BRITISH ARMY BACKS TERROR IN BELFAST

THIS IS THE TRUTH about Belfast, the truth you don't read in the press or see on television. The reason why hundreds of families have left the Lenadoon area for the South as British soldiers and Ulster Defence Association gunmen systematically shoot and harass the Catholic working people...

A UDA slogan ‘Moon-UDA-Moon’ has appeared on many Belfast walls in the last week or so. It is instructive, for Mr Moon, the UDA hero, is a Shankill Protestant Loyalist who is charged with the murder of a middle-aged Catholic, Daniel Hayes, whose body was found on the Shankill Road three weeks ago.

A man called Ralph Henry has been arrested and charged with murdering two men in a Catholic pub in Portadown on 12 July, beforeHenry met the Irish Times stated that the killers were well-known members of the UDA.

**GUNNED**

A member of the Ulster Defence Regiment (the new 3-Specials) has appeared in court on an attempted murder charge – one of the numerous cases where a Catholic and Protestant have been injured or killed from a passing car. The UDA man Mr James Farman was granted bail when it was stated that he had a licence for his gun.

Sixteen UDA men armed with shotguns were seen standing in the Catholic area of Lenadoon on 12 July. In Lenadoon last week, the UDA stood behind the Army as they prevented Catholics from moving into new houses.

Some were seen to have guns. Protestant community groups have been reporting incidents on the Falls Road of Protestant youths shooting into the Catholic Ballymacarrett outside Belfast at least eight Catholics have been shot dead in the last three weeks.

From the South side of the peace line, Loyalists shoot continuously into the Falls Road. Two weekends ago they kept up constant fire into the Catholic Albert Street area until 3am on Sunday morning.

---

In London four prominent Loyalists are in custody facing charges of attempting to procure £350,000 worth of guns. Of them, Mr Charles Smith, is the chairman of the UDA.

When his house was searched it was found to contain lists of released ulstermen and the names and addresses and car numbers of known Republicans. These lists were described as being similar to British Army intelligence reports.

Yet in spite of all this Protestant Loyalist agitation, the British Army apparently has orders to avoid any direct confrontation with the UDA. William Whitlow, Tory supreme in Northern Ireland, is not prepared to meet the backlash now that it has begun. And the British press prefers the fact that it has begun.

Whitlow namely stated in parliament last week that the UDA was not armed. This is a flat contradiction of the UDA's own admissions that not only are they armed but fully prepared 'to counter the riot act', which to them means all Catholics.

The half-cadet Unionist Party has Band up behind. William Craig and his call for GI War. This urges Protestant workers to fight and die so that Craig and the Unionist might return to their positions of corruption and unipolied power.

It was knowledge of this UDA arms build-up and the increasing level of Loyalist military involvement, with no response from the Army, that led to the breakdown of the mix in Lenadoon. This is an area where the UDA is particularly strong, and hence the UDA's arm's rise to power is the defenders of the Catholic section of the estate.

When 700 British troops rolled in and were brought on the Catholic population, the purpose of the operation was to deal with the IRA. When Whitlow's statement that if the IRA got out, the Army too would withdrew is unrealistic. For without the IRA, the area would be left open to UDA attacks, and after the housing incident two weeks ago, no Catholic family can feel safe.

The announcement by the IRA that they have been stopped offensive action against the Army may be related to the reasons here that another general move is on the way. The IRA has suffered heavy losses with at least 10 men killed and 60 injured since the trace ended.

If they can get assurances from Whitlow that he will take a stand against them they may well be prepared to have another campaign. But verbal pledges from Whitlow against physical terror from troops and UDA.

3000 people are homeless as a result of Army occupations of their homes and gardens. Trigger-happy soldiers shoot at anything that moves. One regiment opened fire on another at the weekend. In these conditions people had no alternative but to move out until the Army was removed.

**BANKRUPT**

With the growing demands for more severe military repression of Republicans coming from right-wing Ulstermen here and the Tory Party in Britain, Whitlow is still searching for a more palatable solution to imperialism's problem in Ireland.

The Provisionals have shown their own political bankruptcy in their demand for the British Army to take military action against the Protestant workers. They imagine that British imperialism can somehow solve the problem of a divided working class.

It cannot. The only strategy that can bring revolutionary socialist perspective for all 12 counties of Ireland. And that is something the Provisioners over look.

For socialists in Britain, the need to step up the campaign for the withdrawal of British troops is more urgent than ever.

You cannot stand by while Irish workers are forced from their homes and shot in cold blood. Your action is crucial in the struggle to end British domination.

[End statement: page 12]
DENMARK: WORKERS SAY NO TO SIX

from Rasmus Rasmussen

AT SOME of Denmark's biggest workplaces left-wing shop stewards have taken the initiative in organizing ballots among their workmates to see whether they favour entry to the Common Market or not.

So far they have all given an overwhelming No to the Market. In the most recent ballot—at the Copenhagen shipyard of Blommers and West—95 per cent of the workers returned their ballot papers, more than half of them done so for any other issue, and 88 per cent said No.

These results would seem to make nonsense of the decision in favour of the Market taken at a recent special conference of Danish trade unions.

The main political opposition to the Market is a popular front style alliance, which includes the Communist Party, the Socialist People's Party, the Single Tax Party (followers of Henry George), a group of Social Democrats, a Marxist group and a number of other left-wing organizations. Their activity consists mainly of giving free elbow room to the programme of the respective newspaper advertisements.

The Market has thus become a nationalist form, mainly because of the basic politics of the parties included in the alliance.

The People's Party believes in a Nordic Union and the possibility of achieving a demilitarised socialist Denmark by parlia-
mentary means. The Communist Party believes much the same, and the Anti-Market Social Democrats support them in their attempts to re-awaken the ethos of capitalism and carry on building the welfare state.

ALLIANCE

The worst aspect of the campaign is the revival of anti-Semitic propaganda. The Germans are again portrayed as militaristic by nature. Jack-booted, yellow-jacketed figures are shown waiting to storm over the border.

The two left-wing parties which have made no support to the workmates who are the Communists and the People's Party—certainly not support against the Market—do fear of alienating their middle-class friends in the popular front alliance.

Various small revolutionary groups are trying to combat this nationalist propaganda and the myth that Danish intellectuals are nicer or more democratic than foreign ones. They are also stressing the need for them to link up internationally to fight the international conservative forces.

They are explaining that factory closures and attempts to move production else-
where can be fought. They illustrate this by quotations from the Danish Social Democratic government supports the Market. So do the three parties which have made up the previous government—the Liberals, Radical Liberals, National Socialists and the Social Democrats. They would have no objection to the Market if they knew the politicians who are standing behind it.
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Nark it

APOLLOGETS for the national press claim that its freedom and independence of the state and government make it a vital watchdog for the people, a defender of their rights and freedom.

In reality the press is as independent of the state as a maggot is of monthly cheese. And just how staunchly it fights for freedom can be seen from events in both the High Court and the Industrial Relations Court last week.

