Solidarity with the IRA!

Plessey — The Lump — Paraguay — Angela Davis — Bolivia

River Don Shop Stewards Interview

All Out For The Oct 31 Demo Against Internment.
U.S.F.I. DECLARATION ON THE WAR IN BOLIVIA

Several dozen militants of the POR (Bolivian section of the Fourth International) have been killed in the fighting against General Banzer's coup and the new military regime, others have been captured by the repressive forces and are in concentration camps. Other working class organisations have similarly met with harsh repression. The gorillas in power backed up by American imperialism and its agents in other Latin American countries are just about to launch an even more systematic and savage campaign of extermination. The Bolivian working class, which has experienced a long series of barbaric massacres in its history, is once more threatened and more than ever deserves international solidarity. The POR comrades realised that a show of strength was inadequate in the short term. Since they had a realistic view of the relationship of forces—especially on the military level—they were not under any illusion that they could make a concerted effort to prepare themselves and make important progress in every direction. But these efforts could not be sufficient to launch a popular and spontaneous revolutionary insurrection. The masses which resulted from the absence of a real strategy for the conquest of power and for armed struggle on the part of most of the organisations which claimed to be socialist and which, in fact, did not go beyond a spontaneous conception of insurrection.

Confronted by the rightist coup d'etat which provoked a mass mobilisation and strike by Santa Cruz, our comrades did not hesitate for an instant in participating in the fighting with the forces at their disposal. Thus they fought in the front line with their class brothers. In La Paz, Tomas Chambi, a leader of the independent peasant organisation, was killed with about fifteen of his comrades. In Santa Cruz where the counter-revolutionary onslaught was particularly fierce, about 20 comrades have been killed. The fate of the militants who have disappeared or been wounded during the fight has not yet been verified. Comrades who have been arrested in La Paz, Santa Cruz and Oruro are now with other victims of the repression in the prisons and camps of the selva, among which is Moididi where conditions are particularly revolting. Finally, some leading comrades just managed to escape arrest by taking refuge in the Embassy of a Latin American country (after other Embassies had turned them away) and are now in exile, already beginning the task of reconceiving the movement.

The POR comrades write to us: "We are determined to continue our struggle and we are in a better condition to do it than in the past. Our forces have grown in the last period and new leading cadres have come forward and are already at work. What encourages us most is the confidence that sectors of the vanguard have in us. That does not mean that our situation isn't difficult; but revolutionaryists cannot expect the bourgeoisie to clear the road for them. Now what's necessary is to struggle and we are going to struggle: we have prepared ourselves for this perspective.

The Fourth International salutes the hundreds of workers, peasants and Bolivian students who have been massacred in the dramatic days of August 1971. It salutes the Trotskyist militants who have fallen, to repeat their own words, con el permiso de Dios en su partido y en la Internacional. It sends its fraternal solidarity to all those who are suffering in the prison and in the concentration camps and who must be rescued from their executioners by an international campaign of denunciation.

Long live the Bolivian working class. Long live the POR. Long live the Fourth International.

26th September 1971: The United Secretariat of the Fourth International

ALL OUT FOR Oct 31st!

The rally and demonstration called by the Anti-Interruption League, details of which were published several times bigger than any previous demonstration in support of the Irish struggle. Interruption seems finally to have brought home to many more than ever before that the struggle in Ireland is very much related to the class struggle in Britain itself. The possibility of building an effective mass solidarity campaign in support of the Irish struggle can now no longer be dismissed as wishful thinking.

For it to emerge as concrete reality, however, it is necessary to pull out all the stops between now and the demonstration. All individuals and organisations who accept the slogans of the demonstration—"No Interruption" and "Immediate withdrawal of all British troops"—should be working to ensure the maximum possible turnout on October 31st. Public meetings should be regularly held to explain what is happening in Ireland and to unmask the vicious lies put out by the British press. Bodies like trade union branches and students unions should be approached to give financial assistance to the campaign.

Coaches will be going to the demonstration from all major towns and cities in Britain, but intensive work in the next ten days could close the doubling the numbers. In particular, Ireland is the major issue among students at the moment, and every effort must be made to get motions supporting the demonstration through union meetings, etc. What must be emphasised above all is that this is not "just another demonstration"; on the contrary, it is vital that we show to the Irish that they are not alone in their struggle, but that there are too many for the defence of our own class at a time when it is further raising the stakes in the North.

Details of local mobilisations can be obtained by phoning the Anti-Interruption League at 01-383 3083 or the Spartacist League at 01-278 2616.

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE CAMPAIGN

Just under two weeks ago, Stormont passed emergency legislation with the explicit aim of smashing the civil disobedience campaign. One of the more astonishing things about it was the scant attention it received in the British press. For many papers, indeed, it was totally overshadowed both by the Heath-Falkender talks and by the Labour Party Conference debate on Ireland. Yet this legislation, if it is implemented (as it surely must be), will undoubtedly provoke the biggest upsurge since the days immediately following the introduction of internment.

Until this legislation was passed, the Stormont government was almost helpless in the face of the rent and rates strike initiated by the Civil Rights Association. The strike was estimated to be about 90 per cent effective in Catholic areas, and in its first month alone probably cost the government well over £2m in lost revenue. But even more than its financial effect on Stormont, the civil disobedience campaign has played a vital role in uniting the Catholic working class in mass action against the state, and preventing any separation of the vanguard from the masses. Until the emergency legislation was passed, all Stormont could do was to withhold the rent allowance from those drawing Supplementary Benefits. Even where attempts were made by local authorities to close down facilities paid for out of the rates (e.g. the swimming pool in Newry) these were then taken over by local committees and paid for out of the money withheld in rents and rates.

GOVERNMENT RAISES STAKES

But all this has changed with the passing of the emergency legislation, and with it the civil disobedience campaign faces a turning point. The new legislation now allows the Stormont government to withhold debts to public bodies from all kinds of social security payments. This will include family allowances, supplementary benefits, old age pensions, etc. and on top of this, a weekly payment will be taken to cover arrears. Further, the government will also be able to make attachment orders against wages—and if the employee fails to deduct the wages of his employees, then he will have to pay himself. As a last step, the government will even try to trammel on property.

Nor should this legislation be seen in isolation. The decisions, firstly to blow up many of the border roads, and secondly to increase four companies (including the infamous Ayrghyll) to battalion strength in order to make more troops available for service in Ireland, are further indications that Westminster and Stormont have decided to raise the stakes once more and prepare for a fight to the finish.

BREAK WITH REFORMISM ESSENTIAL

The problems this poses for the resistance in the North are of course immense. The first and most urgent necessity is that the civil disobedience campaign should be stripped of the reformist illusions on which it has so far been based. The situation has quite clearly moved beyond a struggle for civil rights to one for national self-determination—yet still the CRA bases its campaign on the demand for democratic rights, to be embodied in a Bill of Rights legislated by Westminster. Their complete failure to understand the nature and role of British imperialism in Ireland (for that is what it amounts to) means quite simply that they are unable to lead a successful struggle against it. Above all, by limiting the struggle to democratic demands, they relitigate the importance of the armed struggle to a dangerously low level—dangerous, because the British Army, the RUC and the UFE have no such illusions about democracy. The present policy of the CRA could unfortunately lead once again to an August '69 situation—where the mass of the people were left almost defenceless against the onslaughts of armed Protestant thugs.

Unless the armed struggle is rapidly integrated into the civil disobedience campaign, it is difficult to predict anything but a defeat for the resistance. The armed violence of the British Army can only be countered effectively by armed resistance (this is not to dismiss civil disobedience, merely to emphasise that it can be only a part of any strategy, not the whole). The only coherent policy can be to smash Stormont, not to peddle illusions about reforming it—apart from anything else, only by smashing the Orange state can large sections of the Protestant working class be broken from their present reactionary position.

UNCONDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR ARMED STRUGGLE

The only policy for revolutionaries in Britain must be to support unconditionally the armed struggle which has thus as its aim, and not to surround their support with so many equivocations about "sectarian violence" that it actually becomes totally meaningless. The escalation of the struggle by the Westminster and Stormont governments means that either the civil disobedience campaign must change its direction or the masses will suffer a crushing defeat. We as revolutionaries stand unequivocally for the armed overthrow of our own bourgeoisie in Ireland; that is why we call for the victory of the IRA against British imperialism. To call for anything less in this situation is only to spread illusions about the real nature of imperialism and to indulge false hopes in the "peaceful road to socialism".
Sold Down the River Don?

Interview with shop stewards.

The situation at River Don arises out of a strategy laid down in the early 60s aimed at eliminating product duplication and increasing efficiency in the UK steel industry. This strategy involves first of all the elimination of certain production units, and then of the whole company, leaving the remainder to be sold to the steel industry.

A: What is the official position of the shop stewards?

B: Well, we are in a situation where we have to accept the redundancies that have been announced. The redundancies not only affect us, but also other companies in the steel industry.

A: But the shop stewards have not accepted the redundancies. They are not prepared to accept the redundancies.

B: That is correct. We have the right to appeal against the redundancies, but we are not prepared to do so.

A: What is the official position of the shop stewards when it comes to redundancies?

B: We are not prepared to accept the redundancies. We will continue to appeal against them until we are satisfied with the outcome.

A: What is your position in the River Don? Are you prepared to accept the redundancies?

B: Yes, we are prepared to accept the redundancies. We believe that the redundancies are necessary for the survival of the company.

A: What is the official position of the shop stewards when it comes to redundancies?

B: We are in a difficult position. We have to accept the redundancies, but we are not prepared to do so. We will continue to appeal against them until we are satisfied with the outcome.

A: What is your position in the River Don? Are you prepared to accept the redundancies?

B: Yes, we are prepared to accept the redundancies. We believe that the redundancies are necessary for the survival of the company.

A: What is your position in the River Don? Are you prepared to accept the redundancies?

B: Yes, we are prepared to accept the redundancies. We believe that the redundancies are necessary for the survival of the company.
SAU: Spartacus League Expelled

At the last National Committee meeting of the Schools Action Union a few weeks ago, the Spartacus League comrades, together with the IS and various others, were expelled from the SAU as "Trotskyists". This came as no surprise to the Spartacus League members, who had been observing the evolution of ultra-leftist sectarian ideas within the organisation for some time. The meeting itself had more elements of a self-critical discussion than a tactical meeting; in the morning we were treated to a lengthy outburst on "social fascism" directed at the LPTYS by the SAU London Chairman, in the afternoon we read out a paper alleging that members of the Spartacus League, International Socialists and LPTYS had behaved disloyally under the School's Act and a "democratic centralist" constitution (sic) and would therefore be expelled.

The Spartacus League has continually pointed out that the existence of a one-sector organisation being "democratic centralist" is a gross mistake which leads to big political errors, and to use this stupidity to expel genuine revolutionaries marks a further step back in the evolution of the organisation under Maoist and Stalinist influence. The SL demands that the SAU lift their iniquitous ban, for the Spartacus League organisations and readmit the expelled comrades at once.

The days when the Times Educational Supplement or the Daily Worker prophesied that the SAU had 10,000 members are definitely over—even on paper it has less than 400. The big upsurges in the schools in recent months have largely been those of the SAU and in the Christopher Searle case, the SAU were reduced to merely issuing a press statement, which hardly anyone bothered to print.

At no time has the SAU been organisationally significant in the schools, and it is chiefly noteworthy for its ideas which in their confusion, presented a certain primitive stage in the schools movement. The SAU comes from the same roots as RSSF and represents an English caricature of the "ultra-left". The Brandenburgisation of youth typified by the SDG in Germany and the CALs in France which led to tremendous movements. In Britain however, these movements still remain a dream of the May events and the British student upsurge, lacked any kind of radicalised base in the schools. This lack of a base had a serious result for all the autonomous schools organisations, since it meant that upsurges in the schools were not in its theory and in its practice, a partial and fragmented practice. Of course, when a single sector organisation leads a mass movement, the logic of the movement can go beyond the limits of sectional problems and large numbers of young militants then become politicised around the revolutionaries, but because of the defects of the sectional system, the development of generalised struggle has been very much retarded, and the SAU has experienced this contradiction over a long period at two levels. In the membership, the lack of even a moderately sane political strategy (latest document gives the aim as "dual power in school") leads either to ultra-left adventures resulting in victimisation and expulsions, or more often in demoralisation and apathy leading to a lot of paper membership. In the leadership branches in London, however, this contradiction results in strong pressures to downgrade school work and put much more emphasis on solving the so-called "socialist" problems, etc. Thus, the London lumped London leadership has only two alternatives: to continue with the "official line"—invasion into "professionals" and breaking off the struggle—but just as in the case of the SAU in general, there is nothing left of militants working in the schools.

But for the moment it is interesting to examine how the SAU gets its distinctive political line. Single sector organisations restrict the youth vanguard to see themselves initially as a group of school militant; they are unable to understand the role of the working class for their own struggle, and if understanding it intellectually, are often unable to draw organisational conclusions—which would necessarily liquify the struggle into the revolutionary struggle.

These features are shown very clearly in the SAU. School students are not the workers of the revolutionary struggle; the schools struggle has not place in the context of social revolution under the leadership of the working class. Does it not seem to an irrelevant socialist bolshewk school organisation? Only if you believe the schools are totally autonomous from bourgeois society, can you agree that they are linked with bourgeois society in a multitude of ways, and that you can't understand what is happening in the schools without an understanding of the processes at work in bourgeois society as a whole (which is by the way the Marxist position), then school action has to be linked to the struggles of other struggles, both theoretically and in practice as well. From this basis we can then work out a strategy for the schools in the context of the struggles of the working class, the students, and other sectors.

The SAU is therefore stuck in a contradiction between the need for a total strategy for a partial and fragmented practice. Of course, when a single sector organisation leads a mass movement, the logic of the movement can go beyond the limits of sectional problems and large numbers of young militants then become politicised around the revolutionaries, but because of the defects of the sectional system, the development of generalised struggle has been very much retarded, and the SAU has experienced this contradiction over a long period at two levels. In the membership, the lack of even a moderately sane political strategy (latest document gives the aim as "dual power in school") leads either to ultra-left adventures resulting in victimisation and expulsions, or more often in demoralisation and apathy leading to a lot of paper membership. In the leadership branches in London, however, this contradiction results in strong pressures to downgrade school work and put much more emphasis on solving the so-called "socialist" problems, etc. Thus, the London lumped London leadership has only two alternatives: to continue with the "official line"—invasion into "professionals" and breaking off the struggle—but just as in the case of the SAU in general, there is nothing left of militants working in the schools.

From the above it can be seen that the SAU is a correct force for revolutionaries to put a great deal of emphasis on work in the SAU, both in the local branches and nationally. Revolutionaries would be working for their ideas, and trying to broaden the movement and get it political direction. Very obviously this is not the situation today. There is no school movement, and if a political mobilisation did develop amongst school students, it is most unlikely that the SAU would be in a position to lead it. The SAU is essentially an irrelevancy and it is a brief upsurge in the schools, but quite unable, because of its structure as an independent schools organisation, to give a coherence to that upsurge and politically develop it. With no movement that would have developed the SAU itself, it degenerated in mere structure without content—the same people discussing increasingly irrelevant topics quickly divorced from where it was—and is happening in the schools.

If this was all, we could safely leave it to its sectarian gymnastics, but because of the lack of any revolutionary organisation doing serious schools work over the last period, the SAU—without any competition—has been a certain pole of attraction to school student militants. Revolutionaries should not be afraid of helping to prevent revolutionary activity in the schools, helping in its own small fashion to hinder the building of the revolutionary party and behaving in a bureaucratic and sectarian way. We demand that the SAU immediately reinstate the expelled organisations and comrades.

—Chris Caldwell

Meetings on Ireland

Meetings in support of the Irish struggle, featuring speakers from Ireland and the film Urban Insurgency in Northern Ireland, have been arranged by the Spartacus League for the following places. Further information will be available locally or can be obtained by phoning 01-278 2616.

**OCTOBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>London: School of Economics</td>
<td>October 20th, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afternoon</td>
<td>Manchester University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medieval Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>Enfield College of Technology,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of East Anglia,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London College, London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>London College, Manchester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th</td>
<td>Oxford University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further meetings will also be held in London—details will be posted locally.

Fascists Attack

The violence in the North of Ireland flowed over into the streets of Glasgow on Saturday 16th October, when a mob of fascists led by Pastor Jack Glass, the local Paisleyite leader, attacked a 250-strong demonstration called by the Irish Solidarity Campaign to demand the withdrawal of British troops and the dismantling of the Border. As the demonstration, organised by the ISC, and supported by Clann na h'Erinne, the International Marxist Group, I.S., the Anti-Imperialist Solidarity Front, and the Spartacus League, gathered outside the Empire Square, the ringing of the Irish flag proved to be the signal for the start of a series of attacks which continued for hours. The first incident occurred over 30 people were arrested, the bulk of the police forces. The Glasgow police, although giving protection to the march, arrested a number of demonstrators, including 70-year-old Harry McShane, an ISC supporter from Edinburgh, who was hacked through his eye. One of the leading members of Red Clydeside, McShane, who together with Seamus O'Taithoir, (former editor of the United Irishman) was due to address the rally, was released when he realised who he was; but one member of IX who claimed "Good God" when he saw the arrest taking place was himself arrested. Other demonstrators were calling out "Victory to the IRA" and police seized all anti-army recruitment posters carried by the demonstrators. Mark Stedman, an ISC supporter from Edinburgh, had his throat hacked with a razor blade. Members of the press, who are now coming in that several of the ISC supporters arrested have been remaindered in custody for days. Funds are urgently needed to conduct the defence. Send to: Bught Parade, 97 oats Street, Glasgow W2.

News from Ireland

BANGLA DESH SOLIDARITY COMMITTEE DEMONSTRATION

Saturday 23rd OCTOBER 2 pm

ALBERT SQUARE, MANCHESTER

INSURGENCY UNEmployMENT DEMONSTRATION

ISLINGTON SQUARE, LIVERPOOL

2 PM—30TH OCTOBER

CH Rica News: Colour magazines armed directly.

Youth subscription, 12 months (22.50 E) including Irish Review” (€1). Monthly, “China Reconstructions” (150¢). Monthly, “Africa Review” (75¢). Also books, etc. Samples, catalogues, 4p stamp to D.V., 16 Belmore Court, Holmdale Road, London N.6. }
"We've got to have solidarity"

This interview with Ed McGaffney, convenor, and Jack Gray, Chairman of the Shop Stewards Committee, at the Pleasley ARG works is an abbreviated version of the interview that originally appeared in the Glasgow local paper "The Word".

Press coverage of UCS' announcement to oversell the other great workers' struggles in the West of Scotland and the implications of work at Pleasley ARG works at Alexandria. Word reporters went to find out the facts - and very unusual facts they are. The problem is that the whole of the ARG works within little more than a year has been hit by a series of cuts, redundancies, and capitalist confidence tricks in recent years.

How did Pleasley come to over here in the first place?

JG: It's been as we've quoted, they got £3m to take over. They've leased this - they got money to take over Ferretti and Airmech, but they've bought this for the sake of £1.5m of the factory. The Labour government was in when Pleasley took over. They paid £650,000 for this plant, with all the stock and everything, we feel they got quite enough for that. And they had work, they had all the manufacturing contract for the ML24 torpedo through this takeover.

They took this place for two reasons: 1. to do away with a competitor in the torpedo field, and 2. to make a profit from selling all the old equipment. The factory in May 1970 and by January had taken over the whole plant. We cooperated with the management for some time. But from the time we were trying to organise and get involved, we stopped and they had no idea of carrying it on. For example, there was a strike at Airmech. There was a six-months negotiation, they took six months and the agreement was signed a week or two before the closures. There had been a lot of arguments with the company: for instance they were bringing in machine buyers. We protested. They claimed they were going to make a profit, we were looking at stuff that wasn't obsolete. They wanted to sell our equipment to Thailand, but they now say only five machines out. We haven't been letting metal out: they sold it to an American company. We've been requesting information on whether machines can be got out to South Africa. We have full co-operating a pool of skilled engineers. We're all the stuff from here. We want a meeting of steward here but we have no money to set up. 700.

How come you've not done that sooner?

JG: We've got to have solidarity. The pledges from Engle Contract, we can't get through. Ifford is supposed to be organising it now, but if they don't we'll see about it.

JG: Pleasley has 80,000 workers. It's been done through the rank and file, and it takes time to get addresses, but we've had contact with Brenton in Nottingham. 700.

What's the most important thing right now?

JG: We've got to have solidarity. If the pledges from England come out, we can't get through. Ifford has blanked everything from this works. If we can get the general meeting, we'll back the Saltire at the end of the year. Our intention is to move machinery to South Africa and Portugal. We've had AEU support. The District Council said it could be a problem. Thursday. We had support from Rotherham, Rotherham, and was encouraging, from the distilleries, UCS and Albona. There were 7,000 on the demonstration: the biggest in any town we've been in. We've got a left-wing past, you know. There were quite a few communists. This is the last big factory employing a pool of skilled engineers. There's no negotiation. There were 1,300 men employed here. There are Pleasley workers who have been laid off through Pleasley. Our case is different from UCS, you know. We're not unionised, we're tenants. The authorities are scared of coming in here, because under Scottish tarrants laws we can't be caught unless 150-200 regular now. It's through fraudulence and anger that the lads have taken this decision. What have we to lose? Just walking the streets. We feel it's time for all workers throughout Britain to take this action. We must show this Government: we're not happy.

Can organisations be generalised in this way?

JG: We've used the strike weapon for some time. Employers are learning how to handle it. Occupations and work units might well be more effective.

What about labour relations?

JG: We're having some trouble with the Ministry of Defence, or high in the forces on the board. The last one was Sir John Harding. Now it's Sir Charles Elworthy, former Marshal of the RAF and on the Chief of Staff. He was responsible for going into N. Ireland. Mountbatten is supposed to be a big shareholder. And they're all doing stuff for S. Africa and Vietnam.

What do you think of the press coverage you've had?

JG: Very poor nationally. An obvious attempt to play down this type of action.

JG: We're disappointed with the press. They've been playing it down. For instance, the Daily Record only covers 3-2 lines. There's some coverage in the Guardian, but that's it. The local press covered us, but wouldn't support. The Express covered us with a hostile headline. The people who have given coverage are the Workers Press, Socialist Worker, The Red Mole, The Militant. But not The Morning Star, and we're pretty disappointed about that. A councillor here contacted them and told them we would talk to them, but they haven't.

What political lessons have you learnt from the occupation?

JG: We've learnt a lot. The Socialist press have been answering our questions, they've been politically motivated. But if they talk to the lads, they find out. The only political motive is a feeling that the government has to go. Whether it's over the Common Market or the Industrial Relations Bill, it must be brought down. Its policies are totally against the working class. But the majority of the men don't want politics. Just look at that Union back in there. Someone brought in a red flag and about 50 said 'we walk out and put up that. It's their upbringing, through the Express, the Record, etc. that men get frightened off communism and nationalisation and things like that of the words, I mean. They're doing what the socialists say, but they don't want to be politically involved.

How's morale?

JG: Pretty good. We think we've knocked it off. What's happening is that there's no place else to go. They're enjoying themselves meeting their mates, etc. It's better than walking the streets.

JG: The company's idea is to wait us out, but we're satisfied with the numbers, 100-120 in every day. Now we're also going down to the Labour Exchange every day to canvass others. A lot say they'll come up. The management think they'll sicken us, but they won't. We could get more support if we let everybody in, but we're confining it to ex-workers. The police have said to us, "Look, you want publicity. How about letting us come up and carry out?" But we say come and get us. We know the factory, we've got our plant. And local cops don't fancy the job. All the factories say they'll come out if we're evicted.

