The invasion of Vietnam by China directly serves the interests of the Chinese leadership. The victory for the Chinese would add new vigour to the plans of Japanese and US capitalism to shore up their anti-communist puppet regimes in Asia.

The invasion of Vietnam in January 1979 was a major blow for the long term strategy of the Vietnamese bureaucracy. The Vietnamese bureaucracy have also failed in their interests to foster a campaign of anti-Chinese chauvinism. The liberation of the South in 1975 was followed by a mounting social and material crisis. Disastrous harvests contributed to major shortages. Shortages themselves encouraged speculation and black-marketing. There was mounting suspicion and evidence of corruption amongst the Northern officials sent to administer the transformation of Southern society.

Scapegoat

In February 1978, the Vietnamese bureaucracy resolved to nationalise the rice trade. The weight of this measure fell heavily on the merchants of Cholon, the Chinese quarter of Ho Chi Minh City - once Saigon. Anti-Chinese campaign served the purposes of a bureaucracy anxious to find a scapegoat for food shortages and facing mounting hostility to the newly imposed officialism. The formerly prosperous Chinese from Vietnam, including large numbers previously integrated into the Northern regime, led to an accelerating conflict on the Vietnam-China border by the end of 1978.

The national chauvinism of the Vietnamese bureaucracy in an important sense opened the way to the new pro-imperialist offensive against the Vietnamese.

In the face of this invasion we must demand, and campaign for, the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Chinese troops from Vietnam.

Vietnam must be defended against an invasion that serves the designs of imperialism. In that defence the Vietnamese workers and peasants cannot look to the Soviet Union as a stable and consistent ally. The Soviet bureaucracy has its own plans for alliance and 'de-tente' with imperialism. All Soviet aid, any troops or advisers must be placed under the direct control of the Vietnamese themselves and used only for the defence of Vietnam.

Neither can the impoverished masses of Vietnam and Indo-China look to the Vietnamese bureaucracy itself to save them from imperialist encirclement and penetration. Imperialism, using its Chinese ally hopes to divide and rule the peoples of Indo-China. The 'chauvinist campaign of the Vietnamese bureaucracy at home, in Laos and in Campuchia, together with their repressive and corrupt domestic regime, actively prevents the formation of a Soviet Federation of Indo-China. Only such a federation could withstand the plans of the imperialists. The masses of Vietnam will have to overthrow their bureaucracy if imperialism is to be kept at bay.

Arms

It is no accident that the invasion coincided with the Carter administration's announcement of new plans to increase the supply of arms to Thailand and Pakistan. Nor is it an accident the US State Department is waging a consistent campaign to force Australia, Japan and the EEC countries to withdraw scheduled aid to Vietnam.

For several years, the archconservative foreign affairs advisor to Carter, Zbigniew Brzezinski, has been openly seeking to open-up South-East Asia to imperialist penetration by fanning the flames of conflict between the rival bureaucracies of the area.

Deng Xiaoping knew all this well when he unsmilingly informed a sympatheic Brzezinski that Vietnam was, 'the Chinese of the Indian Ocean.'

In 1974, at the height of the war between North Vietnam and the United States, China seized, nominally from a South Vietnamese government, the Paracel Islands that guard the sea approach to Hanoi. They have held onto them ever since. The repressive regime of Pol Pot in Campuchia assured itself of Chinese support by escalating a state of war between that regime and Vietnam. The victory of the Vietnamese-backed Front for National Salvation in Campuchia in January 1979 was a major blow for the long term strategy of the Chinese bureaucracy.

The Vietnamese bureaucrats have also failed in their interests to foster a campaign of anti-Chinese chauvinism. The liberation of the South in 1975 was followed by a mounting social and material crisis. Disastrous harvests contributed to major shortages. Shortages themselves encouraged speculation and black-marketing. There was mounting suspicion and evidence of corruption amongst the Northern officials sent to administer the transformation of Southern society.
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The TUC have also agreed to limit and undermine the closed shop. “Its scope can be as flexible as required and unions might bear this firmly in mind.” This opens the way for management to undermine shopfloor militancy. The TUC further proposes that strikes should no longer be decided upon by mass meetings. Instead they propose secret ballots organised at the discretion of the union officials concerned. This will mean workers will take their decision in isolation from their workmates and in the face of a barrage of anti-strike propaganda from the press and TV.

The message of the Concordat is clear—trade union democracy and rank and file independence are to be stifled by the trade union bureaucracy in the interests of the bosses. Callaghan and Murray see the Concordat as a last ditch attempt to save Labour at the next election. Callaghan has announced to Labour MPs “The Labour Party stands by this document. We will fight the election on it and we will win . . . .”

To hell with the decisions of the Labour Party Conference!

In fact the Concordat—while conceals every borser—and Tory argument that the unions are too strong—opens the way for a new legal attack on the unions by Tory or Labour government. If Murray and Co cannot deliver the goods they promise then the door is already open for direct state intervention.