Counsel for Midland Cold Storage told the High Court, as we reported last week, that the firm had employed private detectives to spy on dockers picking its East London depot. The firm took an even more sinister turn last week as the case reached the High Court.

Mr Alan Campbell, QC, counsel for the company, said that the firm had infiltrated the dockers' stewards' committee and that one of its members was a fact spy who reported the dockers' plans to the employers.

Campbell was at pains to stress that he could not name the spy, just as he had refused to name the man allegedly threatened with a beating by the dockers in the NIRC hearing.

There was also a clouded silence in the High Court when Campbell inadverently let slip the name of the spy on the stewards' committee.

Recovering quickly, Campbell asked the press not to report the man's name, a request repeated by Mr Justice Moggatt.

What did the feartless guardians of our freedoms do? They compiled with the request (repeat: request not instruction) and deleted the spy's name from their reports. So this employee's request—'If he exists—continue his dirty work and the press, by its silence, condones these police-state practices.

Can watchdogs with rubber teeth apply for new dentures for the health service?

WHEN Mrs Madeleine Plenius went to put flowers on her husband's grave two months after his death she found it had not been filled in and just had planks over it. When she complained to her local MP, a spokesman for the company in Nottingham explained that the coffin had been placed in a public vault because Mrs Plenius could not afford a private plot.

'The grave is being kept open to take other coffins,' he said. 'It could be two weeks before it is filled in. Lame ducks, dead ducks... they all get the same treatment in our charnel house.'

Bristol clipper

LATEST fare increases on Bristol's far from perfect bus service brought forth howls of protest from many quarters, including the local Trades Council. Imagine the astonishment of the council when its July meeting was confronted by a delegation of Bristol busmen, led by their chief spokesman Jack Hodge, a member of the regional executive of the Transport Workers Union.

Jack came armed with powerful socialist arguments. 'By opposing the fare increases you are fighting for your wage claim,' he raged.

And he backed up his remarks with a threat to disaffiliate the TGWU from the Trades Council if it made such complaints again. The platform quickly did that same, worked out how much bonus they would lose if the TGWU stood its collar up and agreed never again to make ludicrous remarks in defence of the travelling public (believed to include some members of the trade union movement).

Rising Star

It looks as if the Labour MPs who belong to the ' Tribune' group are having to look elsewhere than their weekly paper to write their soggy articles. Tribune, reviewing the new Labour Party manifesto, was for once not taken in by its empty pledges and was continued sharply by editor Dick Clements in a piece headed 'One swallow does not make a socialist summer'.

This did not fit in with the picture of the party coming more and more under the control of the Tribunites and the trade unions that some Labour 'lefts' have been pathetically painting for the last couple of years.

Eric Heffer sprung into action with a long since that began. There is no doubt that the draft programme of the Socialist Party general executive is a recognition that the party has moved and continues to move left.

The piece didn't appear in Tribune one week ago. Of course, the Morning Star, Is the Communist Party a little too left and little too close for views considered too soggy even for Tribune?

WITHOUT COMMENT department

Mr Brian Train's 'Morning Star on a Communist rally in Sheffield. 'A soft line Common Market dragon pursued a boxun Britannia, giving the march a carnal flavour.'

Dead cell

MRS EILEEN EVANS was arrested on 22 May and charged with stealing groceries worth £1.96. She has been held in custody ever since and refused bail even though she was far gone in pregnancy.

While she was being held in a cell at Tottonen Magistrates Court in North Hampshire, she went on a diet and officials helped to deliver a premature baby.

Last Friday her application for bail was adjourned at Middlesex Crown Court. Her counsel said she was 'unapproachable' and a doctor's report said she was a 'child.'

The judge said he thought it best if the application was heard when Mrs Evans was 'in a better frame of mind.' If he means when she gets over the shock of her brutal treatment and the death of her baby, he may have a long way ahead of him.

PS Mrs Evans is black.

Emergency ward

ST MARY'S HOSPITAL in Paddington is one of the leading teaching hospitals in Britain. Giving evidence to the inquiry into new premises for the hospital officials have produced a grim picture of how hospitals are starved of funds by the central government and the grim effects this must have on patients.

Officials told the inquiry that emergency cases have been carryed to the point a patient in a bed needing for garbage and dirty linen. They dis- cerned the lack of side boards for dis- tressed patients and admitted that the buildings are too old to conform to standards for preventing cross- infection.

Ironically, the hospital is the one where Alexander Fleming discovered penicillin. Should be plenty of fungus for his modern disciples to practise on.
LETTERS ON IRELAND

Statement 'a diatribe against those it should be defending''

As it says on the first page: 'Policy in the Labour Party is made by the members.' And ignored by the leaders.

by Stephen Marks

A cut 20% off for a position of neutrality should have a full-scale conflict develop between the two major parties. The possibility of this is limited by the Orange order, which is in favour of the Union. But it is possible that some form of a compromise could be reached if both parties were willing to make concessions.

The threat of civil war is real. The danger of a partition of Ireland is real, and the danger of a two-state solution is real. The danger of a one-state solution is real. The danger of a two-state solution is real.
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Glyn Carver on the engineers' pay struggle

It is almost four months since the Manchester engineers launched their pay claim for £4, a 35-hour week, an extra holiday and equal pay for women—four months which have seen the shop occupied by tens of thousands of workers.

The fight was a determined one. Some plants were occupied continuously for as long as two months. But now, with only two small factories still occupied, Manchester engineers are having to fight back to the inevitable question. Was the outcome of this magnificent fight a victory or a defeat?

Because of the militant action, some real gains were made on hours and hold-out. On average this amounted to £210 on the rate and two days on holidays.

With few exceptions nothing was gained on the claim for reduced hours and equal pay, nothing was gained on the crucial part of the claim that involved lasting gains. These would not be obtained by inflation but would have created more jobs for some of the 14,000 Manchester engineers who have been made redundant in the past year.

When you stood for a 40 per cent claim and finish up with less than 10 per cent, it is difficult to understand what you failed and what mistakes were made, because these mistakes must not be repeated.

The struggle in Manchester was one of the most significant in engineering since the war.

Outdated

It was the first time that engineering workers had adopted new tactics—take-over in any significant scale. This is in line with the developing militancy of the work-class movement in Britain. In Manchester it was shown that in organisation the employers were able to organise the workers, to organise a real national struggle that would have been the envy of even the most adventurous of the engineering unions opted for the outdated tactic of isolated struggle.

The action in Manchester resulted from the lack of any national action whatever between the engineering unions and the employers' federation. Realising the weakness of the workers who occupied the Lawrence Scott and Electro-motors factory.

Some of the workers who occupied the Lawrence Scott and Electro-motors factory.

The problem of lack of information was compounded by a decision taken at a shop steward's meeting to keep secret any agreements reached.