What are your plans if you're thrown out?

JG: If we're thrown out we'll carry on the picket outside the gate to stop lorries, etc. In that case we would accept outside support. Wouldn't expect older men or those.

JG: We'll make them fight every inch from here to Dumbarton.

What about the viability position?

JG: The company says the factory's not viable. This has been a complete confidence trick by the company. They've conned the press, government, local government and the TUC. They all put themselves out to get a new employer here. We feel the company never tried to make it viable. If they had and built the work, we could have. Originally they claimed they could employ figures like 2,000 over 2 years, etc. This is precisely what Alexandria needs. But the management ran the factory like a crowd of Boy Scouts. There was no production or nothing.

What promises did the company make?

JG: 1,000 employed in one year, in two years 2,000, expanding to 5,000 people. The company say the efficiency has been 25%. But for instance when you got a job you weren't getting the drawings, etc. And if you had a mag, your superior would say just "Carry on, I'll be back." There was no organisation. They enlisted bookmakers from other factories, using the trade unions, enticing them with promises of security for life. There were 60 toolmakers here, but no tooling programme. So there was no work for them.

What about connections in UCS?

JG: Some factories round here have offered to give half the UCS money, but we said no, if UCS keep the focal point. We can get it from them if we need it.

Our decision to occupy wasn't a result of UCS. Our closure was announced first. The idea was born around July, but even a handful of men, 30-40, could take the gates and hold them. On September 3rd we asked all the men to support a takeover of the gates: they had all just received their ex gratia payments. We allowed all those who didn't want to, to leave. In fact everybody agreed to take part in the takeover of the gate, removing the management, and with the police, the gate, and then some left one by one. Then the following day many came back. Especially men who expected to get their pension, or those who opposed the decision originally. We have
The Bryants Strike: A

The following interview with Gerry Kelly, a shop steward from Bryants (Woodgate Va), speaking in his personal capacity, took place immediately after the demonstration in Birmingham on Tuesday 24th October when 2,000 workers marched through Birmingham, the first stage of a campaign to kill the lump. The next day, Bryants (Woodgate Va) capped the claim for a lump, on the ground that a non-providing increase in their basic rate claim was dismissed by Bryants who refuse to negotiate and dismissed the men immediately they went on strike. That evening a joint shop stewards meeting of the site to decide the recommendation to the men that rather than moderate their demands they increase them to encompass the eight demands of the demonstration (see interview below) and to increase the base of the struggle. This is unanimously accepted by the workers at a meeting on Thursday.

The significance of this development is to make the present Bryants strike a test bed of the whole of Birmingham and probably the whole of the Midlands building industry. Employers certainly will not give in easily; a demand would probably add 15% to their bill. However, because the dispute has such enormous significance for the rest of the building trade, the Woodgate site’s strategy relies on really solid support from the rest of the industry. Immediately they took the decision, the Movements workers on the same site elected to put a stop ley per man per week while on strike. The contract is closed for the lump labour and the Movements workers have barricaded their site against lorries using it as a backdoor to the Woodgate site. The trade union branch has marked the strike off and in a statement by leading shop stewards in Birmingham, signed by federal steward and chairman Peter Carter and union official Bill, they state: "This strike is not about lump, but real lump wages and nationalising the lump industry, being ‘among the worst offenders in employing lump labour’. At the time of writing other are considering giving the same support as Movements and all the signs are that it will be effective."

-Could you explain how exactly the "lump" operates?

The lump is labour only subcontracting. A man comes onto the site and says: "I've got ten men, you give me a price for this job" and he pays these men say £4 a day. On the lump the.mag have no guarantees, a proper rate, they are not paid against work done and they never get paid. In the end, they can be sacked at any time of the day or week "according to the whim of the employer."

-Incidentally, the "lump" gets its name because the basis for payment is a lump sum.

-Why are you against the "lump"?

Because it is cheap labour: men on the lump work...
Battle For The Midlands.

Twice as hard for very little extra money. A man being paid £4 a day for a 5-day week would be getting £20 a week. Take away tax and insurance - that would leave about £3 to feed, clothe, and provide for housing and labour of over 60 hours. But the main problem with the lump is that it is a block to trade union organisation on site. It undermines trade union organisation and has been said to break strikes. A classic example of this is the Misters dispute in South London where the men walked out over two months ago over victimisation of labourers by the employers. Misters have now brought lump labour in an attempt to break the picket.

Why do workers go on the lump? They can avoid paying tax and insurance stamps but this is not a gain for them but a gain for the employers because it is the employers who have to pay money towards the stamps and SET. Also, if they were organised in trade unions they would get more wages and would be in a position where they could fight to improve those wages.

How do you organise on a building site? On my site, we have held three or four cantor meetings in which we've put forward the policies of the union and stressed the need for building workers to unite. At one of these meetings a call was put forward for a "Kill the Lump" demonstration and this was carried unanimously. On Bryants job at Woodgate Valley, the largest council site in Birmingham, the management made a move to smash the trade union organisation. The management representative entered the canton at the end of the tea-break and informed the site committee that they were sacked. All 200做了 tools, the management then sacked all the men and brought in the police to remove the site committee members from the site. But they refused to go and a strike meeting was held in the canton and the decision was made to continue the fight. There was a demand for complete reinstatement of all the men with no loss of pay for the time they stopped work. The first action by the management capitulated and the workers won hands down.

- After the demonstration, what went next in Birmingham? To fight lay-offs in the winter. Although we've had the demonstration, it doesn't mean we've killed the lump only delayed the layoffs of workers. We need to do so. The chairman of the shop steward committee has said that if and when the first employer lays men off by the lump, we will assemble 2,000 men and march them down to his office. I don't see that we can take the lump workers and re-organise those men has laid off. I think we should go to fight "five days work or five days pay" the main demand to be taken up by the union, and it will be necessary to get unity in the committees to ensure that this demand is fought for by all the men by every member of the union. We must fight to keep Lump.

35-hour week Now for the winter Full pension scheme A 35-hour holiday with full pay Full pay during sickness and injury A closed shop in Birmingham

With reference to the last demand, we intend to disregard the Industrial Relations Act in order to achieve a closed shop. Interviewed by Birmingham Moles

first instance, successful candidates are elected for five years. If the official is successful a second time, he is elected for life. Bearing these facts in mind, the Building Workers Charter is quite clearly an attack on the completely undemocratic practices of the rightwing ASW leadership.

And it is necessary that effective opposition does develop against the ASW leadership. Conditions in the trade are so bad that a union as bankrupt (not just financially but also politically) as the ASW is completely powerless to fight for the very basic demands that are necessary.

The lump is just one example of what building workers are up against. When a local authority (city) decides to build, it can either undertake to do the job itself, by direct labour, or as the more usual situation, give the job to a private contractor. The contractor in turn will sometimes let the job to a smaller firm of sub-contractors, who will manage the labour side. They are paid by the main contractors, take their cut and then let the job out again to the workers who become the sub-sub-contractors on a "lump only" basis. The workers thus employed work for a set price and are individually paid. There is no bargaining power and therefore no way of making the union or the workers an issue of concern. This is why we have chosen to campaign against the lump.

But the lump is just one aspect of the conditions that the building workers must and are beginning to fight against. The individual builder or contractor is not to blame. He is only concerned with his own profit. Therefore, the lump is a way of keeping the wages down. It creates a situation where the workers are competing against one another and are thus divided. A worker is given a job to do in, say, 40 hours. If he completes this job in 20 hours, he will be paid at say, 50p an hour, that is £10. It is then left to the management how much he will be paid per hour for the time that he has saved the company. This is usually worked out at 50%, that is 25p an hour. So for the 20 hours he has worked, he will receive £1.50. If he finishes the job in 40 hours (the original time agreed), he will not only get no bonus, but he also probably gets the sack for not doing the job in a shorter time, thereby saving the firm's time. This system of bonus payment generally constitutes one-third of the basic wage. But because it is used by the employers to decide how much time should be allocated to each job, full advantage is taken by the management by cutting the hours allotted to each job. So if the hours for a job are cut from 40 to 30, the worker must finish the job in 15 hours to receive the same bonus of £5. But that only gives him a payment of £12.50 for the job.

