

# The Red Mole



## INDIA PAKISTAN

Turn bourgeois  
war into a war  
against the  
bourgeoisie

### INSIDE:

Racism in the Labour  
Movement

---

How to Defend the  
Students Unions

---

Class Struggles in  
Bristol and Sheffield

---

Polemic:  
On our differences  
with the C.P. and I.S.

---

Unemployment in  
Scotland

---

Rhodesia Sellout



# The Red Mole

Number 32 29th November 1971

## THE INDIAN SUB-CONTINENT

### A Bourgeois war could only accelerate the process of disintegration

Ever since General Yahya Khan's armies invaded Eastern Bengal in March 1971, *The Red Mole* has constantly and consistently argued that the shortsightedness of the West Pakistani oligarchy had opened up the road to the liberation of the entire sub-continent. We suggested that the repercussions of the invasion of Eastern Bengal could not be confined to that single province and that the reverberations would be felt throughout India and Pakistan. Events have not contradicted our analyses. The war fever which is building up in both countries: the sabre-rattling by the newly-discovered folk-heroine of international liberalism, Mrs Indira Gandhi and the realisation by both Yahya and Bhutto of what is in store for them, give us a clear indication of the serious dilemmas which confront both the ruling classes in the Indian sub-continent today.

#### The Indian Bourgeoisie: Its Problems And Its Solutions

From the very beginnings, small though they were, of the armed struggle in East Bengal, it was obvious that the Indian ruling class would engage itself in a desperate attempt to try and contain the struggle. The most immediate reason being to prevent the struggle from spilling over into West Bengal. Mrs. Gandhi's government therefore decided on a two-pronged strategy: politically they would contain the struggle by smothering the leading political force (i.e. the Awami League) with an ideological bear-hug; by doing this they would also attempt to gain control of the military side of the struggle by controlling the supply of arms and stationing the Indian Army on the West Bengali side of the border. This strategy has been partially successful. The Awami League leadership in Calcutta has become a tail of the Indian bourgeoisie, but precisely because of this and because of its failure to project any concrete programme for the social emancipation of the Bengali masses, the League has begun to lose credibility and within its own ranks dissensions are beginning to appear at a fairly rapid pace. In particular the divisions between some of the fighting units of the Mukti Bahini and the "Provisional Government" in Calcutta have reached such a stage that an open split seems unavoidable in the immediate future. Another important factor in the struggle is that the revolutionary currents are making more and more gains. Their military activities in Chittagong harbour as well as in the heart of Dacca itself have won them considerable sympathy and support. Also the fact that they are attempting to change the social nature of the Bengali countryside opens up a wide field of potential support. All these pressures have their effect on the fighting units of the Mukti Bahini (Awami League's Army). The increasing strength of the left groups places the different Communist Parties in West Bengal in an untenable situation because what is required of them is not so much empty demagoguery in support of Bangla Desh (which everyone and anyone in India can

indulge in today), but concrete military and political help, which will have to include at some stage the extension of the struggle to Western Bengal. Given the internal dynamic of the CPI(M), the most powerful force in West Bengal, this seems unlikely, but what cannot be excluded is divisions and splits within its ranks, especially if it refuses both to abandon and discard its parliamentarist illusions and prepare its cadres and the Bengali masses for a clash with the Indian bourgeoisie. Despite the weaknesses at the subjective level the situation in West Bengal continues to become increasingly unstable and the credibility of the Indian ruling class is at its lowest. This confronts the Indian government with the task of providing a solution. The 9 million refugees from the East are potential dynamite and while their effects on the Indian economy have despite the sensationalism of the bourgeois press, been marginal, their political potential could well provide the fuse to detonate the struggle in West Bengal and have a devastating effect on India as a whole. In that sense the problems they pose are not dissimilar to those which were posed by the Palestinian refugees in Jordan. Mrs. Gandhi understands this fact well and the last thing she wants is to be forced into a Hussein-type offensive against Bengal. All these factors push the Indian bourgeoisie into one of two directions: either to pressurise the Big Powers to force a political settlement down Yahya's throat or a limited war to "liberate" East Bengal militarily and instal the "Provisional Government" in Dacca. But what the Indian government does not understand is that even the immediate success of either of these options will not represent a medium-term solution. The situation is far too advanced to allow compromises and somewhat shoddy compromises at that, to prevent the unfolding of a revolutionary process. The "Provisional Government" would remain exactly that even in Dacca. Thus the Indian government has no way out of the present impasse which could guarantee a period of unlimited stability for the ruling class it represents. Its problems are very real, but its solutions are false. The Indian masses will not allow it to govern in the same old way for long and since it knows none better it will resort more and more to repression and the establishment of a strong state.

#### The Military Junta In West Pakistan: Its Total Failure And Its Isolation

The most blatant failure of the military regime in West Pakistan has been its inability to crush the Bengali national movement. This failure has had disastrous consequences on the morale of the West Pakistani army and police units, who are involved in the fighting and repression, but more important it has led to a grave deterioration of the economic situation in West Pakistan itself. When one understands that East Bengal both supplied a bulk of the country's foreign exchange earnings and also served as a market for the sale of West-Pakistani manufactured goods, this is hardly surprising. The unemployment levels in West Pakistan have risen phenomenally and when one also takes into account the fact that in colonial and semi-colonial countries a reserve army of the unemployed is a permanent feature of their economies, one begins to grasp the seriousness of the situation. There have been a great deal of industrial strikes in the West and in some cases these have been accompanied by peasant struggles (particularly in the North West Frontier Province and Sind) which have developed

as a result of the entry of capitalist property relations into the countryside in the shape of the "green revolution" and other similar devices. Thus the external failures of the regime are directly interrelated to the mess which it has created internally and for which it has no cure. In this situation a war would not have the effect of providing a pretext for national cohesion (as it did in 1965), but would lead rapidly to the disintegration of West Pakistan. Mr Bhutto, who remains the ablest bourgeois politician in the country has understood this fact well. Also it must be remembered that as far as the Army is concerned they are already "at war" - against the Bengali masses. This war has up till now cost the Pakistan Army more casualties than did the entire Indo-Pakistan war of 1965. To fight a war on two other fronts today would destroy the Pakistan Army. A defeat for the army would remove the most stable prop of the West Pakistani state. The only meaningful option open to the Yahya regime therefore seems to be a negotiated settlement with Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, who somewhat conveniently at the moment, happens to be held prisoner in West Pakistan. Already several bourgeois political leaders have openly called for Rehman's release and Yahya himself has declared that if the "people" demand his release he (Yahya) is not going to stand in their way. If Yahya can pull off even a limited political compromise with Mujib it will preserve the status quo for another six months at best. It cannot even be excluded that dissensions will appear within the Army as many of the younger officers will not appreciate the subtlety involved in invading Bengal, losing hundreds of West Pakistani lives and then negotiating a settlement several months later. There are also, of course, the problems which Sheikh Mujib will confront if he accepts a compromise: the strength and size of the leftist groups and currents would develop overnight and there would be an open split inside the Awami League. Thus the future of the Pakistani bourgeoisie does not seem to be too happy. Internationally both the United States and the Soviet Union understandably from their points of view, more importance to India than to Pakistan. The recent right turn of the Chinese has meant that Pakistan is not the only bourgeois state with which they have friendly relations and which they, as a result, have to cultivate. New vistas of class-collaboration have been opened up for the Chinese bureaucracy and there are some indications that they would be prepared to eschew their previous differences with the ruling clique in India. The fact that Bhutto, who recently visited Peking as Yahya's personal envoy, was sent back without any concrete promises lends further support to the above thesis. It is of course possible that finding themselves isolated both internally and externally some elements in the Pakistan Army would be prepared to take the risk in a lunatic 'do or die' war against India. If they do so they sign the death warrant of West Pakistan as a state and lay open the path to growing instability in the sub-continent. From every possible angle the outlook for the Generals in Pakistan is extremely bleak.

#### Ceylon: An Image of the Future?

The way in which both Yahya Khan and Indira Gandhi went to the aid of Mrs Bandaranaike's reactionary regime in Ceylon against the JVP gives us one indication of what they could do if they faced similar threats in other parts of the sub-continent. If a rebellion started in West Bengal we could easily see the Indian Army moving in to crush this resistance by employing the same tactics and the same language as that used by the Pakistan Army, but at the time of writing the aim of the Indian bourgeoisie is to prevent that from happening as its effect on the rest of the sub-continent would be electric. In order to prevent this it is even prepared to go to war against the Pakistani Army. If it does the task of revolutionary Marxists will be absolutely clear, both in Bengal and the rest of the sub-continent. They must fight against national chauvinism. They must declare that this war is opposed to the interest of the toiling masses throughout the sub-continent. In Bengal, the supporters of the "Provisional Government" could, of course, fight on the side of the Indian bourgeoisie against the Pakistani Army. Revolutionary marxists must criticise this course in unequivocal terms and project a viable alternative. The situation in both parts of Bengal makes that alternative much more concrete and real today than it could have been in 1965. All revolutionaries must struggle to turn the inter-bourgeois war into a war against the bourgeoisie. If this is done the idea of a united Red Bengal would begin to turn into a reality.

Tariq Ali  
20.11.1971

#### The imbalance of power

PAKISTAN		INDIA	
\$714mn	████████████████████	Defence budget (1970-71)	████████████████████ \$1656mn
Total: 392,000 men	ARMY - 385,000 MEN	Armed forces	OF WHICH ARMY - 860,000 MEN
12	Infantry divisions	23	10 mountain divisions
2	Armoured divisions	1	
870	Guns	3000	
1100	Tanks	1450	
285	Combat aircraft	625	



The DES Consultative Document on the reorganisation of the financing of students unions is nothing less than a straightforward attempt to emasculate revolutionary activists in the colleges. The past period, in which the expansion of higher education has provoked crises both institutional and ideological in this field, has warned the bourgeoisie of the explosiveness of this sector and indicated that this technocratic reorientation is as much a political question as a technical one. The Government quite rightly recognises the big role which revolutionaries can play in mobilising radicalised students, as well as the irritation they could be in the coming confrontation with the working class over the next period. It is this role which they are out to destroy. The NUS in failing to understand the precise nature of the attack has laid the basis at its annual conference at Margate for almost certain defeat and implementation of these proposals.

In the last issue of *The Red Mole* (15th November) I sketched the genesis of the need of the bourgeoisie to alter the present structure of SU's as a necessary step in the emasculation to which I have referred. What is proposed to deal with the situation, however, is not direct state attack but a far more sophisticated attempt to integrate them into the college structures. The consultative document puts it this way: "to change the basis on which student unions are financed, and to place the responsibility for providing and maintaining union facilities on each academic institution." The advantages of this are obvious. It puts the onus for emasculating the radical students on the college authorities—a much safer bet than NUS. In the same stroke, this displaces the point of impact of the change from the national to the local level. This, it is presumably hoped, will reinforce the previously sporadic and isolated nature of student struggles in this country. At the very least it will hinder a co-ordinated response from students nationally. After the transition has been consummated the bourgeoisie could get by no matter what ranting and raving NUS did nationally, in as much as the possibility of it leading actions on the ground would be more or less non-existent once the integration had reached a certain point.

#### Financial Accountability: the first step to capitulation

Of course, the present leadership of NUS has no intention of doing any such thing. It is all in favour of sound so long as this is not accompanied by any fury. For the moment the simple message that SU's are under attack has come across to the majority of students. But this can mean all things to all men. For the Student Conservative Association this means that the wrong method has been chosen. For them a Registrar and a reliance on the courts to discipline radical students is all that is needed. Whereas the 20,000 lobbying students of last week were more concerned about the financing of clubs and societies than the threat to independent political actions of students.

The issue is by no means simply one of finance, although it is true that the document goes a long way to obscure matters in this respect. The proposals are not merely: "To encourage authorities in colleges and universities to measure the claims for student union facilities against other claims on their resources." The mere £3m out-layed to SU's out of a total budget for higher education of some £300m. should make this clear. Nor, for that matter, is the concern financial in the proposal to alter the situation whereby political payments are made from: "funds derived from compulsory subscription on purposes which would more appropriately be supported by voluntary subscription of individual students", both are mere tools in the process of removing that cover which militant students have been able to utilise in the past.

Given this, the accession made by NUS conference to the principle of financial accountability is precisely the stepping stone the government needs. Very quickly it will become apparent that this does not affect boat clubs, the militancy of rowers will then decline, and the radicalised element who were depending on these people will be demoralised and succumb to the threat of financial sanctions to limit their actions.

#### Union Autonomy: Myth or Reality?

What will happen now is that those moves by the college authorities which have already been made to blackmail students from taking independent political action by the threat of the withdrawal of finance will now be generalised. This action, therefore, is not something which will be launched at some definite point in the future. It is the strengthening of a trend which is already underway and has been for a number of years.

The view that student unions have ever been autonomous is a myth. What we did see through '67, '68 and '69 was a certain push towards a

# THE ATTACK ON STUDENTS UNIONS

## Build the liaison committee!

greater political autonomy for students in a number of directions. Part of this resulted in a greater appearance of autonomy in the local unions, reinforced by representation of students and students unions on a number of governing bodies. This, however, did nothing to alter the situation whereby student union constitutions, and amendments to them, still have to be ratified by the college authorities. And the last two years have seen a counter-offensive by the college authorities on all these fronts; an offensive, moreover, which has recently received open support by the Government in the attempts by the Privy Council to reduce student representation on almost every governing body which has come under its scrutiny. This is why the present proposals are only the strengthening of a trend: a trend, however, which has been initiated by the college authorities themselves. So far it is only the strongest authorities which have pursued this counter-offensive. The Government proposals will now strengthen the hands of the weaker elements and force them into taking some form of action against their own students.

