blemishes on an otherwise spotless record of police service to the Leed community came to light last week when the police made an application to the High Court to get a magistrate’s decision reversed.

The application centres around Arthur Abbott who has twice been found to have appeared before two magistrates wearing only his socks and underpants. He is charged with burglary and the police claim that they need the rest of his clothes as evidence.

The magistrates ruled that this was unnecessary and that the clothes should be returned to Mr Abbott. The police could not allow this threat to the efficient pursuit of their order to go unchallenged.

They approached the Lord Chief Justice for permission to contest the ruling in the High Court, Lord Wulwawy, well known friend of the British Army, has given the police permission to appeal. The result: Mr Abbott still has the inconvenience of appearing in court in pants and socks.

Lucky for him that justice is blind.

But the police did provide some light relief on Sunday’s otherwise soggy Victoria day at home. In the rain-soaked marchers struggled into Grosvenor Square they were astonished to see hundreds of bashful bohèmes lined up behind the bushes in the middle of the square, looking for all the world as if they had been collectively taken there.

As-you-were(2)

THE PASSING YEARS take their toll of ‘marxist’ principles. In 1941 the Russian Enzyklopaedie defined advertising as ‘Hulsafaloa’, a means of extending people and footing upon them goods frequently useless or dubious in value.

This year’s version of the official encyclopedia has a slightly different approach: ‘Advertising—the popularisation of goods with the aim of selling them, the preparation of demand for these goods by the attraction of consumers with their particular features, their prices and availability, the sales and explanation of the methods of purchase.’

Underminded

THE hidden hand of the General and Municipal Workers Union bureaucracy is revealed in the latest issue of the John Cooper, has worked a neat little trick on the leaders of the Union.

A resolution on the preliminary agenda of the union’s Scarborough annual conference was from the Bathgate branch in Scotland. It called for the abolition of life presidency and the House of Lords. Strangely, the resolution has simply disappeared from the final agenda and cannot therefore be debated. Lord Cooper can safely continue to wear his ermine, and not only in bed.

TOM YARDLEY celebrated his 100th birthday in a particular way. He abandoned on his own home in Cheam and went on a six-day jaunt to London. ‘One afternoon I saw the pictures and saw a French film,’ he said. ‘Then I was full of salads, so I walked out in disgust after a production of La Cage aux Folles.’

Pole-axed

DESCONTENT in the far-right Monday Club, Mr Timothy Stroud has circulated a letter among members protesting at the violation of democratic rights in the situation that is committed to kicking the blacks out of Britain, shooting ‘tame disks’ and loving up to 1000 black people in Rhodesia.

Mr Stroud points out that candidates for local elections are not restricted to a 60-word political biography on the ballot paper. Mr Stroud points out that the limit as did other candidates, but Mr Louis Klerk was on for a mammoth 150 words. When Mr Klerk complained to the Club’s leader, Mr Poley, he was told ‘we take truth for granted in this Club.’

Mr Poley, he said, was unwilling to explain what the situation was, but he certainly wasn’t going to read the entire political biography in the Rhodesian Club System.

COTTONS POWER: following our recent reports about the sale of the AWU union to a company, Mr Alf Le Fevre, editor of the London Bulletin, union of 300 members, has gone through a resolution complained to the enceignants that the situation is such that they have found the time, they have to be made available to the members. It is to be expected of other branches to follow its lead.

Next steps in fight against Act

‘RANK AND FILE must stop the unions’ retreat,’ writes Eddie Marsden, General Secretary of the AUEW Constructional, Section, in Monday’s Morning Star.

Mr Marsden’s views are of some significance. He is one of the two featured speakers at Saturday’s Conference of the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions and a prominent member of the Communist Party. No doubt his article is a preview of his keynote speech which will outline the tactical proposals of the LDC Union leadership.

A good deal of what he says is true and important. Certainly the whole British trade union movement depends on being able to weaken the trade unions and in particular the rank and file and the powerful shop stewards’ movement. Certainly there has been a flight to the left by the TUC from its own declared policy. Certainly it is essential to mobilise all trade unionists, especially shop stewards, in the fight back against the Act.

It is what is not said that is so striking. We are told that the present situation demonstrates the correctness of the arguments of the left unions... but not one word of criticism of the leadership of the biggest ‘left union’, the Transport Workers, which has abandoned its fight to save the Nationalised Industries, agreed to a split and made a serious attempt, on the orders of the court, to persuade its members to support the TUC’s plot in the containerisation dispute.

This ‘dilipomatie’ evasion? Unfortunately, it is because the Communist Party, which is the dominant influence in the LDC Union, places ‘unity’ with Jack Jones and his fellow ‘lefts’ before the requirements of a real fight against the Industrial Relations Act. Unity is, of course, very important but the question is unity on what basis?

Labor unions are popular abroad. It is always possible to get unity, even with Lord Cooper and Frank Chapple on your policy and adopt theirs. The unity that is needed is unity to fight—and this inevitably means divestment with those who are determined not to fight.

The most important development in the last weeks has been the collapse of the so-called ‘progressive’ trade union ‘leadership in the face of determined attacks by the Tory court. A serious rank and file conference would treat this as a central issue.

Sharp criticism

It is clear that not the slightest confidence can be placed on those TUC leaders who have so far demonstrated no capacity for non-co-operation and defiance at Croydon and Blackpool last year. The job of a rank and file conference is to provide the leadership that the TUC ‘leaders’ have not and will not provide.

