THE TORY GOVERNMENT has introduced a wage freeze: nothing more, nothing less. Heath's claim that his new Act is fair to everyone is a lie.

The Act pretends to freeze prices, but...
- Prices of meat, vegetables and fish can be raised without permission from the government.
- Prices of goods made up of raw materials from abroad can be raised without permission from the government.
- Government permission to raise other prices will be available to anybody who can show that the cost of his goods has been raised by "external forces".

The Bill promises to control dividends, BUT: Dividends due to shareholders will be salved away in safe investment for 90 days and will emerge at the end more profitable than before.

The Bill promises to control rents and rates, BUT: The only important current rent rise, that ordained by the Housing Finance Act, are legal.

Rate restraint will only emerge if the local authorities respond to government 'discussion'.

The Bill does not even pretend to control the fantastic fortunes made by property speculators. It does not even pretend to control the rise in value of share prices, up £2,600 million, since the Tories came to power, that would work out at £500 for every man, woman and child in the country.

For the wealthy and privileged, the exceptions in the Bill are more than the restrictions.

For the workers, there are no exceptions. All wage awards and all attempts by strike action or by threats of strikes or lockouts or of influence of strike action are punishable by 51 weeks' fines and unlimited fines on judges.

As a final brutal insult, Lord and Master Heath produces a £10 Christmas bonus for his pensioner workers.

Who will fight this class legislation and the class government which produced it?

Harold Wilson and his colleagues have promised a fight in the House of Commons. It will be as violent and passionate as the fight made by Edward Heath and his colleagues when Harold Wilson introduced wage freeze in 1966.

Wilson and Co will urge their supporters to keep the fight up in parliament and on television, where nobody will get hurt.

The trade union leaders are taking the same line.

In the hours before the freeze was announced, hundreds of thousands of workers were sold to their employers for wage increases which would have been dismissed as contemptible if the freeze had not been mooted.

900,000 local government workers, whose jobs are among the filthiest and lowest paid in the country, were forced to accept £2.40 of their claimed £4, with no change in hours worked.

THE WAY TO BEAT THE FREEZE

At Swan Hunter, on Tyneside, in Fleet Street, in the power stations, and in the industrial sector of the civil service, workers were sold for equally paltry concessions.

Their union leaders preferred to settle for a pitance rather than fight the government for what their members deserved. They have abandoned the class battleground to the triumphant Tories.

Even worse is the plight of the workers who have got nothing before the freeze, but whose claims are in the pipeline.

WHAT TRADE UNIONISTS SHOULD DEMAND:
- Recall the Trades Union Congress to demand all-out action to smash the freeze.
- No more talks with the Tories.
- Industrial action in solidarity with all groups that fight the freeze.
- Mobilise the entire labour movement to fight now for:
  - £25 a week minimum wage
  - £16 a week pension
  - Equal pay for women

The way to beat the freeze has been mapped out by the miners last winter and the dockers last summer. The miners showed that industrial strength could beat government policy, and the dockers showed that solidarity could make nonsense of Tory laws.

The freeze will be beaten only by a union onslaught on behalf of the lower paid. Claims for lower-paid, claims for equal pay for women, claims for pension increases should be pursued through union branches with haste and vigour.

The claims must be backed by the full industrial strength of the trade union movement. Vic Feather, Jack Jones, Ebbie Jenkins and the rest who have proclaimed contempt for these laws must also make it clear that they will give full official support to any group of workers that goes on strike against it.

The government must be told that from now on trade unionists are prepared to talk to them, provided the conversations are limited to the world:

GET OUT!

Striking mother who gets 20p a week

Social Security

If Ed Heath is concerned about the low paid he should concern himself with Barry Mawson. She is one of the First Tube strikers in Plymouth, out for 3½ years.

And Barby gets 20p a week from the Social Security to supplement the £2.50 from the strike fund. She is divorced and is entitled to benefit only for her 3½ year old daughter.

The Plymouth strikers, still battling on, are in urgent need of industrial and financial support. Send to: Fine Tube Strike Committee, c/o Brighton Side, Exeter Street, Plymouth, Devon.
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FIGHT THE TORIES! BUILD THE SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE!
BOSSES' STRIKE IS THREAT TO ALLENDE

by Ian Roxborough and Vic Richards

The reorganisation of Chile's government last week has put in jeopardy all the gains won by the workers of that country in the last six years. Allende—a would-be Marxist dedicated to the policies of "Socialism in one country"—has given three posts to officers of the armed forces.

For more than a fortnight there has been talk of the "threat of civil war". A strike of lorry owners and other bosses has shut down most of the country's transport. Now Allende has tried to plug the extreme right wing by putting the maintenance of public order into the hands of those who can be relied upon to protect the interests of the privileged and well-to-do. He has appointed as his new Minister of the Interior, and second in charge after himself, army general Carlos Prats.

Chile is already in serious financial and economic difficulties due to boycotts and credit freezes but is now threatened with the automatic embargo of the US government. Chilean capitalists are already working out their money abroad.

COUP D'ETAT

The aim of the striking shopkeepers, policemen and factory workers is to provoke a street disorders provoked by fascist squads—to create a situation of political chaos and promote economic collapse, which would then justify a military coup against the government.

The middle-class opposition is encouraging the state to continue up to the Congressional elections, due in March 1973. Some aim for a coup d'état: the Christian Democrats seem to want to discredit Allende so that they can win a large majority in the elections and possibly force him to resign.

Throughout the crisis, Allende has appealed to the patriotism, patriotism to the class interests of the Chilean workers. But Allende, the military, having occupied 21 of Chile's 25 provinces for almost three weeks, have in fact been in control.

The Christian Democrats see Allende's weakness.

THREATENED

He made some serious retreats in the past when under pressure, and was often forced by the international authority to end the bosses' strike. Allende, the Workers Party force of the capitalist state to end the bosses' "law and order".

The Christian Democrats threatened to use the putsch to "defend" the "law and order".

TRudeau ON THE BRINK

by Norah Carlin

Pierre TRudeau, Canada's jet-setting prime minister, may yet hang on to power, even though in the elections his Liberal Party won only the same number of seats as the Conservatives.

The balance is held by the New Democratic Party (Canada's labour party) and the Social Credit party, a rural right-wing group, but a coalition government involving either of these minority parties is unlikely.

Trudeau had widely believed that Trudeau lost votes because he had not won over the French Canadians. The majority of his cabinet and well over half of the Liberal MPs are French-speaking.

But while a few top posts have gone to French Canadians, most of the French-speaking population remains underprivileged in income, education and employment.

In October 1970, Trudeau sent the army into French-speaking Quebec when a British diplomat and the Quebec minister of labour were kidnapped by the separatist FLQ (Front de Libération du Québec). Civil liberties were suspended, and the 492 people arrested within a few days included a broad cross-section of left-wing political and trade union leaders, writers, artists, most of whom had no connection with the separatists.

In April and May this year, Quebec erupted in a wave of strikes, starting with a public service workers' strike against the provincial cabinet. When the strike leaders were arrested and one of the massive sympathy strikes followed.

Trudeau himself did nothing—any intervention would have worsened the situation by routing bitter mass protests. The Liberal leaders bore the brunt of the newspaper campaign.

The most serious blow to Trudeau's government came when the Liberal government was overthrown in a minority vote of no-confidence in the House of Commons in April 1972. Trudeau then called a general election, which the Liberals lost.

The result was a severe blow to Trudeau's government, which was forced to resign. Trudeau then called a general election, which the Liberals won.

ITALY: WORKERS' STRUGGLE HITS UP

by Mike Balfour

During the months of 1968, when labour contracts in the major Italian cities, including Rome, were renegotiated, millions of Italian workers won big advances in wages and conditions after violent struggles in the factories and on the streets.

This year, however, the contracts are being renewed and although the negotiations are being given more attention than in the past, the outcome is likely to be far less successful than in the past for the workers, who are already fighting for their jobs.

Last fortnight 14 million workers struck in protest against the fascist bombings of trade union centres in Rome, a labour rally in southern Italy, showing the militancy of the working class, since only one day's notice of the strike was given.

The fascist bombing is the latest in a series that have hit Italy since 1969. Their main purpose was to disrupt the revolutionary left, which has been making great advances in the south. The violence reached a climax this year with the explosion in Milan which killed 14 people.

Now at last the fascists are being accused of having been behind the attacks.

But the three anarchists imprisoned since the explosion are still waiting for a trial. A few days ago the Appeal Court, using a 1933 fascist law, decreed that the trial should be held in Catanzaro in Southern Italy.

The implications of this are clear. Firstly it will mean a delay of at least another year, due to the bureaucratic problems of moving all the papers to a new court. Secondly, if the trial is even going to take place, it will be as far as possible from the support and pressure of left-wing groups and political organisations who have been demonstrating and sending petitions demanding the release of the three anarchists.

Finally, Catanzaro is a backward city, near Reggio Calabria, which has become a centre of recruitment and training for fascist squads.
HEATH’s new wage freeze has been presented as an unprecedented attempt to stop rising prices by hitting ‘equal wages, prices and rents’. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Suggest all sections of the population are going to be hit equally in the months ahead. The very rich are entering the period of the freeze with a massive start of tax. Tax changes made in the last two Tory budgets, and further changes planned for the first three months of April, will increase the weight of the wedge on each at an ersatz speed. Nothing Heath’s freeze does will stop it.

