

THE WORKER



Published by the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

No 8 April 25 th 1977 3p

May Day 1977

NO ADVANCE WITHOUT MARXISM-LENINISM

WHAT has been demonstrated by the maintenance engineers at Heathrow, as by the tool room engineers at Leyland, is that there is no substitute for straightforward rejection of the social contract as an attack on trade unionism and hostile to the interests of our class. Any attempt by skilled workers to avoid the consequences of the social contract for themselves while not opposing the social contract itself on behalf of the whole organised working class can only end in confusion and frustration.

There is no question that the social contract has resulted in the erosion of differentials and the down-grading of skills. That was part of its intention in the general capitalist strategy of weakening unions like the AUEW and running down British industry by destroying skills. At Heathrow maintenance engineers on shift work found that their pay was little if any more than that of less skilled or even unskilled workers. What they really wanted was an immediate increase in their shift pay without attacking the social contract which prohibited such an increase.

To that extent the strike at Heathrow was like the strike at Longbridge, but there was a difference as well. The demand of the tool room shop stewards for special negotiating rights was against their own union since the trade union machinery for a proper fighting out of their battle in defence of their skills existed and would have been strengthened by their use of it. At Heathrow the demand of the maintenance engineers for greater participation of their shop stewards on the negotiating body for the industry, the National Joint Council for Civil Air Transport, was in furtherance of their union's policy. The AUEW National Committee had called for a change in negotiating procedure whenever the Executive Council could bring this about with the agreement of management. As it turned out Reg Birch, member of the Executive Council responsible for



Reg Birch addresses Heathrow men

civil air transport, was able to use management's mistakes in connection with the strike to bring about this agreement.

Still, it was the maintenance engineers and their shop stewards who some years before, against advice, had accepted that very NJC arrangement they now complain of - just as it was the midland engineers and their representatives who were among the strongest supporters of the social contract which the National Committee then approved by a narrow margin and will be voting on again at the beginning of May.

AUEW Executive Council member Reg Birch took up the dispute on behalf of the maintenance engineers with one hand tied behind his back because of the National Committee vote for the social contract. And then management overplayed its hand and, thinking that the AUEW was completely isolated in the dispute and therefore powerless, used the connivance of other unions on the NJC to get staff engineers to carry out maintenance in

order to break the strike. This was immediately dubbed a "Black-legs Charter" and this flagrant scabbing at the behest of management rallied support for the striking engineers from other workers, ASTMS, for example, forbidding its members to take part in the strike breaking. In this new situation the AUEW Executive member on behalf of the strikers was able to move in on management who now found that it was they who were isolated and get from them an agreement which gave the engineers everything it was possible for them to get.

But the shop stewards, like soldiers in a dugout working out some tortuous peace proposals when the battle above ground has already been decided in their favour, rejected the agreement achieved on their behalf and demanded the acceptance of their own proposals which were not half so good.

It is hard to think that shop stewards could be so puerile as to be influenced by the kind of ultra-leftists who like to pounce

HOW the working class is to advance this May Day from the position of retreat they themselves brought about when Labour came back to power in 1974 is the question for the working class.

The British working class has never lacked the will to struggle. Yet struggle by itself achieves no fundamental change except more and harder struggle in the future to secure what has been gained in the past. The oldest working class with the longest history of class struggle still seeks short cuts and an easy way out, looking for immediate gains. The future lies not in attempting to repeat the past, which is impossible, for history never repeats itself except as farce, but in striking out in a new direction.

Working class action today is invariably a combination of a desire to break the shackles of wage restraint and at the same time a shying away from outright rejection of the social contract, an enslaving derivative of the philosophy of social democracy. What we are going through is the agony of a new birth, a revolutionary consciousness to which, if it is not to be stillborn, we must be midwife. Without a revolutionary consciousness, Marxism-Leninism, there can be no advance. Re-

on other people's struggles, Perhaps they are simply inexperienced since after declaring the strike they had not even established a picket line. In any case their actions seem to reflect the behaviour of Trotskyists those darlings of the bourgeoisie for their way of turning every contradiction between workers and employers into a contradiction within the ranks of the workers themselves. Even when an agreement was reached with management which would have provided a sound basis for further struggle against the social contract, the shop stewards kept running away from the class enemy and wanting to in-

formism (social democracy of the Labour Party and all its hangers-on which decades ago may have provided some alleviation from the worst forms of capitalist distress) today is simply the mask of capitalism in decline and therefore at its most vicious.