This is not to say that the fight to commit the official organisations to the law will be abandoned. Quite the contrary, it must be intensified. But this means sharp criticism of all those leaders who are giving up the struggle, including the ‘lefts’. Indeed, especially, the ‘lefts’ for it is the responsibility of the illusion that Cooper will fight the law. A great many believe that Jones would. And now many will be putting their faith in Scram. A real fight inside the unions means breaking with illusions in the ‘left’ leaders.

This is essential, but it is not enough. It is now vital to develop local Labour Committees or Councils of Action to organise solidarity action in the locals. We are under no illusions that this is something that can be achieved merely by passing a resolution. It requires hard and sustained struggle which must be undertaken if the LDCU is to be more than an occasional conference.

There is very little value in passing resolutions, even radical sounding ones, unless a machine is built up that can translate them into words into action. It is here that the struggle for unity—unity in action against the law—must be conducted. The struggle inside the leadership cannot succeed unless it is based on a genuine rank and file movement in the districts.

The International Socialists therefore call for—

• An end to the TUC retreat.
• Recall the TUC national and strengthen Congress policy of non-co-operation. No registration, no co-operation with the Act and boycott of its legal agencies. Non-payment of fines. Refusal fines in the event of seizure of funds. No compromise with the Tory government.
• End the right wing off the General Council.
• Defend the closed shop. No co-operation with the Commission on Industrial Relations.
• Industry wide strike in defiance of the Act. No cooling-off periods or acceptance of secret ballots.
• Immediate expulsion from the TUC of all unions that register. No cooling-off periods or registration.
• A militant policy to smash the Act: increase wages, improve conditions, fight unemployment, strike as a weapon.
• All strikes to be made official.
• Full support for all trade unionists involved in action against the Act. Build local Liaison Committees or Councils of Action in every area to fight for this programme.
Rangers’ fans put the boot in

SATURDAY has been described as the day when the Glasgow working man gets his revenge on the rest of the week. The need to escape from the drudgery of working-class life and get away from the football, for which the local football team is compounded in Glasgow by intense rivalry between Rangers and Celtic.

But for many of the spectators who came over early this century to attach themselves to the two clubs on a religious basis, this is just one of the many season's fanatical beyond the usual affiliation which football fans feel for their teams.

Rangers, founded by members of the Masonic order 90 years ago, will only sign a player after playing second fiddles. Their tradi-

J ust as the ‘Tory bashing’ tendency in recent copies of Socialist Worker has been raised to a new pitch, so is the appeal to the Young Socialists. It is not enough for us to be the harbingers of the victory of the Tories. We demand that the Tories are defeated, and that we are the vanguard of the working class. We must not be satisfied with a victory over the Tories, but with a victory over the class struggle.

The YS are not content with a victory over the Tories, but with a victory over the working class. They demand that the working class is victorious. They demand the abolition of all class distinctions, and the establishment of the working class as the ruling class. They demand the establishment of a workers' state, where the working class is free from exploitation and the working class rules. They demand the establishment of a society where the working class is free from oppression, and the working class rules. They demand the establishment of a society where the working class is free from exploitation, and the working class rules.

The YS are not content with a victory over the Tories, but with a victory over the working class. They demand that the working class is victorious. They demand the abolition of all class distinctions, and the establishment of the working class as the ruling class. They demand the establishment of a workers' state, where the working class is free from exploitation and the working class rules. They demand the establishment of a society where the working class is free from oppression, and the working class rules. They demand the establishment of a society where the working class is free from exploitation, and the working class rules.
ON YOUR MARKS FOR THE PRICES SPRING

A recent top level conference of Tory Party leaders and government ministers had one subject right at the top of its agenda: the expected price explosion this autumn and winter. The conference was called to discuss it.

That there will be another upsurge in prices later this year is no longer even seriously challenged by government ministers. Their concern now is how to keep the lid down on wage increases before the message about accelerating prices gets across to the mass of trade unions.

The price situation at present is not exactly healthy:

In April the cost of living went up by 5.8%, which was an important increase over the previous month. The figure is calculated on a cost of living index which includes a number of categories which matter most to working-class families.

The government’s own special index for pensioners went up by only 10% per cent during the same month—showing that it is the essentials (food, heating, light and rent) which have risen the fastest.

ENTICE

In the past few months the Tories have ignored the suffering which this appalling rate of increase in the cost of living is bringing to many households. They have claimed that prices are going up at the same rate of increase of prices has already come down a little.

There is some truth in this. Part of the explanation is due to seasonal factors, especially where food is concerned. But part of the explanation lies with the action of the employers’ organisations, the Confederation of British Industry. Last summer to ‘restrain’ price increases to an average of five per cent a year.

The idea has been to use the CBI’s initiative to entice the TUC into a full scale wage bargain with the Tory Industrial Relations Act.

RECOVERY

The restraint has been somewhat hollow. Many firms got in massive price increases before the start of the operation—and others, such as British Leyland and the National Coal Board, broke it with CBI ‘agreement’. In any case, during the past few months there has been a big enough recovery in profits to keep many firms happy.

But after July the five per cent limit comes off and it begins to look as though the sky will then be the limit. Many industries are known to be planning big price increases.

At the same time the full force of the government’s so-called ‘Fair Rents’ will start to be felt by millions of council and private tenants alike.