SELLING OUT THE PUBLIC SECTOR

That is why Len Murray has been working overtime to restrain the public sector workers. In collusion with the leaders of the other unions he has set out to show what ‘Concordat’ trade unionism means in practice. The pathetic Government offer of £1 on account for full-time workers, £3.50 now and a comparability scheme, the rotten fruit of which was won before until April and August 1980—is 29% short of the full claim made by the workers in their last concordat at an eleven day secreted street meeting 13 days before it was announced. The unwelling was supposed, no doubt, to put the finishing touches to the Concordat deal.

The trade union leaders knew the deal was not up to mark and file expectations. Charles Donnet of the GMWU made this clear when he said “We have a selling exercise to do and recognise it as a difficult one”; and this was proved when the NEPE executives, under massive pressure from the rank and file recommended rejection of the deal in the coming ballot in spite of pleas from Alan Fisher.

The real aim of the union sanctioned ballots of the Concordat was shown by Murray’s reaction to NUPE’s decision. He declared the offer to be too low a basis about compensating for a ballot of all the unions involved in an attempt to outnumber NUPE and break it resolve. In the face of the Tory attack on trade unionism and the TUC/Labour Concordat, an immediate testing dispute scenario is needed. The performance crisis is a crisis of the bosses’ system—the workers movement should take no responsibility for it. Every struggle against Labour’s pay code must be supported against the Concordat/TUC. Pay claims and action must be brought forward to ensure an all out fight to bury the Concordat. This urgent task of the day must be backed up by organised action committees of trade unionists in the areas. For the civil service workers to link up at every level with the public sector workers now in dispute.

But against Callaghan and the TUC the workers movement must take up and fight for policies in its own interest. Most vitally these must be:

No cut in living standards—For a sliding scale of wages to automatica­ly protect wages against inflation—1% rise for every 1% rise in the cost of living as negotiated by committees of trade unionists and housewives.

Endacott low pay—for a guaranteed 275 minimum wage protected against inflation.

For real equal pay for women:

These policies can unite the entire class behind a drive to defend and extend living standards. In the face of the dole queue and the threat of lay off and redundancy we must demand:

No loss of jobs; cut the hours not the jobs and share out the available work amongst the workforce under trade union control.

A programme to public works under trade union control: houses, schools and hospitals. For the restoration of all cuts and the protection of the welfare and social expenditure by a sliding scale.

These are the key policies that can defend the independent interests of the working class against the attacks of the capitalists. The Concordat fonts the policies of the Labour Party Conference and the TUC. It commits the Labour Party to a new attack on workers at the expense of trade unionists and living standards. While trade unionists and Labour Party members must not be bound by the Concordat, they must also not be automatically rejected and their movements. That is why it is vital to fight for now!

The Re-Call of the Labour Party Conference—force the leadership to accept a Concordat!
The Re-call of the TUC—to reject the Concordat, to commit the workers movement to actively defending its living standards and organisations.

The extent to which the Great Devolution Debate has stirred the current British political scene was best summed up by an Aberdeen trader quoted in the Guardian: “I asked the lads at work the other day how they would vote and they looked surprised and said they haven’t given it a thought.” (12-7. 1979). This apathy was originally envisaged by the Labour Government as a move to “scotch the nationalists”. But it was also a useful diversionary ploy, that could distract wage cutting class attention from wage cutst, unemployment and so on. Now that it has come to the crunch however, the Devolution smoke screen is wearing a bit thin. When Callaghan visited Scotland to support the campaign it was the picket of hundreds of public sector workers demonstrating outside his hotel, who passed this point, that highlighted the central concern of the Scottish working class. The move towards devolution by Labour was a conscious attempt to stop the rot that was under­mining its once solid electoral base in Scotland and Wales. The use of nationalism, particularly in Scotland, where the Scottish Nationalist Party grew from a collection of cranks into an elec­torally prosperous organisation, forced the Scottish Labour Party to have to defend the concessions so that it could retain its massive base in Scottish working class constituencies. The Welsh and Scottish Acts were the fruits of these concessions. They also served a vital secondary func­tion for the Government. They tied the Nationalist MPs who now hold the balance of power in Parlia­ment, to voting for the Government on all crucial issues, until these acts took effect.

However, the acts have never been seen by Callaghan, as they have by the nationalists, as stepping stones to real independence for the two countries. In a ‘Yes’ campaign speech Callaghan argued that devolution would put the ‘extremists’ who favoured independ­ence out in the cold: “... this Act of ours can unite Scotland without dividing her. This Act of ours can unite Britain and be the basis of a United Kingdom.” (Guardian—13.7.1979).

Devolution is merely a means by which Labour can regain the initia­tive over the Nationalists and the Scottish and Welsh workers’ atten­tion from Labour’s betrayals. The Assemblies as proposed in the Acts, are virtually meaningless. In Scotland the Assembly will have some legislative powers and partial control over taxation but in Wales it will even less than this. In effect the Assemblies will be little more than glorified County Councils subject to strict control, via the
Welsh nationalism is thoroughly reactionary.

