



The
Economic
League

THE AGITATORS

WHO THEY ARE

HOW THEY WORK

WHAT THEY WANT

THE AGITATORS

Extremist Activities in British Industry



Published by
THE ECONOMIC LEAGUE LIMITED
(Central Council)

First Floor, Asphalte House, Palace Street,
London, SW1E 5HQ. Telephone : 01-834 0034

THE AGITATORS

CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1 — When good men do nothing	1
Chapter 2 — The Communist "Industrial Apparatus" ...	7
Chapter 3 — Communist Power through Parliament ...	16
Chapter 4 — Planning for Chaos	22
Chapter 5 — The International Socialists	34
Chapter 6 — Trotskyists and Maoists	47
Chapter 7 — Combating Subversion	60
Appendix — Extremist Organisations	71
Economic League Area Directory	75

CHAPTER I

WHEN GOOD MEN DO NOTHING

"The menace of Communist infiltration (not only in the unions) is much graver than any politician has yet publicly avowed."

This was said on February 25, 1974 by Mr. Francis Noel-Baker, writing as he put it "after some 30 years as a member of the Labour Party, many of them spent as a Labour MP". He feared that, in conditions of economic chaos, "the collapse of parliamentary government is a real possibility". His statement brings to mind the maxim attributed to Edmund Burke: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing".

We can get some comfort at least from the fact that during the past few years a lot of good men have done something to oppose subversion, but all too often their opposition has been directed at specific situations such as revolutionary involvement in major strikes.

By contrast the Communists and other revolutionaries have continuously and relentlessly pursued their aim of achieving a complete takeover of this country without the formality of winning the support of the British people at a general election.

Whilst many of the "good men" have valiantly fought "battles" the subversives have been waging a total war.

One man who understood the real problem better than most was the late Lord Carron. Speaking in 1967 as president of the engineers' union, he described major strikes then afflicting the nation as "hammer blows at our very existence as a trading nation" which were not just senseless but "quite deliberately intended". He went on:

"Surely it does not require a genius to see the linkage between

events divorced in geographical location but identical in nature and expression.

"The docks, building sites and other spheres of activity all bear the same stamp and have the same origin.

"This situation will continue and get worse so long as those in authority continue to bury their heads in the sand and refuse to face the realities of this accelerating development of peace-time fifth-column activities." (Our emphasis).

The last paragraph can fairly be described as prophetic. Since then too many people have buried their heads in the sand and the development of subversion has accelerated so fast that it endangers our national economy and constitutes a threat to freedom itself.

Despite authoritative warnings sounded by people with detailed knowledge, much of it based on personal experience of the subversive threat, there are still men and women in positions of authority who remain unconvinced.

Some fall into the trap of judging the Communist Party by counting the heads of its card-holding members and the number of votes given to official Party candidates at a general election. On such an assessment the Communist Party is presented as insignificant as a political entity. At the beginning of 1974 its membership was around 30,000 and its 44 candidates in the February General Election of that year polled 32,771 votes.

But, as will be shown in a later chapter, this criterion is so misleading that the complacency it engenders actually helps the Communists successfully to implement their real strategy for power.

Faced with their inability to build a mass revolutionary party the Communists have a simple, yet well thought out plan, which involves capturing the trade unions and using their industrial and political strength as a stepping stone to power.

In this endeavour their success is in notable contrast to their dismal failures at local and national elections. For instance, they

and their supporters hold positions of immense influence in key unions such as the mineworkers' and the engineers'. The threat is obvious. We depend largely on coal as a source of energy for our industrial and domestic lives and a large proportion of our vital exports are produced in the engineering and allied industries.

There is another complacency-producing school of thought. Those who support it regard agitators—even those who belong to revolutionary groups—as people who simply "fish in troubled waters".

This attitude is all the more dangerous because it contains a basic and important truth. It is a fact that subversives are adept at exploiting grievances and taking advantage of difficult industrial and economic situations. It follows that the more troubled the waters are, the more effectively the subversives can operate.

It is frequently overlooked, however, that the "fishermen" are well trained, heavily financed and that their fishing is organised and directed by men and women with vast experience of class warfare.

Nor should we underrate their ability to disturb waters that would otherwise be calm. It is not a coincidence that extremists will almost invariably be found in positions of influence at places of work which gain an unenviable reputation as "trouble spots".

Those who doubt this should ask why over a period of years strikes have occurred in certain dock areas, factories and building sites while workers elsewhere, operating under almost exactly similar circumstances, are content to have their problems settled by peaceful negotiations.

An outstanding example occurred when the decasualisation system was introduced in the docks. The vast majority of dock workers operated normally and the strike against the new system was centred on one sector of the London docks. This happened to be a stronghold of the Communist-led "liaison committee", the body that organised the stoppage.

Here is another case. During an inquiry into the strikes affecting a large motor company which had at that time 15 factories in Britain, it was revealed that at 14 of them strikes hardly ever happened. The fifteenth factory, however, was constantly plagued

by unofficial stoppages. Yet in all these factories the same management policies and union agreements applied. The difference was that at the strike-prone factory, there was a Communist-led subversive group directed from outside.

Here is a third case. In the building industry it is normal for large firms to undertake several projects simultaneously. Why is it that under these circumstances one of their sites becomes strike-prone? An obvious example was the year-long stoppage at the Barbican site which was investigated by a Court of Inquiry. It found that a Communist-controlled unofficial committee had played an "active and mischievous part" in the events leading to the shut-down. It had heard "uncontradicted evidence" that this committee had been deliberately subversive, not only of good labour relations on the site, but of the authority and influence of the unions concerned.

Extremist-provoked troubles at plant level have resulted in a greater awareness among employers that all subversive agitators are not card-holding members of the Communist Party.

Many industrialists are of course aware that Communist influence at top level in some important unions has grown and they fully understand the potential danger arising from this situation. But experience has taught that this is not the only problem of subversion now facing British industry.