Tax changes made by the Tories since June 1976 have given away more than £480 million a year to investors, few who have incomes of more than £60,000 a year. Such a handout would have been enough to have given every one of the 2.5 million households of pensioners an extra £1.30 a week.

For those of us who are in work, a freeze like last April will be a date to remember. Under a plan to merge together income tax and surtax anywhere earning £13,000 a year will pay £324 less in April, 1977.

In other words, company directors, top mechanics, the judges, The Times and High Court judges will all get another £6.50 in their pockets every single week—three times as much as Heath wanted the rest of us to accept.

WEALTH

But some of them may still complain. Despite this windfall, they will not gain nearly as much from the tax changes as they would have done. An income of £15,000 a year without even attempting to work for it. Someone raking in that amount from rent or profit of their investments will find themselves no less than £1,340 a year or more off tax. They will gain even more.

The wealth of the very rich will grow in another way as well. Dividends are frozen on shares worth £2,500 a year which is not very low, since they grew by 17 per cent in that way in 1976. Dividends are profits that are handed over to shareholders. If the law restricts the sums that companies can pay out for a period it does not mean that the excess profits go to cut prices or to benefit those that earn from them.

All that happens is that they are handed over to shareholders who then have the choice of the value of shares to be distributed later on.

SUFFERED

A wage increase that is ‘frozen’ disappears for ever. No employee can ever hope to be in work at a later date. With profits it is quite the reverse. The last time a government attempted a freeze like the present one was in 1966. Wages and living standards certainly suffered. For three years after that freeze, according to The Economist, ‘real disposable income per head rose by barely 1 per cent a year’.

In July 1966 Harold Wilson, like Edward Heath in this week, announced ‘six months standstill on wages, salaries, and severance and types of incomes’ including dividends.

In many of the following year’s budgets the government took preventive steps to prevent excessive distribution of dividends.

Between July 1966 and December 1967 the average value of shares increased by 75 per cent. While wages stagnated, any one who was worth one million pounds would be worth £1.5 million a mere 2½ years later.

Prices: vital loopholes for profiteers

ONE THING is certain: the freeze will not stop the upward movement of prices. During the last ‘prices and incomes’ freeze, and the Labour government, prices continued to grow at the same rate as in previous years, at 2.5 per cent a year. In 1966 we had a ‘free’ year at a cost of 1964-68. Big firms found it easy to dodge government controls.

The Tories’ own White Paper admits as much. It provides an escape clause for manufacturers who can ‘prove that their costs rise’. And it exempted food from any control at all.

‘Things like bread, potatoes, meat, that everyone thing buying, they don’t have thinking about other things will not even face the problem of prices.

Experts are predicting that over the next year food prices will increase by rather more than 5 per cent. The government itself has deliberately chosen to increase them by between 2 and 3 per cent as ‘preparations’ for the Common Market. It turned down without hesitation a TUC suggestion that it postpones the imposition of ‘food levies’ which are meant to raise prices to European levels.

Fiddles

It is also clear with plans to introduce Value Added Tax, which will increase by large changes the cost of necessities like shoes and children’s clothes. Again, experts calculate that VAT will, by itself, add about 1 per cent to the overall cost of living. The main difference is that all goods will be changed by VAT. It will be paid on the value added by those who have to pay VAT as those who have to pay VAT. As even after two years in the general classification it will be easy for firms to raise their prices without anyone noticing until it is too late. Meanwhile, the consumer and wage earner will suffer.

Finally the freeze on rents is one of the biggest confidence tricks of all time. Here the behaviour of the government is like that of the burglar who informs the police of a robbery then he himself is safely away with the loot.

The rents of four million people went up last month by nearly £1 each week. The increases remain in force.

The rents of a million people are due to rise by 50p each by next April. The week that the freeze will have ended, if it is extended for another 6 days.

It is not difficult for the Tories to be ‘frozen’ by stopping rent increases in the period when very few are due to take place.

Meanwhile, workers who have just had to fork out an extra pound a week will be upset to pay it. And they will be prevented, if they obey the law, from fighting for a pay rise to compensate them for this extra burden.

HOW FREEZE AFFECTS US

In July 1966 the Labour government imposed a freeze. From that date to December 1968 the value of shares rose by an average of 75 per cent. 80 per cent of shares are owned by just 1 per cent of the population, so the very rich did very well out of the Labour government. Exactly the same will happen under the Tory freeze.

Rebuffing the Board of Britain Limited...

Peter Walker, the Minister for Staters, whose former plan, Peter Walker, has now decided to reverse its profits in its first year in 1966, has taken charge of all British trade and industry.

John Davies, former director of Hill Samuel merchant bank, which has been one of the City’s most enthusiastic backers of the Common Market, moves into more powerful fields as Mr. Walker’s right hand man.

Another move for promising Younger Blossom, former chairman of Holland, Hammers and Cubitt, who shares his Crick and Cubitt had doubled in value since the Tories took power, takes over the department of state which deals with building and conversion. He will be assisted by the Secretary of State for Hammers, Holland, Hammers and Cubitt.

Another promotion for Farmer Joe, Joseph Goodman, whose family’s enterprise, Isaac Goodman Ltd (a delightful little horse-trading establishment in Batford) hopes to popularly hugely from the increased food prices of the Common Market. Mr. Goodman, who used to answer questions on the House of Commons on Rhodesia, is now responsible for agriculture.

The well-known building contractor, Geoffrey Kippin, former chairman of Holland, Hammers and Cubitt, who shares his Crick and Cubitt had doubled in value since the Tories took power, takes over the department of state which deals with building and conversion. He will be assisted by the Secretary of State for Hammers, Holland, Hammers and Cubitt.

Clarence is promotion for Farmer Joe, Joseph Goodman, whose family’s enterprise, Isaac Goodman Ltd (a delightful little horse-trading establishment in Batford) hopes to popularly hugely from the increased food prices of the Common Market. Mr. Goodman, who used to answer questions on the House of Commons on Rhodesia, is now responsible for agriculture.
IT IS AS WELL to remember that the Heath government's famous "poverty trap" strategy has swept away the Prices and Incomes Board and other restrictive Labour government's incomes policy, it did so in favour of its restrictive incomes policy.

Part of that alternative was the notorious "Norm minus one cent" strategy. Key groups of workers in the so-called public sector were to be bludgeoned into accepting pay settlements 1 cent lower than the one conceded to the group of workers immediately before them in the firing line. The strategy was enforced by stand-up fights with any section that refused to knuckle under. When the government smashed the postmen's strike, it believed that it was as well to try to get a little more than the Norm minus one cent.

Another part of the alternative policy was the Industrial Relations Act. This was to tilt the balance in favour of the employer by imposing a measure of state control over the unions and authorising the government executives and full-time officials to "discipline" the rank and file in the interests of the employers and the state.

A third part of the alternative incomes policy was the direct legislative action to redistribute income in favour of the rich. Barber's budgets have given hundreds of millions to those receiving more than £2,000 a year — £355 million in 1971 alone.

Cuts in social services and the massive extension of means-testing for benefits have created the "poverty trap" for low-paid workers. Under the Housing Finance Act, council tenants are already beginning to pay the first increments of the present 1977-78 rent rise. The government intends to screw out of them. National Insurance contributions have been massively increased. Now, on top of all this, there is a return to a statutory wage freeze. And to justify it, the old, discredited claptrap about "fairness" and "working together" is being trotted out again. This is the result of the defeat of the government at the polls from miners and dockers.

**Needs co-operation**

The leopard has not changed its spots. It has merely changed its carpet. In the plus the TUC's National Industrial Relations Act failed to cut real wages significantly. Now the same objective is being approached on a different tack. The TUC's new co-operation of the trade union leaders and Madeleine has led to a Labour government's incomes policy. The only difference is that the government now, with increasing frequency, is being used to try to get an agreement with them through the Downing Street talks was not just a public relations exercise. Even right-wingers like Cooper, Greene and Allen could express the right wing of the TUC's package, much as they would like to have done so. The government would not even guarantee that the present Labour government's incomes policy will not result in a cut of over 16% by 5 per cent over 12 months—a sure indication that they will rise by much more.

The evaluation of the result will undoubtedly ensure that the Common Agricultural Policy of the Community will be worth much less. Next year's rent rises stay, VAT is coming in. Barber's proposed "tax reform" will give another boost to the rich in 1973. The menace of the National Industrial Relations Act remains.

In spite of all this the TUC chiefs still hanker after a settlement with the government. They are simply looking for a few more crumbs to help them sell a deal. The fight against the last Tory attack necessarily includes a determined struggle to get the union movement out of Heath's embrace. No incomes policy fraud, statutory or not, can work without government connivance.

**PLAIN DUTY**

MR JAMES QAOD is a politically motivated man. Explaining his determination to use the Tory National Industrial Relations Court against the AUEW he said: "It is not merely a matter of legal rights. It is over whether the law of the land is supreme or the law of the union." In other words he is determined to make his workers grovel before the Tory Judge Daldorch.