It is a species of chauvinism. The real interests of the Welsh workers lie not in the fight for independence but in proletarian unity with their brothers and sisters in England. There are none on the left who compare the nationalism of the Welsh with the nationalism of the Irish for example. Such a comparison ignores a fundamental factor. The nationalism which arose out of the struggle against Imperialist occupation in countries such as Ireland, acquired a content of class struggle. It is the clear duty of revolutionaries in Britain to support this struggle. Furthermore there is the possibility within a resolute struggle. Furthermore there is the possibility within a resolute struggle of militancy of the and Welsh workers that this nationalism will assert itself and be on the side of the highly skilled and well paid Leyland workers, such as the large, lower paid workforces. This is not an indication of imperialist exploitation by English bosses. We must not view nationalism from the point of view of democratic illusions, but from that of working class interests. The only conclusion we can consequently come to is that it is a suicidal policy for the Scottish and Welsh working classes. In fact it would represent a step backwards from their demoralisation of the workers.

On the question of the Referendum the following positions should be taken by socialists. First of all we argue that the 40% rule imposed on the referendum by Parliament should be ditched. This rule means that people who didn't vote, even though they may be dead (but remain on the electoral register), are counted as no votes, and that the yes votes must total 40% of the entire electorate, not a simple majority of all those who vote. This amounts to the most disgraceful gerrymandering. We say that only those who turn out to vote should decide, and that the decision to set up an assembly or not should be decided by a simple majority.

We argue that to have voted yes would be an endorsement of the illusions of the Scottish and Welsh working class in a reactionary nationalism. We would argue that only an action programme relating the needs of workers in the declining regions to the needs of the working class as a whole poses a real alternative to the Labour Government's anti-working class policies. For this reason we called for a no vote.

The proposed assemblies will not and cannot even begin to solve the problems faced by Scottish and Welsh workers. Nor would their existence represent a democratic reform that could be utilised by the working class as a springboard to mass action. If an assembly is created, and if workers have illusions in it then obviously revolutionaries will have to relate to that situation. But at the moment the best way to fight these illusions is by posing a class alternative to the assemblies.

The NUM, the sleeping bear of the Labour movement, whose hibernation has been extended by the tactics of last year's productivity deals, has lodged a claim for a 40% pay rise. Mr Derek Ezra's response was typical of the NUM's mailbag mentality 318% as an interim payment. This is justified by the coal board by whining references to the projected £460m loss in the industry for 1978/79. The miners' answer to this should be clear and decisive. They need to move into action now on the basis of the full claim with no productivity strings attached. In this way their fight could be linked to that of those sections of the public sector who have not yet settled. Such a militant action is the reply needed in the face of the snalling tactics being pursued by the Labour Government and the union leaders in the shape of the 'Concordat'. If the NUM leadership continues to have their way, however, the prospects for such a struggle developing look hopeful. The productivity deals have left the NUM divided into competing factions - the NUM has voted to accept its share of the cut, the NUM has refused to accept the deal. This rule means that people who didn't vote, even though they may be dead (but remain on the electoral register), are counted as no votes, and that the yes votes must total 40% of the entire electorate, not a simple majority of all those who vote. This amounts to the most disgraceful gerrymandering. We say that only those who turn out to vote should decide, and that the decision to set up an assembly or not should be decided by a simple majority.

We argue that to have voted yes would be an endorsement of the illusions of the Scottish and Welsh working class in a reactionary nationalism. We would argue that only an action programme relating the needs of workers in the declining regions to the needs of the working class as a whole poses a real alternative to the Labour Government's anti-working class policies. For this reason we called for a no vote.

The proposed assemblies will not and cannot even begin to solve the problems faced by Scottish and Welsh workers. Nor would their existence represent a democratic reform that could be utilised by the working class as a springboard to mass action. If an assembly is created, and if workers have illusions in it then obviously revolutionaries will have to relate to that situation. But at the moment the best way to fight these illusions is by posing a class alternative to the assemblies.

NUM 40% claim prospect not good

By MARK HOSKINSON
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the first 15 years of this century tens of thousands of women were involved in an immense struggle for the vote. To win this democracy many women joined in protest marches and were involved in militant tactics such as the destruction of property. Many were imprisoned, beaten, force-fed and endured hunger and thirst strikes. Some even sacrificed their lives.

Although women's suffrage had begun in the second half of the 19th century it had always been opposed by governments. In 1903, a group of Independent LPs (ILPs) gathered at Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst's house in Manchester and founded the Women and Social Political Union. At first the organisation was to be called the Women Labour Representation Committee. Its central goal was to win the Labour Movement to the idea of the enfranchisement of women and to campaign in the ILP branches for the vote in action. Pursuit of this aim. As Sylvia Pankhurst put it, "it was her intention [Mrs Pankhurst's] to give support and sponsorship for the ILP...the new organisation...should be mainly composed of women." To win the support of the ILP, with partial emphasis on the vote.

There is evidence that the early WSPU adopted other objects than franchise alone. For example, it gave general assistance to reform movements, such as the employment, gave support to textile strikers and peace pickets. However, the main work of the WSPU was directed towards getting a Women's Suffrage Bill passed through Parliament and, thus towards winning support and sponsorship for such a Bill from the parliamentary parties. With the WSPU's close ties to the ILP, it was at first hoped that the new Labour Party, with its 29 seats, would support and sponsor such a Bill. From its inception the Labour Movement had supported the cause of sexual equality and given verbal assent to womenhood suffrage. However, Kair Hardie was probably the only Labour MP who wholeheartedly supported the idea and recognition as an issue for immediate political pressure by the Parliamentary Labour party.