The "Sunday Telegraph" of February 24, 1974, carried an article based largely on the views of experienced industrial relations directors. They were concerned about the growth of extremism engendered by local revolutionaries active among shop floor workers and as one of them put it:

"National officials are often forced to adopt a more militant stance than they'd like, to please the local activists and to hang onto their members."

He added that there was a real danger of the situation becoming even worse if the International Socialists increased its power and got "into the act". In some sectors of industry the International Socialists (often referred to as the IS) is already in the act and during 1973 and the early stages of 1974 it formulated and implemented plans to increase its power in important industries and in the unions, particularly at rank-and-file level.

The same is true of other extremist groups such as the Workers Revolutionary Party, the International Marxist Group and the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist).

There is another factor that is not as well understood as it should be. Nowadays subversion is not confined to "traditional" industrial areas such as transport, engineering, coal and electricity supply.

Both the geographical and occupational dimensions within which organised subversive groups operate have been expanded in recent years. In the past they concentrated mainly on such areas as London, the North-West, Scotland and the Midlands whereas now they operate nationally. There is no such thing as an industrial centre completely untouched by their activities.

Similarly organised groups have been set up in such occupational sectors as social workers, civil servants, hospital workers, local government officers, post office workers, steel workers, teachers (including those in technical institutions), the mass media, the entertainment industry and students.

In some cases the Communists are the dominant factor. In many cases, however, it is such groups as the International Socialists that hold the controlling positions. Most of the revolutionary groups using industry as a class war battleground have based their organisation and their tactics on the pattern established by the Communist Party.

The late Les Cannon knew, from personal experience gained inside the Party, exactly how the Communists work. It is worth recalling that in 1967 he posed the question: "Do the activities of Communist groups constitute a 'plot'?" and commented:

"If by this one means do the Communists on a given job, in an industry, or a trade union, regularly meet to discuss tactics whether it be to move a resolution, to begin a strike, or to keep a strike going, the answer is unequivocally yes!"

Mr. Cannon added that the doubters would perhaps be satisfied were they invited to attend meetings held by Communist Party Advisory Committees where "tactics in disputes are discussed in meticulous detail".

One of the important points he made was that the prerequisite of countering subversive activities was to "recognise in the first place that these **organised attempts** to subvert the authority of the trade union movement are actually taking place". (Original emphasis).

This is undoubtedly true but recognition can only come through knowledge. The purpose of this booklet is to provide such knowledge.

To combat the operations of revolutionary groups it is necessary to identify them and to understand the circumstances under which they can operate successfully. Every effort must then be made to remove these circumstances. The great need of today is for men of calibre and courage who are prepared not just to stand up and be counted, but to speak and act against those who avowedly seek to use industry and the unions as stepping stones to an extremist takeover of this country.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMUNIST "INDUSTRIAL APPARATUS"

There are many people who dismiss the idea that Communists can decisively influence industrial disputes on the grounds that Party members are usually out-numbered on the union executives or strike committees involved.

Yet events here and in other parts of the world are repeatedly reminding us of the damage that can be done by determined and organised minorities. There are for instance no reported cases of a jumbo jet being hijacked with the support and approval of its passengers!

One of the best demolition jobs on the "only a minority" argument was that done by Prime Minister Harold Wilson when in 1966 his Labour Government was "blown off course" by the seamen's strike.

With unrivalled sources of information open to him as Prime Minister plus personal experience gained in dealing with the individuals concerned, he had no hesitation in exposing in Parliament the part played in the strike by "an efficient and disciplined industrial apparatus controlled from Communist Party headquarters".

Mr. Wilson added that "No major strike occurs anywhere in this country in any sector of industry in which that apparatus fails to concern itself". Further, that professional officers of the Communist Party were "ready to operate in any situation where industrial troubles are developing".

Speaking in the House of Commons on June 20, 1966, Mr. Wilson stated, with what he described as good reason, that for some time a few individuals had brought pressure to bear on a select few on the Executive Council of the National Union of

Seamen, who in turn had been able to dominate the majority of that otherwise sturdy union. He went on :

" It is difficult for us to appreciate the pressures which are being put on men I know to be realistic and reasonable, not only in their executive capacity but in the highly organised strike committees in the individual ports, by this tightly knit group of politically motivated men who, as the last General Election showed, utterly failed to secure acceptance of their views by the British electorate, but who are now determined to exercise back stage pressures, forcing great hardship on the members of the union and their families, and endangering the security of the industry and the economic welfare of the nation."

On June 28, again speaking in the House of Commons, the Prime Minister stated that the objectives of the Communist Party were not concerned solely with improving the conditions of seamen. The aim was to influence the day-to-day policy of the Executive Council, to extend the area of the stoppage and, he emphasised,

" to secure what is at present the main political and industrial objective of the Communist Party—the destruction of the Government's prices and incomes policy "

He explained in detail how the Communists had exercised control of the Union's Executive Council through two men, neither of whom was at the time a card-holding member of the Communist Party although one of them, Joe Kenny, subsequently joined. Mr. Wilson said :

" I need no evidence, other than my eyes and ears, to recognise that those two have dominated the executive council throughout the negotiations. Again, they were predominant in the executive council's brusque and unanimous rejection of the appeal my right hon. Friend the Minister of Labour and I made to the executive council a week last Friday."

Summing up the result of this dominance he observed that at the time of the dispute the Communist Party's objectives rapidly became the policy of the National Union of Seamen Executive Council.

It is fair to say that when Mr. Wilson factually described and courageously condemned the Communist role in a strike that hit our national economy and did nothing to enhance Britain's reputation abroad, he was not overwhelmed with support from his opponents within and outside the Labour Party. Nor can the attitude of some leaders of the TUC be described as enthusiastic.

He discovered something that the Economic League has always known—that there are easier ways of winning popularity than carrying out the vitally necessary task of exposing subversion.

Maybe this was one of the reasons why some of those who were far-sighted enough to see the danger in 1966 became strangely myopic when faced with a much more menacing situation brought about by the miners' dispute in late 1973 and early 1974.