Unofficial

This meant that many random settlements and pending settlements from around the country were left in the dark about what was actually happening. ASLI leaders and members of the Communist Party almost to the last day ignored the real facts. Inevitably, the whole situation was worsened. It was a case of the leadership visited Manchester and offered verbal support, but they did nothing to stimulate the kind of support needed to bring victory.

Their role in the dispute was a complete abdication of any responsibility to lead. Their lack of initiative had forced the Manchester leaders to go it alone, and in the middle of the dispute it was Schneid who betrayed the militancy by advising that the hours claim be dropped. Even at a local level there was failure. Throughout the dispute there was a complete lack of communication between occupied factories. In many cases the basic task of funding was completely neglected.

The incredible situation in which an unofficial bulletin produced by a handful of militants is forced to play this role underlines one of the key weaknesses of the Manchester struggle.

By the beginning of May stews from several factories realised the depth of the crisis and began to organise settlements from all the all the stews.

The movement became a national movement - a movement of the workers to give support to those in need of help, to engage in a clear overall picture, to organise support for the 14 factories in need of help with national pooling, to send delegations throughout the country to raise money and support to maintain their morale for all four points of the claim.

The first difficulty for the meeting was that only 11 factories were represented. Many of the others were involved in negotiations.

Much of the energy and enthusiasm of the beginning of the struggle had by this stage been dissipated and the meeting reflected this.

Dropped

Two conflicting schools of thought emerged. One was for and organised the meeting believed that if there was to be any hope of winning the situation, they had to act quickly.

Others felt that if a call for action was made to the union district officers and to the workers, they would be better able to organise it. Unfortunately, at this very point in the struggle the local union leaders were considering convening a meeting at which they were to get the trade unions to effectively dropped from the claim, to make major extraneous and to make major concessions on money and holidays (the Barlow committee was forgotten).

It is not surprising to find that nothing was over done about the Stewart request.

On Monday 15 May a stews meeting was held where the local officials argued for dropping money and holidays— but with an overtime ban on all the other claims.

The officials succeeded in winning a majority for dropping money and holidays. The meeting was packed with stews from the whole of the Clydeside and has had a very good effect. The stews have a good to go the jobs, they have got into the situation— but with the role of putting through the claim.

This uncoordinated alliance between the ASLI officials and the members, the reactionary AIL convener, was successful.

The bars were closed, struggle tent were erected, and this marked the point to these things in a matter of weeks it was all over.

Workers in individual factories shelved the national movement to fight the situation on their own. Some occupied, some sat, some went out of the gate, some were left working to rule and some continued working normally.

A recent survey showed, perhaps surprisingly, that a majority of City opinion favoured statutory restriction on prices, dividends and incomes. Notice there is mention of wages. Just to you think it doesn't apply to you.

A survey was carried out by Charles Barker on the financial indices for the first few days of July. At the time the Manchester Index was a measure of the level of share prices surging around 485, after being as high as 549 earlier in the year.

Yet in the same survey the majority of people thought the FT Index would be in the 501-550 range by the end of the year.

Now the chief thing that moves share prices is the level of profits. Or to look at it, look for profits. The Charles Barker survey suggests a higher FT Index, in other words higher profits or a better outlook for profits, was supported by another survey in the Sunday Times where most City opinion was optimistic about the future of the FT Index.

But City opinion was optimistic about the level of investment by industry. In other words, they thought that some ominously would make higher profits but they did not see any sign of higher investment by industry to produce these profits.

As the Charles Barker survey shows, the City is pinning its hopes on an increase in profitability. The profits will be pro-\r\nvided by the workers, who will be-\r\nopposed to 'moderate' their wage demands.

Let's have a profits boom

Send the workers the bill in the city

with T.H. Rogerson

Whatever politicians, union leaders, employers say about the demand for a prices and income policy, the 'national interest', the City at least knows that such a policy is good for profits.

The reason why they and industrialists can stomach a prices and dividends freeze tax, is that the government has tried so hard to stimulate demand (almost ex-\r\ncessively) among the rich and gone so much away in investment grants and tax\r\nrelief that if wages could be con-\r\nrolled, capitalists would make a fortune.

It is interesting that 32 per cent of the 43 per cent who said they would comply with a statutory incomes policy in the Charles Barker survey, stated that voluntary policy would work, 'suggesting that they would happily cooperate with such a policy.'

The City started paying less attention to dividends years ago, spurred on by the Labour government's introduction of Corporation Tax.

Labour

Although it is important for investors to have a flow of income, this doesn't have to be at all great. There are varied criteria on earnings criteria—how much policy is available for shareholders rather than the saving involved, is paid out. The money can be re-\r\ninvested in the company, or even\r\nhigher and profits for the shareholders, so that in future years the level of dividends will anyway exceed what im-\r\n\r\nmediately might appear higher in the next years.

Remember that the last great stock market boom of 1966 was during a period of dividend restraint under Labour.

The City is not stupid. One reason it has been so concerned about wages and prices recently is because it knows that labour can take money that would other-\r\nwise go in profits; a broker's circular recently referred to the rise in the level of wage settlements as a deterioration.

The union machinery is a far cry from that of the 1880s. There has been a dramatic growth in the number of trade unionists, but this has not been matched by a corresponding growth in the number of trade unionists, but this has not been matched by a corresponding growth in the size of the unions. The result is that the unions are not as powerful as they once were.

The unions may have more money, but they do not have the same influence. The result is that the unions are not as powerful as they once were.

The unions may have more money, but they do not have the same influence. The result is that the unions are not as powerful as they once were.

The unions may have more money, but they do not have the same influence. The result is that the unions are not as powerful as they once were.
Pat Sturdy of the Women’s Industrial Union to Socialistic Worker

Organise women and TUC doesn’t want to know...

by Anna Peczuska

PAT STURDY was the moving spirit behind the Women’s Industrial Union, a group of women workers who came out of the General and Municipal Workers Union. The argument was simple: The bureaucratic and decaying giant union would not deal with the specific problems that confront women workers.

Now eight months later she and her group are negotiating for membership of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers. I talked to Pat Sturdy about the union, equal pay, women’s lib and politics.

'The TUC attitude to women is very antiquated. There are very few women among the delegates to Congress—I know one out of 500 I think. So we’re not really represented there. There is an open conference which is good but at national conference we don’t really have representation.

When I wrote to the TUC for affiliation for the Women’s Industrial Union they just replied that we were considered to be a “breakaway”. I was all done discreetly through the TUC’s Women’s Department.

Second class

We had very little contact with other unions. They won’t recognize us. I don’t understand their objections unless they are scared of us having a divisive influence in the movement. That if, then it really shows they haven’t tried to find out what we’re about, and that they have never tried to understand that it is necessary for unions to cater for women.

We want to be in a decent union. What we are really interested in is good representation. Other things like sick pay and benefits are not so important.

’Now we’re negotiating with the AUEW and I think we get good support from them. But we’ve had to work continually to get all the men made aware of the problems women face and to back us up.

Women are second-class citizens in industry as well as a trade union. And the Equal Pay Act has many dangers in it—the problems of women who have to do shift work and be denied testing in the opportunities. I think the Equal Pay Act is a disaster.