The great grub scandal

how your weekly bill has soared

During the last 12 months the Tory press has made a great hullabaloo about how the dockworkers were forcing up food prices by stopping food imports into Britain. Some brainwashed idiot in the East End of London even chalked on a wall ‘Dockers exploit housewives’.

So just to get the record straight before this nonsense gets going again, it’s worth looking at what the government’s own statistics say about food prices since 1969. From figures hidden away in the back of the annual report of the National Price Survey Committee it is possible to work out the price of a weekly shopping basket in 1969 for a manual worker, his wife, and two children.

As can be seen from the table below, to purchase the same amount of food in the month of May 1972 as they did in 1969 that family had to fork out just over £2 a week more—from £8 to £10 for the same amount of grub.

Big bonanza

That extra £2, and all the other extra pounds for all other families, has not gone to produce anything extra at all. It has gone straight into the hands of the food producer bosses, and the bosses of the food distributing and retailing chains in one of the biggest profit-making scandals ever.

The government fooled the housewife at the election, the food bosses swindled the shops during decimation and both government and industry will rob us when it puts the Value Added Tax on food (against its promise not to) for entry into the Common Market.

Unfortunately there has only been a search for individual solutions to this scandal of food prices. For the statistics further show that families are switching from food rich in protein and vitamins to more starchy foods in a vain attempt to make the week’s housekeeping money stretch that much further.

Forced to switch

While meat consumption has stayed about the same, mothers are being forced to cut down on mid-week meals; milk, fish and fruit consumption went down between 1969 and 1970, while potatoes, bread, sugar, margarine and tea consumption went up.

And this was between 1969 and 1970, the last years for which there are official statistics. Food prices have rocketed since 1970, and workers’ families will have been forced to switch more and more to a starchy diet.

The dockers and railway workers are right to take on the government now. If we all waited much longer we would be crawling around on our knees from hunger and exhaustion.

Mr Rising Price: getting fatter every day—‘with apologies to the Daily Express’

LIONEL SIMS
HOPE WAS HIGH for thousands of ordinary working-class people when a Labour government was elected in 1964. If anything it was higher still when that government was returned in 1966 with a substantial majority.

While no one expected human emancipation to tumble out of the sky at the precise moment Harold Wilson’s removal van drew up outside his new home in Downing Street, certain very definite results were awaited.

More money would be spent on social services and less on the gigantic madness of the arms race. The dead wood would be swept out of the boardroom. Somehow some of the weight would be lifted from the backs of the poor.

Quite how, nobody knew. But there was talk of a fair price and income policy. And at the very heart of all Labour Party propaganda in the run up to 1966, there was Labour’s housing programme, a message to the people that a Wilson government would help satisfy one of their most basic needs. Starting from last year’s total of 380,000 houses and flats, we shall go on year by year exceeding that level, 500,000 new dwellings, Harold Wilson told a Bradford audience in March 1966.

This was a pledge to the people.

It is a pledge to us, added, “We shall achieve our 500,000 target and we shall not allow any development, any circumstances, however adverse, to deflect us from our aim.

Less than two years later the pledges and promises were publicly dashed with the Minister for Housing, Anthony Greenwood, angrily announcing in the House of Commons that the government did not now expect anything like 500,000 houses to be completed in 1970.

A dictate of big business to slash social spending in favour of higher profits and investment, saw the Labour government go on the run. The turn on the very section of society that had brought it to power and the early stages of the 500,000 target, fewer new houses were built than at any time in the previous quarter of a century.

But even though the over house building programme had to be dumped, the leadership of the Labour Party quite genuinely believed that they had room for other manoeuvres.

The slums would no longer be knocked back and rebuilt. They would be improved, modernised. “New homes from old homes”, was the reigning slogan.

And so in the 1969 Housing Act a new system of house modernisation grants was introduced. This was not only to encourage the owner-occupier to improve his property. It was supposed to help the landlord lift the standards of tenant’s accommodation without boosting the rents to pay all the costs. The grants ceiling was lifted to £1,000 per dwelling unit for first-class property, and £1200 on three-storey and above. All restrictions on the scale of modernised, grant-aided property were lifted.

Speculators’ opportunity

As Anthony Greenwood saw it, the only problem with the scheme was that not enough people would take advantage of it. We expect such a strange anomaly over the 1969 Housing Act that people will have to be persuaded to take money to improve their houses. He said after the scheme was announced.

In vast tracts of London at least, Mr Greenwood was proved wrong even before the scheme was announced. In the dispiriting working-class areas near the centre of the city, a host of exploiters known as housing speculators saw their opportunity.

If they could get preRelease positions on some of the big multi-occupied tenement houses, fling up the unprotested furnished tenants and winkle out the unfortunates, they could modernise the properties and let in those at vastly increased rents. With Labour’s 1969 Act they could even improve on the immense profitability of the operation. They would gain a tax deduction on the conservation.

London Property Letter (a business journal for the housing speculator) was openly talking of the rich pickings prior to the enactment of the Bill.

Joseph Alix, 13 years in Notting Hill, works on a motor mechanism in the middle of a clearance area. “Yes, we’ll go with the plan. And it won’t be the council houses that go up, either—just more flats for the rich.”

“It is people who make property valuable. You turn out the fish and the immigrants—God knows where they go paint things up and get smart people in,” said his editor Richard Garrick.

Cobellis’ and Tavistock, two districts of London’s Notting Hill, have been the focus for an increasing amount of such operations since the 1969 Act was brought in.