The WSPU insisted only on support for a Women's Suffrage Bill alone, though, it gave formal political sex equality, would in fact only enfranchise one woman in thirteen because of the property qualifications it envisaged. The Labour Party stood formally for full Adult Suffrage and argued that to accept a Bill based on property qualification would be a retrograde step and condemn the properties women, given a vote, would support the Bill. At first the militant tactics of the WSPU, heckling and disrupting meetings from which they were excluded, and lobbies, were directed solely at the Liberal Government in the hope that it would be pressurised into committing itself to Votes for Women. However, despite the efforts of Christabel Pankhurst became the full-time organiser for the movement and a local member of parliament. Christabel herself based her hopes on the speedy amendment of the 1884 law and the realisation that women could participate in their movement. She was most pointedly emphatic in emphasising that, "in the attack on the Liberal government, no distinction is made between the Unionist and Labour Party. The women of both parties have dedicated absolute and rigorous concentration on the single issue of the vote to be eradicated. This attitude was seen as most provocative by the ILP.

The break between the WSPU and the ILP came after the 1907 conference of the Party, at which Kair Hardy pleaded with the Party to conciliate the ILP not to keep some of its most valued tactics. It was agreed that the ILP must refuse to abandon the 'independent' policy. The WSPU withdrew from the Party a few months later. In spite of its early connections with the ILP, and support from working class women, the movement for women's suffrage became increasingly middle class. The intellectual original impetus for forming the WSPU probably came from a petition signed by women in the textile industry in Lancashire, the marches and meetings were well attended by the middle classes. At the 1907 conference of the Party, the ILP rallied to the cause and stood by its commitment to women's suffrage. Christabel's 'incipient Tories' was even more evident in 1910 when, at the King's death, the WSPU suspended all actions and printed a black border on its paper, "The Suffragette," and "vied with the conservatives in her expression of devotion to the throne.

As the WSPU's tactic of political militancy was increasingly directed to winning support from the middle class, the movement for women's suffrage became increasingly middle class. The middle class vote in the parliamentary parties. Christabel Pankhurst was not satisfied with the results of the struggle, their livelihoods not being put in jeopardy by the possibility of constant travelling about the country; their class interests best served by a single-minded focus on getting the vote. Sylvia Pankhurst described these middle class women as, "drawn by the magnet of the militant tactics and the gigantic political power. Mainly it was mainly middle class women who were the stomach-churners and who were sent to jail. However, in jail the upper class women were preferential treated. In jail Christabel Lytton demonstrated to her own identity by dressing as a working woman. Sylvia Pankhurst believed that the WSPU attracted middle class support because, "women raised above the economic struggle by wealth and leisure...began to vote for Liberals as arrant humbugs...to win the vote they would be on the side of the ruling class. As Mrs Pankhurst put it, "We are law-breakers because we want to be law-makers." Christabel's 'incipient Tories' was even more evident in 1910 when, at the King's death, the WSPU suspended all actions and printed a black border on its paper, "The Suffragette," and "vied with the conservatives in her expression of devotion to the throne."

In biblical times a rapist was sentenced to a six-month suspended sentence for every "his" rape of a noblewoman was a serious offence, for every peasant, hardly a rape. Under the feudal system there was no unitary law. The rural communities were literally "privileged," separate laws judged by themselves, protected them and their property. Thus rape of a noblewoman was a serious offence, for every peasant, hardly a crime at all.

The brutal police assault on the Reclaim the Night marchers in Soho last year alerted the house­

Imperialism

Rape has always been used against oppressed sections of society. In the past, as in the Vietnam war, rape has been either tolerated or actually encouraged by the imperialist military, often because of the feminist viewpoint, Susan Brownell in Against Our Will states that war is merely "the perfect psychological backdrop to give vent to men's contempt for women." In fact it is rather that rape in war time is just one aspect of an imperialist army's terrorism of the "haves" and the destruction or confinement of "property". An example nearer to home is that in The Magna Carta it is stated that the WSPU was probably committed to rape. Rape was in fact the primary weapon of the state. In the Indian state of Madras all political prisoners were raped. The rape of a noblewoman was a serious offence, for every peasant, hardly a crime at all.
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portion of the sea, their lives were too hard, their education too meagre to equip them for the contest." When Sylvia spoke on the same platform as James Connolly in support of the Irish dock strikers at the end of 1912, she was summoned to Paris, where Christabel was in hiding, and summarily expelled by the WSPU.

SYLVIA PANKHURST AND THE EAST LONDON FEDERATION

Sylvia Pankhurst remained silent in the WSPU and led no opposition. Instead she left the centre of the stage to Christabel and devoted her life to work in the East End of London. She explained her reasons thus:

"Not by the secret militancy of a few enthusiasts, but by the routine of the mass in the East End can you win."