Women need more organization around the central problems affecting women—long discussions about motherhood don’t solve anything much. It’s the tenants and working women that have to get up.

No difference

‘The girls in Women’s Lib in Manchester and London who have already been in touch with my about setting up industrial groups could really make Women’s Lib have an impact. This organizing work has been left too long. It must be done now.

In my opinion there’s not much difference between Labour and Tory. They both try to make the capitalist system work, even Labour who are supposed to be the Labour Party.

Our principle aim is to disappear altogether from the term “Labour”. It’s not at all the fault of Labour. It’s the parliamentary system that’s supposed to be the Labour Party. We should have a strong left wing. A strong trade union movement could push the parliamentary representatives.

We do need an alternative, but I don’t know how that would work. People are still scared of the word “communitarian” and won’t try to understand. I don’t belong to a political party myself. I just see the need for organization.’

Pat Sturdy can be contacted at 31 Hogarth Avenue, Roselhit, Burnley, Lancs.

Mrs Sturdy, a former GMWU shop steward in the Lucus Group, said this week that talks were still going on with the AUEW. The women want their own section within the engineering union—they don’t want to be absorbed as individual members.

ONLY A MILITANT CAMPAIGN is going to win equal pay for women.

The employers are well organized, determined and prepared to wriggle through every loophole in the Equal Pay Act. But who is going to lead such a militant campaign? The TUC?

The truth is that the TUC would not take up the fight. The pamphlet they have just produced, Your Job and the Equal Pay Act gives a short summary of what the Act says, the various definitions of 'job', talks about how to appeal, how to appeal if you have a case, and no, it says nothing about equal pay now, nothing about collective action, nothing about the opposition of the employers.

It does nothing, in reality, but reassure the employers that women workers are not going to be led into action by the TUC. The pamphlet is worse than useless because it is aimed at women individually—it suggests that ‘you cannot do better than keep close to your union, which will be ready with advice and help’ and ‘if you have a reasonable claim for equal pay, your union will take it up with your employer on your behalf’.

The TUC has been passing resolutions for a hundred years on equal pay for women. It is really going to spend the next hundred million pounds to see that equal pay is no nearer.

The General and Municipal Workers Union has a quarter of a million women members who have a strong feeling for the TUC. But what is going to stop them bringing such a militant campaign for equal pay for women to a successful conclusion?

The report per cent of the congress of equal pay for women is not that they are not ready to fight, but the TUC’s failure to lead the TUC to a militant campaign.

And one more thing—remember that the wages settlement negotiations are not over.

BY THE END of the year Maurice Macmillan, the Employment Secretary, will decide whether or not to insist that all firms bring women’s rates up to 90 per cent of men’s.

At the beginning of this year rates of pay for women were generally between 15-20 per cent lower than men’s. The provision in the Equal Pay Act for increasing pay scales to something like the inflationary spiral of wages in 1973, when the Act comes into force.

The employers were given five years to prepare for equal pay just according to most reports very few have done anything to actually implement it—either because they realise the Act is muddied with loopholes that they can evade it or because they are spending the five years working out how to round it off.

Defused

A recent report in the Industrial Society journal points with the employees’ low official view of the Act is probably justified. ‘If we are industry and commerce were to get something from this legislation rather than just increased costs we could take it a step further. Otherwise we shall have to pay women more money but get nothing back for it at all.

The Equal Pay Act was first introduced by Barbara Castle after the First strike in 1968 when the women’s machine shop closed the giant Department of industry in a strike over equal pay.

The Act successfully defused a movement which could quickly have spread throughout sections of women workers. The first round went to the employers and unions demand for equal pay for work of equal value was thrown out in favour of equal pay for like or broadly similar work—likewise being the same job or a job related equivalent to a man’s job by a job evaluation exercise. The job evaluation is by the biggest single gain, the employers have under the terms of the Act—It always stands scientific and unbiased. In fact it is neither. You take a certain number of characteristics and award them points accordingly, but which score high and which score low is not determined by the type of job but by the employers. It was used to frustrate the intentions of the Act quite successfully by deliberately over-weighting factors where men can be expected to score high like strength and under-weighting things that women usually excel at—like dexterity.

A militant trade union can help, but too often because of their cooperation with productivity deals and job evaluation in recent years, they will not take a stand on behalf of the weaker sections. But job evaluation is a ‘frustrated’ and expensive method of dodging the Act. An easier option is that of separate but not equal—making sure that men and women do different jobs. One team believes all six of keeping them at a lower level and promoting pay cuts or even cuts in pay. But they still pay their employees the same.

In the inevitable loss of jobs nothing is more important than the loss of the whole problem of women’s pay on the agenda of a militant trade union’s agenda for the future.
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Two million women in industry—just think what they could achieve

The women who are in the best position to fight for equal pay are the two million working women in trade unions.

Joan Gallagher, a shop steward for 17 years in the Orum GEC plant in Southend, said: "It was the demand for equal pay, I talked to Nancy about what happened.

In the GEC plant, women were locked out earlier this year and they had to work for a wage in line with the national claim of the national engineering claim. And the management offered us nothing.

We called a meeting and decided on a work to rule to force their hand. We got locked out for that.

We wanted at least £2 for the women because it took us to go to work with £1.50 for the women and £1.40 for the skilled men, plus two extra holidays and additional pay that week.

We tried for some time to spread the news that there were two million women workers and it was a much larger GEC plant. They were getting what they got from their right to strike.

But we had to set up a committee in the factory and before the women left they did call it off. If they go to equal pay, or if we have the support of the movement, it could make a difference.

We want to get a bigger share of the cake, but we need the commitment so we can really rely on the union.

GRADES

I asked Nancy什么样的 statistics and they discussed the wages and women's wages in relation to the men's wages in the factory. It was talked out of parliament earlier this year.

There are several grades through the factory, she said. The grade for women is called 'general grades' and it pays an hourly rate of 40p. The male labourer paid is about 50p. The skilled men are on a much higher flat rate.

The bill didn't prevent great things but it might have provided the opportunity for stepping up a few of the grades in the line of the GEC.

The employers say that equal pay is more than they can afford. Ted March, of the Engineering Employers' Federation, gave the example recently of a small engineering company with 450 employees, 210 of whom were women. In a year, the equal pay bill would involve a total increase in the wages bill of nearly £300,000—about 4 per cent.

This is an enormous bill for a small business. But the equal pay is simply to ensure that women are paid the same as men. The bill doesn't prevent the establishment of the Factory Act and any other legislation which does something about the education and training of women to be supported. The Government can't do too much to help women. They have been ignoring education in schools.

We have to do something about the education and training of women. We are behind the times, she said. The Comerican money is looked after by the Government. It is only a little gesture that is needed to make a person behind a machine realise he has a human being.

The result of its refusal to support workers is that the Government is supporting a militant group of women who have discovered how strong they are.