It is clear that it is necessary to fight these and other forms of blatant exploitation that exist on the building sites. The workers are divided by these means, and it is important now to organise to smash the lump and to unite all workers in the trade. But the fight against the employers cannot begin to succeed while the ASW has its present leadership. An example of the class-collaboration of the ASW occurred at the St. Thomas' Hospital site in London. Negotiations between Laing, the main contractors, and the ASW had established in principle some kind of incomes policy scheme. This management refused to negotiate and so the men began a work-to-rule. The labour force was sacked and the management brought in Whealan & Grant, a lump firm. The dispute was made official by the ASW, but after three weeks the Executive called off the strike, thus allowing Whealan & Grant to operate on the site. It accepted Laing’s assurances that Whealan & Grant was a member of the National Federation of Building Trade Employers (that is not lump only), although it came to light at that time that they were not in fact members. The terms of the sell-out were that Whealan & Grant should operate the National Working Rule Agreement and that they should at some later stage operate some kind of bonus scheme.

This kind of activity on the part of the present ASW leadership clearly shows that its interests do not lie with the rank and file building worker. The recent demonstration in Birmingham showed that some workers were aware of the true role of the ASW leadership. The Member of Parliament from Houghton le Spring was received very lukewarmly and even with the issue of some withdrawal of support he suggested that the only way to kill the lump was by legislation. The speaker from UCD, in contrast, was very clear on the issues. He clearly identified their struggle with that of Upper Clyde Shipbuilders. But it was Pete Carter, speaking on behalf of the Joint Shop Stewards Committee, who made the best intervention and who obviously had the sympathy of most of the men on the site. He saw an integral part of the strike as the battle against the lump in the fight against redundancies and layoffs. Seven sites stopped in all and building workers from all the sites came on the demonstration. Students from both Aston and Birmingham universities pledged their solidarity in a concrete way by procuring to stop lump labour from working on the campuses, as was the situation at present. The demonstration itself was very militant, and the sight of 2,000 building workers chanting "Kill the Lump" marching through the streets of Birmingham must have been an unnerving one for the few workers who continued to work. But it was after the "official" demonstration that the real indication came of the workers determination to get rid of the lump, regardless of what their leadership said or did. 300 workers took over the main roads in the centre of the City and marched to the ATV Centre site, which is ridden with lump labour. They demonstrated effectively both to Bewley, the main contractors, and the men working there, that they were not going to tolerate such a situation. It was noticeable that many of the leading bureaucrats were absent from this demonstration.

What remains to be seen now, both in Birmingham and elsewhere, is how soon the building workers see the need of building a strong union while at the same time realising that this can only be achieved within a democratised trade union. Many more sellouts on the part of the ASW, without active opposition from the membership, will only serve to demoralise the men. The Building Charter is perhaps a step in the right direction, but one should be clear about the role of the Communist Party in this Charter. It is interesting to note that in Birmingham, while a number of excellent rank and file militants have an allegiance to the CP, so also do a number of leading bureaucrats. And this ambiguous situation no doubt exists elsewhere. What is needed now is a clearly worked-out strategy to fight the ASW leadership, this to be seen as part of the fight against the lump, the appalling conditions, for better wages, etc. And in practice, in the day-to-day struggles that are likely to occur over the next period, the shop stewards committees must themselves take the initiative in democratising the union at site level.

T. van Gelderen
P. Hampton
J. Vickers

GLOSSARY

ABT: Association of Building Technicians
ASFG: Amalgamated Society of Painters and Decorators
ASW: Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers
AWBR: Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers
FTATU: Furniture Timber and Allied Trade Union
GMUW: General and Municipal Workers Union
NAPC: National Association of Plaster Operatives
NFBE: National Federation of Building Trade Employees
NFUC: National Federation of Construction Unions
NJCBI: National Joint Council for the Building Industry
NUFTO: National Federation of Furniture Trade Operatives
NCPI: National Union of Packing Case Makers
TUC: Trades Union Congress
SET: Selective Employment Tax
STW: Swindon Trade Union Workers

"Made up of NFUC and NFBE, 1971"
SOME MONOPOLIES EMPLOY AS MANY WORKERS AS WHOLE COUNTRIES

Top Ten International Manufacturing Concerns
1969 Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>(million dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Motors (U.S.)</td>
<td>24,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford (U.S.)</td>
<td>14,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric (U.S.)</td>
<td>8,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business Machines (U.S.)</td>
<td>7,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler (U.S.)</td>
<td>7,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unisec (Augsburg-Drich)</td>
<td>6,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Telephone and Telegraph (U.S.)</td>
<td>5,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips (Dutch)</td>
<td>3,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkswagen (West Germany)</td>
<td>3,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial Chemical Industries (British)</td>
<td>3,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of persons employed in the manufacturing industries of some capitalist countries (in thousands)*

- Data to 1966

GM ignores the results: the pollution of our urban spaces by cars themselves. Says GM Chairman Roche: "America’s love affair with the automobile isn’t over. Instead, it has matured into a marriage.”

As early as 1963 GM had excess profits so great that it had accumulated $2.3 billion dollars in surplus liquid assets, an amount larger than the assessed property valuation of 18 of the 50 states. The Wall Street Journal surmised that last was ‘saving up to buy the federal government’! With its immense economic and political power, it really does not need to.

Nixon’s new economic policy promises to raise GM’s profits even more. With federal excise tax on new cars eliminated and a new 10% import tax on foreign cars (as well as other goods) there will be a greater demand for American made cars. GM’s production will increase and profits will go up. These new profits will stay in the pockets of GM’s elite because the wage-price freeze prevents the unions from bargaining for increased wages. What does GM do with its great corporate power?

MILITARISM AND RACIALISM

As a bastion of the military-industrial complex, GM produces M-16 rifles, launches for the anti-personnel 2.75 rocket, 105mm, 81mm, 20mm projectiles and bomb parts, self-propelled howitzers, parts for military vehicles, engines for helicopters (like the OH-58 performing the main observation role in Asia’s jungle war) and for aircraft (like the A-7—one of the most effective planes performing the close air support role in S, E. Aesal) and many other weapons for use in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and throughout the world.

GM’s racial policy at home and abroad matches their record of militarism. Out of the 12,800 dealerships, GM has allowed only 12 to be owned by blacks. There are no blacks or women in top management positions. In apartheid South Africa, GM’s employment policy is matched only by that government. The starting rate for Africans or Coloureds at the GM engine plant is $24 an hour or $83 a month—$1 below the South African Government’s poverty datum line for an African family of five.

Perhaps the clearest expression of GM’s attitude toward non-whites is R. J. Ironside’s (plant manager, GM South Africa) remark: “I wouldn’t say these people don’t have any reasoning power, but what they do have is very limited.”

For further information contact: The Brain Trust, 507 Church Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan, LNS

defend rouge!

ROUGE TRIAL STARTS

The trial of Rouge, weekly paper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, is now due to open on Tuesday 19th October. The editor, Charles Michaloux, is indicted on five counts for “injuries and defamation of the police and public administration”; the five articles concerned are all accounts of police brutality towards demonstrators or innocent bystanders, of police collusion with the fascist thugs of Ordre Nouveau, of false evidence given by the police, etc.

As we pointed out in an earlier article (Red Mole 28), the Rouge trial is likely to develop into a major public issue in France, for it represents a calculated attempt to silence the paper of the largest and most important revolutionary Marxist group in France. It is important that English militants do not regard the trial as “something which couldn’t happen here”—the Industrial Relations Bill, the Oz trial, and the banning of the Little Red Schoolbook show only too clearly that the ruling class is quite prepared to withdraw such “freedoms” if the deteriorating political climate so demands. Already one of our own comrades in Colchester has been found guilty of “behaviour likely to cause a breach of the peace” simply for selling The Red Mole, and many others have reported increased harassment by the police in the last few weeks. By defending Rouge, we defend our own right to continue publishing revolutionary literature.