Consider the essential difference between the two situations. At the time of the seamen's strike there were no avowed Communists on the 48-strong executive of the National Union of Seamen.

By contrast, there were six avowed Communists plus five extreme Left wingers on the 27-strong executive of the National Union of Mineworkers. Two of them, Mick McGahey and Joe Whelan, were also members of the Communist Party's National Executive Committee. More than this, the Communists made no secret of their ambition to use major industrial disputes not only to destroy a prices and incomes policy, but to bring the Government down. This was made clear in the first directive issued in 1973 from Communist Party headquarters.

The strategy outlined by John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party, at a meeting of its Executive Committee held during the weekend January 13/14 was quite explicit. First he claimed with justification that the Communists had played a big part in the strikes that damaged this country in 1972, particularly in the mines, the docks and the building industry.

He contrasted with pride the "mass leadership" given by the Party with what he described as the "classic, cowardly role" of "Right Wing" Labour leaders and then declared that :

" The scale of mass action in 1973 must be greater than in 1972 and lay the basis for bringing down the Tory Government "

Following this directive there was a concentration on the mining industry. Immediately after the conference of the Scottish National Union of Mineworkers on January 22, 1973, Mick McGahey, the area President, said that an intensive pithead campaign would begin immediately to gear miners for the wages struggle. He stated :

" The lessons of the last year have shown that only massive industrial action can defeat the Tory Government. This will be the lesson of 1973 "

As part of the campaign McGahey urged all miners to support the "Morning Star" (the Communist daily newspaper) financially and to increase its sales in the coal fields.

On January 25 Joe Whelan (who it will be recalled sits with McGahey on the Communist Party's National Executive) urged the miners to vote for industrial action to win their full pay claim and declared it to be time for the " TUC General Council members to get off their backsides and do the job they're paid to do, by calling a special congress to mobilise the whole movement to take industrial action in order to force a General Election "

The original intention was to get the plan off the ground in the spring of 1973 and to gear it to the pay claim lodged by the miners at that time.

When—in conformity with its rules—the National Union of Mineworkers ordered a ballot of all members, all the revolutionary groups participated in a massive propaganda campaign in the coal-fields aimed at bringing the industry and ultimately the country to a standstill.

McGahey was so confident of the outcome that, according to the "Morning Star", he was already issuing instructions that " picket duty would again involve power stations as well as coal stocks ". He had in fact misjudged the mood of the miners and

his instructions proved to be premature. A substantial majority voted against a strike—a result described by Bill McLean, General Secretary of the Scottish National Union of Mineworkers and a Communist Party member, as a "terrific set-back".

It was, however, nothing more than that and it affected only the timing of the Communist plan. By July another miners' pay claim, master-minded by McGahey, was under way. He did not hide his intentions and was reported as saying " It is not negotiation in Downing Street we want, but agitation in the streets of this country to remove this Government ". He was, he said, convinced that the miners could take on the Tory Government and not just defeat them but "end them for ever".

Gollan's January directive was repeated in varying forms at intervals throughout the rest of the year and plans to implement it were discussed at conferences held by "front" organisations that form an important part of the Communist Party's "industrial apparatus".

One of the most important of them is the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions, which has been described by Bert Ramelson, the Communist Party's National Industrial Organiser, as "a vital organising force in the rank and file movement".

Plans to create a winter of disruption were discussed at a national conference called by the Committee on October 20, 1973, the avowed purpose of which was to achieve the "effective mobilisation" of extremist forces in readiness for the "forthcoming struggles on the wages front".

Jim Hiles, the Communist Secretary of the Liaison Committee claimed that messages of support for the conference had been received from Ray Buckton, General Secretary, ASLEF; Eddie Marsden, General Secretary, AUEW/Construction Section; Richard Briginshaw, General Secretary NATSOPA, and Hugh Scanlon, President AUEW.

A declaration adopted by the delegates promised all-out solidarity with the miners in their preparations for industrial action and similar support for engineering and other workers.

The opening speech was made by Ken Gill, a Communist who was at the time General Secretary-elect of AUEW/TASS. He made it clear that he represented his Executive Committee which had supported the Liaison Committee from its inception. In the light of subsequent events the following statement made by him is particularly interesting :

" If there was unity between the engineering workers and the miners, that force would be unstoppable."

" There is no road other than industrial action, it will lead not only to the immediate defeat of Sir John Donaldson and the NIRC and the defeat of this attempt to control our wages, but will inevitably lead to the defeat of the Tory Government."

The same points figured prominently during discussions at the Communist Party's National Congress in November 1973. The use of industrial action to overthrow the Government and replace it by one pledged to "socialist policies" (that is, policies acceptable to the Communists) was the main theme of the Party leaders.

The "hero figure" at the conference was undoubtedly Mick McGahey who told the 450 delegates that the miners were spear-heading the action against the Government's economic policy. McGahey emerged as one of the most powerful men in the Party. Indeed in the election for the new National Executive he topped the poll with 404 votes—30 more than John Gollan, the Party leader, and 29 more than Bert Ramelson, its Industrial Organiser.

In view of the important part that McGahey has played and will continue to play in the Party's industrial strategy, the facts about his well-publicised reference to the use of troops in industrial disputes should be placed on record. It was afterwards claimed that he had been misrepresented and maligned in the "capitalist press". Certainly he provided a remarkable example of a revolutionary back-tracking at speed after being caught in the act of actually making a revolutionary statement.

That he was able to do so with some success was due in part to what we will charitably describe as some over-kind questioning by TV interviewers on both BBC and ITV. If it had crossed

McGahey's mind to issue writs for libel he would have had to include the Communist Party's daily newspaper which on January 28 reported him as saying that if during the miners' strike the Government called in troops to move coal, he would "appeal for them to assist and aid the miners".

The stark contrast between the weakness of the Communist Party as a political entity in its own right and the industrial and political power it is able to wield is still not fully understood inside the Labour movement or by industrialists and those responsible for the administration of Britain's educational establishments.