MILITANT

The problem they face is that they work nights and no union official visited the job of going out at night to recruit women.

To get organised and to protect their jobs against the threat of redundancy, there is some of the most militant action by women for years. At Fakenham, Norfolk, the women in the tiny Sexson shoe factory have been occupying the factory for three months, demanding the right to work. A son, Robert, Shoe Workers' shop steward at Fakenham said recently: "We have to get out of the idea that the women's place is in the home. It's only a little push that is needed to make a person behind a machine realise he has a human being.

The union, because of its refusal to support workers, is supporting a militant group of women who have discovered how strong they are.

Trotsky
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BLACK IN BRITAIN

THERE is a simple reason why capitalism will not provide decent housing for working-class people. The low income of workers compared with the rich means it is more profitable to build high rent housing and office blocks.

Black workers, concentrated in the worst-paid sections of the working class because of race discrimination by employers and unions, face the burden of racist landlords and property companies pushing them around.

On top of the frustration of low wages, boring jobs, long hours, there is the frustration of knowing that the colour of your face and the way you speak marks you out.

In the last major investigation into housing discrimination in 1967, landlords were approached by two whites and a West Indian, in two-thirds of the cases the West Indian was either told that the flat was taken when the whites, who applied later, were told that it was vacant, or the West Indian was offered the flat at a higher rent.

But according to the Race Relations Act, there ought no longer to be any racial discrimination in housing. It’s illegal, and anyone found engaging in racial discrimination can be penalised in court.

The London Accommodation Bureau, for example, one of the largest private flat agencies in London, admitted in court that it had been lying to black people, telling them there were no flats available. It had been doing this for years. It was fined.

Vicious

Meanwhile white workers living in the same decaying slums are urged by the gutter press and racist politicians to blame their plight on immigrants who, it is alleged, ‘take our houses’. This is a vicious lie.

Even the quite ‘respectable’ Milner Holland Committee, appointed to look into London’s housing situation in 1965, concluded that ‘the plight of the immigrant is the outcome, and too often an extreme example of, London’s housing difficulties. It is not new.’

Let’s get it straight. The black worker creates wealth for his employer, no less and no more than does the white worker.

The working class as a whole, black and white, creates more than enough wealth to provide every worker with a decent home. The reason it is not put to this use is simple. Where the wealth goes is not decided by the working class and the capitalists and their representatives in parliament.

The main concern of the capitalist class is, inevitably, to make profits, not to worry about the housing conditions of its workers, whatever the colour of their skins.

Housing: exploited both as workers and as blacks

SSH! NOT A WORD ABOUT THE BIGGEST BUGGERS....

DIRTY BUGGER took on an entirely new meaning last week when the Younger Committee on Privacy published its findings.

It revealed a half-world of tapped telephones, microphones in matchboxes and ashtrays, cameras in cufflinks, language bins, palings and a hundred and one ‘bugging’ devices used by spies and marks to obtain illegal information.

If it all seemed remote from the everyday lives of working people, harsh reality underscored the report as Midland Cold Storage cheerfully told both the Industrial Relations Court and the High Court that it had employed private detective to snop on picketing dockers and had instructed an informant onto their shop stewards’ committee.

And yet despite the Younger Committee’s recommendations for tighter control of private detectives and heavy fines for those caught using bugging devices, the report is merely the tip of the iceberg.

The committee was excluded from examining the threat to privacy by the state authorities—and it is here that the greatest threat to ordinary people lies.

High rents mean overcrowding—mother and child share the same bed.

by Roger Protz
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So always remember Norman...

You’re not paid to think!
Sport TV breaks its narrow limits

A NEW series, Sport Two, which is its name implies, goes out on BBC 2, is beginning transmissions on Friday nights. At last an intelligent sport programme has made the screen. This does not mean that it’s academic or dull. On the contrary, it aims each week to bring together a mixture of actuality and analysis.

Sports coverage in the media as a whole is in general not only narrow and predictable, it is also disappointingly cut-rate and chintzy by comparison. In short the English middle class in full voice.

Sport Two deserves a big welcome for breaking away from this ugly tradition.

In addition to film or video of big sporting events in the previous week, usually just one, there are interesting features where questions of more than trivial depth are asked of sportmen and where connections are made between the actual sporting event and the society in which it’s all taking place: with money, conditions of work, drugs and politics.

When individual sportmen are interviewed in the programme, the meeting is made to do more than reflect and contribute to the dramas and good-natured self-derogatory status, so they become people up against problems in the real world. The programme is not faultless. Far from it. For one thing its format of a two-man presentation team is pretty uncomfortable, and it still has not hit on the right tone. It tends to be a bit too lumberly and at times this descends to being patronising.

But nevertheless Colm Welland and Ian Wooldridge, the two presenters, and their production team deserve congratulation for getting something genuinely fresh and new on the screen.

This is more than I can say for the fashionable and appropriately called Burke Special, which goes out Thursday evening on BBC 1. I start Burke is given half an hour each week to fill with bits and pieces of scientific and technological gadgetry; in this time he has to keep a studio-audience amused as he moves among them, taking his jacket off here, bringing in some world specialist who has 20 seconds to tell us everything he knows about his subject.

The stress of the series is all on the gadgetry. The programme itself reflects this by going out live and pulling off minor and meaningless gadgetry feats in the process.

The overall effect is of bits and pieces. The world is full of fascinating facts behind the day by day mask of reality, but these facts, just like the numerous gadgets which litter the studio to prove the point, seem disconnected and interesting only in and of themselves. This is a profoundly reactionary view of the world and an extraordinarily irresponsible way to treat science on television.

Barry Ellis

LOW INTENSITY OPERATIONS.

by Major-General Frank Kitson, Faber & Faber, £3

LOW INTENSITY OPERATIONS. When the Provisional IRA began their truce in Northern Ireland one man was exempted by name from its terms—Major-General Frank Kitson, former head of 39th Airportable in Belfast and author of this book.

Kitson has been seen as insipid of the Derry massacre, and of the use of "deep" interviews" (in other words torture) against innocents. His work has begun a controversy in the Commons, where Labour MPs have accused him of wanting a strike-breaking role for the army.

Kitson had been approached by the Ministry of Defence to act as an "activist service" and "kick-start up" the "commando training School of Infantry at Warminster. What has this man written that is so dangerous?"

His book is a plan to the British Army and rising class to the lessons of Kenya, Cyprus, Iran, Vietnam, Africa and the Middle East. The list of ghettos, so that they can successfully deal with the danger of social revolution in Britain and Western Europe in the late 1970s.

DISGUISED

The use of Labour MPs that Kitson believes are so bad, so that the army can get back to a safer neutral role in the civil war. The army has always had a strikebreaking role, but the maintenance of essential supplies.

No army can be neutral in the class struggle. Today’s armies are creating a class struggle because so their function is to defend the capitalist America and to the communists, who have been brutally hammered home by the British Army, is not a type of action. Only Labour MPs should be surprised to learn that this book exists.