In this context, the idea accepted by NUS, that some form of alliance can be forged with Vice Chancellors and College principals is disastrous. Although there will certainly be criticisms of this or that formulation, the general thrust of the proposals come as much from the college authorities as it does from the Government. This is stated quite clearly with regard to the universities (where most of the political activity has hitherto taken place): here the enquiry "was conducted... by the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals".

Nor should the reactionary role of this body in the discussions on the document *University Development in the Seventies* be forgotten, when it solemnly accepted for discussion such proposals as "the requirement that grant-aided students should enter specified kinds of employment for a period after graduation, which might have the effect of reducing applications". To base a strategy for fighting the Government's plans on an alliance with the college authorities would be a recipe for certain defeat. After all, the proposals to integrate student unions into these institutions is based precisely on the understanding that the college authorities will be willing partners in the implementation of the Government's plans.

At this stage, two further points also need to be made. Firstly, we reject totally the DES proposals and that position is strictly non-negotiable. We are not prepared to negotiate our political independence—on the contrary, we must fight to extend it. Already the NUS Executive have gone to the DES and sought 'clarification' on a number of questions; and they also manoeuvred a formula at the conference whereby they would be allowed to negotiate. Such moves are a dangerous concession which can only prepare the way for a future compromise. For us the meaning of these proposals is already crystal clear; there is nothing to negotiate about, for they can only be rejected in toto.

Secondly, one of the loudest calls during the struggle will undoubtedly be to 'involve the labour movement'. Such an attitude is a healthy one, for it rejects the idea of 'student power' and recognises that student struggles have only any meaning in the wider context of the class struggle. But we must be clear what we mean by this. We emphatically do not mean meetings between NUS bureaucrats and TUC bureaucrats, nor empty calls for trade union support. Unless the question is approached extremely concretely it will go no further than wishful thinking. What is first of all necessary is a political campaign which explains that the proposals are not mainly about finance but are in essence an attempt to smash the political organisation of students in support of the class struggle. In conjunction with this we must also attempt to involve in our actions those sections of the trade union movement which can be most closely involved in the struggle: the staff associations (AUT, ATTI, NUT, etc) and those workers whose servicing function is of vital importance in the running of these institutions. The experiences of North Western Poly and Norwich (involvement of staff, however half-hearted) and Reading (UPW blacking of administration mail) show that the development of such concrete links is both necessary and possible in advancing



20,000 students marched in London on November 17th against the Tory proposals

student struggles. We must try to get invitations to local trades councils and Union branch meetings to explain our case. But one should not assume that the mobilisation of the TU movement is a precondition for our success. We do not water down our politics to get support from Vic Feather or Clive Jenkins.

#### Strategy for counter-offensive

What we are being asked to endorse is a totally naive view about the growth of so called "student consciousness". Here massive involvement in low level activity on a completely non-political basis is supposed to lead to a next stage of greater understanding and involvement and more militancy. This ridiculous assumption which is canvassed by the CP of course meshes in very well with that of the right wing. For the very reason that 'being at the level of student consciousness' means doing precisely nothing, it is fully endorsed by the right wing. Hence the unprincipled bloc at conference.

This misconception stems from a reliance on a view of students as some sort of workers and the NUS as a trade union. That the CP does not even understand workers struggles is not to the point here. For, whereas workers in their day to day struggles depend precisely on the need to unite all their class, this is not true of students. Here, the nature of the struggle is such that it does not demand that the whole of the student body be involved as a precondition for success. In fact, it is more nearly the case that the mobilisation of a minority is the precondition for attracting wider layers. That is to say, the consciousness of these wider layers is only to be developed in the struggle initiated by a minority.

Our strategic aim is the preservation of the political independence of students, hence student union autonomy. WE HAVE NO ECONOMIC POWER only the ability to take political actions. It is precisely the prevention of this which is the aim of the present proposals. It has to be shown that the outcome will in fact be completely the reverse. Rather

than guaranteeing a quiet life, it should be the signal for an upsurge in student militancy. Any tactic which is based on low level activity like petitions, lobbies of parliament, representation to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors, etc. is not only certain to fail but will be counter-productive: it will be demoralising and productive of precisely that quiescence which is necessary in order to bring in these changes. The tactics recom-

mended must be the most militant right from the start. Strikes, demonstrations, nationally co-ordinated occupations are the only kind of actions which have any chance of being successful. After all it is because students have taken such actions in the past to show that they mean business that the Government is now launching its counter-offensive. Only in this way will we mobilise militant students and draw in wider layers: success is not guaranteed, but it is the only way.

#### The Liaison Committee for the Defence of Students Unions

It is for these reasons that full support should be given to the Liaison Committee established by the Left at NUS Conference. It is hoped that in the first instance this body will provide an initiative for militant action to be taken in the colleges on the proposed days of action of December 8th and January 23rd. But this will be only one stage in gaining the necessary credibility to swing behind it militants in the colleges. Far more important than this will be its role in coordinating and mobilising meaningful support for those colleges who will be in the vanguard of the struggle against their own authorities as these proposals begin to bite and give a boost to a counter-attack from these authorities. Only militant action on a sound political basis will be successful: only the Liaison Committee has the potential to begin this process. All militants must attempt to affiliate their Unions to this body—or at the very least to pledge the support of their Socialist Society. A number of Unions are already certain to affiliate. Delegates must come from every college to the conference in London on December 4th to plan intervention on December 8th.\*

*No to financial accountability!  
For total political independence!*

*Total rejection of the Government proposals!*

*No to negotiations!*

*No to 'Clarification'!*

*Fight to extend student union autonomy! No collaboration.*

*Fight for student-worker solidarity!*

—J. Clynes

\*For further details phone: 278 2616



**Peter Graham:**

**IMG holds memorial meeting**

300 militants attended a memorial meeting organised by the International Marxist Group (BSFI) on Friday 12th November, 1971, to pay tribute to our late comrade Peter Graham, who was assassinated in Dublin several weeks ago. The Chairman, Gerry Lawless, announced that the meeting was held not to weep, but to organise and that was the general tenor of the meeting. Bob Purdie spoke on behalf of the IMG, Frank Roche and Raynor Lysaght spoke on behalf of the Irish Fourth Internationalists. Both of them stressed that Peter's death had only made them even more determined to carry on his work till final victory had been achieved. Cde Roche added: "His assassins will be brought to task. We will avenge Peter. Of that we are sure." Tariq Ali spoke on behalf of the IEC of the Fourth International and said that Pete Graham was only the latest in a long line of Trotskyist martyrs; that what was important was the political ideas Peter had fought for and these must be constantly stressed. Bernadette Devlin, who had agreed to speak at the meeting and had confirmed arrangements only the day before it took place failed to turn up. No reasons were given and no questions asked. The meeting raised £230 for the comrades of the FI working in Eire.

A Peter Graham Memorial Fund has also been set up. Cdes interested in donating money or in collecting it should write to: Peter Graham Memorial Fund, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

**Gerry Roche Imprisoned**

On Tuesday, 2nd November, Gerry Roche was sentenced to four months in Brixton prison on a charge of assaulting a policeman on the August 15th demo against internment last summer. Because of the lack of arrests or police violence on the large October 31st demo, the one in August was a victory for the police: their systematic provocation was followed by 20 arrests.

Innocent of the 'crime' but a militant in the Irish Solidarity Campaign and a steward on the demo, Comrade Roche's sentence was the harshest of all. The magistrate said that four months would be enough to sober him and teach him not to take the law into his own hands. In fact Cde. Roche had been arrested after falling to the ground when the police pressed forward. He was arrested and charged as soon as he stood up again. The police fix trials so well these days that their statement took precisely 1½ minutes and they didn't bother to seriously cross-examine the defendant or his witness. As a loyal member of the bar said afterwards: "When the police want to win a case they take it to Bow Street. And being Irish too, he didn't stand a chance."



**EDITORIAL BOARD:** Tariq Ali, Dave Bailey, Robin Blackburn, J. R. Clynes, Peter Gowan, Teresa Hayter, Alan Jones, Pat Jordan, Branka Magas, Martin Meteyard, Neil Middleton, Bob Purdie, Daniel Rose.  
**DESIGN:** Dave Edmunds  
**DISTRIBUTION:** Phil Sanders

Published by Reigocrest for *The Red Mole*, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1. 01-837 6954, 01-278 2616.

Printed by F.I. Litho Ltd. (T.U.), 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1. 01-837 9987

PLEASE SEND ME *THE RED MOLE* FOR THE NEXT 6/12 MONTHS. I ENCLOSE CHEQUE/P.O./CASH FOR £1/£2.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

**THE RED MOLE, 182 PENTONVILLE ROAD, LONDON N.1. 01-837 6954, 01-278 2616.**

**FOREIGN SUBS:** Asia/Africa/Australia/N & S America: £5 per year (airmail); £3 per year (ordinary). West Europe: £3 per year.

**"It can't happen here"**

In response to the recent revelations of U.S. Defence Department sponsored research on dying cancer patients (needless to say not private fee paying patients), our own Department of Health and Social Security has issued a bland denial that a similar occurrence could happen in a British hospital.

To date some rather vague allegations have been made by Papworth that similar work has been carried out at the Royal Free and at the Hammersmith hospitals. While penetrating questions need to be put to these two powerful teaching and researching institutions, we should not forget that St. Thomas's on the South Bank has actually published defence sponsored research conducted on patients. Again, they were dying cancer patients, 10 with leukaemia and 18 with other cancers. The work was carried out by Dr. H.E. Webb a consultant neurologist at Thomas's, the Professor of Haematology G. Wetherley-Mein, Dr C.E. Gordon Smith, Director of the Microbiological Research Establishment at Porton, and a senior scientific worker also from Porton—Dolores McMahon. \* The financial acknowledgements are to the Thomas's Endowment Fund, to the Max Rayne Foundation, to the research fund of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. (Dr Gordon Smith during his professional career has commuted back and forth between LHS and Porton, he is presently at LHS again). The acknowledgements to the defence establishment and ministries for their financial support has been modestly omitted, but unless defence scientists have been given an unusual degree of freedom in carrying out collaborative research, it is reasonable to assume that there was full official backing.

Webb, a specialist in tropical viruses had found two (Lanyat and Kyasanur Forest) common to monkeys, but not to men, which had the effect of modifying cell structure. The idea was to introduce the virus to cancer patients on the off chance that this might beneficially offset the abnormal cell structures of cancer. What happened? No much, except that several of these dying people became feverish where before they were non febrile, four experienced a mild and fleeting improvement which might have been spontaneous, and 2 developed, in addition to their cancer, encephalitis—a very serious brain disease. They all died. What happened to Dr. Webb? Well, he went off to work at Porton. For obvious reasons we do not know the nature of his subsequent research, but we do know that he was a neurologist not a cancer specialist. We also know that encephalitis is part of America's Biological Armoury, and that under the Quadrupartite Agreement, Britain, the U. S., Canada, and Australia share BBW research.

The question which remains is — were the patents in hospital beds or in a defence proving ground?

\* The work is reported in the *British Medical Journal*, Vol. 1, 258-266 (1966).

**Cadre schools:**

**CADRE SCHOOLS:** "Without revolutionary theory, no revolutionary practice."

In the last two months the IMG has organised two successful cadre schools for members and sympathisers. The first school was attended by 250 comrades and discussed the following items:

- \* *The Workers Struggles in Europe and the Problems of European Capitalism.*
- \* *The colonial Revolution and the Theory of Permanent Revolution.*
- \* *The Building of the Fourth International: Its past, its present and its future.*
- \* *The main reporter at the school was Ernest Mandel.*

The most recent school was on Latin America and its purpose was to acquaint IMG and SL militants on the problems confronting our movement in that part of the world. The following aspects were discussed:

- \* *Permanent Revolution in Latin America; from the founding of the Communist International to the Cuban Revolution.*
- \* *The Trotskyist movement in Latin America: The Bolivian experience/Chile/Argentina.*
- \* *The tasks of the Fourth International in Latin America.*

The reporters were three comrades from the Latin American Commission of the Fourth International and 200 militants attended the school.

**Rhodesia sell-out finally takes place**

For the last six years now successive Labour and Tory government's have been engaged in a desperate attempt to force the white racist leader in Zimbabwe to make verbal "concessions" which would enable Britain to recognise his regime and resume trade relations directly instead of mediating them via Portugal and South Africa. Readers will remember the lengths to which Wilson went in an attempt to appease white racism. We stress this because one can expect the "outrage" which will greet the Tory success in the House of Commons from Labour M.P.'s—the same who would have welcomed a deal had Wilson and gang been in power. The policy of the Tories conforms admirably to the analysis we offered to the changes which were taking place in the political strategy of the Tories, several issues back.

In the next issue of *The Red Mole* we will deal in detail both with the problems confronting the nationalists in Zimbabwe as well as the general problem of the liberation of Africa.

**International**

Bi-monthly theoretical journal of the International Marxist Group.