In this latest test case it is the plain duty of the AUEW members to show the strength of solidarity in the black leg and his Tory backers. And it is the duty of every worker to support his fellow workers at all times.

**Silent service**

THE INDEPENDENCE of the law from the government was well illustrated by the article in The Sunday Times last Sunday about Detective Chief Inspector Victor Kelaher, formerly head of Scotland Yard's drug squad, now on ' sick leave'.

Tape-recordings of conversations between Kelaher and his informants had been obtained by customs officers on the track of a drug shipment. The recordings exposed Kelaher's involvement with American drug control officials in schemes to pay informants and to sell through drug shipments in the hope that they would lead to bigger ones.

Yet the recordings were not disclosed at the trial of Kelaher's informant in July last year, though they constituted crucial evidence both for defence and prosecution.

The recordings were banned, according to the Sunday Times, after discussions involving the then Commissioner of Metropolitan Police, Sir John Waldron, and the then Home Secretary, Mr Reginald Maudling. This was the first time that Mr Maudling had been in contact with Mr Kelaher.

In November 1970 Kelaher and Sergeant Bassett of the drug squad were ordered to investigate an allegation that Jerome Hoffman, chief executive of an offshore property fund called International Investors Group, had been giving access to the criminal world of Scotland Yard.

The allegation had been made by two solicitors in London's West End, Peter Moore and Andrew Lloyd. They represented staff men of IGG who were suing for salaries and stocks held by Hoffman. Twice the solicitors had been told by Hoffman's senior executive that the clients had criminal records.

All three records were produced from IGG files. The records could have come from newspaper cuttings, as some of the offences had not been reported.

A message from Sir John included a reading passage: 'Industry should be responsible as well as enterprising.'

The fourth aim of Aims of Industry printed above Sir John's message, read: 'To provide employment and to recognise that where possible work should make the fullest possible use of men and women's creative abilities, intelligence and experience. To enable men and women to achieve satisfying lives at work.'

Associated Portland Cement is one of the largest British investors in South Africa. On 30 July 1971 the Rand Daily Mail reported that the company's minimum wage rate at its plant at Lichtenburg was £2.47 a week, one of the lowest wage rates for industrial workers in the whole of South Africa.

Sir John Rees is a member of the Council of the UK-South Africa Trade Association.

**Room boom**

ROBERT ADLEY, Conservative MP for Bristol North East, is very worried about the spread of militancy in the building industry, and has been trying to alert his friends to the 'allegations' in a 'dossier' recently published by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers, which all kinds of horrible acts perpetrated by building workers during the recent national strike. Adley is particularly concerned about these things because of his love for his family and his passion for good industrial relations.

He learnt a lot about industrial relations as an executive of Maxwell Joseph's hotel group for eight years, 1958-66, and as sales director of the May Fair Hotel from 1959 to 1964. He is now the director of a Commons Chamber of Holiday Inn, which he uses to finance his hotels under construction in Britain.

It was Adley who pointed out in the House of Commons during the building strike that the strike could mean that several thousands of hotels under construction would not be able for the £1,000-a-night制约 granted by the Labour government to all hotels completed by 1973.

That is enough to drive any patriotic hotel director wild with rage. Which happens to be the effect which it has upon Robert Adley MP.
RAYMOND COLLINAR

IT'S ALWAYS fascinating to examine the ancestry of the British aristocracy. Take the Villiers, for example. More than 300 years ago, Barbara Villiers, the Duchess of Cleveland, became mistress to Charles II. She must have been rather ugly for Charles maintained that his mistresses 'were imposed upon him by his priests as penances'. After his death, King James II came to the throne and frequently did 'penance' with Arabella Villiers, Barbara's sister.

When James, weakened by his age, suffered a partial permanent mental decline, was deposed in the Revolution of 1688, William of Orange became king. He turned to the Villiers to protect his own mistresses. Professor Maurice Ashley says, "William's union with the Villiers tradition almost beyond the dynastic point."

The Villiers girls might not have hearts of gold, but they nevertheless amassed immense wealth. They also added greatly to the social stability of the age.

Among their descendants are the Dukes of Cleveland, Danby and Buckingham, the Marquis of Bute, the Clwyds, the Prits and the Churchills. With the exception of Labour governments, there has been a Villiers presence in the British family in every cabinet for 250 years.

This continuity of political power and influence means that when the ruling class has remained viable, it has exchanged through centuries.

WHAT LABOUR CANNOT DO

THE WAY councils capitulated to government pressure is just another sign of the increasing timidity of Labour Party. It should be remembered that this is Sir Harold Wilson's Bill is simply another turn of the screw, a measure designed to further undermine the U.S. housing bill by putting the expense of the working class, which the government obviously calculates that as introduced, they are not fighting the Bill as they would have done, as a situation where their whole economic system was threatened. And, even if all the steps would be pulled out.

Fighting for its very existence, the ruling class would be forced to become fearsome and formidable enemy. So Sir Harold cannot defeat the Tory Housing Act, there is no possibility whatsoever that it would pull all the strings, to make much more difficult task of overseeing that systematic failure.

THE PRICE OF FREEDOM

SELLING Socialist Worker recently. I came across two instances of the operation of the Government's housing legislation. One regular reader, who is faced with a rent increase of a little over a pound, lives in a house that was built immediately after the First World War. Largely a pre-fabricated structure, it was supposed to have a life of 10 years. Well, after only six years should have knocked down, she is told she should pay more rent and that the increase of the rent is due to increases in the following two years, even if the law (which I can find no definition of the word 'fair') is fully enforced.

'lawn was growing over the Accounting House, it prevented him from putting the two pounds a week back into his pocket. He did not need much of his house, which was a family home surrounded by part of it, He then paid a little over a pound a week. I worked in the Borough Market, it was doing over a pound a week.

The local government officer, who met me on the way, was able to stop the rent being increased, and I'm fairly sure the house is still being maintained, that part of the wall at the front has fallen down. This gave him the pretext to get a certificate of decrepit.

'How can I afford to put up the wall?' asked our reader, 'I am a boilermaker at Swan Hunters and have been out for seven weeks.'

It would seem obvious that government legislation, primarily designed to create a mass in favour of rent, interest and profit, is designed to help the big man very much more than the small, the boilermaker rationally pointed out.

JUST WHO IS PAYING WHOM?

ONCE UPON a time a young man was being shown round a factory when the following conversation took place.

Young man: 'What did you tell them to do just now?'

Employer: 'I told him to hurry up!'

Young man: 'What right have you to tell him to hurry up?'

Employer: 'I pay him £2.50 a week and expect him to work as fast as I can.'

Young man: 'Where do you get the money from to pay him £2.50 a week?'

Employer: 'I sell products.'

Young man: 'Who makes the products?'

Employer: 'He does.'

Young man: 'How many pounds worth does he make a week?'

Employer: 'About £60 a week, discounting cost.'

Young man: 'Then instead of paying him £2.50 a week, you pay him £35 a week and tell him to hurry up?'

Employer: 'But, I own the enterprise.'

Young man: 'How did you get the money to buy the business?'

Employer: 'I sold products and bought them.'

Young man: 'Who made the products?'

Employer (annoyed): 'Shut up, because he might hear you!'

VICTOR SERGE

Memoirs of a Revolutionary 1901-1941

TRANSLATED BY PETER SEDGWICK

The memoirs of Victor Serge, revolutionary, liberal, anti-Stalinist, and one of the most important figures in the Russian revolutionary generations—the sharpest critics of Stalin, a key figure in the French, the syndicalism of Barcelona 1917, Stalin had taken over. As a result, he was executed in a prison cell, as virtually a lone witness.

Note: This is the end.
OXFORD: behind those

THE International Socialists' Fight the Tories campaign is now going full blast in every major area of the country. With the government attack on workers' living standards reaching a crescendo, IS meetings and demonstrations are emphasizing the urgent need to build a mass socialist workers' party. This week, in our special series of articles, we look at a city that most people think of as just a major seat of learning. But like every town in Britain, it has a working-class population feeling the lash of the Tory-employer offensive... 

OXFORD is clearly divided into two parts. One is a university of 12,000 students with a reputation for being the snobbiest in the country. The other produces millions of pounds worth of cars each year.

Cowley has built up a reputation as one of the most militant areas of the British Leyland combine. The two major plants—Morris Assembly and Pressed Steel Bodies—which between them employ more than 15,000 workers, have the highest number of disputes in the country and also the highest rates of pay. The basic rate at the moment is £4.20.

When Lord Stokes decided he needed measured day work if management was to try to contain production, it was at Cowley that he staged one of his first attacks. Although nearly all sections in the plants are now on MDW it is quite clear that it has not yet solved management's problems.

At the moment there is a battle on to reduce the running levels on the Marina, British Leyland's latest baby, which management has so far lost. But they are not yet threatening to take the new model (the ADO 76), which should begin production at Cowley next year, to Coventry if they get what they want.