Both publicity and money are urgently needed for the defence of Rouge. We urge all revolutionaries, as individuals or organisations, to send telegrams in support of Rouge to the following address:

Monseur le President de l’17ème Chambre Correctionnelle
PALAIS DE JUSTICE, 75—Paris 1er. FRANCE

Please also send a copy of your message to the Ligue Communiste in order that they may publish it:

Henri Weber, 95 rue du faubourg St. Martin, PARIS 10e.
France.

Those comrades who are also willing to give money to help pay for the costs of the trial should contact the following address:

ROUGE DEFENCE,
182 Pembroke Street, London N.1.
"Ligas Agrarias" are sprouting up amongst the campesinos as food prices rise and the price they receive from traditional crops falls. The relations between the Church and Stroessner are at their worst ever following the prolonged torturing of a Uruguayan priest called Padre Monteiro, who was accused of Stroessner being a "Tupamaro" but was really a pawn in his constant harassment of the Church's support of the "Ligas Agrarias".

With Presidential elections due in 1973, Stroessner has already been proposed as a candidate for the Colorado Party which he has converted into a political tool for the ruling military clique. But elections remain a farce in a Paraguay ruled by Stroessner and US imperialism.

### Draft Resistance In Israel

The following document, written by Israeli draft resisters, was sent to Jerusalem from Jerusalem with the request to give it all publicity and support possible.

The Israeli Revolutionary Action Committee (IRAC) produced the following translation and is organizing a campaign in support of Reuven Lassman, who has been arrested.

Tel-Aviv, August 2nd 1971

The Minister of Defence, Mr. M. Dayan,
Ministry of Defence,
Haikal, Tel-Aviv.

Sir,

We are a group of young people on the eve of being drafted into the army. After prolonged deliberations we have come to the conclusion that we cannot serve in this army.

Young people are dying in this country because of internal politics and not for noble values as a recent research by Dr. Moshon Arionov and Mr. H. Horowitz shows. An Israeli journalist who served during the last three years was stated: "For each soldier who dies in Israel, there is someone who becomes rich in Tel-Aviv."

We refuse to serve in an army of occupation. It has been demonstrated in history that occupation means

Irish Solidarity Demo in Melbourne Australia

---

Reuven Lassman
5137390
15.8.1971

Dov Gal
6462580
15.8.1971

Givora Neumann
6494474
15.11.1971

Irish Youth of Israel
5137215
31.11.1971

Copies: Israeli Chief of Staff; Chief of Manpower; Israeli Army; State Prosecutor; Mr. A. Zukjimski; B.A. representatives in Israel; Members of the Knesset; the drafting officers; Mr. H. Tadeski, chairman of Foreign and Defence Committee of the Knesset; Foreign and Israeli press.

Tremendous pressures were exerted on the four draft resisters. The Israeli weekly "Ha'olam Ha'aveh", like the rest of the Israeli press, denounced them as cowards and traitors.

As a result of this pressure all four had to run away from the army. Dov Gal broke down and agreed to be drafted on the condition that he will be allowed to speak in the army. Reuven Lassman was arrested, scrawled on, S.B.T.71 and taken to the notorious military prison no 6 near Atar. After a trial and prison sentence he will be drafted by force and imprisoned by the army.

Anyone who feels strongly about these issues or wants further information should contact: ISRAAC, 219 Pulteney Bridge Road. London S.W.14
Dear Editor,

There are remarks in Bob Purdye's article "The holy war" whichstate, "The SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war.

The real issue is that the difference in coverage between the SL and the Irish is that the Red Meat is part of the different political approach of the two papers, and the organisations which produce them. The Red Meat needs to focus on the differences in coverage between the two groups, and use the resources available to it, to produce a paper which is really worth reading. Here is the problem in a nutshell. In the first place, the paper has a very limited readership. The Red Meat has a very limited readership, and there are very few people who will take the trouble to read it. This is why the SL and the Irish are not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war. It says that the SL is not here to win a holy war.

DIFERENTIATION

The point about being "against a British government" having anything to do with Ireland was put forward as a tactical move. One is tempted to think that the Red Meat is quite clear from the recent, e.g. O'Callaghan has simply not read it properly, or more likely he has not grasped that I was making a differentiation between the tasks of Irish and British revolutionaries.

PERMANENT REVOLUTION

If we compare my proposals and the SL's, the difference is clear. The SL propose a series of steps which are counterposed to the present struggle; I propose an initial strategy and its intensification as a preliminary to its qualitative change into a struggle for a new Ireland. Of course the SL could be right, and I could be wrong, but I am convinced that my solution is the only one capable of continuing and intensifying the struggle for a new Ireland.

The Nationalist Revolution

Here we get into a discussion of the theory of Permanent Revolution. Instead of seeing the Irish revolution as a series of national liberation struggles in an oppressed nation, with the workers' movement constituting the vanguard of the struggle, he characterizes the working class to the national independence movements as "travelling on a separate path", and insists on suppressing the proletarian content of the struggle until the national struggle has been won. This is not a strategy for Permanent Revolution as having a beginning, a middle and an end, but "the working class has been condemned to a permanent struggle against a class enemy, but I insist on having Trotsky in the dock along with the Smiths in the present struggle, along the lines I have indicated, to bring the best to break the Irish, and Six County, Protestant workers' movement. The creation of a thoroughgoing economic and social crisis within Ireland, and Britain, will make the integration of these workers with imperialism a much more difficult task, making the bourgeoisie open to revolutionary leadership, which would bring them to Trotsky's "social revolution". This is not a question of the basic strategy, but I insist that it is the only way in which revolutionaries can approach the question; the way of e.g. O'Callaghan and the SL is objectively revisionist.

NOT ESSENTIAL

However, it is also necessary to understand that the involvement of these actions of the working class in the struggle is not essential to the achievement of a united Irish Workers Republic. The Irish working class and small farmers are a large enough proportion of the population to achieve victory even if the Six County Protestant workers fight on the side of imperialism. In this case they would, I think, ensure that the Protestant workers did not threaten the maintenance of their state, so that the "abolition" of the Protestant state is a theoretical possibility, but this is a question of abstract strategy. The social revolution would be an extension of the kind of measures it is necessary to take if workers stop cross lanes or picket lines. Now, how do Irish and British revolutionaries set about achieving a social revolution within their respective states? What are the options for the Irish people? First of all by differentiating their respective tactics. British revolutionaries have to prove to the people that they are on the right track, that they are acting in their opposition to imperialist oppression of Ireland.

IRISH REVOLUTIONARIES

The way to get to basics is to get through to the masses by participating in their struggles, and seeking to clarify the issues involved in this process and the means. Their relationships to the existing movements and leaderships are critical problems. We can only understand them if we understand the forces of the course of the struggle. Whichever way the Irish revolutionaries determine their strategy on the basis of the problems involved in working with the IRA, clearly the approach is a basis for the "moving along" about "merging too closely" with the Provisionals. Whatever the problems involved, revolutionaries have a responsibility to get through to the masses by participating in their struggles, and seeking to clarify the issues involved in this process and the means.

THE S.L.L. & OURSELVES

So the differences between the S.L.L. and ourselves, e.g. O'Callaghan, can be summed up very simply. We try to analyse the strategy, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this. We have a strategy which concocts with the existing system and the SL, denounces the existing struggle. We seek to get through to the masses by participating in their struggles, and the SL seeks to use the pressure of the Irish struggle as a basis for the social revolution. The differences between the SL and ourselves are as follows:

1. We have a strategy which is based on analysing the strategy of the existing struggle, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this.
2. We have a strategy which is based on analysing the strategy of the existing struggle, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this.
3. We have a strategy which is based on analysing the strategy of the existing struggle, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this.
4. We have a strategy which is based on analysing the strategy of the existing struggle, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this.
5. We have a strategy which is based on analysing the strategy of the existing struggle, and counter the bourgeois propaganda. The SL fail to do this.

IRISH SOCIALIST CAMPAIGN

CEILIDH

and meet—

FRANK "BUCH" ROCHE

just released from 14 months imprisonment after being found of Committing acts against the Government'sSingle of its own C.S. Gas.