*International* is a 64-page journal which analyses in detail recent developments in Britain and other parts of the world. In Britain it represents the view of the Fourth International as well as its British section.

Subs. £1 per annum; £2 airmail to Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America.

Name .....

Address .....

Occupation .....

Send to *INTERNATIONAL* Subscriptions, 182 Pentonville Road London N.1. Single copy 15p + postage.

**International Marxist Group**

British Section of the Fourth International

If you would like to be put in touch with IMG militants in your area, please fill in the form below and send it to the IMG, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

Name .....

Address .....

Occupation .....

**THE SPARTACUS LEAGUE**

revolutionary youth organisation in solidarity with Fourth International.

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

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

OCCUPATION .....

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



# B.S.C.—REDUNDANCIES—RIVER DON

The proposed hiving-off of the more profitable section of the River Don Works, Sheffield, and the eventual running-down of the remainder producing 4,500 redundancies, is only the most dramatic of BSC's 'development' plans for the Yorkshire area.

BSC is suffering from two decades of low investment; high profits in the boom period of the 50's and early 60's were made at the expense of the increasing technological backwardness of Britain's small-scale steel industry. The rapid growth in the percentage of world output enjoyed by steel plants with a more advanced technological base and much larger output capacity, particularly in West Germany and Japan, was paralleled by a steady comparative decline in output from British plants. To offset the decline in international competitiveness an increase in annual output of 9 million tons combined with a decrease in the labour force of 125,000 was projected over a ten year period. The means to achieve this streamlining of the industry was nationalisation which would facilitate a comprehensive restructuring through elimination of product duplication, the running down of traditional low profit sectors, and the rationalisation of the bulk and special steels division which provide far higher returns on capital invested. The overcompensated private steel owners could await the outcome of the Government financed £4,000,000,000 investment programme.

## World Recession in Steel

The time scale for this programme was elaborated when the world demand for steel was expanding and when the home market was able to absorb British steel production. That situation has now drastically changed. There is a world recession in steel — 5 steel plants in Lorraine are to be closed, 20,000 steel workers in Germany are on short time; Japanese plants are working well below capacity and have cut back substantially on their investment programme. America has been forced to put up high tariffs to protect its steel from lower priced, particularly Japanese im-

ports. BSC itself while working in many of its plants at only 40% capacity finds itself threatened by Japanese steel both in imports (the monthly average of between 2,000 and 5,000 tons per month over the last three years has risen sharply this year to a monthly average of 20,000 tons) and in traditional export markets like the Scandinavian countries where low-priced Japanese steel is taking over.

This world recession in steel comes at a time when British industry, its profits cut back dangerously through slow production growth, inflation, and the militant wages struggles of the late '60's, is faced with an investment crisis. The solution which the Tories have adopted is to withhold capital from low or non-profit making enterprises, to run down traditional industries like shipping, and heavy engineering and to free investment for the high profit capital intensive concerns — petrochemicals, aerospace, computers — which will provide the basis of British capitalism in the Common Market. The other side of this strategy and decisive for its success is the lowering of the share of wages in the national income, the means being massive unemployment, and legislation against working class militancy in the form of the IRA and the Social Security Act.

Under this pressure BSC has been forced to speed up its rationalisation. The extent of future investment plans is in doubt but it is clear that Davies has made it dependent on a firm commitment by the BSC to drastic cuts in the labour force and the immediate running down of low profit sectors and a number of traditionally sited steel plants. To understand how BSC hope to achieve this without serious struggles from the work force demands some knowledge of the nature of the steel industry and the principal unions.

## Reasons for Lack of Militancy

There has been little history of militancy in the steel industry. This has largely been due to the capacity of the steel firms to grant regular wage increases in the boom period of the 50's and

early 60's. This is reinforced by the peculiar manning patterns, which, with their seniority system, effectively creates an entrenched conservative labour aristocracy. Further BSC attempts to maintain a strong ideological hold over the work force through a series of company newspapers, usually covering two plants, which systematically play off different sections of the work force against each other. The divisions which operate within the work force at plant level are duplicated nationally. The flow of communication at this level is nonexistent. Orders can be switched from plant to plant to facilitate redundancies without the work force being able to intervene. (Rotherham works are at present rolling steel from Irlam works which is due to be closed.) The factors outlined above are reinforced by the nature of the principal union BISAKTA which dominates shop floor workers in the industry. There is no national delegates conference for shop floor workers; by its constitution BISAKTA is almost incapable of strike action, it actively supports redundancies and is in favour of entry into the Common Market (which itself will produce 85,000 redundancies). A further factor which makes the struggle against redundancies particularly difficult is the redundancy payments act. BISAKTA's biggest boast is the size of the redundancy payments which it has negotiated with BSC, and in Rotherham there were 1300 applicants for 600 redundancies. However this has begun to turn sour with BSC's refusal to pay compensation in the case of Park Gate Strip Mill (Rotherham) and a Department at Openshaw (Manchester).

## River Don: Problems and Weaknesses

The situation at River Don is in a number of ways different from this general picture. It is not simply a question of redundancies — a section of the works is being threatened with denationalisation and the rest with closure. Further BISAKTA is in a minority (550 members). The Shop Stewards Committee is dominated by the AEF. However, in spite of the

advantages that these considerations would seem to offer, the strategy of the shop stewards committee has played right into the hands of the BSC. It has largely been built around alternative feasibility studies and demands for an official inquiry, supported by token actions (a mass demonstration and a levy of workers in other industries). Attempts at mobilising the steel workers and engineering workers in the area for an all out solidarity struggle have been rejected in favour of efforts to persuade the capitalists of the profitability of River Don. As negotiations proceeded throughout the summer over 400 jobs were lost at the works through "wastage"; and now with the first redundancy notices handed out, (and the majority of those accepted) a "work-on" has been declared in an attempt to preserve the skilled work force while feasibility discussions continue. That a proposed overtime ban was reconsidered because BSC provided facilities for conducting the "work-on" indicates sufficiently the level of the struggle. The weakness of the shop stewards committee is increased through the antagonism which exists between the AEF and BISAKTA. A levy imposed by BISAKTA on other sections of BSC works is to be used only for the BISAKTA members who will be affected, and cooperation between the two unions is minimal.

The future of River Don is uncertain and there are indications that a complete closure of the plant may not occur. The pressure for an occupation strike, should hiving-off be decided, must be very strong, but there is little prospect at the moment of a successful struggle. For that an occupation strongly supported by solidarity strike action in the surrounding steel works would be necessary, and this in turn would mean the organisation of rank and file steel workers committees capable of leading the struggle both against the reactionary BISAKTA and the BSC. For the moment such a struggle is only beginning.

IMG Militants,  
Sheffield.

## Strike at Rolls Royce Bristol

Over 6000 manual workers at Rolls Royce Bristol have been on strike since November 1st. Last autumn an interim wage award was negotiated which provided for a wage increase if there was high inflation. In January the claim for a 15% wage increase was made. However, after Rolls Royce went 'bankrupt' earlier this year, Bristol management refused to honour this clause. After a series of Friday afternoon walkouts and a ban on overtime, the management offered £1.50. However strings attached to this agreement stated that 50p. of this award would be offset against any national settlement, and that productivity would have to be taken into account. In reply to this offer the RR workers went on strike.

Since RR went 'bankrupt' central management has been considerably strengthened. Three famous butchers, Coles of Unilever, Weinstock of GEC/AEI and Beeching, have joined the board. Local managements refusal to meet this claim is in line with a new tough national policy of RR management. 1,150 workers at Coventry have been locked out by RR and workers at E. Kilbride are still fighting on redundancies. Management seems determined not to give way on the offset clause as it hopes to use this as a precedent for future negotiations. In insisting that productivity be taken into account management has shown that it sees this dispute as a useful skirmish before the major battle when it attempts to introduce its plans for a new wage structure based on a reorganisation following huge redundancies. This new wage structure will be designed to destroy the piece work system—a system which in practice has protected the workers 'standard of living'.

## The Claimants' and Unemployed Workers' Union joins the Struggle

After the start of the strike the strike committee and the Bristol C & UWU met and jointly drafted a leaflet advising strikers how they could get maximum benefit from Social Security

Since then members of the C & UWU along with shop stewards have been present at the emergency SS office. It soon became obvious to strikers what sort of treatment they could expect from the state; the SS, by either refusing to pay benefit or by paying very small amounts, have shown that the state is not neutral, above class war, but is rather a part of the armoury of the ruling class. The law regulating

the payment of benefit to strikers has been viciously tightened up by the government as from November 4th. Income tax rebate is now counted as income and so deducted from benefit, and the amount of income to be disregarded when benefit is assessed has been lowered from £4.90 to £1. The old law whereby a striker can claim for his dependants but not for himself still stands.

The SS are refusing to make any payment at all to single strikers—unless they have been served with eviction orders—and even then the highest payment they are allowing is £4! The SS are using their 'A Code', a secret code which tells them how to 'interpret' the Social Security Act, extensively to limit the amount of benefit payable. They are operating a rent stop, a 'Two times rule' which denies strikers benefit if their last two wage packets were above a certain level. The SS are seen to be directly acting as strike breakers, happily handing out appeal forms but not money to destitute strikers. SS management have a couple of times tried unsuccessfully to evict CU members from the office, on one occasion calling the police. SS staff were much offended, and even threatened to walk out (right on!) when a CU poster which read 'SS—Social Security or Strike Smashers' was put up in the office.

## Lessons of the Strike

1. The stoppage on Friday afternoons and the ban on overtime had a very limited effect—they did disrupt weekend work and delay 'urgent' work, but they were actions broken by scab staff and they both depleted the wages of 'ancillary' workers so splitting them from those on piece work who could make up the lost half day.
2. The SS in setting up a special office which had no facilities for immediate payment, or even a telephone to contact permanent offices have cleverly engineered a situation where strikers are firstly separated from ordinary claimants, and secondly, forced to go to a permanent office if they need immediate payment (this has as yet been made to only about three strikers out of 6000!). In future strike committees and CU's must boycott these special offices.
3. The only way of getting benefit for single strikers is by collective militant action that goes beyond

appeals—occupations of permanent offices is the best tactic and will succeed when single strikers have organised themselves with this end in view.

4. Both strike committees and Claimants Unions must by any means possible publicise the strike breaking role of the SS.

As this goes to press, the workers at RR are still on strike. They can win this battle through a determined fight—no surrender. They will be helped by the tool-room strike at Coventry which will increase pressure on management. However, if they are to defeat management plans for a complete reorganisation of Rolls Royce they will first have to make stronger national links, the class traitorous leadership at Derby is a particularly big obstacle to this. Second, trade unionists will have to forge a strong and active internationalism. The aircraft industry does not recognise national boundaries any longer and will become increasingly monopolised and supra-national. There are fitters from RR Bristol working on Concorde at Toulouse—it is the lack of these international trade union links which has prevented them from coming out on strike in solidarity with their brothers in Bristol.

—A. Metcalf  
—J. Shearer  
—R. Perry

GLASGOW RED CIRCLE  
WEEKLY DISCUSSION GROUP FOR  
REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS  
IONA COMMUNITY CENTRE,  
214 CLYDE STREET  
EVERY THURSDAY AT 7.30.



# THE NON-EXISTENT FIGHT AGAINST

## Racism in the British

### T.U.C.'s Acceptance of the Immigration Act

Above the Great Russell Street entrance to the TUC headquarters in London is a larger-than-life statue of a worker, representing the TUC, helping a fallen comrade to his feet. It would have been more realistic for the TUC to have been depicted putting the boot in and if the fallen worker was a black, putting both boots in.

To put it bluntly, the trade-union leadership as a whole, not just the worthies of the TUC, is one of the main props of racism in this country. This has been recently highlighted by the fact that the Immigration Act was allowed to become law with no real opposition from the unions. Thus in the case of the Industrial Relations Act the unions did at least organise meetings, rallies, massive demonstrations, etc., though even in this case the only meaningful weapon at the disposal of the trade union movement—the General Strike—was not used. In the case of the Immigration Act, opposition didn't even get this far and was confined to mere words. Even in their demagoguery the T.U. leaders were pathetic. Their basic assumption was that the Immigration Act was nowhere near as 'important' as the Industrial Relations Act. Moreover we are here talking about an Act whose main aim is not simply to terrorise black workers as an end in itself (although it will undoubtedly accomplish this with its provisions: for their first five years in this country blacks will only be able to change their jobs with government permission; they will have to re-apply to the government every year merely to stay here and that, in any case, they can be deported if their deportation is "conducive to public good"). In spite of all this the main aim of the Act is to attack the whole of the working class by attempting to create a pool of low-paid potential black scabs whenever strikes occur. Hence the Immigration Act (IA) is of equal 'importance' as the I.R. Act.

#### Racism and the Trade-Union Leadership

Though its response to the IA is perhaps the most blatant example of the 'concern' shared by the T.U. leaders for the black workers, yet it is not the only one. The TU bureaucracies are every day either passively tolerating or actively promoting racism. One instance of this is their refusal to even mention, let alone fight, the massive wage differentials which exist between black and white workers. Thus in 1966, taking income per head as the measure, the average for Asians was 13% less than the overall population and that for West Indians 30% below. Again in its much-vaunted campaign against unemployment, the TUC makes no mention of the way in which blacks are doubly exploited in this respect, as blacks and as workers. If Vic Feather wants to forget about this he should keep away from Bradford, where blacks represent 1/10th of the potential labour force and constitute ¼ of the unemployed.