The influence of the Communists and their capacity for disruption is based on comparatively small groups operating under central leadership within key industries and inside important unions.

At the 1971 Communist Party Congress both Gollan and Ramelson confirmed that they had been a decisive force in many of the larger industrial conflicts and controversies that have afflicted this country.

As Gollan put it, the Communist Party is able to do these things because it is a "nationally organised, disciplined" organisation which operates "across the boundaries of different industries, unions and movements".

This is a fair description of its "industrial apparatus". It is based on "factory branches" which are, according to Gollan, "the most important unit of Communist organisation". He emphasised this by declaring that no matter how effective Communist work outside the factory gate is, "it is work **inside**, by our factory comrades and organisations, which is decisive".

The formation and control of factory branches is facilitated by the detailed knowledge possessed by the Party leaders about the industrial life of all rank and file members. They know in which industries they work, what jobs they do, what company they work for, the address of their place of work, the trade unions to which they belong, the branches they normally attend and any other organisations of which they are members.

This information is co-ordinated and it enables the Communist full-time officials to assess Party strength in different sectors of industry and in the trade union movement and to plan accordingly. Members of the factory branches are well instructed about their duties, one of which is to conduct class warfare against the employers "at the point of production".

Another function of the factory branches is to provide those who direct strategy with information about the company, industry or union within which they work so that forward planning is based upon adequate "intelligence".

The Communists use the description "factory branches" to describe Party-controlled groups set up at any place of work—a coal mine, building site, rail depot, power station, car plant, office and so on. The members of these groups are the mainspring behind the "front organisations" such as the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions.

This was set up in 1966 to oppose the Labour Government's prices and incomes policy. It stemmed from the London Industrial Shop Stewards Committee, the aim of which was to provide an organised link-up between extremists in different factories and industries, to furnish them with a channel for communications and to co-ordinate their actions.

The Liaison Committee now does this job on a national basis, particularly in the engineering and allied industries. Associated with it are unofficial groups such as the National Post Shop Stewards Committee, the Building Workers' Charter Group, the Engineering Voice group, the Power Worker group and a number of union organisations, including shop stewards' committees, mainly at local and district level.

At the outset the Liaison Committee was strongly opposed by the engineers' union. Indeed on August 18, 1967, the Executive Council of what was then the AEU circularised its branch secretaries informing them that "Branches must not send delegates to, and our Shop Stewards must not attend, any meeting convened by this Liaison Committee for Defence of Trade Unions".

A different and more dangerous situation now exists. The same Committee—the Chairman of which is a highly experienced

industrial agitator named Kevin Halpin—now operates with the open support of top officials of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers. So does the Engineering Voice group.

At a conference organised by the Liaison Committee on March 31, 1973, the "credentials" issued to the 1,154 delegates revealed that among them were representatives from the executives of the technical, supervisory and construction sections of the AUEW, the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades, the South Wales and Scottish sections of the NUM, 334 union branches, 53 trades councils, 26 union district committees and 70 shop stewards' committees.

The importance of this trend cannot be overstated in view of the avowed intention of the Communists to use the trade unions as a road to political power (see Chapter 3).

The Communist Party's "industrial apparatus" is so constructed that the full-time officials can, through factory branches and front organisations, plan and direct agitation in specific sectors of industry and can exert influence in important trade unions.

Through this apparatus information can be transmitted upwards to the Party headquarters, and orders and directives downwards to Party groups on the shop floor and in union organisations.

Frank Chapple, leader of the electricians' union, has explained how such organised groups are able to exploit rank and file trade unionists. He said:

"How many workers at a shop floor meeting realise they are really attending a second meeting?"

"The first meeting has already been held by militants in private. They have already decided what action should be taken."

Tom Jackson, General Secretary of the Union of Post Office Workers, has described how Communists attempt to manipulate union conferences by "acting in unison". He revealed that prior to the 1973 Rules Revision Conference of his union, 35 of the delegates had attended a special meeting at the Communist Party headquarters and that their fares had been paid by the Party.

CHAPTER III

COMMUNIST POWER THROUGH PARLIAMENT

Despite their dismal failures at government and local elections the Communists—unlike other revolutionaries—are quite serious when they avow their intention of using the Parliamentary road to power.

Indeed, in 1973 their plan to achieve this by gaining control of the Labour Party was stated with a frankness that has puzzled some observers.

The probability is that such a clear exposition of the Party's tactics was not given entirely by choice. The most likely explanation is that, faced with the inroads into their recruitment made by the "ultra Left" organisations, the Communists considered it necessary to re-establish themselves as a revolutionary party with a credible programme for attaining power.

Communists have of course always sought to penetrate the Labour Party. That is why over the years Labour leaders have sturdily resisted Communist Party applications for affiliation.

They have also rejected the attempt on the part of the Communists to cash in on the fact that, through union affiliation, some trade unionists are members of both parties. The effort by the Communists to invoke the principle of "democracy" in support of their contention that their members in the trade unions should be accepted as delegates to the Labour Party's Annual Conference has fallen on deaf ears.

It is unlikely that the Communists expected any other response to their overtures. In any event, such rebuffs are regarded by them as obstacles that impede but cannot stop progress towards their goal.

How this goal can be reached by the extreme Left wing was explained by Ernie Roberts, an Assistant General Secretary of the AUEW, in a booklet entitled "The Solution is Workers' Control", published by the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. In a section headed "Workers' Control of the Labour Party", Roberts—who is an ex-member of the Communist Party—said this:

"The Labour Party membership is made up of 700,000 individual members, 22,000 Co-operative and Socialist Society members, and 5,500,000 affiliated trade union members. It is clear from these figures that the block votes of the trade unions can determine the policies of the Party's Annual Conference."

Ernie Roberts—whose pamphlet was issued as a guide to the Left wing as a whole—went on to say that the sooner trade unions acted to make Labour Party Conference decisions binding on the Labour leaders, the better.