Unemployment

But this is not the only fight. There is a growing fear that British Leyland's rationalisation plans will hit Oxford soon. Several plants might be closed, or their work split, which produces car components. There will also probably be layoffs in the Atkins' yard, the Service Division (export packing) and the CKD (cars and packing), drastically reducing the workforce.

If you compare the level of unemployment in Oxford with the national average, then it seems as if Oxford has been quite lucky. Nevertheless the rate is much higher than it has been for several years. If there are massive redundancies in the car factories, there are few alternative sources of jobs.

The university is not the only institution of further education in Oxford. The Polytechnic, which is more of a mile away from the city centre, is growing fast but has nothing like the facilities of the university.

That does not simply mean that the Poly has no boat clubs and fewer rugby pitches but also that the libraries and the teaching facilities are inadequate. The accommodation facilities are abysmal, while Poly students have smaller grants than the university students they are forced to compete with for lodgings. And the rents are high.

Oxford has a chronic housing problem: two families a day approach the city's social services department because they are homeless. It is surprising that with a tradition of working-class militancy there has not been a serious struggle against the 'Fair' Rents scheme. The reason is that although there was a rent increase in April for the next one is not due until April 1973.

Because Oxford city housing department made a profit of £300,000 last year and because the first tenants pay the fourth highest rents in the country, there is a possibility that the rent increases may be postponed even further.

The local Labour Party's role in the rents issue is interesting. Before the local elections they accepted a motion from a local Engineering Union branch committing them to fight the increases. Since the elections, when Labour were control of the council for the first time, they have interpreted 'fighting' as arguing with the housing commissioner not to increase the rents too much.

It is already clear that 'Fair' Rents will begin to affect Oxford soon. Labour will not fight and there is more than ever before an urgent need to build tenants' associations which will fight.

It is not surprising that the local Labour Party is running away from a real fight on the rents, for it is dominated by middle-class university intellectuals and not many of them live in council houses.

Monday Club

It is worth noting that the candidate who won the nomination for the parliamentary constituency is Eren Lauer, who lost the seat in 1970. His renomination was rejected by the 5660 branch of the Transport Union. This branch has over 6000 members— one would have thought that in a town of 100,000 people that its vote would have counted for something. Almost all the left-wing political organisations are active in Oxford. But the right wing is also large and active.

Not only is there a member of Bennison's (the man who prosecuted Peter Hans) organisation spying on left-wing activists but the Monday Club is planning to hold its annual student conference in Oxford. This is scheduled to take place on 17-18 November.

The Left has united to stage a demonstration against the Monday Club and its fascistic supporters on the Sunday. There will be a march from Cowley to the city centre for a rally. Anyone who can get to Oxford on that day should come and march with us.

It is worth remembering that the last time Enoch Powell came to Oxford he was met by such a large, militant demonstration that he had hardly dared to show his face here again.

EMILY WALLACE

The £25 breadline

THIS IS Mr. S. Hopkin of London SW7. He works on the doughnut at Westminster Hospital. He's worked there for 25 years—a significant figure, for that's how much he earns before deductions: £25.

Cameraman Mike Cohen caught Hopkin on the lively 200-strong demonstration outside the hospital workers' union offices at the Elephant and Castle. They were demanding that the union withdraw its £2 a week pay claim and submit one for £7 instead. It's the only way that workers like Mr. Hopkin can see of keeping ahead of inflation in the next year.

Trotsky's

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

The language of the civilized nations has clearly marked off two epochs in the development of Russia. Where the aristocratic culture introduced into world parlance such barbarisms as czar, pogrom, knout, October has internationalised such words as Bolshevik, soviet... This alone justifies the proletarian revolution. If you imagine it needs justification—Trotsky.

Three volumes, 50p each, post and packing 75p, three...9 BOOKS, 6 Cottons Gardens, London E2 8DN

Behind the facade of the university, the picturesque Oxford that draws the American tourists, there is another City—that of the workers. Not just the transport workers, now facing big cut-backs, but the whole army of college servants—all massively under-paid.
by James Fenton

IN 1970 Harold Wilson went to the country with the notion that his personality, and that alone, would pull in the votes. Not only was there no radical programme put before the voters; the ministers of the old government were actually discouraged from making ‘important’ speeches.

One did, and that was a disaster. Anthony Wedgewood Benn took on Enoch Powell, and came out rather worse.

Several ministers were rather annoyed at being left out of things and complained—but only after the event. One of them, Richard Crossman, would have been delighted to talk to the voters about his new pension scheme, which was supposed to earn him his place in the history books.

As it was, Wilson concentrated on ‘meeting the people’. He met them, and not surprisingly they were not very taken with what they saw. Crossman and his colleagues found themselves kicked off the stage of history, and went back to managing their large farms, and other profitable pastimes. They are still there now, wondering what hit them.

When Labour went out of office, it had various great schemes to put across—technological revolution (meaning rationalisation), a planned economy (incomes policy), and a new emphasis on welfare and social services.

PUNDITS

When Labour went out of office, incomes policy was in ruins, welfare and social services had in many respects deterorated, in other respects they had barely kept up with the rising cost of living.

Only one element of Labour’s programme remained shining bright: productivity deals and rationalisation were the order of the day. Yet Wilson said to the tele-pundits, wages are rising fast—but in those cases this is linked with productivity.

In other words, the workforce was being reduced, and more work was being done at lower rates.

If the incomes policy of 1965 had one selling point for the trade unions, it was that the lower-paid were supposed to benefit—inflation was to be reduced. So increases should be confined to the following conditions: that there is general recognition that existing wage and salary levels are too low, and a reasonable standard of living.

If that ‘all’ work out? Well, when a pay claim involving higher and lower-paid wages was increased, the Prices and Incomes Board, the lower-paid would be allowed a higher percentage increase only if they arrived at the expense of the higher-paid workers in their factory.

This sort of horse-trading, which divided the working class, was not bound to come in. The trouble is that for many low-paid workers there was not even any chance of such a bargain, since they have no chance of being more productive. So even in the later stages of the Wilson government the number of low-paid workers remained fixed, and in the following table shown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF 500 IN MANUAL WORKERS EARNING UNDER £15 A WEEK GROSSED IN SEPTEMBER 1965</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National agreements</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages boards</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is worse, unemployment was very high. In the reasons where there was a large proportion of low-paid workers, there was one solution to the problem of the low-paid, and that was the solution that the trade unions themselves adopted after the collapse of incomes policy: they simply campaigned for better wages for them. And in this they eventually had some success.

It seemed a long time since, in 1964, Wilson had promised a guaranteed income below which nobody would be allowed. The Labour Party had grown to believe that increased wages for the general workers and the national interest. But there was one thing they could do. They could increase social security, to keep it in pace with the rising cost of living.

They did increase it from a total of £25 million in 1964 to £367 million in 1969—although that represented a proportion of 0.3 per cent of the Gross National Product, as opposed to a previous 0.7 per cent. But these figures concord various changes in the country at the time—unemployment rising, and an inrcease in the number of old people. In real terms, social security grew very little during this period.

SALARIES

If there was more demand for social security during the period of Labour government, the same was true of every other social service provided. Yet between 1964 and 1968 expenditure on housing rose by only 0.2 per cent of the Gross National Product. More money was spent, but that money was wasted in much less.

The spending on the health service rose a little, but of which was taken up by increased salaries for doctors and dentists whose wages rose 10.4 per cent in 1967-8 while surgery increased 11.2 per cent.

Meanwhile the wealthy continued to grumble at the high tax rates. In fact they were doing it all badly. In 1965 a man earning £100 a week would have pay about 20 per cent in taxes, all told—which is one per cent less than someone earning £20,000.

The subsidies to the rich, tax concessions on capital gains, and so on, continued as ever, Death duties had a decreasing effectiveness, capital gains tax produced only a minute proportion of total revenue.

Not only were the wealthy left unimpressed by the Wilson government’s record on welfare, the social services, the redistribution of wealth, the incomes policy. Labour economists themselves are hard put to find a good word to say for it. Peter Townsend and Nicholas Bosanquet wrote recently: ‘Departmental decrees did not fail in the 1960s: it was not tried.’

In the economy climate, and the means of achieving a greater equality of wealth, were continuously losing ground. There should be no need to say the present prospectus for changes any better.

As many Labour politicians—such as Richard Crossman—are perfectly prepared to admit, their interests lie in a ‘better’, rather than an abolition, of capitalism, not its abolition. For such people the abolition of poverty was a low priority.

Rip Van Winkle union at Little Snaresing

THE total workforce of 13 men has been made redundant at Norvic Engineering, at Little Snaresing, Fakenham, Norfolk. Their work—making milling machine driver heads—is to be transferred to a parent company, Baldings, in Norwich.

Baldings have decided they can make themselves more competitive in the larger Norwich and Yarmouth area, by exploiting the cheap labour in a small factory in the country.

The workers were advised to get the men in Norwich to accept a change to two eight-hour days. They are promising a higher basic rate (£4.35, but with no chance of overtime bonus, the basic wage would be less than at present.

The men have refused so far, but have not organised opposition. A few are in the GMB and Musicians Workers Union, but the management refuses to recognise the union or to give guarantees that victimisation of men joining the union would not be tolerated.