And 1 to 9 Cobelle Gardens summarises all that has happened. The average rent of a flat in it now is around £390 a year, more than many adult males in this part of Notting Hill earn in a year after tax. Kenneth Allen of television fame has a house on one of the 93 newly-converted flats.

Back in 1967 working-class families lived in the place, mostly in the cramped misery of one and two room flats, sharing kitchens and toilets. For multi-occupation had been the most common method for landlords to get juicy returns from London’s acute housing shortage.

The method was brought into Notting Hill by the infamous Rathbone who channelled his enterprise a stone’s throw from the area, in Bermondsey, to the Lambs’ Gardens. But he had been exposed and dealt with. The pressure was on someone else to someone else without such a tangle of names.

And with the 1969 Housing Act, and its modernisation grants no longer needing to rely on brutality and intimidation. The developer could afford to be the protected setting his sights.

So it was with 1-9 Cobell Gardens, All but two of the original occupants are gone now. In equally cramped and inadequate property somewhere else in London that has one million living in a sort of acute housing stress and environmental degradation.

Two of the families—both with three children—are still homeless after being worked out to make way for the speculator armed with a modernisation grant supposed to help the poor.

In 1952 the block was bought for £1000. By 1967, the property owner had taken its value to £52,000, and with outline permission for pre-1967 grant-aided modernisation its true value is £65,000.

Clear out undesirables

A year later, with Greenwood’s improved grants scheme, it was sold for £130,000, double the 1968 value. For in 1969 the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea put up £113,135 in grants to modernise the block.

This fantastic sum of money was more than twice what the same Royal Borough in 1967 had refused to lend to the Notting Hill Housing Trust to buy and convert the property for those who originally lived there. And the trust asked for only £52,000 and the council said no.

The local political bosses are fervent supporters of the speculators. And they do clear our the undesirable elements from a Royal Borough known mostly for its wealth and respectability.

The working-class area is an embarrassment to the rich and powerful on the other side of the borough. Their desire to drive them out is suitably disguised as the drive to get more rates in, which in turn will allow the council to provide the solid and respectable bungalows of Kensington and Chelsea with better services.

Council involvement in clearing the place out of patch to solid recognised but goes deep. Publicly known facts few, but isolated instances point up the real intentions.

Kensington and Chelsea has built no council housing whatsoever in recent years. In the past year it has only once
Alex Gordon belonged to the political underworld. He was the type of man the authorities did not like to talk about and even suggest do not exist. He was an agent provocateur.

At the present time, with the Tory press full of the trial of the Angry Brigade, it is timely to recall that Gordon still attended meetings of the government minister devised not by socialists or anarchists but by a person in the pay of the police.

In this connection, with the Gladstone in the Air Ministry, the Lyons in the Home Office, and the Stettin in the Admiralty, one can almost say that the whole of the government is employing the police to further its ends.

Network

The First World War itself was a great propaganda campaign. The government used every means at its disposal to keep the public informed of the progress of the war. They used the press, radio, and cinema to inform the public of the latest developments.

John S Clarke: revolutionary laureate

This poem became well-known among the workers throughout Britain. It was a popular song at social gatherings. The feeling of revolution was so strong that, according to Tom Bell, Gordon was shipped to South Africa for a time to save his life.

When things calmed down, Gordon returned to Britain. The government only had apparent use for him. Clarke was arrested and died a few weeks later. He was hanged, like so many others, after being sentenced to death.

"There are several ways of murdering our valiant workers. Some are the straightforward, brutal way of the German, which killed Lenin in Luxemburg. And there is the secret, sinister, always smothering, always invisible method, which killed Mr. Whendon."
THE struggle for Britain's unions

FOURTH AND FINAL PART—BY BERNARD ROSS

THE main legacy of the massive growth of unions at the end of last century has been a host of new organisations, the Transport and General, and the General and Municipal, the first and third largest unions today.

Though both have developed from the same historical origins, they are very different today. The General and Municipal is, for instance, notorious for its undemocratic structure.

The old Gas workers' Union was easily the most dominant element in the amalgamation which formed the General and Municipal, and its internal government had always involved powerful central control.

A delegation of their full-time officials has also been easier than in smaller unions because of the absence of any significant militant section of the rank and file. In the right-wing leadership of the membership is in the public services and a miscellaneous range of manufacturing industries, which is very different to the 'organised-unionised' sections of trade unions.

In other words, they have a long tradition of union membership but no tradition of rank-and-file activity.

TRADITIONS

There are significant differences in the background of the Transport and General, and the General and Municipal. The formation of a large number of unions, for the most part fairly small. The Dockers' Union, with Ben Tillett and Ernest Bevin as its leading officials, was the most important but by no means dominant.

The amalgamation of the amalgamating unions had traditions of militancy and rank-and-file pressure, and influence went into the Transport and General. Dockers and ironworkers have always been prominent, to be joined more recently by car workers. Today almost two-thirds of the union's membership is in engineering and transport, which is in contrast with the General and Municipal.

Yet despite these important differences, there are also many similarities between the two unions.

Both have a large number of officials in relation to their membership, and in both unions the national conference, in theory the policy-making body, is too large and too short to initiate policy effectively, and it is easily manipulated by the leadership.

In their historical development both unions have been marked by parallel Marxist plinths and officials, many of whom have played leading roles in both Dockers' and Gas workers' Unions, and provided their origins leaders. Bevin, the first secretary of the amalgamating Transport and General, was also a Marxist in his early life.