He then explained how through union affiliation to the constituency Labour parties it was possible to influence the selection of candidates. He said "The area where the central struggle for power and workers' control must take place is in the selection of Parliamentary candidates" and pointed out that once elected they became the Parliamentary Labour Party and were able to "exercise real political power".

It is fair to say that not all advocates of workers' control agree that it would inevitably lead to a Communist state. Some supporters of the Institute for Workers' Control (IWC) are scathingly critical of the way in which the right of workers to strike, to demonstrate or even to elect their own union leaders has been destroyed in countries where Communists rule.

Nevertheless, the activities carried out by the IWC—of which Ernie Roberts is a Vice-President—are highly dangerous to the well-being of British industry and to everyone employed in it, not least the rank and file workers. From the outset, the IWC has aimed to use every strike in private industry as a "step towards workers' control".

A lot of "militants" rally behind the banner of workers' control but would not wittingly touch Communism with the proverbial

barge pole. The vagueness of the term is in itself of considerable help to the Communists. As the late Jim Conway—the General Secretary of the AUEW who was so tragically killed in an air disaster—said, "Workers' control can mean all things to all men".

Some think of it in terms of "consultation" or "workers' participation" in the industrial decisions that affect their livelihoods. The Communists and their supporters have no such illusions.

In a discussion with Bert Ramelson—published in the Communist journal "Comment" of June 30, 1973—Ernie Roberts clarified the point as follows :

" Perhaps it will help if I say why I prefer the term workers' control to the term 'industrial democracy'. It is for the same reason, I would say, as Lenin preferred 'Communist' to 'Socialist': because of those who brought the term 'Socialist' into disrepute. 'Industrial democracy' is being used synonymously by so many with participation and consultation which, of course, means collaboration with the ruling class "

Roberts went on to say that workers' control implies a "workers' state in which power is in the hands of all workers". (This, according to Communist legend, is the present position in the Soviet Union). He added :

" It is properly called the dictatorship of the proletariat and **the aim of the dictatorship of the proletariat will be to create conditions for a Communist society and the withering away of the state when all mankind shall be free.** That is what I would say briefly is meant when I use the expression workers' control ". (Our emphasis).

Understandably Bert Ramelson agreed with that definition of workers' control and declared it to be "a very important slogan in the working class movement". But much more important from his point of view is exactly how this slogan, translated into action, can lead to a Communist society.

Not many workers are familiar with the journal "World Marxist Review". This is a pity, because it carries reports of international

study groups at which Communist strategy in Britain and elsewhere is discussed in detail. The results of these discussions do not figure in day-to-day Communist propaganda in industry and the unions.

"World Marxist Review" is the theoretical journal of the Soviet Communist Party and its aligned Communist parties throughout the world. It is published from Prague but its Editor-in-chief has always been a Russian.

Here is a contribution made by Sam Aaronovitch—a leading member of the British Communist Party—to a "World Marxist Review" conference exactly as published in its February 1973 issue :

" S. Aaronovitch spoke of the fight to sway the British trade unions and, accordingly, the mass base of the Labour Party, to the left. He noted, in particular, the significance of the major strike struggles that swept Great Britain in recent years. It is the mounting revolt of the workers which is the biggest problem now facing the Tories.

" What has been the strategy of the CPGB ? It envisages a process of mass struggle carried into and reflected in the mass organisations of the working class and especially the trade unions.

" 'We see such a movement,' he said, 'altering not only the policy but the leadership of these organisations. As a result we have seen the possibility of increasing sections of the trade union movement shifting to the Left on both immediate and long-term issues, influencing the policy of the Trade Union Congress, as well as the direction and composition of the General Council. Simultaneously, both directly and by way of trade unions we see the increasing pressure on the Labour Party at all levels. We expect the result of this strategy, if successfully pursued, will be to break up the coalition of Right-wing trade union and Labour Party leaders and create a political crisis for the Right wing.'

" It was the partnership of these Right-wing leaders that had helped entrench reformism in the British labour movement.

The new strategy is not only of theoretical interest but has already yielded some important results, and unlike any previous period since the formation of the Labour Party, the leadership can no longer depend on solid and overwhelming trade union support. This is a truly historic change." (Our emphasis).

Idris Cox is one of the Party's "experts" on international affairs. The May edition of "World Marxist Review" reported his comments at an international research group meeting. In words strikingly similar to those used by Ernie Roberts, he said:

"Notably, more Communists are being elected to leading key positions in the trade unions. Through the unions they can influence Labour Party Conference decisions."

In June it was the turn of Bert Ramelson. "World Marxist Review" carried an article by him entitled "The Class Struggle in Britain". He stated that:

"Unlike some other countries, Britain has no history of political strikes. Even the short-lived 1926 General Strike was primarily in solidarity with the miners in their struggle against wage cuts, and the moment it began to assume political implications it was betrayed by the TUC leaders.

"However, since 1968 there have been a number of unofficial and official strikes that were entirely, or to a large extent, political in character. They were directed against the Government rather than particular employers. The various strikes against the Labour Government policy 'In Place of Strife', and the Industrial Relations Act of the Tory Government, the threat to call a General Strike (which forced the release of five imprisoned dockers), the national miners' strike (which was not settled at the head office of the Coal Board, but with the Prime Minister in Downing Street), the series of strikes by engineers in support of the decision of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (AUEW) to defy the law by refusing to appear in Court or to pay the £55,000 fine—all these can be described as nothing else but political strikes.

"What is outstanding is not only the increased number of strikes, but their changed character. There has been a quali-

tative political change in the attitude of millions of British workers, and this has made a strong impact within the former reformist-dominated leadership of the trade unions, and even within the Labour Party and its members of Parliament."

At another international research group conference reported in October 1973, Idris Cox was even more explicit:

"In the conditions existing in Britain it is most decisive that the Communists win over the trade unions. The Communist Party in Britain is not a big party. But it is able to influence the Labour Party through the affiliated trade unions, which, by virtue of its unique structure, represent the strongest force within the Labour Party.