Such a situation is not unique to Britain. Throughout the world the need for Marxism-Leninism is painfully obvious. Witness Ireland and the Middle East. The imperialist powers are driven more by fear of such revolutionary potential than anything else. Their actions are but reactions to those of the proletariat who are the principal actors on the world stage today. Callaghan told the EEC summit last month that failure to reduce unemployment will result in social upheaval. In southern Africa, where the people have but flexed their muscles, Britain and France not to mention the US and the Soviet Union are pouring "aid" into every quarter. The Soviet Union and France are sending advisors, with Britain and the US no less active. National groups lose their names and identities. They are referred to as Soviet-backed or US-backed. We have no truck with foreign-backed "national" liberation forces, only with people-backed liberation movements. The imperialist powers hope to distract the people's attention away from self reliance, ideological as well as material, without which no true liberation can be attained. Here in Britain self reliance, breaking away from social democracy, developing our own revolutionary ideology is central to our advance too.

involve themselves in an inter-union dispute about whether others on the NJC were going to endorse the settlement or not.

However, once the dust settles it has to be supposed that this example of correct Marxist-Leninist leadership in keeping the main contradiction between workers and employers clear to those in struggle and in making sure that the working class's principal weapon, their trade union, is properly used to achieve whatever is possible for a particular stage of the struggle will have its effects not only on the maintenance engineers but on all of us who still have a class war to win.



The fifth volume of the works of Mao Tse-tung has come out in China.

Games won't save NHS

SPECIALIST hospitals were given a temporary reprieve during the 1974 re-organisation of the National Health Service, until 1980. 'Rationalisation' is the current phrase now that re-organisation has exposed itself as its opposite.

Special Health Authorities under which these hospitals would be grouped, are proposed by the DHSS for such 'rationalisation'. The proposed Queen Square site would encompass the Great Ormond Street Childrens' Hospital, the National Hospitals for Nervous Diseases (Queen Square and Maida Vale), the Royal London Homeopathic Hospital, Queen Elisabeth Hospital and Tadworth Hospital. How such plans would benefit the Health Service, the Hospital secretaries (called administrators in re-organised hospitals) themselves cannot say. What they have said to the Joint Unions Committee is that they cannot give guarantees of no redundancies, nor that staff conditions would not worsen, that total bed loss would be at least 90 and responsibility for this lay with the DHSS, not them.

The JUC then wrote to Ennals stating how unacceptable this proposed situation would be to their members and patients alike and formally requested a meeting with him to 'thrash out these major problems confronting... members'. At the same time mass meetings were held and the stewards explained local management's inability to guarantee 'no redundancies', and maintained standards. Unfortunately, factions of pro and anti local management were allowed to give a floor show. Such juvenile antics may provide 'entertainment' but when the fate of another part of our NHS is dependent on united opposition to the DHSS it is sick comedy.

Administrators will be just as necessary when the NHS is under our own control - in a socialist Britain - so that if we have an NHS 'top heavy' administratively we do not demand cuts on that section but that the numbers of doctors, nurses, pharmacists, ancillaries and technicians shall be increased.

We have a responsibility as health workers, whether 'shop floor' or administrative, to resolve the parochial issues and together actively resist the government strategy of running down what is one of the world's finest health services.

Trespass to occupy?

DANGER lurking behind the proposed Criminal Trespass Bill, which still poses as a great legal reform has still not been appreciated by our class.

The Law Commission in its report proposed several changes in the Bill, proposed in the Queen's Speech last autumn. Section I of the Bill abolishes the crime of conspiring to do something legal as a crime in itself. Not exactly a momentous step, but Section II makes sure that the law is even more strengthened by making a variety of occupations which were previously considered to be civil offences into criminal offences. This means that the police have got powers to intervene immediately. And the third Section aims to limit trial by jury for certain offences on the grounds of expense.

Given that there are ample laws already on the statute book which deal with violent entry, refusal to obey injunctions and so on, one wonders why the bourgeoisie decided it needed another law. Several lawyers, after the experience of the Industrial Relations Act have expressed their doubts about the sense of more 'Inflammatory legislation' when certain powers already exist. And perhaps it is the memory of the Industrial Relations Act's defeat which is feeding the complacency in the working class, who feel that they will be able to defeat the Bill in practice rather than before it comes into effect.