So a factory which once employed 30 men in the depressed area of Fakenham has been deliberately closed down and is now being closed without a fight.

The men have always been isolated and vulnerable. They are trapped by the lack of public transport. To go to market, Baldings did offer jobs in Norwich to six men—but this would have meant 50 miles travel to and from work daily—3½ hours per week in good weather, more in winter fog and snow. The offer was turned down.

The men have accepted the closure passively, and it is too late to do anything for Little Snaresing now.

The GMB should get to work, negotiate with it. The Little Snaresing factory had only three union members until recently. The other 10 workers joined a month ago, so they could force the management to talk to the union official.

The men at the Little Snaresing factory had not received a penny of the pay rise they were due to receive 11 weeks ago. The regional official, H B Williams, was partially successful in getting the back pay due.

It is worth noting that he came only after being called by the shop steward. Williams had made no attempt to check all members were getting the pay rise. He had never tried to tie the three factories in Little Snaresing, Norwich and Great Yarmouth together. He had not attempted to increase membership within the factories, or to give assurances that victimisation of men joining the union would not be tolerated.

So a factory which once employed 30 men in the depressed area of Fakenham has been deliberately closed down and is now being closed without a fight.

The men have always been isolated and vulnerable. They are trapped by the lack of public transport. To go to market, Baldings did offer jobs in Norwich to six men—but this would have meant 50 miles travel to and from work daily—3½ hours per week in good weather, more in winter fog and snow. The offer was turned down.

The men have accepted the closure passively, and it is too late to do anything for Little Snaresing now.

The GMB should get to work.
Justice wilts in the Garden

1: A VERY GRAVE OFFENCE

ON 13 FEBRUARY 1970, the Garden House Hotel in Cambridge was hit by a mob of demonstrators. Two windows, valued at eight guineas, were broken, and two tables bearing plates of delicious Greek food were overturned.

The trouble was caused by what all the newspapers described as a 'mob' of demonstrators protesting against a £3-a-night 'Greek week' dinner, whose main purpose was to promote tourism and foreign currency for the colonels' junta in Greece.

The Cambridge Evening News, whose advertising manager had been instrumental in arranging the banquet in the first place, labeled the demonstration 'a riot'.

Six people were arrested at the demonstration, and charged with an assortment of minor offences. But Mr. Frederick Porter, the chief constable of Mid-Anglia, was determined that left-wing Cambridge students must be taught a lesson once and for all.

On 14 April, the six were indicted with a further set of more serious charges, and another 14 people were charged with offences arising from the demonstration.

Horror

One was chairman of Cambridge University Socialist Society, two were ex-chairmen and another chairman-elect. All others except one (who was eventually released for lack of evidence) were known in Cambridge for their political views.

Explaining his decision to charge only left-wing demonstrators, Mr. Porter said: 'The evidence was so clear that there could be no other explanation.'

On 15 June nine days before the trial, all the defendants were charged with the additional, more serious offence of riotous assembly.

The trial was presided over by Mr. Justice Melford Stevenson, who found it difficult at any stage to escape his horror of the affair, and said he had asked for the written confession of one policeman of a silence that had attended an identification parade, and said it had caused him deep concern.

The judgment was delivered on 27 August 1970.

2: NO ONE TO BLAME

ON 24 APRIL this year, the Garden House Hotel, Cambridge was hit by a mob of demonstrators. Mrs. Caroline Billington, of Howhill, Cheshire, was burned to the ground.

Mrs. Billington, a popular cottage-garden enthusiast, was killed by the fire at her hotel. She had been staying there with her husband and two young children.

The hotel had been closed for several weeks due to a dispute between the landlord and the management.

The fire started in the hotel's kitchen and spread rapidly, destroying most of the property.

Several people were trapped on the upper floors, but all were rescued safely.

The fire service was called and they were able to control the situation quickly.

There were no reports of any injuries to the occupants or staff.

The cause of the fire is still under investigation, but initial reports suggest that it may have been caused by a short circuit in the kitchen.

The hotel is expected to re-open within a few weeks.
Eamon McCarron on Whitelaw's Six Counties plan

'THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT have a clear objective in Northern Ireland. It is to deliver its people from the violence and fear in which they live today and to set them free to realise their great potential to the full.'

So says Whitelaw in the foreword to the Green Paper on The Future of Northern Ireland published last week. This is nonsense, of course.

The clear objective of the Tory government is to find a solution to the Irish problem which leaves the British big business free to continue the exploitation of the whole island as peacefully as possible. An examination of the Green Paper demonstrates this.

The longest section of the paper is Part Two, entitled 'Proposals and Possibilities'. In it Whitelaw sets out the plans put forward by the various Northern Ireland parliamentary parties and the ideas of certain commentators and private individuals who, he claims, have written to him.

THREE-WAY

Part Three, 'Towards a Settlement', and Part Four, 'The Way Forward', examine combinations and permutations of these plans.

All the plans considered involve some sort of rearrangement of the three-way relationship between the London, Belfast and Dublin governments.

The Unionist Party, for example, proposes that Northern Ireland should remain within the United Kingdom but retain control of security and that there should eventually be a 'reformed Stormont' based on the principle of a House of Commons.

The Social Democratic and Labour Party suggests that Northern Ireland should be run jointly by the Dublin and London governments but, strangely enough, that it should not be represented in the Dublin or London parliaments.

GUARANTEED

Ian Paisley's Democratic Unionist Party argues for the 'complete integration' of Northern Ireland into the United Kingdom after the departure of Scotland and Wales. The Alliance Party and the Northern Ireland Labour Party want a 'reformed Stormont' elected by proportional representation in which security and other matters are guaranteed a place in the government.

Alliance wants an Anglo-Irish Council, including members of all three parliaments. Labour wants a Council of Ireland of the Unionist model.

What all these plans seem to do is to discover a method whereby Orange and Green Toryism can co-exist in Ireland. The Way Forward indicates which aspects of the suggestions the British Tory government considers most likely to achieve this.

Whitelaw rejects Paisley's plea for complete integration and the SDLP's 'conundrum'. He says specifically that control of security will remain with Westminster in the foreseeable future. Thus we can see emerging more clearly the final Tory plan which is scheduled for unveiling early in the new year.

There will be a regional assembly in Belfast with limited power. Almost certainly it will be elected by proportional representation.

The government, or regional executive, or whatever it is called, will be formed from both majority and minority parties in the assembly. Giving minority interests a share in the exercise of executive power would be some all-Ireland body consisting of members of both the Northern Assembly and the Dublin government.

It would be seriously wrong to dismiss this plan as an irrelevance, at some have done. It is the most determined and intelligent plan yet put forward by British big business to guarantee the security of its investments in Ireland, North and South, to stabilise the rule of the Orange and Green Tory parties and to undermine the potentially revolutionary forces.

All three parliamentary parties in the South of Ireland have indicated general acceptance of the outline scheme. 'Moderate' leaders on both sides of the religious fence in the North have given it a guarded welcome. Both front benches at Westminster are in favour.

We are witnessing the beginning of a massive propaganda campaign to convince us that only laminated extremists oppose the Whitelaw plan.

When Whitelaw talks of giving Catholics a 'share in power' what he means is giving the Catholic middle class a share of office—handful of regional ministries. (There is obviously no intention to give Catholic workers or Protestant workers for that matter—any power.)

The hope is that this will satisfy most of the Catholics, thus isolating the IRA, enabling the army to smash it. The commitment to the retention of the border, it is hoped, will satisfy the Protestant masses so that they will not object too strenuously to the removal of security powers to Westminster.

This could happen and the reason why it could happen is the bankruptcy of the political leadership in Ireland. The reformist SDLP, for example, cannot count the Whitelaw—''even if it wanted to—having steadily lowered its sights month by month since the introduction of internment.'

BALANCED

The leadership of the Official Republicans has had the ground cut from under its feet. Having insisted that 'full democracy' guaranteed by a Bill of Rights is the next stage in the Irish struggle, it finds now that the Tories are enacting something remarkably akin to this demand.

The Provisional leadership, with its latest mass political break-out of the Catholic ghettos and mortar and pestle across the border, face a challenge.

What the Green Paper portends is that the Tories have struck the balance they want between their Orange and Green counterparts in Ireland. They are evolving a single strategy towards Ireland, not resting on any one section of Irish capitalism but on both.

Only the tiny revolutionary socialist forces, attempting through the trade union movement to build a revolutionary socialist party in Ireland and South, have the potential to take on and defeat the emerging imperialist cronies. It has never been more necessary that they receive the active support of British socialists.

Men the Tories consulted...

Whitelaw consulted the parliamentary parties in Northern Ireland before publishing his Green Paper. Their views differed in detail but not in principle: that British domination of the whole of Ireland must continue with a few tops to the Catholic community.
Parliament is largely a show, to deceive the public into believing its elected representatives govern the country, or at least decide on policy.

Duncan Hallas on socialist ideas and capitalist myths

IN OCTOBER the Heath government completely reversed its strategy on the wages front. After two and a half years of trying to bash the union leadership into acting as its agents by the Industrial Relations law and by pitched battles with selected unions to 'prove' that the system will always win, Heath and co were forced to backtrack.