But such leaders as Bevin, or Will Thorne, secretary of the Gas workers and later of the General and Municipal, moved far to the right by the end of their careers. Leading leaders of the General and Municipal were similarly right-wing, or, as the case was with Bevin's successor, Arthur Dukin. In both cases, enthusiasm and support played an important part in choosing their successor.

The pattern of right-wing dominance of both general unions was broken only by Cousins' election as Transport and General secretary in 1916. This was largely an accident, following the deaths in quick succession of Dukin and his own former assistant. As and noted, the later militant image of the Transport and General has not always been matched by its industrial practice.

WHAT explains the transformation of the militant, socialist-inspired 'new unions' which for much of this century have been bastions of the right? Why have union leaders who have claimed to be left-wing in fact behaved in a similar manner to admitted right-wing leaders?

The answer is that two problems have been the early leaders of the new unions and have been of continuing importance. First, the leadership of militant action are set by the industrial strength and level of consciousness of the union's members. While the General unions are by organizing unions whose strategy was still small and therefore collective consciousness, apart from short periods of explosive action, was often limited. This in itself forced them to adopt cautious or conservative policies.

But the nature of these unions' recruitment also limits their membership particularly unsuitable--as it is shown by the heavy losses after 1919 and between the wars, and also by their present high turnover.

So a major concern of their officials has always been the stability of the union itself, and the safest way of ensuring this, in their view, has been through friendly relations with employers. The union leader in this situation, the direct interests and wishes of the membership have had to be balanced against the desire to maintain the goodwill of employers through 'moderate'. demands and 'reasonable' actions.

DISTORT

The transformation of the militant new unions of 1850 into the conservative general unions of the 1920s is an example of the way in which concern with stable working relationships can distort a union's policies.

But to some extent the same process is evident in every trade union. It affects not merely the general secretary of the Transport and General, but also the convenor in a car factory or even a shop steward representing half a dozen workers.

Whenever he negotiates with management, the union representative is obliged to consider not only the point at issue but also the way in which the policies adopted will affect future negotiating relationships. Negotiations and compromise are the bread and butter of trade unions: the tendency is for the union representative to seek regular and routine solutions with the employer, to treat grievances as problems to be solved rather than as battles to be fought.

Even committed militants cannot wholly escape this tendency, for the problem is basic to trade unions.

UNIONS by their very nature are a part of capitalism. In bargaining over wages and conditions they implicitly accept the position of their members as wage-earners, forced to sell their labour power to the capitalist class.

The limits to which unionism can achieve through negotiations are set by the basic realities of capitalism. So any trade union representative, however genuine a socialist, tends to behave in his day-to-day union activity as if capitalism were permanent.

The history of the general union points therefore to the built-in limitations of trade union action. The argument is that militants who engage only in trade union struggle will in the trade union system, will be forced to come to terms with it.

Only through political involvement in a revolutionary party can trade unionists escape the tendency, in their industrial activity, to treat the capitalist employment relationship as inevitable and natural.
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DAGENHAM BATTERIES

LAST YEAR Ford workers for nine weeks fought the longest and most militant battle in the history of the British motor industry, in Ford Strike—the Workers’ Story (Panther 40). John Mathias admirably demonstrated their bravery.

The 1971 struggle had been precipitated by the ‘party’ campaign launched by the Ford shop stewards after the 1969 strike. Parity meant equal wages to the workers with the highest productivity, and even this meagre demand was rejected by the management.

The parity campaign was a breakdown of the narrow limits within which shop stewards had previously struggled for their aims. For generation, workers in Britain had been able to achieve improved working conditions and by fighting purely local struggles at the workplace.

Facing the growing consciousness of the employees and the state, Ford began to discover that they were not so far away from their goals. For generation, Ford workers in Britain had been long enough nursing a sense of class, and they had found the basis of the wages league in the car industry.

COLLUSION

Mathews describes the build-up of the parity campaign’s success against the background of the painfulliberalism of the government controlled at Ford through the 1960s following the catastrophic 1962 defeat.

At that time, 17 leading militant Ford workers were operating within the Ford management and the union. This did not go unnoticed by the guidance of the notorious Lord Castelet.

The book opens with a useful chart that illustrates the rapid drop in the rise within it of the multination corporation. Since the war, the multination corporation has undergone a marked expansion that has not been matched by expansion of the British market.

The output of vehicles has increased, the rate of increase has been declining in recent years. The facts is that the Ford plant in the US and Europe has been operating at only 75% of its capacity. In Europe, Japan, the Ford plant is at a saturation point and in the US it is already saturated.

The result of this stagnation is intensified competition, reflected in a spate of mergers and takeovers. In the jugle of world capitalism competition, not survival but destruction, its basic seed is war, and the outcome of this struggle between Ford and the workers is a question of self-preservation and survival.

The result of this stagnation is intensified competition, reflected in a spate of mergers and takeovers. In the jugle of world capitalism competition, not survival but destruction, its basic seed is war, and the outcome of this struggle between Ford and the workers is a question of self-preservation and survival.

The success of these firms spans many countries and wherever they operate they represent a danger to their workers. For those who are threatened with state policies of savage retrenchment and unemployment, the Ford struggle is a vital part of the struggle for the survival of our way of life.

MARY M. WHITEHOUSE walked out of the Clockwork Orange (Warner West End, Leicester Sq. London) which is in itself some kind of recommendation. It is the latest film from the American director Stanley Kubrick, maker of A Clockwork Orange and 2001: A Space Odyssey.