However, one of the more disgraceful aspects of the TU leaderships is the way they tolerate and promote racism within the TU movement itself:

a) The most obvious example of this is the Courtalds strike of black workers in 1965 in Preston, Lancashire. Here the total workforce was 2,400. Two workshops consisted entirely of black workers, 120 West Indians and 610 Asians. The management and the union officials (T&GWU) agreed jointly to impose on these two black departments 1½ times extra work for a certain bonus. The black workers refused, organised a sit-in and converted it into a strike. The white workers did not come out in support. The TGWU declared the strike to be unofficial. Further they stigmatised it as a 'racial' strike because, they said, only black workers were involved. The local Trades Council secretary declared: "If they don't like it here, there are plenty of trains, boats and planes to take them back." Since they were completely isolated the workers returned to work after three weeks. The management then forced all the workers, including those who had not struck, to do the extra work for their bonus.

b) Another example relates to the Qualitex factory in Burnley. Here the management trained 8 Pakistanis to operate crimping machines. The workers in the all-white crimping department refused to let the Pakistanis work there. A Mr. Ronald Tee, a crimper and a local branch committee member of the Preparatory Workers Union declared: "There are 4000 employees at the Mill, 70 of whom are Pakistanis. Many of us feel that is quite enough. We don't want our departments flooded with them." At this stage the dividing line between tolerating racism and encouraging it becomes somewhat narrow.

c) Perhaps the most classic example of racism is shown by the remark of a union official concerning a strike by blacks in protest against bad working conditions: "They do not understand that we do not go on strike. There is a cultural problem of getting them to understand our

Now we can see what Jack Jones meant when he said at a Conference on racial discrimination: "We believe in the brotherhood of Man."<sup>4</sup> What he really meant to say, perhaps, was that he believed in the brotherhood of white men.

#### Racism Structurally Part of the Working Class

To understand how racism is consolidated in the working class, it is necessary to examine not only the role of the trade-union bureaucrats, but also that of the two parties which have a certain degree of influence in the working class: the Labour Party and the Communist Party. The former still dominates the ideas of millions of workers and the latter has an organisational and an ideological hold over a few thousands of advanced workers, represented in every major industry in the country and fairly dominant in the West of Scotland. The role of these parties taken together with the role of the trade-union bureaucracies explains why racism is structurally part of the Labour movement.

Of course the precise way the structural relationship of the Labour Party, Communist Party and T.U. leadership to the working class, operates, differs in each case. In particular the LP and the CP are political parties (albeit social-democratic and Stalinist). The trade-unions, on the other hand, are the basic organisations of the workers, created to defend living standards and to lead the daily economic struggles of the class, even if with treacherous bureaucratic leaderships and lack of internal democracy. The importance of these differences is that the LP and the CP determine the consciousness of the class, they don't merely reflect it. Thus the Labour Party is one of the factors determining the extent of racism in the working class. Given the historic function of social-democracy in Britain—i.e. to preserve the capitalist system in Britain and to sell this idea to the workers it dominates—its role in encouraging racism cannot, therefore, be seen in terms of a 'sell-out'. The TU's on the other hand, being defensive organisations, are objective necessities for the class. Here though 'sell-outs' occur they are obviously not an inevitable result of T.U. organisation as such. They occur because of the politically corrupt nature of the bureaucratic leaderships of the trade-unions, and it is these bureaucracies which again are one of the factors determining the consciousness of the class. This is particularly the case as regards racism, where the TU leadership both tolerates and encourages racism within the TU movement itself.

While the CP, the LP and the TU leaderships might have different structural relationships with the class, yet the main purpose of this article is to show that racism does not exist in the abstract, but is very concretely manifested in the organisations of the class itself.

#### Racism and the Labour Party

The first point to make here is that—contrary to the progressively weaker assertions of the Labour 'left'—the support of racism by the Labour Party is nothing new. It is not a question of the LP betraying a Socialist past. It has never had a socialist past. Thus the pre-war LP was one of the staunchest supporters of the British Empire—and it later granted 'independence' to India only under the pressure of the mass movement and then only so that imperialism could convert its colonial relationship with the sub-continent into that of neo-colonialism. Again, it was Wilson who sent troops into the Irish colony.

Again many examples can be given of the way the LP has actively encouraged racism between black and white workers, e.g.

a) Role of the LP is clearly seen in respect to its part in the recent history of so-called 'immigration control'. Here the only difference between the LP and the Tories has not been over their support for control—only over its timing and over which party happened to be in office at the time. Thus when the first controls were brought in (1962) the Labour Party was in the political wilderness and Gaitskell spoke out in Parliament against them (though of course this was even then the limit of its opposition). However by 1964 when it became apparent Labour had a chance of regaining power, it stated in its election Manifesto: 'Labour accepts the number of immigrants entering the U.K. must be limited. Until a satisfactory agreement covering this can be negotiated with the Commonwealth, a Labour government will retain immigration control.'

b) Again, when LP came to power it was quite prepared to bring in its own racist legislation. Most obvious example of this is the notorious 'Kenyan Asians Act' of 1968—whose purpose was not to keep out all Kenyans, not to keep out those who had come from England to plunder Kenya. Its purpose was to keep out black Kenyans and, more particularly, those of Asian parentage

who had opted to retain their British citizenship when Kenya became 'independent' in 1963.

Now the reason why the LP supports and initiates such racist legislation is not so much that psychologically its leadership is racist (although this is probably also true). Rather it is that as a Party it is committed to maintaining capitalism—and what capitalism needs now in its crisis is a reduced work force and a racially antagonistic work force which is unable to unite against the bosses.

c) Given this basic assumption, the LP's support for racism can only be understood in class terms and not in terms of individual psychology. Yet it is one of the signs of the total bankruptcy of the LP that even within its own ranks it is racist—and even acknowledges itself to be racist. Perhaps the most startling example of this occurred in July of this year. Here the Bradford City LP refused to let a Pakistani member of the LP stand for the local Council. The National LP admitted that this was on manifestly racist grounds, but as Harry Nicholas, the party General Secretary stated, he did not propose to do anything about it as "There is a whole group involved"<sup>16</sup> In other words Labour can't attack racism as this would mean attacking itself. Another example occurred in July 1968 when Clifford Kenyan, the Labour MP for Chorley sent a letter to a Jamaican family, whose neighbours had been complaining about 'late' parties, threatening them with a House of Commons investigation(!) and telling them 'you may be required to return to the land from which you came'<sup>7</sup>. Once again, the LP did nothing about this. Indeed it could hardly do anything, as the day Kenyan wrote this letter Roy Jenkins, who was then Home Secretary, was refusing to allow Stokely Carmichael back into England because of his support for Black Power.

#### Racism and the Communist Party

In respect to racism, as in respect to everything else, the CP attempts between reformist and blatantly counter-revolutionary postures. Thus two examples can be given of the CP leadership's reformist posture.

a) The *Morning Star* (Oct. 5th 1971) proclaimed that the 'Community Relations Council should be in the forefront of the fight against the Immigration Bill'. Now the Community Relations Council was set up by the (Labour) government under its Race Relations Act 1968. The Race Relations Act was on the one hand a sop to liberal opinion. On the other hand it was actually a way of clobbering blacks even harder. Thus the criminal provisions of the Act against 'inciting racial hatred' has never been used against the Powellites and fascists—instead the only people who have been convicted under this provision have been black militants for fighting against racism and in particular against the racist police.<sup>8</sup> Therefore what the CP want is that the institutions of the bourgeois state be used to fight (or rather lead the fight!) against racism. Whereas in fact it is precisely the Capitalist State which needs racism to divide the working class.

b) Another aspect of the CP's reformism was its so-called anti-Immigration Bill demo held last month in London. The first point to note about this national mobilisation called by an organisation which claims about 30,000 members, is that it attracted something like 60 people. The only conclusions to be drawn from this is that either the CP leadership is not really concerned with racism and its rally was a deliberate sham or else today it is so organisationally (as well as ideologically) bankrupt that it is only capable of mobilising 0.002% of its membership and 0.0% of its sympathisers. In fact these conclusions are not mutually exclusive and both are correct. Again, the reformism of the CP was shown by the solution it offered as a 'cure' to racism—merely a Labour Government. Well, comrades of the CP, if you don't agree with *The Red Mole* on this point just read Lenin ("The Labour Party is not a political workers' party but a thoroughly bourgeois party"). Moreover the only way we can begin to destroy racism is to destroy the bourgeoisie—i.e. to destroy capitalism.

However, the CP is not merely a reformist outfit. It is also explicitly counter-revolutionary (as opposed to the implicit counter-revolution of its reformism). Again many examples can be given of this:

a) The Australian CP in practice supports the 'white only' immigration policy of this and previous Australian governments. The British CP leaders have never uttered one word of criticism of this.

b) Again the British CP is actually prepared to organise and participate in joint demonstrations with the National Front—i.e. with self-acknowledged racists and fascists. This occurred in the CP's anti-Common Market rally where CP members and fascists marched side by side. Indeed the *Morning Star* published a photo of the rally on its front page with the fascists' Union Jacks figuring prominently—and with one of the more prominent banners blaming Heath for 'corrupting our children' by first letting in 'wogs' and now 'wops'. The *Morning Star* made no comment on any of this—and indeed praised in general terms the attendance of so many organisations on the demo!



# AGAINST THE IMMIGRATION ACT

## Labour Movement.

The fact that the CP leadership instead of trying to smash all fascist organisations, actually joins with them on an anti-Common Market demo is in part a reflection of CP's own national chauvinism—the same chauvinism on which racism is founded. Thus the CP leadership is against the Common Market on the grounds that it will undermine the influence of 'our' Parliament—in other words what the CP wants is that only British capitalists should have control of British Capital. You cannot defend the interests of the British working class by choosing between two sets of capitalists. You can do so only by stressing the unity of the British and European workers against capitalist Europe and pose the question of a workers' Europe, i.e. a Red Europe. Since the CP does not believe in proletarian internationalism it chooses this particular phase of the decline of capitalism to pander to the worst aspects of British chauvinism.

Now the CP has not only decided to support one lot of capitalists—it has also decided to support the lot which is based exclusively on all the rotten, chauvinistic, jingoist racism with which the capitalists here so engulfed the working class, i.e. it has decided to support the 'little Englanders'. This is why it is quite natural for the Stalinists to march with the fascists and the racists.

c) One of the features of Stalinism is the way it conceals counter-revolutionary practice behind revolutionary rhetoric. As regards racism this is seen very clearly in the CP's much vaunted campaign here in respect to Angela Davis. At first sight this seems to be based on revolutionary internationalism—in fact it is just the opposite. Thus at its best it is a pretty liberal effort—the main emphasis being on *bail* for Angela Davis (why not her immediate release?) and a mass petition in the States (petitions being a typical CP manoeuvre precisely to avoid revolutionary politics, as in themselves they neither commit anyone to do anything or raise anyone's consciousness).

However, at its worst the whole Angela Davis Campaign as run by the CP in Britain is a piece of sheer opportunism, cynically calculated to direct attention away from racist attacks on blacks here. In the last issue of *The Red Mole* it was shown how the bourgeois press was only too willing to give coverage to racist frameups and murders in the States—Angela Davis, Johnathan Jackson, Rap Brown, etc. precisely because these are happening 3000 miles away. It gives hardly any coverage to similar events here—indeed its publicity of what is going on in the USA is precisely to distract attention away from here. Moreover the CP uses *exactly* the same tactic. In particular at a time it is devoting a large amount of energy to the Angela Davis Campaign it hardly ever mentions the current frame-up of the Mangrove Nine here. Indeed it plays down the frame-up. This was clearly seen at the large Angela Davis meeting, the CP held in London, which attracted over 3000 people and which occurred the week the Mangrove trial began. Some of the more noticeable features of this meeting were (a) No-one from the Mangrove was on the platform (b) the CP only eventually allowed a comrade to speak under pressure—and then he was slow hand-clapped (c) When the Black Panther paper describing the frame-up was passed to the Chairman, he said he didn't know what it was referring to (d) A £1000 was collected at the meeting—and of course the Stalinists were not prepared to offer any of this to the Mangrove Nine who desperately need it (e) Again no attempt was made to mobilise the 3,000 present in support of the Mangrove 9—through a demo outside court, etc.

Of course, revolutionary internationalists working in England, the only meaningful support we can give to Angela Davis is to help link up her struggle with the struggle of black militants and against racism here. This means giving full support to the Mangrove 9. It is just this link which the CP will not make—because to make it would put it in a position of having to fight racism here.

### THE CHANGE IN THE BOURGEOISIE'S NEED FOR A CHAUVINISTIC LABOUR MOVEMENT

Lenin wrote extensively of the effect British imperialism i.e. Britain's vast colonial possessions and monopolist position in world markets, had on the consciousness of the working class. In particular he emphasised how the bourgeoisie, through imperialism, had materially 'bought-off' sections of the working class, in particular the craft unions and the 'labour aristocracy'—i.e. it bought off these sections by giving them a share in the loot stolen from the colonial proletariat. As a consequence of this, the Labour Aristocracy identified its own interests with those of the bourgeoisie as opposed to the interests of the proletarians of the colonial countries.