"The Communists have visibly increased their influence in the unions in recent years. Our comrades hold key positions in influential organisations at a regional and national level and **the stand of some of the unions on fundamental issues is shaped under their influence.**" (Our emphasis).

Finally, in November 1973 "World Marxist Review" had an article by Gerry Cohen—a member of the Communist Party National Executive—headed "Communists and the Labour Movement". He was just as definite:

"The Communist Party is exerting its position as a key section of the Labour movement in Britain. Because of the part which it plays as an organisation deeply rooted in the movement, it often initiates and advances policies on crucial questions of the day. Many of its members hold leading positions in organisations directly affiliated to the Labour Party".

The Communists have avowed their aims and their methods. Those who choose to ignore the danger cannot say that they have not been warned.

CHAPTER IV

PLANNING FOR CHAOS

In 1972 the building industry was disrupted by a 12-week national strike. This in itself was a serious blow to the companies involved and everyone employed in them.

The situation was made far worse by a campaign of violence comprising personal injuries, arson, and damage to valuable plant, equipment, materials and property.

In a fully documented report the National Federation of Building Trades Employers said that "the violence was the work of comparatively small, but co-ordinated groups of people who were well organised, well directed and well financed". The report continued:

"The end result of the incidents recorded in this file was that small but well-drilled groups were able to hold to ransom a whole industry employing a million or more men and thereby cause incalculable damage and loss. Their methods went well beyond what could possibly be construed as peaceful picketing. That these methods had to be adopted becomes clear when it is remembered that **the vast majority of building operatives had no wish to strike at all.** Virtually every communication from building firms received by the N.F.B.T.E. recording the closure of their sites as a result of militant action recorded also the fact that the work force was unanimous in not wanting to strike. In this light the activities of the 'flying pickets' are a serious menace to the health of industrial democracy in this country."

Violence apart, the strike itself was an example of how extremist groups organise and plan their operations against British industry. The first direct steps leading up to the events of 1972

were taken two years previously and a lot of the ground-work was done even earlier than that.

On April 25, 1970 extremists working on 54 building sites throughout the country were called to a conference in Manchester. Among the 280 present were "representatives" from Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Stoke, Leicester, Harlow, Stevenage, Durham and London.

It was at this meeting that the Building Workers' Charter Group was formed and its leaders immediately began preparations for a national building workers' strike to take place two years later when a new wages agreement was due to be negotiated.

The Manchester conference was called by three "front" organisations—The London Building Workers' Joint Sites Committee, the Merseyside Shop Stewards and Building Operatives Committee and the Manchester Building Workers' Forum.

The most powerful of these organisations was the group based on London and led by Lou Lewis, a prominent Communist and an experienced industrial agitator.

The Joint Sites Committee was formed in 1962 and was then centred on No. 10 Downing Street where major building renovations were in progress. No doubt the leading figures enjoyed sending out directives "from No. 10" to their supporters on other sites. Two years later, under Communist direction, the Committee was reorganised and revitalised in preparation for a large-scale campaign. It maintained ceaseless activities on certain major building sites, and through regular meetings and the issuing of thousands of leaflets it conducted a consistent propaganda campaign designed to inflame labour relations and persuade workers to oppose the decisions of their unions.

It was, however, in 1966 that the Communists began using the Joint Sites Committee as the base from which they could strengthen their influence among building workers in other parts of the country. The Committee established and maintained links with extremist building workers in other areas by personal contact, by organising meetings and through a journal called "Rank and File" (this has since been replaced by "Building Workers' Charter").

"Rank and File" was first published in March, 1966 by a Manchester group then calling itself the Building Workers' Action Committee.

The journal soon became national in circulation and regular contact centres were established in London, Manchester and Liverpool.

Later in the year the Joint Sites Committee made full use of the Communist-inspired strikes at the Barbican and Horseferry Road building projects in London. This provided the pretext for the leaders to tour building sites and other industrial enterprises in England, Scotland and Wales to whip up financial and other support.

At a meeting in the Onward Hall, Manchester, for example, money was collected from sources outside the building industry and it was unanimously agreed that pickets would travel from Manchester and Liverpool when necessary to support the "London lads".

Both the Barbican and Horseferry Road strikes lasted for more than a year. The fund-raising and contact-making campaign—which was not confined to the construction industry—went on for the whole of that period. On August 2, 1967, the "Morning Star" carried a letter by Joe Leith, who described himself as a Federation Steward. He wrote :

" The stand being made by the London building trade workers in support of shop stewards is highly commendable. On a recent visit to Merseyside by their strike committee representatives, they inspired building trade workers at meetings and on the sites.

" They made the rounds of the sites and jobs with the assistance of the Merseyside Building Workers Movement, and over £200 has gone to support their fight."

The use of force on the picket lines at Barbican revealed the shape of things to come during the 1972 national strikes.

Violent scenes at the Barbican led to the arrest of 24 men. Although some sections of the press described the arrested men

as "Myton's strikers", several of them were not even employed in the building industry. Among them were a leading figure in the International Socialism Group, an unemployed coach builder, a student, a book seller and an unemployed man who was on the editorial board of "International Socialism".

A "Defence Committee" was immediately set up under the chairmanship of a Communist named Max Boyer and demonstrations were organised in which just about every subversive organisation took part—the Communist Party, the Socialist Labour League (now the Workers Revolutionary Party), the Trotskyist Young Socialists, the International Socialists, the Revolutionary Workers' Party, the Syndicalist Workers' Federation, the Anarchists and the Solidarists.

The Court of Inquiry set up to investigate the causes and circumstances of the two strikes concluded that the Joint Sites Committee had "played an active and mischievous part in bringing about the series of events which ultimately led to the closing down of the contract on each of the sites".

The Report also declared that it had no doubt about the association of the Joint Sites Committee with the Communist Party and had some caustic comments to make on the evidence given by Lou Lewis.