Kubrick has become a cult director. It was reported in Clockwork Orange came from Malcolm McDowell, who plays the central figure, Alex, complained that he got almost no publicity and Kubrick was played in every piece of advertising. Which was true, the input of the film industry terms understandable, for Kubrick’s name, like Hitchcock’s, can sell a movie without a star.

In one way or another the director has shown a fascination with technology. In Dr Strangelove a mixture of idiots (Peter Sellers’ RAF officer, spitting Blakely’s General Jack D Ripper and the B.52 Bomber crew) and fanatics (Dr Strangelove) succeed whilst Nixon is still only trying, and blow up the world. In 2001 a beautiful but cold technology thrums man towards Saturn and involves the spaceman (Keir Dullea) in a battle with the computer HAL. Whether by accident or design the only human moment in the film comes when Dullea is fighting the computer for control of the ship. Slowly HAL, reverted until it is singing nursery rhymes taught it long ago when being programmed.

Leaving Dagenham last year at the start of the nine-weeks’ strike

Mathews describes the attacks on Ford workers and their resistance to them that led up to the great 1971 strike. In 1967, the company management was unable to impose a major productivity squeeze on Ford workers based on a massive job evaluation scheme. In 1967 there were no incentives, the principle of the scheme that had lasted since the 1962 victimisations.

1969 saw the famous ‘penalty clause’ strike in which Ford workers were locked out for 36 weeks on their first major national stoppage. Ford, closely backed by the Department of Employment, were attempting to impose penalties on ‘unofficial’ action.

Barbara Castle was preparing her White Paper, In Place of Strike, and Ford workers were in the front line of the Labour government’s offensive. The strike broke the strength of the right wing on the trade union side of the National Joint Negotiating Committee.

But the response of the rank and file to the ‘concessions’ call for a national strike was uneven. Workers at Halewood took the lead, but while many sections at Dagenham waited for an official call to action, their union leaders. In this situation, the officials were able to maintain control of the strike and, in the compromise they reached with Ford, the penalty clause violations were watered down but the principle was accepted.

AGITATION

By 1970, the parity campaign had begun to gather pace, so much so that Ford’s had to offer £4 in order to buy off strike action that was threatened to back up the demand for £10. But the £4 was accepted and the result was a set back for Ford militant.

But exactly a year later, rank and file agitation continued by the shop stewards since 1969 finally paid off. Ford’s insatiable £2 offer made in response to the claim for parity provoked spontaneous walkouts in Dagenham, Halewood, and in the Swansea districts. Mathews suggests that Ford management might have wanted to provoke trouble in order to gain a peace in the production of the new Cortina which was proving severe technical problems.

Whether or not there is truth in this, Ford’s could certainly not have wanted or bargained for a solid nine week strike which revealed an unprecedented level of rank and file militancy and determination. Ford’s had believed they could repeat the previous year’s experience when anti-strike workers had shunted down their shop stewards at mass meetings. They were in for a shock.

Given the strength of the rank and file in 1971, a substantial break towards parity could have been achieved but for the fatal intervention of union leaders Scammell and Jones. Going over the heads of the NIPFC, they negotiated a new contract with Gillen, Chairman of Ford Europe, and no doubt Ford workers were to receive an immediate increase of £6 per week and a further £4 spread over two years.

During the two years of the agreement, there was to be a ban on the normal action in support of economic demands. In addition, Scammell and Jones willingly acceded to the need for a new formula to determine the workers’ attitude to strike action. They wanted to prevent militant pay demands by building up pressure on the leadership of the union, as they had the previous year.

TRANSFORMED

What caused Scammell and Jones to act as they did at a time when they had previously no signs of cracking? Apart from the bureaucratic wish to protect union funds from the risk of strike action, there was the fact that Gillen might have offered them something more. The Ford future agency shop under the projected Scammell supervision transformed into Ford’s.

Whether or not this was so, the fact that Ford himself transformed what was potentially a massive victory into what could be a considerable defeat by the introduction of the running strength of the workers, as a principle, is the first step.

Aside from relatively minor errors and oversights which the weakness lies in the absence of any political conclusion. The Scammell and Jones militants the impossibility of relying on a genuinely Ford future agency shop for a consistent lead.

The union leaders fight solely on the terrain of the trade unions within and against it. Because of this, they inevitably betray.

SABBY SAGALL

Kubrick takes the pith...

The plume of the universe is beautifully conveyed, but all one is left with at the end of the film is a galactic freak-out as the lone spaceman is trapped with the stars.

Clockwork Orange is back to earth. England in the near future, a world of worked council flats, cold stainless steel architecture, clinical bars where you get smacked on the backside by a young (Lloyd) and the ‘hero’ and gang of ‘droogs’ move in and out of the landscape, robbing, raping and brutalising all they come into contact with.

Cold cynicism

Eventually Alex finds himself in the nick, on a 14-years’ stretch for murder. But prisoners are getting overcrowded and the government sets upon aversion therapy as a way out of emptying the jails in preparation for filling them with political offenders. The therapy destroys Alex’s ability to choose between good and evil, he has no choice but to commit crime.

Drifts through his previous happy hunting grounds, a prey to his old friends and enemies, rejected by his revelling parents and denied even the pleasure of his beloved Ludwig Van Beethoven by the shock treatment. The film’s conclusion, which I won’t reveal, continues the same pattern of cold cynicism.