However, international capitalism is today by no means at the same stage as it was 50 years ago. Thus Lenin wrote at a time of the rise of imperialism, when the bourgeoisie needed to propagate a chauvinist ideology to justify its imperialist plundering. It was then quite correct to speak of a labour aristocracy which had a definite material base for chauvinism in the loots of imperialism. Today we are in a

period of decline and crisis of imperialism. It is no longer time to speak of a labour aristocracy which is quantitatively better off materially than the rest of labour nationally and internationally. For instance, it is no longer timely to refer to the T.U. bureaucracy as a labour aristocracy in that its reactionary position is not so much determined by their relatively better material standards (which, because of the decline in British imperialism, is often marginal) instead it is determined by their whole status as bureaucrats and by their strong ideological and organisational ties to the CP and the LP.

Today we are in a situation where the British bourgeoisie, in its decline, uses racist ideology not so much to justify plundering of colonial lands—though this of course is still one use, particularly in respect to Ireland. More particularly though a threatened bourgeoisie uses racism to *divide* the working class here so as to prevent it fighting back against it in its weakened state. Indeed racism is now necessary for the bourgeoisie's own survival. This means it is no longer enough for the bourgeoisie that a part of the working class is chauvinistically antagonistic to the colonial proletariat—instead it has to ensure that the *whole* of the working class is *racially* divided here.

This is why the main purpose of this article is to see how, just as the bourgeoisie now needs to intensify racism, so also this intensification does not take place in an abstract way. One concrete way is through explicitly racist propaganda. Another way is through racist education. However, the main way is structurally through the organisations of the working class itself. Thus the question of how racism is structurally incorporated in the labour movement—and how the racism of the class is determined by its own organisations—becomes of crucial importance in a period of imperialist decline.

### IMPLICATIONS OF THE STRUCTURAL RACISM IN THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Once it is understood that racism is structurally in-built in the labour movement then certain other conclusions follow:

a) It shows the organisational hold racism has on the working class. Thus in discussing racism in the class with class conscious workers, revolutionaries are usually met with the objection that e.g. there have been many strikes where black and white workers have come out together or that, e.g. there is no racial friction in a particular factory. Against this, revolutionaries are apt to quote individual instances of racism by workers—e.g. attacks on Pakistanis, dockers marching in favour of Powell, etc. However this method of argument is meaningless. It is not a psychological question of whether some particular groups of workers are subjectively racist or not—examples can always be given either way for this. Rather the real political problem is that the working class holds allegiance to *organisations* whose role as organisations (and in the case of the TU's the leadership of such organisations) is precisely to promote racism within the class and thus mobilise it against itself.

b) From the point of view of black people, this structural racism of the working class is the reverse side of the coin of the daily attack on them by capitalism. Thus on the one hand the State attacks blacks both materially—excessive unemployment, bad housing, etc.—and physically—Mangrove 9, murder of a black by Leeds police, etc. On the other hand blacks can expect to receive no help from the labour movement and indeed is frequently attacked by that movement.

c) This again explains why blacks have formed their own organisations—such as the Black Unity and Freedom Party and the Black Panthers. It is ridiculous and non-Marxist for the Socialist Labour League<sup>9</sup> to declare that such organisations are dividing the working class and are 'class enemies'.

The working class already *is* divided. The problem is precisely *how* to get unity—and the basic prerequisite for such unity is for blacks to assert themselves. Again it is no use advising blacks to fight racism by joining their local union (which is the advice given by Mike Caffor in his IS pamphlet on racism) without at least recognising that racism has to be fought *within* the unions as well.

d) This structural implantation of racism within the working class also makes it easy to understand why opposition to the Immigration Act was so token.

Moreover the acceptance by the labour movement of the Immigration Act helps—paradoxically—to refute the argument of black organisations such as the BUFP that *fascism* already exists here. Now what fascism means is the complete destruction by the bourgeoisie of bourgeois democracy—which means the destruction not only of all organisations of the working class but also of the bourgeois parliamentary form of government itself. It is an extra-parliamentary counter-revolutionary movement. This is



what occurred with the Nazis in a period of capitalist crisis, when capitalism needed to re-assert itself. None of this though has happened here. Indeed one of the factors that revolutionaries have to take into account today, is that notwithstanding the present crisis of capitalism, bourgeois democracy is still strong precisely because the working class is still imbued with parliamentary illusions. In other words, one of the features of present day British politics is that the bourgeoisie *don't* have to resort to fascism to bring in its anti-working class measures such as the Immigration Act and the Industrial Relations Act.

The fatal mistake the German Stalinists made in the 1930's was to regard fascism as having come into existence three years before the Nazis in fact came to power. In these years the Stalinists refused to work in a united front with the social democratic Trade Unions—denouncing them as social fascists. Consequently when the Nazis did seize power the working class was totally split and divided. Now of course the BUFP has neither the political strength nor the overall political perspectives of the Stalinists. However it will make big political mistakes in its own development unless it realises that the passing of the Immigration Act and Industrial Relations Act does not mean fascism is here—and unless it does not underestimate the hold parliamentary democracy has on the class.

### BLACK OPPRESSION AND IRISH OPPRESSION

The final point to notice is the way the labour movement has played on almost analogous reactionary role as regards the question of Irish independence from British imperialism as it has in respect to the oppression of black workers. Indeed the chauvinism of the labour movement in respect to Ireland is much akin to the situation when Lenin was writing 60 years ago about the need for English socialists to campaign in favour of Irish independence. Marx, Engels and Lenin all saw that there is no chance of British workers making the revolution here unless they are prepared to break with their own bourgeoisie and support the struggle of Irish workers for self-determination. This is precisely why the IMG as Trotskyists, as Marxist-Leninists, gives unconditional support to the IRA as it leads a struggle against British imperialism in Ireland. This is in spite of the fact that as marxists we have many criticisms of both the sections of the IRA. This is exactly the same as our unconditional support for all black organisations struggling against oppression.

—S. Cohen

- 1 Became law on 28th October—with no mention from the bourgeois or revolutionary press.
- 2 Quoted in *The Position of Black People in Britain*, published by Students Union at the School of African and Oriental Studies.
- 3 Quoted on p.9 of *The Trade Union Movement & Discrimination* by the Runnymede Trust.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Many more examples can be found in *The Position of Black People in Britain*.
- 6 *The Guardian*, July 18, 1971.
- 7 *The Daily Telegraph*, July 10, 1971
- 8 *The Red Mole*, No. 32
- 9 *Workers Press*, November 6, 1971.



# The Compton Report

## how to whitewash British Imperialism

The Compton Report despite the whitewash, has lifted the rock and shown us some of the scum which wriggles around underneath the surface of British politics.

The enquiry found that prisoners in internment were

Made to stand in the "crucifixion" position against a wall, in one case for 43 hours;

Subject to a continuous monotonous electronic noise machine;

Deprived of sleep for fifty hours or more;

Forced on a diet of bread and water.

Wall torture. All eleven men whose cases are described had to spend long periods outstretched against walls, with their feet out from the wall and only their fingertips touching it. The report concludes "As regards the posture on the wall we find that the action taken to enforce this posture constituted physical ill-treatment" (para.92).

However in para 48 they attempt to justify the treatment. It requires "detainees to stand with their arms against a wall but not in a position of stress" it "provides security for detainees and guards against physical violence during the reception and search period and whenever detainees are together outside their own rooms in a holding room awaiting interrogation."

In para.64 they explain how Mr. Auld was kept in this position for 43½ hours and Mr. Clarke for 40 hours in a period of six days — presumably for their own self defence?

In para.80 they offer a quite extraordinary justification for the beating of prisoners. "We were told that in a number of instances as a result of maintaining the required posture for a considerable period an interrogated would find his hands or arms had become numb. In such cases the guards would rub the hands or swing the arms of the interrogated to restore normal feeling".

According to Compton this was not torture, but in para. 62 we are blandly told "if a detainee collapsed on the floor he was picked up by the arm-pits and placed against the wall to resume the approved posture."

**Hood Torture.** In para. 93 Compton says "the general allegations are substantiated and we consider that they constituted physical ill-treatment." However, in para. 59 we are told "we were told that in fact some complainants kept their hoods on when they could have removed them if they wished."

**Noise Torture.** They admit that this is "a form of physical ill-treatment."

**Starvation.** Para. 95 "we find physical ill-treatment in the diet of one round of bread and one pint of water every six hours for men who were being exhausted by other measures at the same time."

The main task of the Compton Report was not to find whether or not torture had taken place. Its task was to free the British government from the horns of a dilemma.

Because of the close-knit nature of society in northern Ireland, what was happening inside the internment camps was already common knowledge. This knowledge, when added to an already bitter hostility to the Unionist government in general, and to the internment policy in particular, has created such a groundswell of resentment and anger in the Catholic community that it has forced the withdrawal of all politicians claiming Catholic support from public office.

The appointment of the Catholic Dr. Newe to Faulkner's government only emphasizes this withdrawal. The British government desires to reverse this trend, in particular, there is a desire to get the SDLP, the main opposition party, to return to Stormont. A reversal of this abstentionist policy is considered crucial to the British government's policy of dividing the Catholics and attempting to isolate the Republicans from the more compliant elements. British counter-insurgency experts see this as the key to the success of their war in Ireland.



It has been well known for a long time that Gerry Fitt has been entering into negotiations to this end behind the backs of his colleagues. Had the Compton Report been a complete whitewash, it would have decreased the possibility of success for this manoeuvre.

An enquiry which told the truth however, would have so repulsed public opinion in Britain that it would have increased the pressure, already mounting, for the end of internment and the withdrawal of British troops from Ireland.

Compton's solution is to redefine the meaning of the word brutality.

In para. 105 the report says, "We consider brutality is an inhuman or savage form of cruelty, and that cruelty implies a disposition to inflict suffering, coupled with indifference to or pleasure in the victim's pain."

Thus, by their definition, brutality has nothing to do with the condition of the person who is being maltreated, it depends on the state of mind of the person inflicting the treatment.

Not since De Valera got the definition of a Republic from the Oxford Dictionary has British imperialism been so well served by a semantic play on words.

This hair splitting provides the basis for a preamble to the report by Maudling who states "the committee have found no evidence of physical brutality, still less of torture and brain washing."

Supporters in Britain of the Irish people's struggle should refuse to be drawn into these semantic discussions. Britain has no right in Ireland.

Our task is to use the increased awareness in Britain of what is happening in the Ulster torture chambers to intensify our campaign in this country for the end of internment, the withdrawal of British troops.

For this reason, we welcome the decision of the Anti-Internment League to mount a demonstration through the West End of London of **December 19th**,

**Demonstrate against torture and Internment in Ireland for the withdrawal of British troops.**  
**Sunday 19th December, 4.00 pm.**  
**Assemble Embankment, Charing Cross Tube Station.**

Sean Reed

# Defend SAOR EIRE

The war in the north of Ireland overshadows events in the south. Yet there is a struggle going on there too. The 'forcible entry' Bill recently passed in Dublin is a savage piece of legislation to beat the widespread agitation on housing. The police too are extremely active.

It is generally believed that the Lynch regime is both eager and willing to do as other Fianna Fail governments have done, and intern the IRA. The first shift of a balance of forces in their favour will allow them to launch an onslaught of the mass republican movement. Meanwhile they don't dare move.

At the moment they content themselves with picking off left wing republicans a few at a time. The latest victims are Sean Morrissey and Paddy and Joe Dillon, republican activists, and allegedly members of Saor Eire (Free Ireland) Group. The three have been on the run for eighteen months. Two of them Sean Morrissey and Joe Dillon are now charged with the murder of a policeman Richard Fallon. The third Paddy Dillon was savagely beaten by the police.

Frank Keane, another alleged member of Saor Eire recently stood trial in Dublin on the same charge of shooting the same policeman during a bank robbery last year. He was acquitted. It was widely believed before Keane's trial that he was victim of an attempted police frame up. The 'evidence' produced at the trial reinforced this view. The police witness who claimed to identify Keane proved unreliable. And evidence regarding fingerprints was easily shown to be inadequate by the standards of international forensic science. Keane was released on bail to now stand trial on a lesser charge after he had already spent over a year in jail in the shadow of the rope. (In Ireland the death penalty still exists for the killing of a policeman.)

Sean Morrissey and Joe Dillon now have to face the same ordeal. If the police are preparing to press the same charge after their experience with Frank Keane then they must count on making a better case. They will not hesitate to fabricate one. Once before they have framed Joe Dillon. Dillon was convicted of robbery on the same sort of flimsy evidence lodged recently against Keane. For example 'his' fingerprints were identified on a basis of far less points of similarity than is acceptable to Interpol. He got five years in jail. Truly Joe Dillon has no reason to have faith in green Tory justice.

Joe Dillon and Sean Morrissey believe that the police aim to try and do a better job than they managed on Frank Keane. They have issued an appeal for solidarity action to the Irish and British Left. They believe that the publicity given to Keane case in England may have had a restraining effect on the police. As militant socialist republicans who have been victimised in the past and are almost certainly being victimised now, they have a right to this solidarity.

A Morrissey-Dillon Defence Committee has been set up to give publicity and raise money for their defence.

Contact: Patrick Byrne  
 c/o 349 Alexandra Park Road,  
 London N. 22.

(Readers interested in more information related to Saor Eire, should write to THE RED MOLE for back copies in which we published both Saor Eire's manifesto and an interview with leading SE militants.)