By creating a women's movement in that great slum area of poverty, Sylvia Pankhurst hoped to raise a rallying cry for similar movements in all parts of the country. However, the East London Federation of Women, as her organization was called, had very similar tactics to the WSPU—mass meetings, depor­tations, rallies, hunger strikes and prayer. Her main aim was to organizing, providing for and protecting the women in the struggle for the suffrage. The main difference with the WSPU was that the ELF organized working class women whilst the WSPU centralised on middle and upper class women. Their tactics did not make alliances and common cause with other working class organisations or with the WSPU. It was this working class connection that irked Christabel Pankhurst, she saw no value in a working class women's movement, "working women were the weakest feathers to young men in civilian clothes who were drafted into the army. The ELF, a centre, a toy and garment factory for unemployed women, cost price restaurants, dirt and dust, and then a school. They agitated for prices to be kept fair. They felt the cost of living, for equal pay for women doing jobs previously done by men and supported soldiers' and sailors' wives and relatives for better pension conditions for all. They advised women not to register for war work as a protest against conscription and war.

Meanwhile the other suffragette organisations abandoned their work. The WSPU, in particular, gave," its energies wholly to the prosecution of cases for the release of Sylvia, extreme, its chauvinism unexam­ined amongst all the women's societies."

The first world war was to widen the gulf between the WSPU and the ELF. The letter, with its paper the Women's Dreadnought (later changed to the Workers' Dreadnought) took an anti-war stance.

VERSACE

The world war was to widen the gulf between the WSPU and the ELF. Between 1914 and 1919, Sylvia Pankhurst worked with her mother to raise £2000 for the ELF. This was largely in order to keep the WSPU from interfering with their work, and to avoid being affiliated with the WSPU. Sylvia Pankhurst maintained that the best way of winning the war was to end it. She argued, "The war is an accident, not a necessity."

VERSACE

Women's suffrage. The main difference with the WSPU was that the ELF, not those of revolution­ary Marxism, was to be the driving force of the WSPU, not those of revolution­ary Marxism. By creating a women's movement, "a women's movement", she was to the secret militancy of 'enemy race' in Britain. Mrs Pankhurst toured the country, making recruiting speeches and arguments to revive her movement and support for Labour's Government. Sylvia's work was to be continued and repudiated by Mrs Pankhurst.

VERSACE

The war thrust the ELF forward, but the ELF was to operate without the WSPU only to orient it towards women's suffrage. It was decided to form the ELF as its own programme of class struggle. Although opposed to working class women it was not politically working class in the strictest sense of the word. Sylvia Pankhurst broke with the WSPU, who were now to become both the suffragette and reformist ELF tradition. But she was never able to find a genuine alternative to the WSPU's meaning and method of revolutionary Marxism.

VERSACE

Just as the WSPU tradition from whence she came had positively rejected the Labour Party and Parliamentarians so the post 1918 Sylvia Pankhurst negatively rejected the Labour Party and Parliamentarians. She was with Lenin and the Third International against standing for Parliament and seeking affiliation to the Labour Party, and her inability to play a role in it has given rise to controversies within the Third Interna­tional. By 1921 her WSPU and ELF were publicly denounced by the newly formed British Communist Party as being a reflection and opportunism, deliberately courting and then welcoming expulsion from the party.

VERSACE

The lessons of the period must be learned for the emancipation of women. In particular, the Sylvia Pankhurst movement attempted to break from the reactionary logic of suffragette the gulf between the working class women's movement and the white women's movement. They openly solidified with the Bolshevist revolution. In the wake of the limited enfranchisement of women Sylvia declared, "gone was the false distinction between enfranchised womenhood as a base and non-enfranchised womenhood as a base."

VERSACE

The ordal of the police inves­tigation, described by many women as "women's war", had brought the right of the courts to question a woman's private life, her appearance, dress etc are all clearly gross violations of women's democratic rights. The facts of the case in hand, with independence, was performed by a doctor chosen by the victim not the police, is essen­tial. Women should have the right to have the case heard in camera. We should also demand automatic compensation for wages lost, moving house, expenses incurred due to abortion and medi­cal treatment etc. Rape Crisis Centres at present are being funded and were not. They should be state funded, with proper medical and social and community control.

VERSACE

In terms of reproductive measures a number of things can be done. Some are simple measures like the repeal of the Contraception Act. Others involve the provision of facili­ties for women to come to train women in self­defence.

VERSACE

Socialists should argue for the Labour movement to take up the question of 'women's rights and the defence of women's rights. legalized, there are certain measures we can take. Right at the beginning of the movement, a campaign, especially one that tries to link up rape to pornography and prostitution, the answer must be a resounding 'no' to this 'economic' or 'public' ally for the women's movement.

By Sue Dye
In January of this year Peru experienced in fourth General Strike in as many years, the symptom of the growing crisis fac­ ing the Peruvian economy. Following President Morales Bermudez, Bermudez's regime restored powers in 1976, booting out General Velasco Alvarado, whose left regime carried out a series of nation­ alisations and limited land reforms, was welcomed by the American capitalists, through the IMF, with high hopes. As high hopes were at the beginning of 1977, by de­ manding a series of ‘supply’ measures which resulted in a dra­ matic increase in unemployment and price rises of up to 50%.