But we must not belittle the importance of statute law as part of the machinery of repression. Section II of this Bill is not aimed at squatters who take over people's homes when they are away on holiday - there has never been a case of this, despite Press scares; nor is it aimed at squatters at all. It is aimed at occupation of the workplace. Its aim is to cut out vital time of waiting for a court injunction while the workers can make plans to prevent asset stripping. Occupations such as those at Plessey, the Elisabeth Garrett Anderson Hospital, Butlins, Wildt Mellor and in universities could have been more easily attacked if this law had been in effect.

Workers must mobilise to defeat this Bill before it gets on to the statute book, for it adds one more weapon to the bourgeoisie who are preparing for the counter-revolution faster than we are arming for revolution.

DEAR Editor,

Visiting the gigantic new £16 million transport interchange in Bradford at its preview opening, one could not fail to be impressed by the skills and ingenuity which had gone into its design and construction. Likewise, the array of omnibuses, spanning the 30's to current models, was further testimony to the skills possessed by the British working class that made them.

It was the High Speed Train, designed at Derby, which attracted most attention. Encapsulated in this gleaming Concorde of the railways were decades of experience in the production of high quality, safe means of transportation.

Fifty thousand visitors demonstrated the interest in and desire for efficient public transport systems.

Yet such is the contradictory and wasteful character of capitalism, that at the time such transport systems become possible, they should come under the threat of remaining a pipe-dream because of the cuts initiated by the Labour Government. Fare increases too are making public transport less accessible and long-distance travel a luxury.

Is it not a superb irony, that on the very day of the official opening of the interchange, rail

SALT on the tails of birds of prey

WHAT is behind the farce about arms limitations? A lot of fuss was obligingly created by the press and the rest of the media when the recent Carter proposals for 'arms limitations' in order to reopen SALT negotiations were rejected by the Soviet Union. Gromyko, the Soviet Foreign Minister in a Krushchovian manner shook his fist and thumped the table at an unprecedented press conference accusing the US of cheating.

That was not the first time that such a theatrical display of disagreement and tension has been enacted. The purpose of such episodes is to sow fear and desperation in the face of such 'super powers'.

The US attempt to blackmail the world by their inhumane and unnecessary atomic attack on Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of the second World War was foiled by the Soviet Union who under the leadership of Stalin, developed their own atom bomb. Barely a decade after the death of Stalin with the usurpation of power by the revisionists in the Soviet Union, this first socialist country joined the US in the game of terror and intimidation. H bombs were developed. Everyone was saturated with the devastation such bombs could cause. Krushchov boasted of a doomsday weapon just before he walked out of a well-publicised summit with Eisenhower, in Paris in 1960. Everyone was supposed to kneel and pray for those two men to make it up. The 'peace' movement gathered strength. Easter marches by the CND attracted tens of thousands. Wars of liberation were supposedly a danger to world peace and could lead to world-wide annihilation. The Vietnamese people either did not hear of those threats or did not take notice of them for they took on one of those 'super powers' with every intention of winning. China's atomic explosion was the final stroke to destroy the myth of the atom bomb for they described it as a 'paper tiger'. To the annoyance of all imperialist powers they promised never to be the first to use it.

Letters : Railway Irony

unions are holding a meeting in the city to protest against the proposed decimation of the railway network? That in the very week of its unveiling in the North, the HST and the Advanced Passenger Train should come under threat of becoming mere museum pieces because of the Labour Government's refusal to fund the capitalisation programme of British Rail?

Leeds worker

New norm

DEAR Editor,

One aspect stands out from the new pamphlet 'Albania, the most successful country in Europe', published by the New Albania Society: that socialism creates a society that cares for every member. Each worker is an asset to be developed to his or her full potential, so they might give their best. Every worker has the right to health and education and is cared for as best as possible at work. For example the pamphlet says 'Clinics are provided in the factories and special checks are given to workers in high risk jobs'. In the

Mao Tse-tung Textile Mill where the noise levels in some sections are quite high the law provides that any worker in danger of suffering is moved. In the dyeing section the workers handle dangerous chemicals and so receive higher pay, longer holidays, regular medical check ups, early retirement and frequent breaks with nourishing milk to drink. As was said 'All life is precious in Albania.'

Compare this with the situation in Britain today. Capitalism only provides for workers if forced to, and always will do as little as possible. Last week for example it was reported that the official standards set for asbestos dust levels in 1968 are inadequate and many workers die prematurely.