Neither is Kitson some British teenager. Kitson, trying to force a class civil war, His reforms of the army, it can be carried out, would rip apart the system of revolution in the bud.

What he proposes is that the whole range of techniques developed by the army that have been employed in different stages in Britain. This whole is upon low intensity operations, such as we have seen in Ireland. These ranged from intimidation, planting spies, black propaganda, even interception with the local population (very useful-causes. Spies...)

It is the main source of his disagreement with established methods of dealing with "subversives", for only a small number of people provide the facilities and training for this kind of work. Judging by the catch-hand job which the police Special Branch accords to patrols of framing several Saoirse Eire militarist, he could well be right.

Provo’s view goes on film

LAST WEEK Rose McArdy, a supporter of the Provisional IRA, was in London, on Saturday, January 18th, to promote "the Provisional IRA Film" which gives the Provisional view on the recent resurrection of Sinn Féin, and the purpose of her visit was to make an appeal to the organisations of Britain for money and medical supplies for the "No Go" areas.

During her visit she was interviewed by a "Provisional" film which gives the Provisional view on the recent resurrection of Sinn Féin, and the purpose of her visit was to make an appeal to the organisations of Britain for money and medical supplies for the "No Go" areas.

Kitson places great stress upon his good intelligence sources. Here he advocates various techniques, mainly based upon the idea of subverting the subvertisers.

In short, Kitson wants to turn the army into a kind of Leninist counter-revolutionary party of the ruling class and socialise them in a new form of democracy."

The book is in his prehistoric belief that revolution comes from Moscow. He expects the uprising of a number of guerrillas to be accompanied by a supporting invasion from Eastern Europe. This is sheer nonsense.

EMPIRE

In France, in 1968, the Communist Party proved one of the last lines of defence for the Gaullist state. They got the ten million strikes back to work. But the riot police had failed. And May ‘68 had an immediate impact within Russia’s empire, especially in Czechoslovakia and Poland. In any future imperial project, Moscow’s main concern would be keeping law and order within its borders.

The other failing is much deeper. Kitson now faces the fact that revolution in this country would be very different from the examples used in the book.

Mau Mau and EOKA were not mass working-class socialist movements. The Provo’s support is confined to a few aristocratic shoots, and they won only heart among the majority of the Irish working-class party with deep roots in industry.

Moreover, it is the danger and adversity that lies ahead of the army that Kitson’s book makes.

Kitson totally fails to consider the fact that between the IRA and the Provisionals stand aghast another group of revolutionaries, the Provisionals. This is planning now how to deal with us.

But he cannot see that in the face of a modern, mass-organised working-class class he is helpless. You cannot deal with the army, you can as with a few thousand in the East End.

Finally, read this book—you’ll learn a lot.

Book review by Robert Frank and Tony Boyle

Barry Ellis

About your

Army

The Army must be especially awake at night, and for this reason must carry night-trained troops equipped with tripods. In Ireland these troops, nicknamed duck squads, were used to get people accustomed to having troops moving quietly and safely at night.

But the most interesting of Kitson’s ideas is his belief that the army is capable of providing leadership in any class struggle. This is a human being, for there are people who can lead.

So we can end in some confidence. Kitson’s book is a dangerous and reactionary one. It is planning to deal with us. And he cannot see that in the face of the army the Provisionals are helpless. You cannot deal with the army, you can as with a few thousand in the East End.

Finally, read this book—you’ll learn a lot.

Barry Ellis
The International Socialists is a democ- ratic socialist group whose members are open to all who accept its main principles and are willing to contribute and work in one of its organizing bodies. We believe in Independent working-class action outside the framework of capitalism and its replacement by a classless society for production for use and not for profit.

We work in the mass organizations of the working class and are firmly commit- ted to a policy of internationalism.

Capitalism is international. The plant firms have investments throughout the world and governments allegiance exist to themselves and the economic system they make.

In Europe, the Common Market has been formed for the sole purpose 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 indefinitel- ly survive unless workers of other countries actively come to its aid by extending the socialist revolution.

In addition to building a revolutionary socialist organization in this country we also believe in the necessity of forming a world revolutionary socialist inter- national with the co-operation of either Washington or Moscow. To this and we are in contact with a number of other socialist organizations throughout the world.

We believe in the necessity to unite socialist theory with the day-by-day struggle of working people and therefore support all genuine demands that tend to improve the position and self- confidence of the working class.

We fight for and in control of the trade unions and the regular selection of all officials.

Against secret societies. We believe that all such movements should be exposed or rejected by mass meetings.

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

Against anti-trade union laws and any
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THE "TO LET" notices are out in Wapping High Street, heart of the dockland.

JUST UP RIVER OF the spectacularly valuable Hays Wharf on London's dizzy Thameside dockland lie the Stamford and Dudge Street wharves.

Dudley Street was closed down in March. Of 24 registered dockworkers were returned to the unwanted register. Stamford Wharf went in March this year, with the loss of another 20 jobs.

Both wharves are owned by the giant Union International empire, which, apart from being the biggest merchant company in the world, has subsidiary interests in shipping, food processing and retailing and insurance properties.

Reason for the two closures was, not as Union International claims, consciousness of the trade and the ships that gave rise to the dockers' jobs in the first place. Rather the ban of the Union International empire, Ronald Arthur Vestey and Lord Samuel Vestey, realised they were sitting on a goldmine. The streets of this part of London are literally paved with gold for those who sell the accident of commerce hold title to the land.

HIDDEN

Stamford, Dudley Street (and that third wharf employing 85 dockers whose name no one knows) (though, small though these are, more valuable per acre than the docklands), can be traced back to the 10,000 register and under normal circumstances.

But Union International still had business to be done. Given the iron law of business, if something is possible—this was now to be done outside the reach of docks trade unionism. The work would be transferred inland. But for the operation to be really successful, Union International had to make it seem as if the transfer was possible.

Dockers picketing the Union International wharves in East London have always maintained that the reason for the closure was a Vestry subsidiary and that the work at their Stamford and Dudley Street wharves has been disrupted but had been brought to the new dock to be done by unregistered labour.

On the other hand, the firm which took the picketing dockers to the National Industrial Relations Court, and got secret agents on them and their families to extract information and evidence, and every trick in the book, can cover up its strategy.

MEMBERS

WADSWORTH is in public meeting, Lake Loveland Road, 6.30pm. HENRY STANMORE is in public meeting, Clapham Manor, 8pm.

NOTICES

IMPROVEMENTS AND THE WAY TO FIGHT BACK

The "NOTES & QUERIES" column is now published every week.

WHAT'S ON

Copy for What's On must arrive by first post, Monday. What's On is published on Monday.

DANCE: Hardon, 400x100, £3.50 and CASH WITH ORDER.

No alterations without payment. Invoices accepted on request.