The Peruvian working class reacted with a national general strike, the first since 1919. The regime, clearly shaken by the force of the strikes, announced elec­ tions. However, the elections, planned for June 1978 which would pave the way for the new regime to the government in 1980. Having at­ tempted to placate its bourgeois critics, the regime turned with feverish energy into the task for the risks they were last analysis tolerable, can have progressive' generals of the general strike which affected every mudez Government, even to the constitutional guarantees were ary. At least 24 people were killed and over 40000 in a dramatic increase in unemployment and price rises of up to 50%.

By 1978, the Bermudez regime owed $2 billion to America alone. The regime had to discover new ways of financing. The Peruvian capitalists, through the IMF, started to tighten the screws on the working class, criticising the regime for rising class struggle that the left led workers' union claimed had refused to break from the programmes of the Ber­ mudez Government, even to the point of fighting a CGPT congress.

decision to call a general strike in January 1978. The result was an open split in the party with a PCE (majority) walking out and the PCF (Underground), using its bureau­ cratic stranglehold on the CGPT to purge the Federation of all oppositionists. It was against this background of rising class struggle that the left elected workers' union claimed had refused to break from the radicalised workers and peasants. The gener­ al had already made clear in ad­ vance what sort of constituent assembly it was acceptable to them. It had no legislative powers but was only there to draw up a con­ stitution. This constitution had to institutionalise 'the fundamental re­ structuring of the major party's organization' or it would be dis­ solved by the military. To further safeguard Peruvian capitalism, a series of restrictions were designed to reduce the influence of the left - those who could not speak and write Spanish were ex­ cluding 3 million peasants who only spoke their native languages, 400000 signatories had to be collect­ ed and "recognised as valid" for a slate to reach the ballot. The left groupings continued suffered harassment from the military during the campaign culmin­ ing in the deportation of its leaders a month before the elections. The PCF (Underground) put themselves forward claiming to represent the Peruvian workers and peasants. The UDP (Democratic Popular Union) was a Mason group, with significant support of cer­ tain sectors of American capitalism. It is important to note that in this case Mussolini declared himself as an "activist Government" putting itself forward claiming to represent the Peruvian workers and peasants plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ ment" with the left and peasants parties plus the "progressive bourgeoisie", which in this case meant seeking an alliance with the UDP, a group of the SUCF (FNTMMP), who had a classically Stalinist conception of "stages and steps" and called for "popular unity of the left" to form a "people's Govern­ Men
The recent strike wave has put the Labour government under pressure to democratically confront the power and militancy of the working class movement, to resolve the long-standing trade union problem. Peter Jenkins of the Guardian has pointed out that: "the first task of any government for they and being to contain the power of the trade unions", and "if neither party has an answer to the TU question it follows that neither party can make a solution to the problems of achieving or avoiding Britain's industrial decline.

The entire political establishment is agreed on the nature of the problem, but certain divisions exist over the proposed solutions. The "moderate" majority of the bourgeoise favour legal reform of industrial relations only after achieving a right wing consensus for it in the TUC. They quite correctly recognise that the organisation, militancy and confidence of the rank and file in the TU's rules out an immediate confrontation with the potential of success. The hard line minority are for drastic legal reform now, even at the expense of confrontation (the CBI for instance is for legal compulsion to the end of the TUC bureauacracy, with memories of the TUC Industrial Relations Act still fresh in their minds, would like to avoid legal wrangles for the moment. But they are not opposed to it in principle, nor are they opposed to the need for a radical reform of industrial relations. What does this so-called reform of industrial relations consist of?

**control**

The need to outlaw "unconsti-tutional practices that have gone before the exhaustion of dispute procedures, and to eliminate the facation of the strike weapon", are the two major planks in this programme of "reform". There is a mass of interrelated provisions floated: abolition of the closed shop, restriction of wildcat strikes, no automatic reinstatement of strikers, weakening of shop stewards powers, etc. It is not the time to discuss the legal niceties, but it is important to stress the manner in which the TUC's proposals are being sold to the unions. In all the major unions, the rank and file have had no bearing at all on the criminal liability of pickets.

**criminal**

As far as the civil law is concerned, since the 1966 Trade Disputes Act there has been a statutory right to "attend at or near a place of work in the furtherance of a trade dispute". The 1974 TULR Act merely recoponfirmed that right. Moreover this right applies also to "any other place where another person happens to be". Since the 1966 Act strikers have been immune from civil action for breach of "employees' contract. However, during the 1960s a legal precedent was established concerning the "tort" (or civil wrong) of a breach of contractual or criminal contract. The existing trade disputes provisions conferred immunity to all, including strike breaking contracts, thus leaving strikers vulnerable under the new legal precedent. It was precisely immunity from such civil action (covering both of commercial contracts) that the 1976 TULRA Amendment Act introduced, which is why the Tories want so badly to repeal it! This shows that the 1976 Amendment Act and throw immunity for breach of commercial contract, it would render a wide range of trade union activity illegal, especially secondary picketing, and the strike leader's call 'to amend the law on picketing'. There is also a debate in Tory circles that the police, possessing as they do wide powers of discretion in relation to picketing, should get a little tougher on the picketers. This is why there were for instance in the lorry driver's strike.