Enver Hoxha said in his recent report to the Albanian congress 'The slogan of our party 'All for one and one for all' has become a new norm of socialist morality. We British workers should accept nothing less than this norm as our goal. Its expression now is in revolutionary struggle against the immorality of capitalism.

Exeter worker.

The US and the Soviet Union now hope to recreate the atmosphere of fifteen years ago. Kennedy's two hemispheres idea of dividing the world between the US and the Soviet Union which was destroyed by China and Albania who insisted on socialism and independence, is today being peddled under the slogan of 'deterrence', an imperialist understanding to oppose revolution throughout the world.

The so-called arms limitation talks are intended to create the illusion of two great (call them

'super' if you wish) camps between which every country has to make a choice, a choice between one vicious imperialist power or another, equally vicious. That is the choice of slavery. In themselves the talks are a farce, and of no consequence to the world peoples, for who cares how many anti-anti submarine missiles the Soviet Union has or how many cruise missiles the US has. Wars of liberation, revolutions are not won by weapons but by people.

Heritage threatened

THE VICTORIA and Albert Museum in London is forced to abandon services to the regions and close one day a week because of the Government's expenditure cuts. The staff level is also to be reduced from 700 to 620 through early retirement and redundancy.

The director of the museum said that the reduction of staff in each department would bring about 'an irrevocable collapse of learning, scholarship and public service. These cuts are not temporary and, as far as we know at present, there is not the remotest chance of a change in fortune until at least the middle of the 1980s.'

Not only is this another part of the ruling class attack upon the skills and knowledge of the working class; it also serves to highlight the systematic destruction of our historical heritage for the sake of profit. For many years, archaeologists and historians have been fighting - often a losing battle - to preserve historic buildings and sites.

Priceless buildings with preservation orders have been demolished to make way for 'redevelopment' and the massive profits of property speculators, or deliberately allowed to decay through lack of repair, so that they can be swept away

with less public outcry.

Similarly, archaeological sites uncovered during building and construction work are all too often available for archaeological study and excavation for only a few weeks or days before they are destroyed or covered up. In many cases, because of a likelihood of delaying work, finds are not reported at all, and once again our past is destroyed for the sake of profit!

Paintings and antiques are hoarded by private collectors, and valuable treasures allowed to be exported to overseas collections, while the price of acquiring one of these objects has assumed ridiculous proportions. Even works in public museums are threatened in this way. Recently in Edinburgh, for instance, an historically valuable collection of early photographs was reported to be up for sale.

In many cases, museums have not got the funds to maintain and preserve existing collections properly, let alone extend them. Many works of art lie in cellars and warehouses because of a lack of space to display them. In the National Film Archives, because of lack of money, irreplaceable early films are in danger of deterioration and decay. Such is the short-sightedness of British capitalism.

Port Talbot men defend their skill

ELECTRICIANS, 520 strong, whose strike has closed the Port Talbot steelworks in South Wales voted overwhelmingly on April 15th to continue their struggle for proper recognition of their skills.

Two years ago these electricians who have all undergone intensive technological training submitted a claim based on skills which the BSC rejected. The present dispute was sparked off by the dismissal of five electricians who refused to operate the new £27m plant which prepares iron ore for

the blast furnace until they received a £10 increase bringing them into line with other technicians doing the same job. All 520 electricians walked out.

The BSC in choosing to close down the plant and lay off 8500 workers rather than negotiate with the men shows that capitalism really has no further interest in the future of steel-making in Britain. (See Worker Issue No. 7). The closure jeopardises other jobs in foundries and tinplate works and serves as an excuse for the BSC to import from the

continent Swedish flake and Dutch rolled coil which could perfectly well be produced here.

Despite all attempts by the BSC, local dignitaries and a Labour MP to blame the electricians for the consequences of the strike on the Government's £835m investment promise and on the livelihoods of 21 per cent of the population of West Glamorgan, the electricians know that the preservation of their skills is part of the fight for the preservation of British industry.



Port Talbot electricians discussing the strike

John Sturrock (Report)

Responsibility of AUEW National Committee

"...take arms against a sea of troubles..."

CHALLENGE or adapt. Principle or expediency? These are the choices which face the AUEW National Committee when they meet in Eastbourne at the beginning of May. Resting on the shoulders of the 52 delegates to this, the policy-making body of Britain's leading and most democratic trade union, is a great responsibility - to declare for or against continued collaboration with a dying capitalism that is fast destroying Britain. In addition, because of its pre-eminent position this responsibility is made even greater by the impact that National Committee's decision will have throughout the labour movement.