MEETINGS

CLANN ADARE (Belfast) meeting in栖 hackney Town Hall, 3.30pm, Sunday 27 July, 3.30pm

NOVA (London) meeting in Greenside Gardens, 2.30pm, Sunday 27 July, 2.30pm

BADDHURST (Sussex) meeting in Greenside Gardens, 2.30pm, Sunday 27 July, 2.30pm

PUBLIC MEETING IN CALMENOS, May 16, 2.30pm

SEAN O'TOOLE DEFENCE COMMITTEE meeting in Greenside Gardens, 2.30pm, Sunday 27 July, 2.30pm

CRITICAL SOCIALIST GLOBAL ACTION GROUP meeting in Greenside Gardens, 2.30pm, Sunday 27 July, 2.30pm

THE BATTLE OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WORKERS CHARTER MEETING 27 July, 2.30pm

SEAN O'TOOLE MEETING 27 July, 2.30pm

NOTICE

NOTICE INVITATION to join group publishing socialist leaflet on 'Halden' in Scotland. Meetings held at 7pm, July 27, 14 Camellia Lane, Northfield, Stirling.

STUDENT COMRADE requires room in mid-Somerset, please write to 50 The Branch, friends of the Socialist League, 6 Cornerbridge, London E2 8DN.

HOLIDAY REPORTS NOW AVAILABLE in West Kensington News. Phone Dave 087 3536.

OYSTERS POETRY MAGAZINE (England) requires Gallows jam, buttonholes jam and all and any foreign workers in total numbers of the Union International empire, which, apart from being the biggest merchant company in the world, has subsidiary interests in shipping, food processing and retailing and insurance properties.

HAYES is in public meeting, Back Way, 7pm. Phone Dave 087 3536.

YOUNG WORKER requires room in West Kensington. Please write to The Branch, friends of the Socialist League, 6 Cornerbridge, London E2 8DN.

PRAGUESS THEODOR BRANCH announces a public meeting to discuss the latest developments in socialist movements in Europe, 7pm, July 27, 14 Camellia Lane, Northfield, Stirling.
Laurie Flynn investigates the Vestey empire

known in the offices of the Ulster Bank—is that the 99.998 ordinary £1 shareholders are nominees wholly owned by the Vestey family. As the dockers maintain, the Vestey family own Midland Cold Storage. Their jobs did not simply disappear due to membership of the Transport and General Workers' Union. They were transferred instead. If USDAW was brought in to enable the management to break the dockers' labour scheme, it was the Vestey family who used their influence to make the dockers feel that USDAW was just a tool of the Vestey family. And, as all Vesteyes are the richest families in Britain. Their world-wide beef empire has been built up since 1867. From £250 million cart-stretching from South American cattle ranches, refrigerated shipping vessels and stevedoring companies in的东西, the Vestey family own Midland Cold Storage.

Prescott, head of the organisation of the 31-year-old Lord Samuel Vestey, who inherited his first million at the age of 13 when he was a baron. He was a member of the Vestey family. His personal fortune is now estimated to be £50 million.

It was the good Lord only took over last year from his father, who had run the operation in the hands of his brothers. Lord Samuel Vestey, who had managed the estate for the two of the four £1 management directors, who hold four of the £1 managing directorships in the Vestey family-owned companies, Western United Investments, and Vestey Bros.

The intricate array of intertwining companies that makes the Vestey family’s wealth possible is a legal way of avoiding death duties. The estate is one for taking only on the dockers.

12,000 take on tobacco giant

TWELEVE thousand Imperial Tobacco workers voted on Friday in a walk-out by 12,000 of the company’s 13,000 work force in a nationalised industry official action against a supposedly ‘unprofitable’ giant and was called by the 16-member executive of the company. The overtime has been banned for four weeks and a second strike is threatened. The Nationalising Union is also involved in the struggle in the company’s Glasgow, Nottingham, Bristol, Newcastle and London branches.

The workers want a £2.50 an-hour rise, but their strength boosted this week by crucial action by fellow workers. At Catterick, near« Durham, workers have stopped production on tobacco for Rolls-Royce, due in retaliation for Rolls-Royce’s acceptance of work from Aire Tube in production by the state. The strikers have been told by shop stewards from SNTCA, the firm-owned French Concorde, that it will be their future. Eye Tube producer.

Blacking support for Fine Tubes strikers

PLYMOUTH—Fine Tubes workers, on strike for more than two years for trade union rights, have their strength boosted this week by crucial action by fellow workers. At Catterick, near« Durham, workers have stopped production on tobacco for Rolls-Royce, due in retaliation for Rolls-Royce’s acceptance of work from Aire Tube in production by the state. The strikers have been told by shop stewards from SNTCA, the firm-owned French Concorde, that it will be their future. Eye Tube producer.

Tenants prepare for October

by Hugh Kerr

The complete collapse of official Labour policy for the tenants’ movement in the NATFHE’s Bill makes it crystal clear that only direct action by tenants and trade unions can defeat the Tory rent cuts.

Since Labour’s botched retreat it has become more vital than ever that every tenants’ association in the land should send delegates to the National Tenants’ Conference in London on Saturday July 29 organised by the National Association of Tenants’ Organisations.

The tenants’ movement is stronger and better than ever before.

In more than 20 areas tenants are on the rent strike against increases imposed in April or May. In some towns tenants have forced council rent control decisions by militant action. In many other places tenants’ organisations have declared that they will go on rent strike in October if forced with the issue.

But a national link-up of tenants’ organisations has not yet been achieved.

A comprehensive policy is needed to defeat the Bill.

The policy is based on the well-proven tactic that every rent increase under the Bill will be met with a complete refusal to pay. This must be combined with a pledge that any action against tenants by councils or the Housing Commissioner will be challenged with a national rent and rates strike.

Trade unions, at local and national level, should be asked to give backing to, in parallel to every attempt against immediate action.

IUC, the Nationalists for the Working Classes Conference, are available from 283 Grays Inn Road, London W1.

WEARMTH—Tenants successfully prevented council officials inspecting council rooms to means test “fair rent.” The official who arrived to inspect 70-year-old Mrs Geovina de Mora’s flat in Hammersmith one night was rebuffed by the tenants from the Tenants’ Federation and was actually thrown out of the house. Mrs de Mora’s 74-year-old husband already pays £7.50 a week for their flat and already 20% a week.

CLAY CROSS, Derbyshire—Tenants are threatening to evict their landlord in a rent strike that turned up in the autumn. One council official this week saw the empty rooms and asked why the council had let the property go.

DUBLIN—Thousands of tenants all over Ireland are on rent strike. Dublin tenants, who cannot repay their rent, have declared that they will not pay. Dublin City Council has put up to 20% of the staff on strike and is paying for rent, but were defeated by a white flag, an agreement to pay to get back the property when tenants are acceptable tenants.

BARKING—A pox on with 8,000 signatures and a demonstration by 100 tenants has left the council not to use rent policy to put up rents last week.