**power**

The Tories more often than not make no distinctions in their attitude to the TU movement. Rank and file militants and big shop stewards are condemned alike for ruining the economy, hence the Tories call for legal reform of industrial relations right across the board, from the closed shop to the picket line, Callaghan has perceptively noted however, where the real threat to the stability of British industrial relations is coming from—not from the trade union leadership, but from the rank and file activists: "power has developed upon shop stewards who do not fully comprehend the basic tenets of Trade Unionism". Consequently the Labour leaders are making a legalistic point in order to moderate the influence of the TU leadership. The Tories mean, hence the attempt at a Government-TUC Concordat. Callaghan's remark's are an echo of the 1968 Donovan Commission on British Industrial Relations, which noted two distinct systems of industrial relations—a national, official one, and an unofficial, local based on the shop steward system. The tendency since then has been decisively in one direction: 1) between 1969 and 1977 the number of Trade Unionists in Britain rose from 10,472,000 to 12,707,000 an increase from 44,4% to 52.5% of the total trade labour force. 2) The number of shop stewards has risen from an estimated 250,000 to 300,000 in 1968 to between 350,000 and 400,000 at the present time. 3) A cursory glance at the strike statistics also proves revealing. The number of stoppages rose to double the post war average in 1970, declined erratically to a low point in 1976 at the height of the Social Contract, but is now again accelerating upwards. 4) The continued growth since 1968 of local plant bargaining and shop stewards representation (especially in the public sector) has complemented each other, thus creating a new strategy of collective bargaining out of the control of union officials. This has been further reinforced by the limited decentralisation which has taken place in two of the biggest unions—the TGWU and NUPE. As one bourgeois economist put it: "the need is clear, to get authority back to TU headquarters, so that decisions can be centralised and thus be controlled by responsible considerations."

All the indicators show the massive, potential strength of the working class movement as a whole. And yet in order for that strength to be effectively employed in the defence of trade union rights, the rank and file of the movement will have to engage in an increasingly bitter fight against the arrogance of the official leaders. Despite militant noises and aggressive stances from the likes of Fisher, who is under tremendous pressure from his rank and file members, the Trade Union leaders are desperately trying to moderate wage claims and limit the militancy of their members, to divide one section from another. "The leaders are faced with the demands of a capitalism in deepening crisis. The cry for increased profit rates, to improve the competitiveness of each firm, can only mean workers being forced to accept real wage cuts. Demands for increased productivity, mean special speed up in the labour discipline, bolstered by the lengthening dole queues. The trade union leaders, who accept, "the mixed economy", as others do, will have to decide which they act as brokers between Capital and labour, based on the answer to these demands. They suggest chauvinist and state capitalist remedies like import controls or increased government investment in industry which they themselves hardly take seriously, but their real message is "restraint" for the workers. Help the economy recover, a little hardship now and propriety will soon return." Remembering the twelve years between 'In Place of Strife' (1969) and the Industrial Relations Act (1972) during which the militant led workers bundles fought determinedly into action, the TUC's message to the Tories is, 'Leave them to us to discipline'. Thus, whilst they like secret ballots, would love to see the picket lines boarded and paged, and hate effective picketing, they are at present opting legal, striking, preferring to 'reform' the 'abused' themselves. In reality, unlike the lorry drivers strike, rank and file militants have shown they know many of the key tactics that win; flying or secondary pickets etc. But the present house's offensive, will be more vicious and sustained than the Heath Government's attack. The State, thanks to a Labour government, is now more aware of the flying picket busters, the Special Patrol Group, etc, but must be more brutal than in the early seventies. In addition the Labour and Trade Union leaders have still to sell the pass to the Tories by agreeing with them that effective trade unionism is a "problem". They have to dissemble the "cui users", the militants and the file leadership.

For these militants to continue to accept the leadership of the official TUC leadership and to share their basic political outlook is to enter the flight with both hands tied behind their backs. The working class does need real trade unionism. It needs unions that can defeat the bosses offensive. It needs trade unions that under the leadership of militants grouped in a revolutionary party can become weapons to overthrow the bosses state and to play a key role in the construction of a socialist society. However, to achieve this requires first a revolu- tion in the trade unions them selves. The bureaucrats must be kicked out and once for all. Full and regular elections, must be our watchword—not the mock parliamentarism of the secret ballot, where each person votes in isolation with Robin Day or Woodrow Wyatt voting from the paper or the screen, but votes at full meetings after full debate. We are for the revolutionary and regular re-election of all representatives from top to bottom of the unions and for the salaries of the full-time officials of the unions to be pegged at that of their members.

**unity**

To achieve unity and effectiv eness across the industries and within the individual unions, all the commit tee members covering all the major companies must be built. The unionised trade unions need to be replaced by councils of action based on workplace delegation. On this basis we can route the 'Trade Union Reform', the bosses and their Tory and Labour agents who want to make the unions privacy cops for the labour movement. The answer to 'Trade Union Reform' must be no, No Legal Shackles on the Unions! For the Complete Independence of the Unions from the State! Kick Out the TUC Collaborators!

by Mike Rooke

---

**KICK OUT TUC COLLABORATORS! PUT UNIONS ON WAR FOOTING!**

---
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The insurrection in Teheran was not a blow to the Shah's grip, but a blow to one eight of whom have now paid for their treachery before firing the shot.