Underlying all the issues to be considered is the concept of the social contract. It is this which must be confronted squarely by National Committee in principle before AUEW members can begin to combat its effects in practice. Agreement with a policy that denies collective bargaining denies the very existence of a trade union - and it is trade unionism which must first be defended.

A practical illustration of this point concerns the much publicised position of skilled men. That the social contract with its false insistence on helping the lower paid has led not just to a cut in real wages for all workers, but to a further erosion of differentials, is well known. Recent engineering NEDDY figures confirm that the differential between average skilled grades and average semi-skilled grades is now smaller than at any time in the history of engineering. In the last ten years compared with labourers, skilled differentials

have fallen from 145 per cent in 1966, to 128 per cent in 1976 - semi-skilled differentials on the other hand have just remained constant.

What these figures illustrate are the effects on differentials of successive wage restraint policies over the last decade. Yet they also expose the self-deception of those who now say they wish to restore differentials, but without opposing the principle of wage control that is embodied in the social contract. To indulge in such evasion of a point of principle by calling for a 'stage three with flexibility' amounts to no more than saying 'let there be a social contract for others - but not for us'. Both this philosophy and its opposite, which says 'sacrifice the position of the highly skilled for the less skilled' are wrong - and in essence, are anti-trade union. The very opposite in fact of the principle of improvement of wages and conditions for all workers upon which membership of the AUEW is based.

Yet perhaps the most pernicious myth which has been peddled in the trade union movement, and which must now be exposed, is that we have endured a period of restraint to aid the government's so-called 'industrial strategy' - a strategy which its proponents claim will revive the wealth-creating capacity of engineering. Like all myths it has little basis in fact. Not only have investment and production continued at abysmally low levels since last May (lower in many sectors than during the three-day week), but profits and capital outflow from Britain have reached record levels.

So why - with this evidence before us - and with the knowledge

that wages are the primary investment in any industry - should we wish to believe that a wage freeze means anything for industry other than further decline, decay and unemployment? Contrary to the philosophy behind the decision of the 1975 recalled National Committee, who reversed a long-standing commitment to the right of collective bargaining, a decline in real wages goes hand in hand with a decline in industry. Thus the legitimate and genuine concern about the collapse of engineering as the wealth-creating heart of Britain becomes little more than a humbug if it is to be believed that acceptance of further wage cuts will lead to economic recovery. Further, it develops into blatant hypocrisy, trying to lay the blame for our economic problems on too many nurses, doctors, teachers and civil servants - and it compounds every industrial evil including increasing overtime working, which in turn exacerbates unemployment.

The whole question of unemployment, however, demands much more of National Committee than mere condemnation on paper. Firstly, because of the increase over the last year in unemployment throughout manufacturing - itself a denial of the so-called 'industrial strategy' - and secondly, because what we have begun to experience is not a temporary phenomenon, but is in addition to the absolute decline in the numbers of engineering jobs that has occurred in the last fifteen years; some half million in the last five years alone! If further proof is needed that the rate of decline in engineering is now even more rapid, we have only to take note of the following: Between 1967 and 1970 the annual 'intake of apprentices was around 25,500. In the four years 1971 to

PROFIT figures of the major building firms speak eloquently of the nature of the present crisis in the building industry and, indeed, of the whole economic direction of Britain today.

The Ready Mixed Concrete organisation recently showed a spectacular 82 per cent leap in profits to £22,940,000. Interestingly enough, while profits in Britain increased by £1.6m to £14.2m the contribution from overseas activities doubled over the year. This trend of investment abroad of money earned in Britain is all part of an overall capitalist movement of capital.

The construction group Taylor Woodrow announced 1976 profits of £20,990,000 - a record for the 16th successive year.

The Consolidated Gold Field's mining combine the British Amey Roadstone building material division stepped up its half year profit from £5.8m to £8.7m. Consolidated as a whole upped their profits from £7,160,000 to £26,920,000.

CPSA debates Contract

THE Civil and Public Services Association, the largest civil service union, meets in early May for its annual delegate conference and the main subject under consideration will be the Social Contract. The strength of feeling on this issue can be judged by the fact that over 60 branches have submitted motions in opposition to the Social Contract and for a return to free collective bargaining.

What is equally heartening is

Profits and the dole go together

Yet Department of Environment figures show that the rate of starts on new houses has slumped by 20 per cent in the past three months and is now 38 per cent below this time last year.