Alex is intended by Kubrick as a figure of pure evil, and yet at the same time can be oddly likable. The basic argument of the film is that ‘Man’ (whoever that is) must be free to choose even when the choices is always in favour of wrongdoing and the trouble with the film is that Kubrick doesn’t believe that ‘Man’, or anyone else, is capable of doing good.

The origins of the film are a novel, of the same name written in 1962 by Anthony Burgess. It was written when ‘teenagers’ were still a new and frightening idea to middle-aged, middle-class like Burgess. They threatened all the ‘culture’ which was already being chewed up by commercial television and Rock music.

Burgess then, and Kubrick now, seem incapable of understanding that violence is not just something used to terrify liberals and the ruling class. People are violent for reasons, and in reaction to the rotteness of the world around them. Despite Kubrick’s success in portraying this sooty world, he never gets into why Alex does what he does. He sees him as the character in the film, he is an alien and there’s no way to happen to like Beethoven.

Clockwork Orange is worth seeing just. But it isn’t the great near exposure of ‘our violent world’ which’ Fleet Street seems to imagine.

NIGEL FOUNTAIN
WHAT WE STAND FOR

The International Socialists is a democratic socialist who believe that the state is open to all who accept its main preconditions who are willing to participate and work towards the goal of achieving socialism.

We believe in an independent working-class action to achieve the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by a classless society. This action is for the benefit of all workers and not for profit.

We work in the mainstream organisations of the working class and are firmly committed to a policy of internationalism.

Capitalism is an international phenomenon. The giants of the world each have investments throughout the world and there are no local or regional issues that do not affect workers and themselves and the economic system itself.

In Europe, the Commons Market has been formed to deal with the problems of increasing the trade and profits of these multinational firms.

The international power of capitalism 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 are working with the number of other socialist organisations throughout the world.

We believe in the necessity to unite such organisations with the day-to-day struggles of working people and therefore it is a direct responsibility of such organisations to tend to improve the position and self-confidence of the working class.

We fight:

For rank and file control of the trade unions and the regular payment of all full-time officials.

Against secret negotiations. We believe that the organisation of the rank and file is respected by mass meetings.

For 100 per cent trade unionism and the defence of shop stewards.

Against anti-trade union laws and any curbs on the right to strike, whether the strikes are official or unofficial.

Against productivity deals and job evaluation and fight for a trade union unity and joint shop stewards' action to form a common basis.

For real pay and a better deal for young workers.

For a minimum wage of at least £20 a week.

Against unemployment redundancy and other cuts. 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 racism and police victimisation of black workers.

Against immigration restriction.

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 to and solidarity with anti-imperialist 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 parties and organisations. We work to build a revolutionary workers' party in Britain and to end the support of all revolutionary groups.

The struggle for socialism is the central struggle of our time. Workers' power and a new world based on human solidarity, on the increasing of man's power over nature, with the coming of the day when man can, is certainly worth fighting for.

It is not using just talking about it. More than a century ago Karl Marx wrote: The philosophers have merely interpreted the world. The point is to change it. If you want to help change the world and build socialism, join us.

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY is currently the scene of an unprecedented upsurge in trade union organisation and militancy.

As a result, the building industry wage negotiations are for the first time in a decade quite different from the usual protracted face to face that has been the hallmark of this industry for so long.

There is now a spirit of militancy and militancy is spreading to more and more of the workforce.

For us, the high point of the building upsurge was in 1980, when the Tories introduced the Trade Union Act and the Labour Government in 1981 was forced to act on this legislation.
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Engineers strike -against own union

TEN TWELVE Engineering Union members employed at the union's Peckham, London office are now in the fourth week of a sit-in strike against management's arbitrary dismissal of two of their colleagues.

Early in May a member in the technical department was told by his office manager that he should find another job. He requested to have his union representative present at the interview, which was refused.

When union representatives did make contact with him, the manager was unable to substantiate complaints other than that the man had taken a sick leave of several days.

The manager was not prepared to reconsider his decision and added that the man's departmental union representative would also be sacked.

The worker went to the AUEW general secretary, Jim Conway, who explained the situation and gave the man a week to return to work, otherwise he would lose his job.

The technical and production studies department prepares back-up material for wage claims. AUEW members are deprived of this service, according to Jim Conway's attitude.

One of the sit-in strikers is responsible for preparing and sending out basic union letters approving strike pay. No letters are now going out.

The Power Game

by Colin Barker

The truth about the power industry and the workers' pay claim and productivity deal. 15% for all. Write to ADVANCE, 68 Fountain Road, Stenton, Lancs.
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Labour to urge backdown

REPRESENTATIVES of more than 100 Labour councils will meet in Sheffield this week to discuss their attitude to the Tory's new Rent Bill. They will be under strong pressure from the Conservative Party leadership to abandon any defiance of the Bill's provisions on rent control.

Anthony Crosland, the Labour spokesman on housing, recently told Labour councillors: "Don't try the legalistic. That is only costly in principle, but it won't help the situation."

Instead, he is advising councils to put up rents by less than the Tories themselves want. He claims this is possible under what is called the "Birmingham concession", which enables the councils themselves to decide how much rents go up initially in October, without having to impose the blanket £1 a week increase recommended by the government.