It was also a serious blow to the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomini, to his mullahs and to their bourgeois allies. Khomini and Bazargan had been engaged in international negotiations with the generals for a peaceful transfer of power to themselves. Whilst the assault on Doshan Tappeh was going on, meetings were taking place in the area pleased with the attacks on the government of the Sh'ite leader. They were ignored. The worst fears of both the Shah and his allies have materialized. The army has disintegrated and the masses are armed.

The calls of the Ayatollah for government to hand over the weapons have been rejected by the mosques, the factories and the class. The Ayatollah's cabinet is a government of 'nation-principle contradiction' and positions. Bazargan's cabinet is a conservative bourgeois regime the army has been asked to protect. A government of 'nation' is in no sense a gain for the workers and the armed masses.

The Iranian working class, the Fedayeen, are armed because the Ayatollah's government has not passed it to them. It is the workers who can hand over the power to the workers and the Fedayeen. The Ayatollah's government is easier for the Ayatollah to do this. The worst fears of both the Shah and his allies have materialized. The army has disintegrated and the masses are armed.

The workers in the factories and the armed masses have been asked to protect the Ayatollah's government. They are armed because the Ayatollah's cabinet is a conservative bourgeois regime the army has been asked to protect.

Time

With Khomini's second task, establishing a conservative clerical-bourgeois republic, time is of the essence. As long as it is delayed the more will the reactionaries and the armed masses in the towns and countryside be exasperated. The Ayatollah and the revolutionary bourgeois politicians must be exposed. To reach this 'stability' a referendum will be taken place as soon as possible — in a matter of weeks according to the Revolutionary Committee. The Ayatollah's cabinet must be disbanded in two months according to Bazargan. The masses would be stampeded into an Islamic Republic and then into a rubber-stamp 'Constitutional Assembly' by the 'Islamic Revolutionary Committee'. The Fedayeen, the Sinn Féin of the Ayatollah, must be registered by Bazargan as the revolutionary rebels.

Revolutionaries must have the task of winning the working class to block this reactionary design. Such a referendum would be aimed at obstructing any advances that the working class could make in the present situation. To partake in it, they would, therefore, be to accept the validity of this obstruction.

Already the Tehran press is besieging a 'National Guard'. Constituted from soldiers, mullah-dominated militia-men and guerrillas such a force, Bazargan hopes, can perform a holding operation until the army is rebuilt. It could play the same 'conservative' role as the French 'National Guard' did in June 1919. Bazargan has smashed the Parisian workers. Similarly, the Freikops were used in Germany in 1919. Revolutionary councils must counterpose to a Bazargan Khomini national guard the universal arming of the workers and peasants, the creation of soldiers' committees and the election of all officers. Only a well-armed and disciplined workers' militia can protect the working class, the national and religious minorities and extend the revolutionary demands of the masses.

Defeat

First he must disarm and defend the workers on the streets. Unfortunately despite the heroism of the workers who have demonstrated, the armed masses in the towns and countryside are exasperated. The Ayatollah and the revolutionary bourgeois politicians must be exposed. To reach this 'stability' a referendum will be taken place as soon as possible — in a matter of weeks according to the Revolutionary Committee. The Ayatollah's cabinet must be disbanded in two months according to Bazargan. The masses would be stampeded into an Islamic Republic and then into a rubber-stamp 'Constitutional Assembly' by the 'Islamic Revolutionary Committee'. The Fedayeen, the Sinn Féin of the Ayatollah, must be registered by Bazargan as the revolutionary rebels.

Revolutionaries must argue for immediate strike action to Fedyane: military technique OK, but their politics不对; disaster.

bougeois democratic demands plus the hybrid 'peoples councils'. They add to this a commitment to guerrilla struggle "as a strategy as well as a tactic". This approach is likely to prove an obstacle to formation of democratically controlled mass workers' councils.

Groups founded on this basis — whether in Portugal (PRP) or in Latin America show an tendency to desert the working class at key moments. Either by probabilistic adventurists; or by voluntary disappearance into the underground — when real class represion is coming.

To stand any chance of influencing militants or sympathizers of the Stalinist organisations Iran Trotskyists will have to stress a number of key positions, to the face of Khomini's offensive it should be an appeal for united front of workers parties centred on Legality for all workers parties, trade unions etc. An appeal for workers defence militant. The Iranian Trotskyists, which have faced a number of key positions, to the face of Khomini's offensive it should be an appeal for united front of workers parties centred on Legality for all workers parties, trade unions etc.

An appeal for united front of workers parties centred on Legality for all workers parties, trade unions etc.

An appeal for workers defence militant. The Iranian Trotskyists, which have faced a number of key positions, to the face of Khomini's offensive it should be an appeal for united front of workers parties centred on Legality for all workers parties, trade unions etc.

The centralisation of factory strike committees into city-wide workers councils.

These limited demands should be accompanied by calls on the Tudehs and Fedayeen to break the bourgeoisie and the mullahs and join the struggle for a workers Peasants Government. In no case should Trotskyists expose their strategic goal of working class power based on Soviets or their total opposition to the Bazargan regime. It is to this task of overthrowing this Government that Trotskyists must win over organised workers, peasants, soldiers and oppressed nationalities.