This is the logic of the social contract and it ought to stink in the nostrils of all workers in the industry - an industry in Britain that has more to do with the dole queue than with construction.

Youth are especially hard hit as unemployment continues to increase. From 1971 to 1976 the number of unemployed among the youth of Britain increased four fold. There are 7 million youth unemployed in the OECD countries.

the opposition to "Priestleyism", by which civil service pay has been supposed to be governed by the rates paid outside for similar work, as discovered by "pay research units". More and more, members are questioning why they should meekly stand at the back of the queue bleating for parity with other workers. As The Worker has said before, parity is at best a stick to beat a capitalist dog with. At worst it implies abject 'taillism', coasting in the slipstream of someone else's struggle. There are over 40 motions against "Priestleyism".

In fact, the CPSA has opposed the Social Contract for each of the last two years but has gone on to accept pay rises in line with it, this partly from our isolation and inexperience, and concern about our use in society. The press has been conducting a fanatical anti-civil servants' campaign, portraying us as lazy and vastly overpaid, with massive pensions on retirement. We who work in the civil service can and must give the lie to this.

Nor is our struggle helped by false left wing-right wing division in the union, with each faction trampling over the other (and the membership) in their fight for the important union posts. This is all very well, but the membership have been forgotten, cynically downgraded to 'X' number of block votes for candidates A or B. Then these so-called leaders (both left and right) complain bitterly when the members tell them where to go in the middle of a dispute.

This squabbling is not good enough. We the members must demand that conference decisions are based on our desire to unite for meaningful action. We must oust aside those who wish to further only their own narrow interests within the union and reassert our ownership of the union's structures and executive. It is we who will defeat this government's stranglehold on our pay packets and we will use our union fully in this role which was the sole reason for its creation.

No Social Contract!

Dartmoor men act

PRISON officers at Dartmoor are complaining about the appalling conditions of their living quarters. A local surveyor said some of the houses should have been condemned forty years ago and the officers estimate that £600,000 would be needed to make the houses habitable. The Home Office did not respond to petitions and complaints. So the Prison Officers' Association began a campaign of well-planned guerrilla action.

They began by banning workshop duties and other supervisory tasks, resulting in prisoners being locked up most of the day. After Home Office threats to send home 'excess' staff during the ban a meeting decided to step up action if this occurred. The Home Office then made an offer of £102,000 which was rejected by the officers who say they will accept nothing less than full improvements or new accommodation.

The campaign continues.

US and us

PRESIDENT Carter, speaking for the US Government which has used its own nuclear capacity to try to blackmail the rest of the world into submitting to the interests of US imperialism, has suddenly come out against the recycling of plutonium in connection with fast breeder reactors as adding to the dangers of nuclear proliferation. It just so happens that as one of the countries best endowed with uranium the US, unlike Britain, has no need of reprocessing and recycling.

Announcement

MAY DAY MEETING

Speaker, REG BIRCH, Chairman,
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
MARXIST-LENINIST



Not devolution - Revolution
Not social contract - Socialism



Saturday, April 30th, 7.30pm Conway Hall,
Red Lion Square, Holborn, W.C.1. (Holborn Tube)

OTHER MAY DAY MEETINGS

LIVERPOOL	May 1st	8.00 pm.	Mitre Hotel (near Tunnel entrance), Dale Street, Liverpool.
BRISTOL	May 1st	7.30 pm.	The Swan Hotel, Stokes Croft, Bristol 1
NEWCASTLE	May 1st	7.30 pm.	Bridge Hotel
HULL	May 2nd	7.30 pm.	Meeting Room No. 1, Central Library, Albion Street
LEEDS	May 2nd	7.45 pm.	Room 102, Park Lane College, Hanover Way, Leeds 3
MANCHESTER	May 2nd	7.30 pm.	Millstone Hotel, Thomas Street, Manchester 4

Not devolution - Revolution

Not social contract - socialism

May Day for Britain is like spring cleaning.

The parlous state of Britain will continue toward greater decline except workers break from passivity and inertia.

The acceptance of the social contract, no matter why, is surrender. The demand a return to free collective bargaining (as if it ever existed!) is not enough. We must work to end wage slavery and direct our efforts toward socialism.

The Government is the biggest employer. We are a capitalist state and the Government is the capitalist. Devolution is a device to divert us.