Coproduction 'partnership' became the order of the day. As one Conservative commentator put it, Heath's problem became to 'aid responsible union leaders to come into partnership with him and to take a genuine share in the management of the British economy.' And to this end, all sorts of concessions, previously 'out of the question', were offered.

Leave aside the immediate outcome. What concerns us here is the role that parliament played—or rather didn't play—in the operation. Here we have a fundamental change in government policy on what is, by common consent, the key political questions of the day: inflation, prices, wages and wage negotiations.

How does the government attempt to trap the organized working-class movement into supporting its line? By direct negotiations with the representatives of the TUC and the representatives of business. Not by parliamentary debates and resolutions but by private talks in union offices to 'prove' that the wages even backbench MPs.

This single fact tells us more about the real power relationships in Britain today than any number of textbooks on 'The Constitution'.

Package

The parliamentary Labour Party was invited by the government to be 'observers to the tripartite talks', let alone to participate. Mr Wilson was invited to be, at best, the touchline.

Not that he has any grounds for complaint. The Heath government produced its famous National Plan 1965-70, the intention was to lay the foundations of the 'New Britain', not a single MP outside the cabinet was consulted in advance. Big business was consulted. The civil service chiefs were consulted. The,Integer Group was consulted. 

Parliament was not consulted. It was presented with a package, negotiated in advance, in private, and allowed to go through the motions of debating it.

In short, parliament, in spite of its legal sovereignty, is not the place where the real decisions on matters of moment are taken. Parliament is largely a show, the aim of which is to deceive the public into believing that elected representatives actually govern the country or at least decide on policy. They do neither.

Let us consider the testimony of Professor John P Mackintosh, MP, constitutional expert, Labour right-winger, supporter of Hugh Gaitskell in the past and of Roy Jenkins today and an ardent upholder of the British way of life.

In a book entitled The Government and Politics of Britain, he admits, 'The old nineteenth- century role of parliament as a body which chose the government, maintained it and could reject it, which operated as an intermediary between the electorate and the executive, has gone.' Professor Mackintosh goes on to tell us, on the basis no doubt of personal experience, that 'the life of a backbencher MP soon becomes unsatisfactory and offers so little scope for achievement, for registering even the smallest impact on a restricted area of public life...' the state of affairs has come about as the inevitable result of the growth of the labour movement and the extension of the right to vote to working people. There was a time, roughly from the end of the revolutions of the seventeenth century until the beginning of this century, when parliament was in fact as well as in law the supreme policy-making body.

Those were the days when the House of Commons was described as 'the best club in Europe', Lords and Commons together actually contained virtually everyone with real power.

'It is doubtful, writes the historian of the eighteenth century, Professor Fletcher, if any member of the ruling class, no matter how odd or eccentric his political views, was ever kept out of parliament if he really wanted to get in.' In these circumstances parliament could and did function as the natural forum in which the ruling class debated and decided its policies.

Bosses

The extension of the vote, under threat of revolution, to the middle classes after 1832 and even its extension to the working class in 1867 and 1884 did not immediately change the role of parliament. The class composition of parliament changed very little for a long time.

But because of this could not last indefinitely. Today parliament does not contain most of the big business houses, banks and financiers. Nor for that matter does it contain any of the large trade union leaders.

And therefore all important decisions are taken outside parliament. The legal forum remains, the reality has changed completely out of all proportion. Parliament still matters but its importance is largely ideological, it serves as a front behind which the ruling class and its state machine can project themselves as the protectors of their wealth and privilege against working-class encroachment.

And the role of the parliamentary Labour Party is to ensure this mass of people have some credibility in the eyes of working people.

That sound like snapping concrete, but it is a fact. We are talking, not about a party which can win the general election, but about one which can win the next election, if it knows how.

Then they mate

Then they BOTH reproduce

To some extent, women's participation in the labor force has increased over the years, but we can't really be described as 'fully employed'. Can we, when so many of our women are married to men who would rather be doing anything else?

It sounds more like this;

They just dig up another one.

They make them all have children.

Then they are free to work.

We get on with our work.

Women: why do we work for him?

Men: why can't we play around like that?

Women: he play like a little baby

Men: can't we play like a baby like he do?

He makes aeroplanes and they burn them.

Men can't we play around like he do?

Women: I can't we play around like he do?

While he plays with aeroplanes

GLENN NOLLOTI, 14

For a shorter working week

THE NORTH- EAST ENGINEERS' 'shorter working week' campaign of 1962, led by Clarke, N McCord and D J Row.

Frank Graham.

This was the first and perhaps the most important struggle by skilled engineering workers to get a reduction in the length of the normal working day post the formation of the amalgamated local unions of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in 1945. It was the first serious attempt to describe a 'shorter working week' strike on a regional level.

Graham led the battle which united the local problems and dealt with a whole series of factory problems in a rather naive and quizzical way.

The battle was won.

They are able to demand changes in the local plant, and the fight went on in the engineering industry, culminating in the 1961-62 campaign.

The battle was fought with the help of the Amalgamated Local Engineers' Society, which remained aloof from the strike, but was on the lookout for a way in which the local newspaper's residual paternalism is the result of the 'trade-off' negotiations, of the weary old trade-off between 'comfort' and 'danger', 'richness' and 'security', 'the.AMMIRAL, 14

London

I think I'll be an executive, That way I can make him say what he says. My dad says I'll be on the bus, and I'll be over the lot of it.

ALAN TWINING, 13

William

THE British radical publishers Falling Wall Press have just published two beautifully produced pamphlets on which they are considered as one of the liveliest of the small political presses. This paper reviews the two pamphlets written by ALEXANDRA ROLLIN, who has produced a series of pamphlets on the Class Struggle and Socialism and the New Modern Socialism.

Two pamphlets deal with the changes in the structure of the working class, the 'micro' in the micro-social relations, and the 'macro' in the micro-economic relations.

The two pamphlets deal with two essays on the modern WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT and the Women and the Subversion of the State pamphlets, both of which are on the subjects of feminism and racial identity.

An essay in the Italian flag Lotta per il comunismo, written by one of the leading figures in the movement, is also included in the book.

All these books can be obtained direct from the publishers, Falling Wall Press, 26 Richmond Road, Montpellier, Bristol BS5 6RJ.
THE BULLDOZERS
RIGHT: a cartoon by Frank McDiarmid illustrating UCSF's demands and first printed in the Manchester community paper Mole Express

POW! CARTOONS AGAINST TORIES

The trouble is people believe them. More than 500 American high schools celebrated an annual Sadie Hawkins Day based on Lil Abner. American servicemen were consciously encouraged to think of themselves as Superman.

For in the strip cartoon world violence is an unrealistic ZONK to the jaw and sexless curves and cleavages—and politics it always somebody else.

British strip cartoons for kids were profitably pioneered by a drunken Australian called Baxter who drew 'Ally Sloper's Half Holiday' in 1870. Cecil Harmsworth then launched Comic Cuts and Chips and was said to 'kill the penny dreadful with his h'peny dreadful'!

Despite the complete ban on girls in the boy's mags and vice versa, comics were a working-class kid's source of amusement. Stuffed shirts were made fun of and teachers, policemen and parents were under continual siege from Dennis the Menace and the Bash Street Kids.

It was all just to let off steam. When the tables were turned in the comics the authorities replaced the terrible vengeance and horrible punishments.

John Leat's Varmoshka cartoon (now issued as an annual by Eryn Meehan at £1.25) is part of the modern political comic revival. It's a mixture of Jane of the Daily Mirror, and Vicky, the political cartoonist, an amalgam of idealised and innocent super-female and the vile and vicious Tories.

Kent draws Heath's glanded jews and whiskey sideboards with every bead of sweaty inanency showing. And Varmoshka's box of form is closely drawn too (a nice liberal paper like The Guardian has to have an excuse for its pants-up).

Hopefully one day Varmoshka will, as The Woman's Newspaper once drew her, join Beryl the Peril and Mrs Andy Capp to start their own cartoon while Steve Clayton and Desperate Dan do the washing up.

We have other favourites. Frank Dickson's Bratow is real and enjoyed by thousands of London office workers. His struggle against the Chester-Perry Empire is a continual triumph of bloody-mindedness and skilled skiving.

And for our money. Our Norman is a weekly triumph of marxist draughtsmanship, whatever Yours Disgusted says in The Letters. One day Norman, Brenda and Brutow and tens of thousands ill-used workers will inherit the earth.

Until then follow this strip...

Dave Widgery

END PIECE

THE UNKNOWN ORWELL, by Peter Stanley and William Abrahams. (Cont'd) - three questions is a disappointment. Orwell's widow has made (and is work impossible to deny them the right to quote from his unpublished works for the Orwell Archives.

We get a lot of paraphrasing of Orwell's autobiographical bits, and some extra interviews with people who worked in the office in different phases up to 1933. Some of the new witnesses of Eric Blair (Orwell's real name, dropped for reasons of book-writers) are good: Note especially that Orwell's fine essay, A Hanging, is written as though it were a personal report, is actually fiction, since Orwell confided in a friend that he had not written an execution.