MARLOW—A move by housing committee members and the leader of the council to reverse rent rises imposed in April was defeated by 17 votes to 13. Marlow has no rents council-owned on.
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Boost for Tarmac

THE STRIKE at the Tarmac civil engineering plant depot in Wolverhampton is now entering its fifth week. Workers are taking action to prevent four men being made redundant and to secure better pay, shorter hours and longer holidays. Last Thursday, their struggle received an important boost when workers at Tarmac’s Road Surfacing depot in Rookley Rugeley struck for a rate of £1 an hour.

Conditions are appalling. For over a year there has been no ambulance station and no fire safety officer. There is no canteen and washing facilities for all construction workers, consisting of two buckets.

Throughout all negotiations before the strike, management’s only response was that the men could not expect high rates in an area of high unemployment.

REVOLT OVER SHWEPAC CONDITIONS SPREADS

LONG EATON—Seven, 11, Pakistan workers and five white workers at Jones, Straw are on strike. The dispute is part of a continuing drive to unionise workers in backstreet firms of the sort which abound in the East Midlands, and which especially affects Pakistanis. The men, all members of the Transport Union, are demanding the recognition of their union and compensation for injuries sustained while splitting the workforce, with some white workers still working.

Conditions are appalling. In particular, the men have had no wage increase for the past 10 years. The basic rate is 45p an hour for all overtime and shift work. This is basically the same as at Cepha Show in Nottingham, where strikers recently won an increase to a similar amount of unionisation and black market specials. The strike was set at five as many of our leaders of police have been ‘observing’ the pickets.

The successful handling of the dispute official because the district official claims he doesn’t know what they are doing. The men are absolutely solid and are determined to bring the conditions of ownership up to a high level.
Dockers: Why we fight on
by Bob Light
TGWU London Royal Docks

The battle of Britain's dockers to defend their jobs, wages and conditions is continually being turned into a struggle against unionisation and against other trade unionists. This could not be further from the truth. The employers and successive governments have used unionisation to decimate the docks labour force.

The Port of London Authority has led the fight back, and the employers, believing that the unionisation of dockers should be in the interests of the employers, have, rather than boosting profits, fought to maintain the dockers' wages and conditions to the detriment of the dockers. Dockers have made it clear that they cannot accept what they are being offered. They have organised a strike and are fighting to keep their jobs.

For years trade unionism has been in the dock, and, with the organised action of dockers and their allies, the employers have been fighting to keep the dockers out of the Union. The employers are only interested in fighting the dockers because they want to keep the dockers out of the Union.

The recent rise of unionism within the dockers' union has led to a growing influence from those workers determined to fight this corruption. This has linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union. The Union recognises the need to maintain a more formal structure in the dockers' industry, but it has also linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union.

In such a situation the union leadership might well attempt to negotiate a compromise, but it is by no means certain that this would be prepared to fight the demands on dockers' hours in a new offer on the table.

That is why the dockers are demanding:

1. No retreat on the claim, no production as the basis for the whole-time settlement.
2. A three-week strike on all sites of the 39 companies.
3. Mass picketing of all sites that fails to respond.
4. Mass picketing of brick and cement works to completely cut off the supply of materials to the entire industry.
5. Rigid enforcement of the national overtime agreement.
6. General sympathy strikes by building and bricklayers' trade unions.
7. Full support from the TUC, including support for all picketing.
8. Regular strikes from the union's members.
9. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
10. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
11. No EPUP/TPU members to cross the picket line.
12. No recognition or co-operation with the Industrial Relations Act and its courts.

The dockers have made it clear that they cannot accept what they are being offered. They have organised a strike and are fighting to keep their jobs.
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In such a situation the union leadership might well attempt to negotiate a compromise, but it is by no means certain that this would be prepared to fight the demands on dockers' hours in a new offer on the table.

That is why the dockers are demanding:

1. No retreat on the claim, no production as the basis for the whole-time settlement.
2. A three-week strike on all sites of the 39 companies.
3. Mass picketing of all sites that fails to respond.
4. Mass picketing of brick and cement works to completely cut off the supply of materials to the entire industry.
5. Rigid enforcement of the national overtime agreement.
6. General sympathy strikes by building and bricklayers' trade unions.
7. Full support from the TUC, including support for all picketing.
8. Regular strikes from the union's members.
9. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
10. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
11. No recognition or co-operation with the Industrial Relations Act and its courts.

The dockers have made it clear that they cannot accept what they are being offered. They have organised a strike and are fighting to keep their jobs.

For years trade unionism has been in the dock, and, with the organised action of dockers and their allies, the employers have been fighting to keep the dockers out of the Union. The employers are only interested in fighting the dockers because they want to keep the dockers out of the Union.

The recent rise of unionism within the dockers' union has led to a growing influence from those workers determined to fight this corruption. This has linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union. The Union recognises the need to maintain a more formal structure in the dockers' industry, but it has also linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union.

In such a situation the union leadership might well attempt to negotiate a compromise, but it is by no means certain that this would be prepared to fight the demands on dockers' hours in a new offer on the table.

That is why the dockers are demanding:

1. No retreat on the claim, no production as the basis for the whole-time settlement.
2. A three-week strike on all sites of the 39 companies.
3. Mass picketing of all sites that fails to respond.
4. Mass picketing of brick and cement works to completely cut off the supply of materials to the entire industry.
5. Rigid enforcement of the national overtime agreement.
6. General sympathy strikes by building and bricklayers' trade unions.
7. Full support from the TUC, including support for all picketing.
8. Regular strikes from the union's members.
9. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
10. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
11. No recognition or co-operation with the Industrial Relations Act and its courts.

The dockers have made it clear that they cannot accept what they are being offered. They have organised a strike and are fighting to keep their jobs.

For years trade unionism has been in the dock, and, with the organised action of dockers and their allies, the employers have been fighting to keep the dockers out of the Union. The employers are only interested in fighting the dockers because they want to keep the dockers out of the Union.

The recent rise of unionism within the dockers' union has led to a growing influence from those workers determined to fight this corruption. This has linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union. The Union recognises the need to maintain a more formal structure in the dockers' industry, but it has also linked up with the newly-formed UCATT—a merger of the workers' movement, the dockers' movement and the dockers' unions—to prove itself as a competent organisation to operate against the corrupt influences of the employers of the Union.

In such a situation the union leadership might well attempt to negotiate a compromise, but it is by no means certain that this would be prepared to fight the demands on dockers' hours in a new offer on the table.

That is why the dockers are demanding:

1. No retreat on the claim, no production as the basis for the whole-time settlement.
2. A three-week strike on all sites of the 39 companies.
3. Mass picketing of all sites that fails to respond.
4. Mass picketing of brick and cement works to completely cut off the supply of materials to the entire industry.
5. Rigid enforcement of the national overtime agreement.
6. General sympathy strikes by building and bricklayers' trade unions.
7. Full support from the TUC, including support for all picketing.
8. Regular strikes from the union's members.
9. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
10. A mass campaign for a building and bricklayers' strike.
11. No recognition or co-operation with the Industrial Relations Act and its courts.