At a time when Europe is in contradiction, national governments in chaos - except for West Germany - comes the call for a European Parliamentary Government in Brussels.

And in Britain, separation - Welsh, Scots, Cornish? For us there must be no fragmentation. A united Britain of workers under the sovereignty of workers - the dictatorship of the proletariat.

By the same token: one Ireland of Irish workers.

Not common market -

British self - reliance

Students reject 'discipline'

BRISTOL University students have decided to fight harder and more effectively to defeat the University authorities' attempt to subject 26 students to internal discipline for taking part in their Student Union's recent occupation of the University administration block. The occupation was to back the demand of the Student Union that the college authorities do not implement the government's proposed 300 per cent rise in tuition fees. We are demanding that our University oppose the DES circular in fact as well as in words.

The discipline measures are seen as being directed not just against the students named, but as an attack upon the ability of the Students Union as a whole to take action to defend its members. Indeed for the National Union the situation in Bristol is seen as something of a test case, for according to the success of the discipline proceedings here, similar attacks can be expected in other colleges, as the government via the medium of college authorities, attempts to stifle any opposition to their imposition of cuts.

The response of our Students Union to the disciplinary measures has been two fold: firstly, we do not recognise the right of the university to discipline our members and are therefore in principle boycotting the disciplinary proceedings; secondly the best reply to discipline is not to be intimidated or dilly-dally in taking action, but to develop the fight against fee rises. On this note, our Union is to implement a goods picket to close down strategic parts of the university, and is organising a national demonstration of students in Bristol on May 18th. Both these actions will demand that university authorities stand by students and education and not by the government and their vicious cuts and sanctions.

Bellman Bookshop
 Revolutionary Literature
 Available from:
 155 Fortess Road,
 London, NW5

open them to intimidation forever in the future.

Teachers' boycott of dinner money will force the Authority to employ more school clerical staff or give every child a free dinner. Boycott of midday supervision will force the employment of more ancillary staff.

The attack on school meals has woken Hull teachers to the limitations of fighting on staffing alone. Victory appeared to be won, only to be followed by another battle. Cuts in capitulation have been increased from 20 per cent to 25 per cent. After a thoughtful debate, Hull NUT has decided by an overwhelming majority to apply to Humber-side Division NUT and the National Action Committee for approval to operate sanctions against all the £1½ million cuts for 1977/78.

Hull NUT defends '68 pact

SANCTIONS action by the teachers' unions has forced Humber-side County Council to withdraw its cuts of 287 jobs. But, to extract a pound of flesh in revenge, the Authority has decreed a reduction to a third in each school of teachers taking meals without payment.

The reaction of Hull National Union of Teachers has been swift and sure - an instruction to members not to do midday supervision nor to collect dinner money. Leaving the decision to 'individual choice' was rejected in face of the clear need for collective union action. It is the Authority which is threatening to wreck the meals service, which declares that school activities must go by the board. The NUT is determined to maintain the standard of education provided to pupils.

Humber-side Authority is unilaterally breaking the 1968 National School Meals Agreement, hoping that teachers will acquiesce in this erosion of their conditions in return for 'saving jobs'. Teachers, to their credit, are seeing through this Mafia blackmail. They know that to give in on school meals, would

'THE WORKER' 155 FORTESS ROAD, LONDON NW5
 £2.50 per year (including postage)

NAME.....
 ADDRESS.....



A section of the NUT Conference

Andrew Wiard (Report)

Teachers on brink of dramatic step

TEACHERS were on the verge of a revolutionary step at their Annual Conference held at Eastbourne over Easter. Finally after a close decision this sovereign body of the National Union of Teachers withdrew from a proposal to take action on classes of more than 30.

Nonetheless a cautious step forward has been made. The Union will give support to members who refuse to teach classes above a maximum number which has yet to be deter-

mined, but will be less than 35. Members of the union must decide in the schools what this figure should be, then inform their officials and get action on the matter.

The Conference united on an issue which has split the union for some time. Delegates decided rashly three years ago to accept extra payments for teachers in schools in depressed areas. This divisive policy has been fought against within the union since its adoption. Now the

union is to seek to have these payments phased out.

A crucial item on the agenda was that of the "Social Contract". The union after much debate came out in favour of adopting a "Phase III" of the Labour government's pay restraint policy. The stark realities of the situation were clearly put before Conference by those delegates opposing the "Contract". Yet, Conference decided to stick by the TUC-Government axis for a further year.