The authors tend to make over-sweeping judgments which are then partly withdrawn: for example, that Blair's prime intention in becoming a down-and-out in London and Paris was literary (to gather writing material) rather than political (to purge his guilt after serving imperialism in Burma; or that his marriage in 1936 was 'the first time in his life he entered a deep and passionate bond'—when for a start there are two meaningful emotional involvements with prostitutes on record. Some of the information about the trappings of Eton and the parish register makes it work impossible to write of young-footed tourists in Old England. Orwell's London remains more unknown than before in these lifeless pages.

ON TO Imperial College Department of Mechanical Engineering, where a Conference of Radical Scholars of Science and East Europe fills a big rig lecture-theatre. The students signs of beards in mortarboards and academic robes rather than the New Statesman as they discuss who's 'in' this year at the Kremlin. But it is a very established audience: to judge from the attendance, the speakers' position is generally head up, as another politician has heard the story to get under its belt after a diet of demonstrations.

The conference that the Russian Question mark is at once more; the money-mad 'sceptical' movie about Trotsky's murder; the new-found interest in oppositional events surfacing in Russia; and somebody in the interval tells me that a sly light drama all about the Kronstadt rising of 1921: I can only add my hopes that it will be written for performance on ice.

Peter Sedgwick

The Industrial Relations Act from the Liverpool Big Flame broadsheet

The original, from The Guardian

Varmoshka, the original, from The Guardian

Varmoshka, Beryl and Florrie off to the Women's Liberation Rally, from The Women's Newspaper.
WHAT WE STAND FOR

The International Socialist is a democratic organisation whose membership is open to all who accept its principles and who are willing to pay contributions and to work in the interests of its organisation.

We believe in independent working-class action for the establishment of capitalism and its replacement by a classless society with production for use and not for profit.

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

Capitalism is international. The giant firms have investments throughout the world and engage in price wars and monopolistic practices.

The international power of capitalism can only be overcome by international action by the working class.

A single socialist state cannot independently survive unless workers of other countries actively commit to it by extending the socialist revolution.

In addition to building a revolutionary socialist political organisation in this country, we also believe in the necessity of forming a world revolutionary socialist international independent of any one country or continent. Such an international organisation will have close relationships with a number of other socialist organisations throughout the world.

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

We fight:

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

Against secret organisations. We believe that all secret meetings should be agreed or rejected by mass meetings.

For the complete disbandment of the defence of shop stewards.

For anti-trade union laws and any attempt on the part of strike, whether the strikes are of 'officials' or 'unofficial'.

For the occupation by a better paid for a longer term of all workers who strike.

For productivity deals and job evaluation and for militant trade union unity and joint shop stewards committees both in the plant and on a combined area level.

For a minimum wage of at least £2 a week.

For an end to the present struggle over time and pay. 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 the efforts of the bosses and police to blacken their workers.

Against immigration restriction.

For an end to the exploitation of coloured people and to organised groups of people in their own defence.

For real social, economic and political equality for women.

Against all forms of imperialism. We unconditionally give support to and solidarity with all genuine national liberation movements.

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

We are opposed to all ruling class policies and organisations. We work to build a revolutionary workers' movement in Britain and to end the present struggle for the unity of all revolutionary groups.

The struggle for socialism is the central struggle of our time. Workers' power and a world based on human solidarity, the increasing of men's power over men, the abolition of the power of woman over men, it certainly worth fighting for.

It is not a joke talking about it. More than a century ago Karl Marx wrote: "The emancipating movement of the proletariat against capitalism is the only way to bring about a new society."

If you want to help us change the world and build socialism, join us.

THERE ARE 13 BRANDS IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS

BLACKSHIRT SMEAR ON PRINT UNION MILITANTS

JOHN LAWRENCE, Father of the Chapel (shop steward) of the NAPSOTA clerical workers at the giant Press Association news agency in London, has been suspended on full pay after his union had urged strikers to return to work without giving up their re-instatement.

Lawrence was sacked in the course of an industrial dispute by Press Association members to gain the same wage increases that had been granted to the firm's jornalists. Management's offer to NAPSOTA members was £1.50-
£2.50 a week. London Branch NAPSOTA and John Lawrence had agreed with the journalists.

DISTURBING

NAPSOTA contended that John Lawrence and other members had put a number of contracts of employment in withdraving their labour, and also in breach of union rules. The union also stated that Lawrence was not being victimised and instructed its members to return to work, leaving John Lawrence outside the gate.

The most disturbing aspect of the union officials' behaviour is the kind of tactics they adopted to isolate its PA members and John Lawrence.

London Branch NAPSOTA, lastly, has accused of 'blackshirt [sic] fascist' tactics to ensure that union officials 'were not able to adequately respond to the members . . . at chapel meetings.'

The circular argued that the union's tactics were unfair and asked all members for their loyal support in 'trying to control this anarchist and anarchical situation.'

"No support, moral or financial, should be given to these people other than the union or individuals, it concluded.

OPPOSITION

The NAPSOTA leadership is making an increased number of such statements as which demonstrate the activities of the union. The organisation with differences of opinion and principle as the agents of right-wing, anti-trade union elements.

John Lawrence is well known for his opposition to the NAPSOTA leadership, in particular for his stance on such questions as internal union democracy and the way the NAPSOTA and NACP amalgamation has broken off.

Power-man Chapple in the key pillar of the right

by an electrician

WITH the collapse of the power talks last week, we have to take a look at one of the leading power workers' negotiations and his union.

Frank Chaple of the Electricians and Plumbers came to prominence in 1916 when, after a long and successful contract negotiation, the High Court ruled that John Byrne, a violently anti-communist full-time union official from Scotland, should be refused general secretary of the union.

Chapple, an ex-Communist Party member, was joined to the 'official group' that helped Byrne to victory, quickly concocted control, and then was Les Cannon.

But this time, it was to be short; he was elected General President before he could gain a real power base he died in 1970.

Wrangling

Many thought his departure would see a softer form of union policy but that they were quickly proved wrong. Chapple assumed the role but not the title of General President, allowing him to lead negotiations on behalf of the union.

His formal position of General Secretary was only an administrative one, but this situation was cleared up this year when, after months of wrangling on the union executive and a cost-cut in breach of their former reform group member and full-time who had fallen out with Chapple in the last election. Chapple was the candidate for the vacant post. This means that Chapple is now not only General Secretary and General President, but also the elected member of the executive at the role of the General Secretary closely and may even decide to ask the Secretary to appoint an official from the union to the membership whether the post should be abolished.

Since the ballot rigging case and the takeover by the reform group, Chapple knew that the union's democratic union of the left to be a pillar of the right wing, with appointed officials and the removal of important rank and file bodies such as the shop stewards committee.

Chapple has played his part in creating the image of a respectable union. On many occasions he has installed a computer at head office and, in the present climate of reorganisation, branches up and down the country to the very top of the organisation's efficiency and cost effectiveness. Some think that everything that is written about the 'moderated' branches are in the large towns and have a left-wing viewpoint.

Rank and file opposition in local is often centred around the paper Flashlight. It has had fewer successes so far, but there are signs that signs and that there are beginning to realise the real nature of their leader.

They see miners, building workers, car workers and others fighting and winning big gains, and compare them to Chapple, nipping up to the bosses and grabbing little publicity for himself.

Changing the union will take a lot of hard work and rank and file, but EEFUU members must ensure that the union is theirs, not Frank Chapple's.

Power-man Chapple in the key pillar of the right
Don't blame union chiefs

SOCIALLY WORKER 29 October, published by the Socialists to Workers at Hawker Siddley Aviation, Chadderton, blackburn, working for their all-party and wholeheartedly with the wholly dissatisfactory attitude of the AUEW executive council.

As the district secretary representing workers at Hawker Siddley Aviation, as a member of this factory, I would like to add an experience which happens all too frequently in the course of my duties, often for a newspaper which was sent free to general practitioners, 'Pulse', published by Morgan Grampian.

I have found the attitude of our union's representatives towards the patients whom we represent is sometimes more or less a very brief allusion to Thalidomide children, and I want us to go on the record and express our indignation at the way in which our union's representatives have behaved to these unfortunate victims. — PHILIP JACOBS, London N17.

Don't ignore Irish reality

TWO NATIONS' THEORY IGNORES IRISH REALITY

THERE SEEMS TO BE a regular campaign in the British press to make Ireland into a sort of Sick society

If only Mary Whitehouse and Lord Scarman could see the extent of economic and social inequality that is basic. Sir James's letters in the Sunday Times are no basis for assessing the extent of the difficulties of life and the situation of the people. Sir James, however, should have had more knowledge of the activities of unemployment, which are based on the principle of the two-nations theory of many of the government's economic policies. Sir James' letter is another attempt at a class analysis of Ireland and a worsening of the situation.

The two-nations theory is the policy of the Irish people on the British Army? Do they call for it in the years between the Irish and the Army? If you write to the Irish Daily Mail, or the New York Times, or the USA? Critical support perhaps? Or do they stand up for the two-nations theory? Is the planned decolonization of the British, the Irish and the Jews, or the left-wing of the Irish Socialists—John MOLYNEUX, Southern, Hunts.

WILLIAMS, AUEW, District Secretary, Oldham, Lancs.