The International Socialists are backing out on an Open Letter to Labour councillors at the Sheffield meeting. It points out how misleading Crosland's arguments are: "The Birmingham Formula for rent-setting is not only incorrect, but is likely to become illegal after the Bill becomes law in July. The Act specifically says that "No ratepayer should be hit by the tenants' income in setting the Fair Rent."

"More important, although the council may decide the first rent rise in October, this power will be taken out of its hands soon after."

"The council does not set the rent," adds the bulletin. "This is done by the Rent Scrutiny Committees. Composed as they are of lawyers and property experts they will certainly use the criteria set down in the Act. This will be "fair rents" to the Birmingham value of £14.8 plus rates, rather than the figure talked of by the Labour Party of £20.8.

"Therefore the loophole is no loophole at all. It is a hole which will be filled the full £1 in October, they will all be faced with double rents when the Rent Scrutiny Committees go to work."

The mould for Labour councillors is clear. If they implement the Bill in principle with its ridiculous figures, they are collaborating with the Tories whatever the contrary. Labour councillors at this meeting must decide whether to fight the Tory attack on tenants in the following manner:

1. Preparation of a presentation of the Housing Bill and no rent cut.

2. No co-operation with the Tory Housing Bill.

3. Full backing to the tenants' movement in fighting for rent cuts.

BRADFORD: The Trades Council passed a resolution last week calling for a city opposition to the new Bill. The campaign is to include the trade unions, tenants associations and the Labour movement.

HARINGEY: A regional conference of tenants organisations has been called by local Labour Councils to highlight the rent fight against rents.

HASTINGS: Delegates from the tenants organisations in Hastings, Bexhill, Winchelsea, St Leonards and Rother are to meet on Sunday to discuss the fight against rents.\\

CAMDEN: The Trades Council in Camden last week passed a resolution opposing the new Bill. They are also to hold a meeting on Monday to discuss the implication of the Bill.

HALIFAX: The Trades Council has called a conference to discuss the implications of the Bill in Halifax.

SWANSEA: Swansea Tenants Federation is organizing a demonstration for 1 July.

Labour to urge backdown

THE RENTS BATTLE

by Rob Clay

HARTLEPOOL: When the first case involving the engineering section of the AUEW came before the Industrial Relations Court on Monday the union executive refused to attend and made it clear that it was boycotting the court "In accordance with TUC policy. Significantly press and television virtually ignored the case and the fact that the union refused to appear.

The concern is the 14 week-old strike of 18 welders at the Expanded Metal Company of Hartlepool. The welders are the only known case in the North East of their trade being graded lower than other skilled workers.

WALKED OUT

They have been struggling for parity with welders at other firms. Their struggle started with a week to note to the board. But the management, refusing to work under a flexibility agreement, the other welders walked out. The agreement was made official by the union and is considered to be of central importance to the welders, and to the skilled workers in the Hartlepool area. All AUEW members are paying a 25% levy in support of the welders and all support have been received from local trade unions.

There has been one unfortunate aspect to the strike so far. The fitters at Expanded Metal, who are also in the AUEW, have refused to come in support of the welders.

The district union of the committee of the welder asked them to give support but did not order them out, Daniel Secretary Owen Richard told me that the management was being to the NIRC that fitters had been ordered out by the committee was a "dodgy lie."

But the fitters have now given notice of strike action themselves in protest against General and Municipal members washing on the welders' jobs.

BLIND EYE

At the NIRC on Monday the company asked the fitters to return to work on the strike grounds that proper notice had not been given. According to their union leader, the judge, Sir John Donaldson, turned a blind eye to the law. The fitters went on strike and refused to return.

But he did make it clear that when the company's claim for damages from union of the strike because of the strike is heard on 23 June the case involved would be "very heavy indeed. He warned the union to consider whether they were wise to allow the welders' strike to go on without notice and to encourage the fitters to come on strike without notice."
GLASGOW: 1400 workers at the Caledonian Dockers Union have decided to work on Monday after a six-week long strike. The result was a partial victory for the men, with an across-the-board rise of £2 a week and one day's additional holiday.

The settlement did not include any provisions for presenters but there is likely to be a further meeting next Thursday when the Transport Workers Union will meet to discuss further action on its pay, hours and job conditions.

Last week TGWU docks delegates voted to strip off their national strike for two weeks to give the employers time to improve on their latest offer. This was for an extra £3 on fallback pay and a further week's holiday spread over the next two years.

But on the crucial containers depot issue management offered only vague promises to bring in the dockers under the control of a Dock Labour Board. It is the use of non-docks labour in the docks which lead to the widespread blacking campaign against container lorries and the £53,000 fine on the union by the Industrial Relations Court.

Vague promises are not enough. Dockers are fighting to defend their pay, hours and jobs and there must be no further retreat on these demands until the TGWU strike at Thursday's TGWU meeting.

Docks stewards call strike

THE militant National Port Stewards Committee has called a one-day strike by the dockers next Thursday when the Transport Workers Union will meet to discuss further action on its pay, hours and job conditions.

But on the crucial containers depot issue management offered only vague promises to bring in the dockers under the control of a Dock Labour Board. It is the use of non-docks labour in the docks which lead to the widespread blacking campaign against container lorries and the £53,000 fine on the union by the Industrial Relations Court.

Vague promises are not enough. Dockers are fighting to defend their pay, hours and jobs and there must be no further retreat on these demands until the TGWU strike at Thursday's TGWU meeting.

It is vital that dockers throughout the country support the Port Stewards' strike in order to back the hand of the delegates at Thursday's TGWU meeting.
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