# Striking W. Virginia miners describe mood in coal mines

The following article is reprinted from *The Militant*, weekly journal of the Socialist Workers Party in the United States.

By CALVIN GODDARD

MORGANTOWN, W. Va. — When their three-year contract expired at the end of September, 80,000 bituminous coal miners, organized in the United Mine Workers of America (UMW), shut down coal production by walking off the job. A few weeks later this correspondent came to Morgantown to talk to miners here.

Morgantown's over 4,000 shaft miners work for four companies and are divided accordingly into four locals which are part of UMW District 31, covering northern West Virginia.

William Fox, 44, began working in the mines when he was 18. Elected president of UMW Local 4043 in 1969, he has been unable to work for the past 16 months due to an on-the-job back injury. He has had two operations and has been in the hospital seven times for treatment. He was recently certified as having the first stage of black lung, which is not sufficient for compensation. One must be judged totally unable to work.

Two years ago, Fox was managing Tony Boyle's election campaign in Morgantown. However, "At this point I'm pretty well fed up with Boyle. He made promise after promise. When Boyle was here before the last election, I asked him about autonomy. He said autonomy was all right with him if the districts wanted it. But now there's a big fight over it so somebody isn't telling the truth."

About 500 miners came to Washington last spring to demand action on a government suit filed seven years ago to force Boyle to give up his stranglehold over 19 of the UMW's 25 districts which are held in trusteeship by the international. This bars nearly 170,000 UMW members from voting for their district leaders and blocks them from participating in district affairs.

"I think we were used in that election," Fox told me. "I used to be very friendly with District 31. A lot of us feel now that we should fire everybody, kick them out of these offices, and start all over again. It's taken me 26 years to see through some of this stuff."

William Fox's son Keith, 24, has been working in the mines for five years. He described what happened when the union contract expired at the end of September. "We walked out one second after midnight with the young miners leading the way. The district officials tried to keep us working an extra day by saying that our contract expired at the end of Oct. 1 instead of at the beginning. Our contract plainly says Oct. 1 and that's when we went out."

Miners have a tradition of "No contract, no work," and they ignored pleas by the coal operators to renew the contract on a day-to-day basis. The operators argued that they might as well stay on the job since there would be no raise during the wage freeze.

"Another shuffle deal that came out of the district," Keith Fox went on, "was that we've been faced with our own UMW scabs" following the walk-out. These "shop men," he explained, were brought in to maintain mine equipment during the strike. They were recently organized into the UMW and were told they could receive a pension although they contribute nothing to the Welfare and Retirement

Fund. District officials claimed that they could work during the strike because they were under some sort of special contract with an expiration date different from that of the miners.

"Five of us went down to the mine and asked the men to stop working," Keith Fox said. "The district leaders came down and gave us a lot of double-talk. They remind you of those fast-talking carnival men. They said we were on private property and could be sued. I got so mad I almost hit him. The next day, 30 of us showed up and pulled the men out. The young men aren't afraid of anybody. They just do it. They called us names—hippies and everything else—but we made sure they shut it down." Under intense pressure from the district, however, the shop men returned to the mines.

William Fox quoted what a district official told a local miner: "The trouble with you miners who want to reform this union is that you're too fat. A good long strike will bring you back in line and make you appreciate Tony [Boyle]."



Coal miners in Pennsylvania carrying out body after one of frequent mine disasters.

Fox said angrily, "It's easy for these officials to say we're too fat while they're sitting around on a full salary drinking beer all day while our men are walking the streets and not getting a dime." He was referring to the fact that the miners have received no strike benefits because Boyle has used a technicality in the union constitution as an excuse to delay any payments until at least four weeks after he officially declared a strike on Oct. 11, almost two weeks after the walkout. Busloads of miners recently went to Washington to stage protests at the union headquarters and the union-owned National Bank of Washington.

"Hearsay has it that we have \$70-million in that strike fund," said Fox. "We sent registered letters to Washington asking for application forms for strike benefits. We'll have to wait and see whether we get anything or not."

This is the first strike the UMW has officially sanctioned, although belatedly, since 1950. Contrast this with the intense struggles of the late 1930s and 1940s, which saw more than 10 national UMW strikes and walkouts.

The great rank-and-file walkout of 1943, defying a wage freeze and a no-strike pledge, defeated all attempts of the government and the union bureaucrats to make the miners sacrifice for the war, and set the stage for the powerful labor upsurge in the months immediately following the war.

Regarding the miners' share in the wealth they produce, Keith Fox remarked, "The district and big union officials are screwing us all the way. Last time, back in '68, we got \$7 a day more over three years and three cakes of soap at pay day." That wage increase has since been completely wiped out by inflation.

He predicted a settlement including \$50 a day over three years (now a maximum of \$37), a 5-day sick leave (miners get no paid sick leave at present), and a couple more days vacation (now two weeks a year). "And even this will be chopped up by the district and the management by the fine print in the contract. If we all stick together, though, we could win."

Keith Fox said bitterly, "Whenever

we get a raise, everything goes up in the stores around here. The same thing will happen again, freeze or no freeze. Why not freeze food instead of wages? It seems to me that we've got a kind of dictatorship from Nixon on down."

The Morgantown miners were generally displeased with the coverage, or rather lack of it, which the strike is getting from the media. "We've got a monopoly in this town," said John Pringle, a shop steward in Local 4043. "There's a Republican paper and a Democrat paper and both are put out by the same people, the Griers, who own limestone mines, steel mills and almost everything else around here. There's been almost a total blackout on news about the strike in the papers, the radio and the TV."

Asked what the local miners were going to do during the strike, William Fox replied, "We're organizing a mass meeting of the four locals here to try and thrash out some of this stuff we've been talking about. We invited the district officials to attend. I've been told that if I step on any toes, I'm going to get my toes chopped off. And I've only just started."

## First lessons of a big struggle

Work has started again at SEAT in Barcelona. 'Order' reigns once more, an 'order' which began to think that it would last forever, after it had, in the image of the Francoist dictatorship, stifled all movement of struggle for ten years. This order can only survive by killing: Antonio Ruiz Villalba, involved in the fighting on 18th October died several weeks ago.

The workers have gone back, without having obtained anything. But they have not been beaten; the true meaning of their victory is somewhere else, in the magnificent solidarity struggles which shook Barcelona for a fortnight, involving some 100,000 workers at the time of the General Strike on Friday 29th; and in the awareness of the strength which unity in struggle gives, and did give for the first time in action in SEAT. The workers have gone back—not in surrender but in a retreat to prepare better the next offensive.

From the construction workers' strike in September when Pedro Patino was murdered to the IME NASA strike at Pamplona when the workers built barricades in the street when charged by the police and the SEAT struggle, a large workers' vanguard is adopting the radical forms of struggle advocated by the revolutionaries.

The break with its reformist policy and its criminal legalist education shows itself even in the ranks of the PCE: in Sabadell as in Rubi, two workers' suburbs of Barcelona, our comrades of the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria have organized a solidarity campaign on a United Front basis on the basis of a leaflet of which 30,000 copies were distributed which called for the formation of self defence pickets and fighting brigades.

Paradoxically it's Bandera Roja which says that it is police provocation alongside the C.P. bureaucrats and, denounces this "call to armed insurrection" in the name of the unity of the workers' movement!

It's our comrades who have built this unity by their resolute and implacable intervention. The audience that they have acquired can be measured by the denunciations of the Franco Press, calling down thunderbolts of repression on them. Contrary to their allegations our comrades have not been the diabolical instigators of the SEAT struggle. But their intervention has had an important weight in the struggle.

In Madrid, the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria brought 300 militants out on a solidarity demonstration; in Barcelona in a fortnight our comrades distributed 200,000 leaflets in all; their militants in SEAT produced three editions of SEAT Proletario. In the Universities and workers' districts solidarity committees were formed on their initiative. Several factories struck on October 20th at their instigation.

While they are working on a pamphlet which will make a balance sheet of the struggle, they are continuing their solidarity work in support of the metal workers and miners of Asturias who are entering their second month of strike. This work on solidarity is the much more necessary since for the second time, the Asturian miners are being basely betrayed by the Polish bureaucracy, which has not hesitated to increase its coal sales to the Franco regime.

## Red Mole T-shirts

Black on red, red on white:  
£1.05 each including postage from:  
The Red Mole, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1





# The politics of I.S.

In the last issue of *The Red Mole* we printed an article by David Windsor. While this was absolutely accurate in the way it outlined the evolution of I.S., nevertheless it is not sufficient merely to make criticisms of I.S. without explaining what are the theoretical roots of its political mistakes. In the case of I.S. these may appear obscure and indeed most of those in opposition to the leadership within I.S. do not see the questions of theory on which the International Socialists are based, for example, State Capitalism, the Permanent Arms economy etc., as being relevant to the present debate over the leaderships opportunist course. If it were the case that these theoretical positions were not relevant to practice then it would indeed be a red herring to introduce them into the debate. What *Workers Fight* has unfortunately not done, is to show at all how the positions on the Soviet Union etc. are interrelated with practice. In consequence, W.F.'s criticisms appear merely sectarian and academic. It is however necessary to show how I.S.'s political practice flows from its theoretical positions.

## State Capitalism

The original defining feature of I.S. was its position that the USSR was State Capitalist. For most of its members this position is still what appears to divide them most from 'orthodox' Trotskyism. As State Capitalism is the most fundamental feature of I.S.'s politics, it can in fact be shown that all I.S.'s political mistakes flow from its incorrect methodology on this question.

The most fundamental feature of Marx's methodology is that he defines economic categories as social relations. His criticism of bourgeois economics was precisely that it saw things, for example machines, as economic categories. For example he states that "In capital-profit, or better still, capital-interest, land-rent, labour-wages . . . represented as the connection between the component parts of value and wealth in general, we have the complete mystification of the capitalist mode of production, the conversion of social relations into things." (1) He states categorically, for example, that "The existence of things qua commodities, have absolutely no connexion with their physical properties and with the material relations arising therefrom. There it is a definite social relation between men that assumes in their eyes (the bourgeois economists) the fantastic form of a relation between things." (2) Even more simply Marx states that "Economic categories are only the theoretical expressions of the abstraction of the social relations of production." (3) It is therefore clear that if we wish to determine the nature of a society we must investigate the "social relations of production" which exist within it therefore are the social production relations of capitalism?

It would not take long to prove that all the Marxist definitions of capitalism show that capitalism is a society in which all products, and in particular labour, become commodities. We could for example take Lenin's definition that "By capitalism is meant that stage of the development of commodity production at which not only the products of human labour, but human labour power itself become a commodity." (4) In an article in I.S. 41 (p. 37) Chris Harman tries to deny this by appearing to suggest that the commodity production relations can differ between modes of production. This view is however specifically rejected by Marx himself. He writes that "No matter what the basis on which products are produced which are thrown into circulation as commodities — whether the basis of the primitive community of slave production, of small peasant and petty-bourgeois, or the capitalist basis, the character of products as commodities is not altered." (5) Cliff however, in contradiction to Harman, accepts that generalised commodity production including that of labour power is the basis of capitalism. He states correctly that "Under capitalism, and only under capitalism, all, or even a majority of products, take the form of commodities." (6) What then are commodities? They 'embody' exchange value or as Marx refers to it "commodity, as universal labour-time embodied in a particular use-value (7), as 'universal labour time, i.e. the product of universal exchange' (8) or simply as "means of exchange i.e., commodities" (9) Is therefore exchange value a social relationship? Very definitely. Marx states that "exchange value is a relation between persons", (10) and exchange value of commodities is, in fact, nothing but a mutual relation of the labours of individuals." (11) and "It is a social process participated in by individuals independent of each other but the part they take in it is that of owners of commodities only. Their mutual relations are those of commodities." (12) We can therefore clearly see that exchange value is a social relation. The basis of this social relationship of exchange value is that labour is carried out independently. As Marx puts it "Objects for use only become commodities because they are products of private labours, conducted independently from each other." (13) And "only such products can become commodities with regard to each other, as results from different kinds of labour, each kind being carried on independently and for the account of private individuals." (14)

We may therefore summarise; if we wish to determine the nature of a society we must examine the social relations of production which exist within it. The generalised social relations of capitalism are those of exchange value (i.e. commodity relations). The question therefore is whether the Soviet Union is characterised by social relations of exchange value. But these social relations do not in fact exist either within the USSR or between the production relations of the USSR and those of other countries. Even the I.S. is forced to admit that. For example Cliff admits that within the USSR "one is bound to conclude that the source of the law of value (i.e., determination of the economy by exchange value) . . . is not to be found in it." (15) Harman also realises this and tries to assert that something else can play the same role. (16) Marks even goes so far as to claim this 'insight' is the fundamental theoretical 'advance' of state capitalism. (17) The reason they have to do this is of course because the social relations of exchange value do not (by I.S.'s own admission) exist in relation to the USSR. The talk of other mechanisms (social relations) is incorrect precisely because any other social relations mean a different mode of production and in the case of the USSR mean that it is not in any sense a capitalist state. Let us just repeat what Marx says again, "exchange value is a relation between persons," and "The conditions of labour, which create exchange value are social conditions of labour or conditions of social labour. Social, not in the ordinary, but in a special sense. It is a specific form of the social process" (18) That 'specific form of the social process,' that 'relation between persons' does not exist with regard to the USSR. Its social relations of production are not those of capitalism. In short, despite I.S. it is not a capitalist state. The theory of state capitalism is fundamentally methodologically wrong.