East's best

THE NOTION that 'for all its failures, Russian style socialism is better than the West' is seriously challenged by a recent report (November, by Maryn Matthews' Class and reform, Oxford University Press, which Harman quotes demonstrates anything of the kind and indeed Matthew does not appear to have dealt directly with this question.

There seems to be a need to discuss that which are the various issues and the USSR are low in comparison with western levels. This is why, in the British press, whether relative inequality is greater in Russia. Harman offers no evidence at all in support of this assertion, which is, of course, the crucial question for the Soviet Union.

It has, however, been dealt with elsewhere. James's letter on the wages question (Pendle 1971) suggests that top incomes are earned in the USSR by the top 200,000 people, while the top 1% of the population earn 300 times the minimum and 100 times the maximum. However, even if one is able to accept the comparison, not only those 1%, however, were only 11,000 and 7000 times as much as the minimum. For instance, the top 1% of the population lived in the USSR, 1971, compared with the USA, 1971, at a level of inequality which had been 'amazingly striking' for the last thirty years, they were producing 'extremely rich people with a very poor standard of living'.

The podcast is written in Socialist Worker's style and the workers' unions, showing them up for what they are. This is not the place to discuss the issues and their work, but the Socialist Workers' Party leaders are confronting each other, not with the same kind of arguments, the work of the dockers and bus drivers, where workers are able to define the issues for themselves.

The lack of independent thought and political leadership in the trade unions (eg, the British TUC) peaceful, and has a long history of socialists making stand on the road to socialism is in a banner—"LITWIG, London NW3.
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Bosse uses strike to get more cash

LONDON—Shop stewards on the World’s End strike committee this week got definitive confirmation that their employers, Cobh’s, have deliberately prolonged the three-month-old strike in order to get still bigger contract payments from the client, Kensington and Chelsea Council.

At a meeting with council representatives last week, Cobh directors demanded a substantial increase on the negotiated tender price. If this was not granted, they said, they would withdraw from the contract.

Cobh’s would refuse one of the industrial relations at its issue.

The World’s End site committee, faced with this situation, has now merged its organisation with the strikers on the Lovell’s Guildford Street job.

The Lovell’s strike began seven months ago when two steel floor Bearan were sinking for providing their insurance costs and P&I to their employers, a subcontractor.

It is the second time Cobh have been working on ‘loopy’ labour—i.e., by men not paying insurance, and tax contributions. The system is organised by the National Joint Council for the Building Industry in the

Starts here: three pages of news and

POWER SELL-OUTS IN BIG SETBACK

The word ‘sell-out’ is often loosely used, but it springs readily to mind connected with the new power workers’ deal.

The power workers have lost a third of their jobs over the past five years. Thanks to their four unions, the engineering, transport, general, and municipal, and electricians’ they have been working under ‘productivity deals’.

It is doubtful whether they have made any monetary gains at all, in return for seeing their jobs and working conditions eroded, once allowance is made for taxation and inflation.

The spring miners showed the impact of electricity cuts on Britain’s businesses. The power beak was giving its official backing to the miners striking off, as if in order to persuade the men to end their strike.

The regional secretary, Bob Johnson, is arguing that in such cases the unions have no duty to re-employ the two men as a blatant case of the Mackay lecturers being ‘relocated’. And far from the strike being ineffective in fact the only strike that matters.

The strike committee had given the strikers over the issue of the World’s End men urgently need financial support to keep them going. Donations to J. Fontaine, Joint Stire Committee, 22 Northam, London N16.

DEAL

But they don’t and they aren’t.

The latest deal gives them £26.65 per week, plus another 40p in March, extra days off and three days extra holiday. Compare this with their claim for £5, 35, 35-hour week, and an extra week’s holiday.

Power workers’ union leaders who will point to the fact that they got

by Colin Barker

their pay rise through before the freeze. Some advantage! The deal calls for them to receive 3.5 per cent in 1973 plus rent and mortgage rates, and higher pension contributions. It is as good as guaranteed that in go to the print workers will be worse off in real terms than they are now.

And when they come to negotiate their next deal, they have lost a further advantage. The next negotiations will be in the spring. If they take action and it’s a big ‘if’ with militants like Frank Chapple and Bob Wright at the helm, they’ll be causing power cuts... in June.

All unions in existence have got the money today the best gift they could have. So let’s get their freeze-off to a flying start.

Every employer now facing a pay claim and more and more companies offering to resign their leaders of the power workers and not being hit by the power workers and not being hit by the Electricity Board.

With such clarity about the Industrial Relations Act, which is being used to stop the working man, the ESI is hardly likely to exert a significant challenge to the Electricity Board.

Uprising and rising blind a vegetation. But militants who want to save their own plant out to show that this organisation offers no way forward for the power workers.

Its appeal is obvious. But a few years need stressing. The ESI has issued a leaflet on the Industrial Relations Act (under which it is registered) which begins: ‘DO YOU KNOW what you are? FREE? It argues that the Act has opened the way to a union for supply workers alone, and refers to the membership of the four unions, in other industries, as ‘UNCLE COLE’.

With such clarity about the Industrial Relations Act, which is being used to stop the working man, the ESI is hardly likely to exert a significant challenge to the Electricity Board.

LEAFLET
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THE RENTS BATTLE
Tenants strike in more than 80 towns

Tenants are on rent strike in more than 80 towns. They have spent weeks and months of their lives trying to win concessions from landlords to overcome the rising cost of living. But landlords have proved to be almost as tight-fisted as the government, which reduced housing subsidies at the same time.

To understand the number of tenants involved, one needs only to look at the statistics. In 1972, the government reduced housing subsidies by the same amount as the increase in rents. This has led to a situation where tenants are forced to pay more for less housing. The government's policy has been to reduce housing subsidies as a way of controlling the cost of living, but this has only led to an increase in the cost of living for tenants.

The government's policy has been to reduce housing subsidies as a way of controlling the cost of living, but this has only led to an increase in the cost of living for tenants. The government's policy has been to reduce housing subsidies as a way of controlling the cost of living, but this has only led to an increase in the cost of living for tenants. The government's policy has been to reduce housing subsidies as a way of controlling the cost of living, but this has only led to an increase in the cost of living for tenants. The government's policy has been to reduce housing subsidies as a way of controlling the cost of living, but this has only led to an increase in the cost of living for tenants.
FOR UPHOLDING its own rule book and its members’ rights to discipline a blackleg, the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers this week faces the prospect of massive fines imposed by the National Industrial Relations Court for defying the law. The union’s funds may even be seized and a state official appointed to run it.

Socialist Worker reporter

The issue for every trade unionist is crystal clear. Trade unions and trade union rule books are the property of the membership—not of any government or its front men in the courts of so-called ‘justitia’. The court threat to the AUWE and the entry of the blacklegs from James Goss, employed along with 400 AUWE members in the CAUST injection plant in Sudbury, Suffolk, in August 1967, all the men, except Mr Goss, came out on strike over a bonus dispute.

Ever since, there has been no talk of so-called ‘principles’. Mr Goss chose to blackleg. He later allowed his union to be taken into arms and was expelled from the union. Now the drogher upholder of principles wants to get back to the AUWE and try to shift union ship to guard his promotion prospects.

The members of the AUWE allowed the shop stewards and Sudbury branch officials not to want him back in the union because he is a blackleg. Under the union rule book they are perfectly entitled to take this stand.

As former James Goss and his concern for his promotion prospects are backed by an Australian trade union, there he is and must be treated as a member of the AUWE. An injunction instilled by union officials from treating others

If the union and its officials do not put their heads together and act collectively, the AUWE will be no union, its funds will be frozen, its organisation will disintegrate.

Rank and File supporters of Mr Goss have a standing on which to campaign for the union, attacking its funds, its organisation, and its members.

Union officers have so far stood firm, backed against this blackleg and the court order. At the 20 October meeting branches in Walkley and Rook have called a shop steward at CAUST Sudbury, met the members, and agreed to stand firm. Rank and File told Socialist Worker: ‘A large body of teachers and engineers agree that this direct action protest will not be enough. Demands for militant action are already coming in. Half-day, one-day, even extended strikes have all been proposed.’

Michael Saunders’ message is that trade unions are the property of the membership and not created by the members of the Tribunals chairman or high court officials, all teachers, who have fallen behind in the past few years.’

RUSH TO A BAD DEAL

The press has made much play of the way in which, it claims, local government in the West Midlands has been forced into a deal that will cost the ratepayers an additional £20 a week just before the freeze was imposed. The chief function of the freeze, of course, is to force the ratepayers to the point where they will put up with the proposals to get us at the vital central financial aid.

The promise of a ‘good deal’, however, for the West Midlands was made worth less and less as the price of living increased. Inflation, however, was relatively moderate compared to what was to come.

The West Midlands was not the only area to be the subject of ratecapping. In the West Riding, in the North East, and in Scotland, local government was also being forced to accept cuts.

In the West Midlands, the West Lancashire Joint County Council, led by the Labour Party, was determined to protect the ratepayers from the effects of inflation. The council’s budget was reduced by £2 million, and it was determined to hold the rate increase to £2 per week.
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