In view of the part subsequently played by the Joint Sites Committee in agitation within the construction industry the conclusions of the Court are worth recording :

" The evidence of Mr. Lewis as to the constitution of that Committee was both bizarre and incredible ; it is fair to Mr. Lewis to add that we do not think that he intended some of his evidence to be believed. In any event, we did not believe him when he said the Committee had no officials, no constitution, no regular meetings or means of calling meetings, or that its finances depended on the casual contributions from collections taken by unspecified persons in the course of meetings. Frequent references in the Press cuttings produced to us and the persistence of the activities of this body, coupled with its purported publication of pamphlets and leaflets, certain of

which were produced in evidence, leads us to the inference that this is a well-organised body with substantial financial resources upon which it can draw, far in excess of the casual revenue derived from collections at public-house meetings designed to defray (as Mr. Lewis stated) the rent of the rooms in which the casually convened meetings were held. It also appears to us to follow from the evasive and indeed incredible evidence of Mr. Lewis that he was deliberately trying to mislead the Court and to conceal the truth as to an organisation with which he was himself closely associated."

It was this "well organised body with substantial financial resources" that paved the way for the much larger and even more substantially financed organisation, the Building Workers' Charter Group.

Those behind the Manchester meeting on April 25, 1970 were not old style loud-mouthed agitators with a lot to say but with little capacity for action. They were men experienced in the techniques of class warfare and backed not only by the Communist Party's "industrial apparatus", but also by the propaganda machines controlled by other revolutionary bodies.

The immediate task of the new Group was to produce a national rank-and-file journal. This was called "Building Workers' Charter" and an editorial in the first issue described it as "our agitator, educator, organiser"—the same words repeatedly used by Communists to describe the "Morning Star".

It was explained that the most important reason for publishing "Building Workers' Charter" was to establish a regular form of communication for rank-and-file building workers throughout the country.

The attitude of the Group to the trade union officials was also made clear. An article by Alan Abrahams (a Liverpool building worker and a member of the Communist Party) contained a bitter attack on the union leaders who had negotiated the 1970 wage agreement. He described their attitude as a complete abdication of their responsibilities to their members and accused them of being true to their "right-wing role of collaborating with the employers' needs for more profits".

The Charter Group leaders were experienced enough to know that national strikes could be initiated and controlled only by a national organisation. Top priority was given to the setting up of such an organisation. A contributor to the first issue of "Building Workers' Charter" had this to say:

"If the paper is to be used as an effective weapon in every area of the country, then it will require the setting up of committees of readers and supporters in all those areas where rank-and-file committees do not exist. It is the intention of the paper to give every assistance possible to the trade union branches and sites in any area, to establish such committees".

It will be recalled that the first National Conference was sponsored by three unofficial committees.

When the second was called by the Group at the Houldsworth Hall, Manchester on April 24, 1971, there were eight "sponsoring" organisations plus four "supporting" groups.

The sponsoring groups were based on London, Manchester, Merseyside, Wigan, North Staffordshire, Glasgow, Widnes and Runcorn and Leicester. The supporting groups were active in Birmingham, Edinburgh, Dundee and Durham.

A pre-Conference article in "Building Workers' Charter" outlined its aims. It said:

"What we have to realise is that the 'Charter' is only a policy, a policy that we must batter into the thinking of the trade union leadership. Having done that we then have to batter the employers into acceptance".

The Conference itself was attended by some 400 delegates and although the phrases used by a succession of speakers to denounce the employers and the Government were not exactly temperate, the most vicious attacks were aimed at the unions, particularly at what was then the Amalgamated Society of Woodworkers and Painters.

As the target date for a national strike in the building industry came closer, the Charter Group intensified its activities throughout the country.

For instance in January and February, 1972 the leading figures were called to special meetings in London and Birmingham. The Conference in London on February 24 was significant because one of the main speakers was Kevin Halpin, a leading Communist who has never worked in the building industry. At the time of this meeting he was a ship repair worker but before that he had become notorious as an unofficial strike leader in the car industry. At the time this booklet was written he was employed as a mechanic fitter at the London Transport Works in West London.

More important, however, is the fact that he was the leader of the Communist "front" organisation the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions.

These meetings were followed by extensive propaganda campaigns among building workers, particularly in London, the Midlands, Scotland and the North West. They were aimed at boosting support for yet another National Conference. This time the venue was Birmingham and it was the final meeting prior to the launching of the strike plans.

On April 28, 1972, the "Morning Star" conformed to the familiar pattern of publishing a pre-Conference briefing. It was written by Peter Carter who was described as "leading Birmingham building worker and chairman of the city's shop stewards' committee".

The "Morning Star" could have added, but did not, that between 1963 and 1969 Carter was employed full time by the Communist Party as the national organiser of its youth group, the Young Communist League.

Carter—who has also called himself Robinson—stated that the Conference was aimed at popularising the full Charter demands and suggested that the authority of the building unions' negotiators would be strengthened by nationwide militant action "including strike action".

The Conference itself proved to be one of the biggest meetings of its kind for many years. No less than 865 "delegates" took part and among them were 646 members of the Union of Construction, Allied Trades and Technicians and 207 members of the Transport and General Workers Union.

Looking back to this Conference, and bearing in mind the events of early 1974, it is interesting that one of the demands made was that the "TUC should call a national strike to defeat the Tory Government and bring about a General Election".

Once the strike was under way two factors stood out. The first was the decisive influence of unofficial groups led by members and supporters of revolutionary organisations. The second was the use of intimidation against building workers and union officials.

Anyone who doubts these statements need do no more than study the reports published in extremist journals. For instance a "Builders' Strike Special" published by "Socialist Worker" (the journal of the International Socialists) said this:

"The main factor in bringing about the present unprecedented militancy among Britain's building workers has been the existence of a thriving rank and file organisation. **In the Building Workers' Charter movement, the building trade has the largest rank and file movement of any industry in the country.** (Our emphasis).