Once this point is seen the rest of the apparently curious parts of I.S.'s theory no longer appear separate and isolated but fall neatly into place. For example, why cannot I.S. have a proper theory of profit? Why in dealing with imperialism and the effect of armaments does it have to talk in terms of 'leaks' and 'drains' and not in terms of profit as every previous Marxist has done? (19) The answer is simply because 'profit' is itself a social relation derived from the social relation of exchange value. (20) If you cannot understand that exchange value is a social relation, then neither can you understand that profit is a derived social relation in Marxist terms as well. In consequence you can have no proper theory of profit, and you fall back into the curious jargon of the 'leak'. You cannot then have any real theory of imperialism.

## State Capitalism and Industrial Practice and Building the Party

So far the reader may say 'O.K.' I agree that the USSR is not state capitalist, but that is an academic question; How does it relate to practice? The answer to this lies in the fact that I.S., in order to appear credible, has to give a proof that the USSR is capitalist. It cannot do that in terms of all the social relations of production in Russia, because, as we have seen it is not possible to claim that the social relations of exchange value exist in relation to that society (i.e., either internally or in relation to relations of production in other states). The only way in which the theory can be made plausible is to forget about the social production relations of exchange value, and instead just talk of the authority relations within the factory. Here it is possible to find all sorts of abuses, and of course, in certain societies authority relations have determined the mode of production. For example Rosa Luxemburg notes that "In an economic system based on slave labour or corvee, (economic) reproduction is enforced and regulated in all details by personal relations of domination." (21) However, Rosa Luxemburg, like every other Marxist at once notes that these relations of domination (authority) are not the defining ones of capitalism. Paraphrasing Marx she writes that under capitalism, "The only social link between these producers is the act of exchange," (22) and "no social link exists between the producers other than the exchange of commodities." (23) However, I.S. in order to make its position on State Capitalism credible, and because it cannot deal with the social relations of exchange value, i.e., the real definition of capitalism, has to concentrate only on the relations of factory. (24) Thus, Cliff even describes the "social counter-revolution" counter-revolution of the five year plan in terms of the factory. (28) The reason why State capitalism cannot deal with the social relations of production is because any analysis would show that the social relations of exchange value did not exist in relation to the USSR prior to 1929 (the supposed date of social counter-revolution) and neither did they afterwards. All that can be shown, and it is of course true, is that authority relations in the factory deteriorated completely. But they had done that even before 1929.

Once State Capitalism has identified the key relation as that of the factory all the rest flows logically. It becomes clear at once why most State Capitalist groups are anarchist. Any authority easily to them becomes capitalism. State Capitalism's economic and reformist industrial practice becomes easily understandable. If the key social relation is that in the factory (so key in fact that it defines the nature of the mode of production, and hence of the society) then obviously revealing the nature of that relation is the key thing in day to day political practice. From this arises I.S.'s discussion of everything in terms of the factory — i.e., their economism (26) and their inability to comprehend the importance of propagandising on the subject of Ireland, the colonial revolution, etc. Hence also their inability to understand the national question in Ireland. Once this is established I.S.'s practice in relation

to the party and in relation to their recruiting drives, etc. falls logically into place. If the relation in the factory is the key social relation then an understanding of it must be the key aspect of political consciousness. Having political consciousness is a criteria for membership of a revolutionary organisation. Therefore, it is correct to recruit anyone who understands the factory struggle. Hence the basis of the recruiting drives and the subsequent political degeneration and bureaucracy. The position on the Labour Party soon appears as well. Obviously in our society a large number of workers do understand the authority relations of factory. Furthermore, in any struggle they learn about these types of relations quite spontaneously. Thus, the key thing is to start a struggle on any issue and political consciousness will be gained. Hence, the reformist programme for the Labour Party on which the working class may fight (unfortunately it would not gain political consciousness in the course of it). One this is established then the definition that Hallas gives to propaganda and agitation inevitably appears. The whole reforming political position now appears not as an accidental or incidental series of mistakes, but it has a complete inner consistency once the beginning false analyses are arrived at. Each stage of the argument supports every other and once the original pre-suppositions are made it is impossible to break out of the vicious circle. It is obviously impossible to deal with everything here, but those I.S. members who are prepared to think about it will soon see how the incorrect political practice fits exactly with the theoretical positions. It is these positions which completely underpin its incorrect positions on building the revolutionary party.

The conclusion is simple. Those in I.S. who see the arguments over the USSR, the colonial revolution, etc. as academic or irrelevant are one sense right. The way they have tended to be presented by *Workers Fight* they are unrelated to practice. But in fact the implications of these political positions for political practice are crucial. Once the wrong positions on the USSR, etc. are adopted then you are politically trapped. It is not possible to accept the theory of State Capitalism and reject the reformist practice. Certainly the question of how to build the party is the key one but it cannot be answered without breaking with I.S.'s theoretical positions. It is only too true in the case of I.S. that "there cannot be revolutionary practice without revolutionary theory."

J. Marshall

(1) Capital, Vol. 3, p. 830; (2) Capital, Vol. 1, p. 73; (3) Poverty of Philosophy, p. 95; (4) Lenin, "On the so-called Market Question,"; (5) Capital, Vol. 3, p. 325; (6) Cliff, Russia — A Marxist Analysis, p. 149; The quote is from Marx; (7) Critique of Political Economy, p. 50; (8) Ibid., p. 49; (9) Ibid., p. 53; (10) Ibid., p. 30; (11) Ibid., p. 31; (12) Ibid., p. 41; (13) Capital, Vol. 1, Chap. 1, cited in Mandel — Inconsistencies of State Capitalism; (14) Capital, Vol. 1, p. 49, cited Cliff Op. cit., p. 143; (15) Cliff, op. cit., p. 159; (16) Harman in "World Crisis", p. 187; (17) International Socialism 49, p. 29; (18) Critique of Political Economy, p. 26; (19) See Mandel — The Mystifications of State Capitalism; (20) See Preobrazhensky — The New Economics, pp. 196-202; (21) Rosa Luxemburg — The Accumulation of Capital, p. 33; (22) Ibid., p. 34; (23) Ibid., p. 37; (24) This is coupled by I.S. with a complete distortion of Trotsky's position on the USSR. Cliff claims that Trotsky was 'formalist' because he defined the USSR as a workers state because of nationalised property and ignored the social relations. (Cliff op. cit. p. 132). This is completely untrue. Trotsky stated clearly that "it is necessary to distinguish the real from the supposed forms of property, i.e., from juridical fictions." He then goes on to explain clearly that what he means by nationalised property is the series of social relations of a planned (i.e., non-commodity) economy. Trotsky — Writings 1935-36, p. 121; (25) Cliff, op. cit. pp. 17-20; (26) See B. Grogan — Further Developments (?) in State Capitalism, in International, Vol. 1, No. 6.

## AN OPEN LETTER TO THE COMRADES OF "WORKERS FIGHT" FROM USFI

Dear Comrades,

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International has been informed that a grouping within the I.S. group in Britain—which holds political positions in basic agreement with the FI has been threatened with expulsion from I.S. This tendency, generally known as *Workers Fight*, if expelled, would thus be faced with the problem of defining its position towards the FI and the building of a revolutionary party in Britain.

We do not wish to return to the past policy of your tendency. In any case we must remind you that the Ninth World Congress took decisions orienting all our sections towards open work. The main point which we wish to stress is that the same World Congress recognised the International Marxist Group (IMG) as the British section and called upon all FI supporters in Britain to join that section. The IMG and the Spartacus League have grown in the past period. The normal way in Britain to join the Fourth International and fight alongside it, is to join the IMG. We can easily understand that comrades who have, in the past, struggled within another organisation, with another perspective, may have some difficulty in coming to this conclusion, but nothing would be more incorrect for them than to think that the FI would be ready to change its views on this matter and be ready to work and maintain "special relations" with a new organisation in a country where it has a recognised section. On the contrary the FI would do its utmost to help comrades coming from another background to integrate themselves via the British section.

Except for the question of the old perspective of work inside I.S., we do not exactly know what are your disagreements with our organisation, be it with the FI as a whole or the IMG as its work in the British context. We invite the *Workers Fight* tendency to approach the IMG, as the British section of the FI, for immediate discussion with a view to joining the FI and helping to build its British section. The USFI would be prepared to participate in any such discussion.

The creation of a separate organisation would be both unnecessary and redundant. There could be no future for an independent organisation which claims to agree with the basic policies of the FI and yet could not be part of it. Such a group would be condemned to 'discover' differences in order to hold together, and then it would rapidly abandon the line of the Fourth International.

If the *Workers Fight* does decide to set up an independent organisation before a discussion has taken place, then the situation would be completely changed as far as we are concerned. Our experience has taught us the irrevocable logic of such a step as we have outlined above. It is necessary to speak frankly so that the position is clearly understood.

There may be, of course, differences on purely tactical questions with the line of the Fourth International and its British section; however, it would be unprincipled to justify the creation of a separate organisation for tactical reasons. Such differences should not be an obstacle to building the section together. The political discussion we are now suggesting is made precisely with complete openness as regards the tactics of building a section in Britain. Within the general line laid down by the World Congress, any member of the FI is free to argue for different tactics inside any section of the International.

We hope that you comrades of the *Workers Fight* tendency will understand that this position of ours is only the application of the norms of the functioning of the FI, as specified by the draft statutes, and that the United Secretariat is thereby trying to help you to avoid taking a wrong path and to help you to join the FI as soon as possible.

—UNITED SECRETARIAT OF THE FI.

16.11.1971

## POSTSCRIPT

Since the above declaration was made a meeting has been held between members of the Political Committee of the British Section of the Fourth International and a representative of the steering committee of the *Workers Fight* tendency of I.S. It was suggested by the representatives of the IMG that the steps towards reaching an agreement on the basis of the statement of the United Secretariat could be undertaken at once by immediately having a series of discussions to see to what extent differences existed between *Workers Fight* and the IMG. The representatives of the IMG agreed that any discussion could include the previous history of the IMG, of *Workers Fight*, of the orientation of the Fourth International in Britain, the character of the revolutionary newspaper and any other subject.

It was also stated that the representatives of the IMG were prepared to discuss, on the basis of the USFI statement, any other subject *Workers Fight* wished to raise. All these proposals for discussion have since been rejected by the representative of the *Workers Fight* steering committee and he has announced the intention of bringing out a journal in opposition to the Fourth International. Despite this the IMG will continue to operate the declaration of the Fourth International. The offer of a full political discussion remains open for the *Workers Fight* tendency as a whole right up to that point where it brings out an opposition journal to those of the Fourth International in Britain. We appeal to the comrades of *Workers Fight* to understand the inevitable logic of cutting themselves off from the International. In order to justify their independent existence they will have to invent differences with the F.I. If these differences are political they will rapidly arrive at incorrect positions. If they are tactical they will teach the basically wrong methodology of putting tactics above politics.

In any case, we find it extraordinary that an organisation which was prepared to join I.S. on the basis of 4 reformist points, refused before undertaking the task of setting up a new organisation, even to have a discussion with the Fourth International. It is a bad omen for the future of *Workers Fight*. Comrades of *Workers Fight* will, we hope, understand that the logic of sectarian politics, on which they are about to embark, is dictated not by subjective intention, but by the whole position of an organisation trying to define itself by tactical means. We hope *Workers Fight* will reconsider their position and agree to a frank discussion between the IMG and their tendency. We assure you that any discussion will be completely open on our side as regards all questions of building the Fourth International in Britain, provided only that they are within the orientation laid down at the Ninth World Congress of the Fourth International. This we are naturally unable to change, although members of *Workers Fight* would, like any other members of the F.I., be entitled to argue for a change in the decisions of any body of the International if they join the F.I.

—The Secretariat of the International Marxist Group (24.11.71)



# THE 32nd C.P. Congress

The more it changes, the more it remains the same.

The Communist Party of Great Britain held its 32nd Congress in mid-November—the pre-congress discussion in the branches and the paper which caters for party activists, had been dominated by pessimism and recrimination. Well it might have been: the party is faced with declining membership; loss of readership, and a catastrophic crisis in its youth organisation. The position is all the pronounced when it is contrasted with the dramatic growth of all the other left organisations (apart from the SLL) since the election of the 1964 Labour Government. What is more, the decline in influence takes place with a backcloth of intense class struggle and rapid growth of revolutionary ideas amongst the youth.

### The Profundities of John Gollan

If the rank and file of the party thought that this Congress would assist in overcoming this problem, Gollan, party secretary, soon disabused them: "Some argue that because we have not grown our policies must be wrong. This argument is contradictory" droned Gollan in his opening speech. He went on to say "...it is our view that the biggest single immediate factor regarding" (he may have meant 'retarding'!) "our growth is the insufficient understanding of the role of the Communist Party in the British labour movement." This extremely profound and penetrating remark was followed by re-affirmation of the general strategy of the CP: "...Socialism cannot come without a strategy for socialist revolution. A realist (!) strategy of socialist revolution as we have outlined in 'The British Road to Socialism', ..... must be based on the realities of our political situation, our labour movement, our social forces, and on the background of world developments. To the extent that a new Labour Government is compelled to carry out a left programme, to that extent imperialism and militarism would be weakened, the power of the City and the trusts loosened, the Tory Party weakened, and the power of the working class and the progressive forces increased. All this would be an advance in the direction of socialism." Bernstein and the founders of the Fabian Society couldn't have put it better.