MUSIC AND ENTERTAINMENT

Reckless pub, Tottenham Court Road, W.I.

SATURDAY 30TH OCT. — 7.30 p.m. 20p.

THE SPARCITANS LEAGUE

revolutionary youth organisation in solidarity with the Irish revolutionaries

I am interested in getting more information about the Spartacist League.

NO ADDRESS

OCCUPATION

Send to: The Spartacist League, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.
INTRODUCTION

For black people in the USA and increasingly so in Britain, Engel's description of the State as a "body of armed men" is a very meaningful reality. Black people are under physical attack from the front line of the State—namely police, courts, prison, and (at least in the US), the Army. And the recent terrorist attacks of Che Guevara, murder of George Jackson, frame-up of Angela Davis, etc. Here we have constant harassment of blacks in Nottingham Hill, a rampage by police in the Mangrove Nine, etc. etc. This explains why all the recent writings of black militants have at their centre a description of police, prisons and the courts. As George Jackson says: "Black men born in the US and fortunate enough to live past the age of 18 are conditioned to accept without question the police... (Letters from Prison). And as Eldridge Cleaver says, "The police are the armed guardsians of the social order" (Soul On Ice).

Of course the penal system is not the only way blacks are attacked. The Immigration Bill, for example, is a much more insidious way of attacking black police and prison brutality and court frame-ups are for blacks the most immediate and most violent weapons in the State arsenal. Moreover it is not just a coincidence or an accident that these weapons are being increasingly used. Instead, just as racism itself is intensifying under the conditions of economic crisis and decline with blacks being made the chief scapegoat, so the repressive machinery of the state is intensifying. It's true that it is not only blacks who are attacked by this machinery. White militants (and even liberals) feel the lash as well—hence the Chicago Seven's acquittal of Rudi Dutschke. However, blacks are doubly susceptible to the "body of armed men" because they are black and also because at the present time they are fighting to take power. Finally, just as capitalism is (outside of the workers' states) an international phenomenon, so is the black liberation struggle and so likewise racism becomes intensified internationally. That is why it is fatally wrong to dismiss as hysterical or make-believe, allegations of police brutality in Britain. Matters are getting as vicious here as in the US.

Indeed, this last week has shown the similarity of police, police and court brutality here and in the USA. This is revealed on the one hand by the publication of Angela Davis's book, If They Come in the Morning, and on the other hand by the trial of the Mangrove Nine in London.

"IF THEY COME IN THE MORNING"

This is issued here by the "Save Angela Davis Committee" and was compiled as part of the campaign for the release of herself and other political prisoners in the USA who are suffering under the criminal rule of her sister, other black militants (Elridge Cleaver being a conspicuous absence) and a few white "radicals" who have been unpublised. There are three basic reasons to make it. Firstly the book is excellent. Secondly the book is conditio sine qua non for any serious discussion of the revolutionary struggle and the contradictions of capitalism on every matter. Thirdly, the aim of this review is to summarise every point made but to bring new points which we believe to be the most important and pertinent political facts and ideas (some of which are arguable) contained in the various sections.

1. WIDTH OF STRUGGLE OF NATIONAL MINORITIES IN USA

One of the facts that is constantly brought home in this book is that the struggle of the blacks is not the only struggle by oppressed national minorities in the States. For instance the occupation and movement of the rural Chicano (US Mexican) population in Northern Mexico began in Alianza Federal de Mercedes. The occupation has spread to over 14,000 families who in October 1966 took over the National Forest, renaming it the People's Republic of San Joaquin. The leader of the movement, Cesar Chavez, has stated: "There is no information. No information is given about the subsequent history of the movement—but it is important not least because it shows that the popular出版 efforts of the Chicano grapepickers to form a union is not, as the bourgeois press would have it, to remove an isolated grievances. Again there are quoted examples of struggle by the native American community and its recently formed revolutionarisation organisation, the Young Lords (in particular, the occupation of the Puerto Rican Lola Lebron who is still in prison since leading a raid on the House of Representatives in Washington in 1954).

2. U.S. PRISONS—SCHOOLS FOR BLACK REVOLUTIONARIES

Indeed some of the material about what is happening in the prisons themselves. In particular it's quite apparent that the effect of the prison is one of mass repression. This is the case with the Soladale Brothers—George Jackson, John Cluchette and Floeta Dumas who in San Quentin were being framed for the murder of a guard at Soladale, with only one being (legally) being subsequently murdered by a guard). None of these prisoners were politically active or politically conscious. Similarly, this was the case also for example with Russell Magee (who is now on trial with Angela Davis and Cleaver). However, these again are not isolated cases—literally hundreds of blacks are being politised in US prisons. As George Jackson says, "Prison is behind the walls; we're seeing through the madman of capitalism, class interest, surplus value

The reasons for this are probably many. One is the general politisation of blacks outside as well as inside prison (as H. Rap Brown points out, the only difference is one in maximum and the other minimum security). Secondly, the already mentioned social contradictions about work and lead political struggles in the prisons (thus Malcolm X in his autobiography shows how he became politicised by coming into contact with Black Muslims in prison). Lastly we have the police now at both Panichio and Chico cell in various prisons. Thirdly, it seems that through the contradictions of political capitalism is desperately attempting to preserve a liberal facade, it allows its prisons almost unlimited reading material. The black Panthers in New York and Lenin, Marx, Mao, Trotsky, in Soladale. It would seem that a comparison can be made here between the politisation of black prisoners in the USA and the politisation of prisoners in the so-called "socialist" states. In any industrial society, itself it tends to conceal politics behind the (the committee in most of its guerrillas merely spout capitalism, the organisation) and Angela). For instance, when Louise Patterson spoke in Manchester, she played down the fact that Angela Davis and her colleagues had in New York the Angela Davis Committee which has a churchmen and other "respectables" on it. Again, the whole impression she gave was that Angela was an unfortunate woman who just "happened" to be in prison. Similarly, in the-or the main activities of the Angela Davis Committee is the circulation of a million signatures. Petitions of course are a cheap tactic to evade politics in that it is too dangerous to do anything. But anyway it doesn't engage consciousness and commit anyone to do any thing.

4. ROLE OF THE BLACK "LUMPENPROLETARIAT" OF THE BLACK LUMPERPROLETARIAT

We come now to some more contentious points. Thus Angela emphasizes what she considers the vital role of the black lumpenproletariat in the revolutionary struggle. She says, "There is an urgent need to organise the lumpenproletariat as the Black Panther Party as well as activists in prison have already begun to do." Now Marx dismissed the revolutionary character of the lumpenproletariat—i.e., that section of the working class which is virtually declassé by being semi-permanently jobless and therefore divorced from the productive forces. He did this on the grounds of their consequent political demoralisation and therefore inability to organise consistently. In arguing for the revolutionary vitality of the black lumpenproletariat Angela makes a point which is made by many black militants in Britain as well as the USA.

Now it is true that a large section of the black community is through racism semi-permanently unemployed and thus "lumped"—Again it is true that the Black Panthers are very much based on this section. However, what is equally true is that with the murder and imprisonment of the Panther leaders, this movement has shown itself too volatile and disorganised to continue in anything but a spasmodic way. Compared with this is the continued steady growth of revolutionary black organisations in the US who are doing political work not only in the "community" but also in the factories—in particular the League of Revolutionary Black Workers which now plays a significant role in the black community of Detroit and in certain of the essential car plants there. Again, in Britain it is the case that black groups who have organised in "the community"—e.g. Black Panthers and the Black Unity and Freedom Party—have not attracted the support that groups here who are also organised around the workplace—e.g. Indian Workers Association.

The conclusions one can draw from all this is that it seems to be (a) Angela is correct in arguing that the black "lumpen" do have a vital revolutionary potential quite unlike their white counterparts, and (b) this potential however will only be realised if it is part of a wider black revolutionary movement which is also doing habitual work round the points of production.

Finally another contentious point which is raised in Angela's book is the question of the nature of fascism. Clarification of this question is of absolutely key importance for revolutionaries, and it merits a separate article. Red Mole will be publishing material on fascism (how we define it, the idea of "creeping" or "galloping" fascism, etc.) in a forthcoming issue. —S.C.
READING: Not so Ideal at Ideal Casements.

A recent strike over the sack of 13 workers at the Ideal Casements (Reading) Ltd. factory, which occupies one of the 50 moribund tube shops, has been important if basic lessons for trade unions, especially in view of the new legislation now at the disposal of the government. Namely the Tanner Industrial Relations Act. Significantly, Mr. J. W. Whitaker, managing director, who has gone on record as welcoming this basically anti-trade union law, and stating his intention of using it.

The strike began in the afternoon of Friday 17th October, when 13 workers at the tube shop, a subsidiary company of Ideal Casements, were sacked at only 4 hours notice for alleged misconduct. This followed a breakdown in negotiations for a 15% cost of living pay rise, but was almost certainly a deliberate attempt to provoke a strike over the question of reinstatement (i.e. a return to the status quo) in order to divert attention away from other issues such as poor toilet, washing and heating facilities, and the men's demand for protective industrial gloves to be provided by the firm for those who work with acids.

As soon as the 13 were sacked, the other 50-60 workers at the factory, in particular the only manual workers’ union (in the factory) straight away went on the afternoon Friday, and the rest of the strike was planned.

A strong and militant picket of the factory gate was well-organised, and probably about 20 strong, mainly of metal window frames, was rapidly bringing to a complete standstill. As time went on, the attention of the authorities, the local Tubular trades’ union, the only manual workers’ union (in the factory) straight away went on the afternoon Friday, and the rest of the strike was planned.

TUBULAR TRADE UNION

Eight of the 13 strikers were not re-engaged, the job was out of the factory, and the men not to take the strike action on the basis of “this victory.”

SUPPORT FOR THE STRIKE

During the course of the strike the Social Security office dutifully played its role of strike breaking by not paying out the supplementary benefits that the strikers were entitled to for their wives and children. The intervention of the “Tubular Trades’ Casements” branch in the strike, to inform the strikers of their rights, to organise “mass visits” to the Social Security, and to lodge appeals against decisions, gave considerable potential economic strength to the strike by increasing the power of the strike. However, unfortunately the strike was out and over before this had its full effect, though appeals against these decisions and the amount not paid are going on.

A recurring theme of the trade union situation at Ideal is disillusionment with “the Union” for its continual backing down and playing into the hands of the bosses. But this is not the whole story. Some things are different, in this case different shop are often paid at considerably different rates, and in some case this happens even within one company.

THE SELL-OUT

On the Friday of the first full week of the strike, therefore, the first two stewards went in with the T.G.P.O. officials to talk with Wallace, and an “offer” of a 50p per week pay-rise plus reinstatement of the 13 was made. This deary offer was turned down by the stewards, and their men, and no more went in.

By Monday the management was even more troubled, because the pickets had succeeded in preventing crucial supplies of oil from getting through, and the following day Hibbert, the local T.G.P.O. official, announced that he’d another offer from the management. This turned out to be even more deary, including reinstatement subject to the one rejected by the stewards on the previous Friday. However, back up with a threat of no more strike pay if the strike was continued. Hibbert pushed through a recommendation to accept the offer and call off the strike at a mass meeting with practically no discussion, and got a vote for a return to work on Thursday.

This vote was noticelessly greeted with murmurs of discontent, not surprising since many of the workers remembered a previous sell-out at the hands of Hibbert last April, when he “secured” the reinstatement of only 10 out of the 11 strikers (the 11 strikers having not to take the strike action on the basis of “this victory.”)

The effect of this vote was that the strike was deliberately broken by the T.G.P.O. officials in the company with their previous management permission. This shows how far Hibbert has gone to go against the interests of the workers with the bosses in order to thwart the purposes for which trade unions were founded and fought for—namely, the defence of the interests of their members. It also shows how much he fears those who simply tell the truth about the inhumanity of the treacherous class-collaborationist trade union officials like himself in workers’ struggles.

—Nicholas Green—
Lawrie White

Bristol Claims Union

BRISTOL CLAIMS UNION SIT-IN

On the 24th September some 40 members of the Bristol Claims and Unemployed Workers Union occupied St. Catherine’s House—one of the main Social Security Offices in Bristol—for about three hours.

The Union was staging a protest against the slowness and inefficiency shown by the Department of Health and Social Security in dealing with claims. This complaint is, in fact, no more than the tip of an iceberg of abuses of claims’ rights by the Dept., but it was a complaint which could be substantiated with documented evidence and one which was causing widespread hardship to many people.

A statement was prepared and distributed to the press and public, whilst a worried manager made unsuccessful attempts to intimidate members into leaving the office. Eventually the manager, suitably and predictably baffled by a Union that refused to nominate a spokesman, decided to negotiate its surrender, called in members of that other noble institution noted for its abuses of people’s rights—the police.

The morning after the publicity, we wanted—coverage was given by BBC television and radio, The Bristol Evening Post and The Western Morning News—there was a palpable probability of jail for the weekend, and a fine no members, as claims, could afford, we decided to vacate the office—almost two hours after it was officially closed.

We are now looking to see some improvement in the service offered by the Dept., if there is none, then we’ll be back, but next time we won’t be walking out.

In the long run we would hope to see such action from the furlinements of one of the points of our Charter:

—A Free Welfare State with all, with its services controlled by the people who use it.

The other points of the Claims Union Charter are as follows:

—The right to an adequate income, without means test, for all people;

—No secrets and the right to full information;

—No distinguishing between so-called “deserving” and “undeserving.”

—A Bristol C.U. member

Fortnight’s Notice of 300 Redundancies.

Two days before the implementation of a £2 pay rise for all workers at the Standard Bottle Company, Brindley Park, the Local Management Board was to be closed down and dissolved. Two hundred and fifty workers, some with jobs at the plant for 40 years, were to lose their jobs, and the plant will be closed on 22nd October, and the final 90, retained as skeleton staff, will be out of work by the New Year.

A strike of about 100 workers took place at a meeting with management on 6th October, a last-ditch attempt to save the job because, due to be paid off. The managing director of the company justified this by saying the workers would “be better off on benefits” and that “the number of redundancies would have disrupted production and brought forward the shutdown.” A printed company statement handed to the strikers said that the management had been “studied and the company is now trading profitably, the decision on capital employed does not justify the continued operation of the plant.” In other words, although they’re making a profit, it’s still big enough for the investors, and so the workers will have to go. The factory will be replaced by workhouses.

The response of the union (the GMWU), which is leading the way in registering under the Industrial Relations Act has been pithy. All they have said for is £10 handkerchief for all redundant staff who now have to face the dock for £260 a week, and the more highly skilled workers for those with longer service, for example, the defence of the interests of the workers. In the meantime, the movement in the factory, 190 of the 300 made immediately redundant fell into the first category. Once again, the struggle against redundancies has been shown to be as much a struggle for the Bläckföreningen militia and the Bläck or the anti-union bureaucracy as it is against the employers and the government. The fight to democratise the trade unions is an essential part of the struggle against redundancies, in the same as the role of the Standard Bottle Company shows only too clearly.

HUNTERDON DEVELOPMENT.

The Tory government is soon going to have to decide whether it can scrape up £1,000 million and whether it wants to invest this in a 10 million ton steel works (annual output) at Hunterdon on the Ayrshire coast. The site has already been chosen but the Scottish bourgeoisie are still very nervous, according to the Sunday Times Business News, that the government will back out and have more profitable areas in mind for investment (e.g. petrochemicals). The site has the advantage of land next to deep water. But the scheme’s key advantage lies in the possession of the joint public and private corporation to develop Hunterdon...none other than Mr. Standish, ex-Scottish Tory Treasurer and present boss of the new Govan Linthouse division of UCS. No doubt Mr. Standish will be urging the Tory government to pump the money into Hunterdon on such “humanitarian” grounds as the high unemployment levels on the Clyde and in the West of Scotland generally.