No wonder Sid French, the leader of the pro-Kremlin opposition which postures as being left, could say "The proposals made in the executive committee's analysis contained the mixture as before. There was nothing new in them and they would give the executive *carte blanche* to weaken the marxist basis of the party".

### IRELAND: C.P. policy to the right of the *New Statesman*

There was a vigorous debate on Ireland. The executive committee's emergency resolution stopped short of calling for the immediate withdrawal of British troops. Indeed its general line was that of legitimising their presence and the power of Westminster to take political decisions in Northern Ireland. Etienne Arnholz, moving a lengthy amendment, understood this: she condemned the resolution as being vague just where it was imperative to be precise—on the question of whether Britain had a right to rule part of Ireland.

The amendment, which itself was not clear on these questions nor on the attitude British socialists should take towards the anti-imperialist struggle in Ireland, was lost by 62 votes for, 262 against and 11 abstentions. This vote was approximately the same as on other issues where the Surrey opposition challenged the leadership. However, some of the most interesting aspects of the debate on Ireland came out in the speeches of majority supporters in the debate. Jack Henry stated that British troops should only leave after there was democracy in Northern Ireland. Bernard Panter denounced talk of the withdrawal of British troops weakening British imperialism as purely adventurist, side-stepping the issue of creating a united North as a first stage. Jack Ashton claimed that the immediate withdrawal of British troops would mean the annihilation of the civil rights forces—a similar argument to that used by IS in 1969 for not calling for immediate withdrawal.

In his reply on behalf of the leadership, Jack Woddis supported and repeated these right-wing views and added, "The slogan to withdraw the British troops forthwith was unrelated to the fight to change British Government policy." Paradoxically enough, the *Morning Star* of November 18, had an editorial calling

for Labour's leaders to come out clearly for the withdrawal of British troops.

### Women's Liberation

The most lively debate was on women in society. Sensing opportunities in the women's liberation movement the leadership of the Communist Party has made somewhat of a turn away from the "sanctity of the family" line which dominated its thinking and faithfully reflected stalinist policies in the Soviet Union. Even so many of the speakers in debate on the resolution on women in society were extremely critical because of its economic approach. Beatrix Campbell received loud applause when she asked why there was no creche at the congress. The conservative hostility towards women's liberation was best illustrated when Betty Reid, well-known bairter of Trotskyism, denounced the women's liberation movement for not putting out material dealing with the welfare of children.

### Unemployment

The emergency debate on the fight against unemployment and the general discussion showed no sign whatsoever of rethinking the disastrous policy of tail-ending the TUC. No evaluation whatsoever was made of why the promising struggle against the Industrial Relations Bill fizzled out. There was hardly a critical voice even on the question of the CP's present course in relation to such struggles as UCS—on the contrary in the voting for the new executive committee Jimmy Reid came top of the poll with 381 votes (as against 331 for Gollan, for instance). This is clearly an indication that the overwhelming majority of the delegates enthusiastically endorsed the policy in relation to UCS (even the negotiations which pledge class collaboration with potential buyers).

Some of the most significant political retreats were to be gleaned from statements made in speeches rather than the rhetoric (jazzed up to sound left) of the resolutions. For instance, the party which established its credentials in large sections of the labour movement owing to its work in organising the unemployed could have statements like the following made at its congress; Kelvin Halpin, chairman of Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions, "We don't want an unemployed workers' movement, the trade unions must take responsibility for the position."

### A deepening of Reformism

Thus we see that on general strategy, on the key issues facing the left in Britain (Ireland, unemployment, the fight against the Tories) and on such questions of principle as the oppression of women, the CPGB is committed to continuing its reformist policies. On the other hand, there is no opposition within the Communist Party of importance which seems to be grappling with these problems at even the most elementary level of analysis. The pro-Kremlin opposition, based upon the Surrey district and quite strong in the YCL, provides no answer. Indeed it can be seen quite clearly that this opposition is of considerable use to Gollan and co.

The Surrey tendency gives the Gollan leadership a way of branding any opposition within the party to its present reformism as being narrow and dogmatic. Any call to give blind support to the Russians on such questions as the invasion of Czechoslovakia automatically alienates younger communists looking for a way out of the impasse. On the contrary it strengthens the hands of those, like Monty Johnstone, who would seek to take the party even farther to the right.

It is noteworthy that in this year's congress there was much less support from industrial militants for the Surrey opposition. However, it would be wrong to think that this struggle is over: the Communist Party will be in increasing trouble on the industrial front as the 'left' trade union bureaucrats make compromise after compromise, on such questions as registration. On the other hand, each development in the crisis of stalinism will hit the CP harder and harder. As younger elements are shaken loose the old guard will tend to turn in on itself and find consolation in re-affirming its faith in the Soviet Union.

### The Strength of the CP—Its Industrial Base

Despite its decline in recent years the Communist Party remains the biggest of the left organisations. When it comes to industry and the trade unions, the CPGB is in a much stronger position than all the other left groups put together. Despite these advantages the party is quite unable to play any significant role in the fight against the Tories. On the contrary, its function is essentially a negative one: through its Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions it has succeeded in

leading thousands of militants into a blind alley. The 2,000-strong rally organised by that body in autumn last year, showed the immense potential for struggle against the Tories. Had the movement that conference—and the subsequent strikes called by it—represented been given a militant leadership the Tories could have been stopped in their tracks.

Many hundreds of devoted and sincere militants remain in the Communist Party. On the main reasons for this is that the CPGB has built up in most of the important industries a network which gives militants a framework within which to fight the right-wing. In many cases, leaving the CP (and still more joining another left organisation) would isolate them from this left network. This network has its origin in the party's early days and the role it played in the thirties in the fight against unemployment. It is this industrial base plus its identification with the workers states (this is a decreasing factor because of the crisis of Stalinism) which enables the CPGB to survive despite its betrayals, somersaults of policy and outright support for the crimes of stalinism.

Only a study of the party's history and its relationship to the phenomena of the bureaucratisation of the Third International which followed on from the degeneration of the Soviet Union can explain its present policies. This approach is also necessary to understanding why the CPGB is capable of making 'left' turns. In the present context there is an identity between the line of the Communist Party and the petit bourgeois pacifist wing of the social democracy, as expressed by a section of the Labour left. This is why both the Communist Party and *Tribune* make the European Security Conference, opposition to the Common Market and recognition of East Germany the main axis of their foreign policy positions. The invasion of Czechoslovakia upset this harmony and it was the threat to this alliance which compelled the Gollan leadership to condemn the invasion.

### Comrades: Cast Away Your Soiled Shirts

The position, therefore, of those militants in the Communist Party who are in it because they see it as a vehicle for building a revolutionary party is very bleak. Nothing that happened at the 32nd Congress of the CPGB can give them much comfort. In the last analysis, although it may seem extremely daunting to leave the party and undertake the job of building the basis of a new party this is the only road open to them. The International Marxist Group though much smaller than the CPGB has shown that it is possible to combine principled revolutionary politics with fruitful day-to-day work in whole range of activities. On Ireland, Vietnam, unemployment, in Women's liberation, *in steel* and in other fields members of the CPGB and YCL find themselves working with the IMG and Spartacus League on political positions opposed to those of Gollan and co. (not to speak of French and Johnstone). After the 32nd Congress these comrades should think out their position and see if it would not be more logical for them to join in building the basis for a revolutionary party in the traditions of the CPGB of the time of Lenin and Trotsky.

*Editorial note: The Red Mole would be pleased to publish letters or articles on the issues raised in the above article by CP and YCL members.*

—Pat Jordan



C. P. LEADER JOHN GOLLAN

*Wants to turn Britain Left by an alliance with the Right*

### SPECIAL FROM RED BOOKS : TWO CLASSIC REPRINTS—

The Third International after Lenin: Leon Trotsky. Price: £1.25.

The Jewish Question: by Abram Leon (with an introduction by Ernest Germain and Nathan Weinstock). Price: £1.15.

182 Pentonville Road, London N.1. 01-837 9987.



# Unemployment in SCOTLAND

## BLACK SPOTS OF LOST JOBS

This map shows some of the main redundancies in the past fifteen months.

GRANGEMOUTH	
Geo. Peiner	30
S C W S	20

POLMONT	
W. N. Wilson	34

FALKIRK	
S G S (U K) Ltd	450

CUMBERNAULD	
Barroughs	1000
Rubery Owen	30

CALDERCRUIX	
Robert Craig	300

CLYDEBANK	
Singer	800

ALEXANDRIA	
Plessey	760

GLASGOW AREA	
U C S	3200
The Paper Industry	100
G K M	310
Brit. Food Freezers	100
K. K. Porter	170
Clyde Paper	180
Davy Ashmore	300
S C W S	180
Mavor & Coulson	80
Rolls-Royce	1600
J. T. Boyd	50
Warinite Ltd.	95
L. Sterne	150
Barclay Curle	120
Fibreglass Furn	450
Long John	150
The Baking Industry	200
Sir Wm. Arrol	60

PAISLEY & DIST	
Brown and Polson	200
A. F. Stoddart	100
India Tyre	20

IRVINE	
Ayrshire Metal	100

PRESTWICK	
Scottish Aviation	180

KILMARNOCK	
British Shoe	250
Glacier Metal	200
Massey Ferguson	830
Glenfield Eng.	66
Southhook Coll.	50

UDDINGSTON	
Ranco	400

HAMILTON	
Arch. Stevenson	240

NEWHOUSE	
Noneywell	400

BLACKBURN	
John Collier	160

LIVINGSTON	
Lee Cooper	170
Cameron Iron	350

BATHGATE	
British Leyland	600

ABERDEEN	
Ladybird	113
Mullard	69

PETERHEAD	
Grosse and Blackwell	20

DUNDEE AREA	
Joseph Modin	71
Lawside Foundry	140
N C R	1320
Jute Industries Ltd.	421
Veeder-Root	125
Tay Textiles	230
Kriller Foods	200
Low and Bonnar	25
Sweil Foods	80
Coird (Dundee) Ltd	150
W. G. Grant	300

ARBROATH	
Giddings-Lewis Fraser	280

CARNOUSTIE	
Lockwood Foods	87

TILlicOUNTRY	
Samuel Jones	81

GLENROTHES	
G E C	150
Cessna	72
Marconi-Elliot	140
Emihus Micro	140

LINLITHGOW	
Avon Paper	100

EDINBURGH	
James White	700

MUSSELBURGH	
Inveresk Paper	300

DALKEITH	
Microwave Systems	72

LEITH	
W. Crawford	250

GALASHIELS	
B E P I (Electronics)	29

BROXBURN	
Golden Wonder	130

### Day of Action?

Unemployment in Scotland has now risen to some 140,000. It promises to reach 200,000 in the not-so-distant future. These figures alone should be enough to demonstrate the need for continued militant, united action against unemployment. Further, any slackening of the pace, or downturn of the level of struggle in Scotland, must lead to a reckoning by the Tories and the employers that the time has come to put the boot in on UCS, redundancies – and, of course, the Industrial Relations Act.

The UCS struggle, even though confined within certain limits which this paper has analysed before, has awakened within the working class in Scotland an extremely high degree of political awareness on the need to fight redundancies. They have shown by their support for the work-in and for the demonstrations of a few months ago that they are prepared to back up any lead in the direction of militant action.

It is within the framework of this current situation in Scotland, that we think it necessary to write about the miserable record of the Glasgow TU bureaucracy over the 'national day of action' called for the 24th November. At the time of writing, the only demonstration organised has been that called by the Claimants' Unions of Cumbernauld, Parkhead and Clydebank. At the last meeting of the Clyde district Committee of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, the question of action on the 24th was raised: proposals from the Boilermakers and the AUEW(T & SS) for a ½ day stoppage were deferred to the executive committee. Representatives of the AEF, arguing for a 1-hour stoppage, stated flatly that any longer stoppage would prevent workers contributing to the UCS fighting fund! Finally, the Executive Committee itself called for – a one-hour stoppage.

The final decision is a ludicrous token – a drop in the ocean compared with the actions of a few months ago. Nor can the proposed 'Mass Lobby of Parliament' be expected to add much to class solidarity in the fight against redundancies. If the representatives of the working class refuse even to draw on the power of that class, let alone direct it against the right targets, then the representatives of the ruling class are not likely to give them more than a polite listening – or a repetition of the advice of Tory Chief Whip, Sir Francis Pym: "The only genuine prospect of more jobs is offered by steadier prices, moderate wage settlements and higher production."

The problem facing even the 'left' Trade Union bureaucrats is that, whilst they need the power of the workers to bargain with employers and pressurise the government, in no way are they prepared or willing to see that class involved in a movement which goes outside the bounds of purely formal protest. For they know that such a movement involves a conflict on a scale which places it outside the control of the union apparatus – and themselves. The wave of working class militancy sparked off by the UCS action is receiving no clear leadership from the Trade Union leaderships, the 'left' bureaucrats or from the Communist Party. On a day of national action against unemployment, the working class in Scotland has been confused and demobilised – and no action is being taken. It remains to be seen whether the angry protests which are already being registered by shop stewards' committees and the councils of more militant unions can be translated into concrete action a later date.