The same publication gave details of how the so-called "Flying Pickets" operate. Dealing with strikes in Bristol it referred to these pickets as the chief tactic of the unofficial Strike Committee and added:

"Every morning 300-400 workers would assemble outside the Union hall. They were divided into two groups, and given a list of sites. And they went out and stopped them".

Examples were given of the "fantastic success" achieved by the "Flying Pickets". For instance, workers on one site who had voted to stay in were forced to strike by the sudden appearance of 300 pickets.

The "Builders' Strike Special" also urged workers to extend the stoppages and to insist on an all-out national strike. It called for the mass picketing of all sites still working, and of cement works and other sources of building materials supply and power for contractors. It emphasised this point by saying:

"The miners would never have won so speedily had they not mass picketed coal depots and power stations. Builders should put the pressure on cement and brick works".

In the light of this advice it is interesting that two of the eight pickets arrested outside a cement works in the Midlands were London members of the International Socialists—one of them a journalist employed by "Socialist Worker".

The Anarchist journal "Freedom" also paid tribute to the "spade work" carried out by the Building Workers' Charter and reported how sites had been brought to a standstill by "Flying Pickets".

The "Morning Star" reported similar instances, one of the most notable being the complete closure of a site by a force of nearly 500 pickets.

The "Morning Star" of August 19 gave one example of the way in which union leaders were being intimidated. It reported that union officials on the platform at a demonstration in Glasgow were "howled down and jeered every time the crowd felt they were diluting the unions' full claim". By contrast, the most popular platform speaker was Eamon Monaghan (then the Building Workers' Charter leader in Scotland).

The Trotskyist daily newspaper "Workers Press" of August 26 reported that Glasgow Corporation building workers had "dealt a crushing and humiliating blow to their union leaders by deciding to stay out on unofficial strike". When a national executive member of the T&GWU supported the union's official policy he was "drowned by boos and shouting".

The situation was well summarised in an editorial published in the "Daily Telegraph" of August 24 which stated that most union leaders, if left to themselves, would probably have accepted the employers' 14 per cent offer. It added:

"Indeed, the Union of Construction and Allied Trades and Technicians—a recent amalgamation of the woodworkers', painters' and bricklayers' unions—was about to come to terms with the employers. But in the wings there lurks the militant, Communist-dominated Building Workers' Charter Group".

It has become a regular pattern of subversive operations that as soon as one dispute is settled industrial agitators begin preparations for exploiting the "next round". It was predictable, therefore, that when the employers and unions concluded the agreement that ended the strike, the Building Workers' Charter Group began preparations for another National Conference to plan the next "stage of the battle".

An edition of "Building Workers' Charter" was quickly produced and circulated bearing a front page banner headline "The Fight Goes On". The opening paragraph of an editorial in this issue read:

"If ever there was a need for the Building Workers' Charter, that need was demonstrated by the recent sell-out of the national wage claim.

"Two things stood out in sharp contrast during the strike. One was the strength and determined ability of the rank and file to conduct a strike of such proportions. The other was the failure of the national leadership to give **effective** leadership through the National Action Committee.

"There can be no acceptance by the rank and file of the 'sell-out' and the progress made during the strike must be carried forward".

The "progress" included the setting up of even more regional committees controlled by Building Workers' Charter. The number had grown from eight to fourteen.

The next conference took place on March 10, 1973 and again it was held in Birmingham. There was the usual pre-Conference edition of "Building Workers' Charter" in which under the headline "Mobilise Now" it was explained that the aim of the Conference was to launch a fighting campaign among the building workers. The opening paragraphs read:

"With 1972 drawn to a close, it was a year that saw thousands of building workers participate in the most militant struggle that the industry has experienced in its history.

" The 12-week national strike for £30 for 35 hours witnessed the important and successful role played by the rank and file and the Building Workers' Charter, in uniting, organising and prosecuting the strike.

" It can be accepted without doubt that if the running of the dispute had been left just to the TU leadership alone, the strike would never have got off the ground, and the employers know it." (Our emphasis).

At the Conference, which was attended by some 650 "delegates" and about 100 "visitors", plans were made to organise token strikes during the following months. Further, no attempt was made to hide the ultimate aim which was to bring down the Government and to pressurise its successor into nationalising the construction and building supply industries. This was followed by the first All-Scottish Conference held by the Building Workers' Charter Group in Glasgow on March 24. The decisions taken at the Birmingham Conference were, of course, fully endorsed.

The arrest of 24 men charged with offences arising from picketing during the 1972 strikes provided the basis for widespread extremist agitation in 1973 and early 1974. Meetings and demonstrations—sometimes accompanied by calls for strike action—were organised in support of the men who were emotively described as the "Shrewsbury 24". Six of them were ultimately sentenced to terms of imprisonment.

The avowed aim of what then became the "Shrewsbury 24" Campaign was to force the government of the day to release the men who had been tried and found guilty by jury. It is doubtful, to say the least, that those who led this campaign really believed that any government would take action amounting to political interference with the processes of law.

A feature of the campaign was that it aroused little enthusiasm among building workers. Indeed at all the demonstrations they were heavily outnumbered by supporters of revolutionary groups from other industries and from the educational establishments.

Splits occurred inside the Building Workers' Charter Group over the question of whether its obsession with a hopeless cause

was weakening its influence on the building sites. There were charges and counter charges that the Communists and the International Socialists were exploiting the "Shrewsbury 6" Campaign for their own political ends.

On April 27, 1974, a Building Workers' Charter Group conference was held in Liverpool to re-assess the position. The attendance, which was around 300, obviously disappointed the leaders. Although references were made to the "Shrewsbury 6" it was the exploitation of future wage claims that figured most prominently in the discussions.

Among the speakers were Pete Carter (Birmingham), Peter Kavanagh (London), Lou Lewis (London), Harry Tierney (Liverpool), Eddie Loyden (Labour MP for Garston) and Simon Fraser (Liverpool Trades Council).

At the time of the conference local Charter groups were active in the following areas :

London	Bolton
Widnes, Runcorn, Warrington	Birmingham
Manchester	South Wales
Glasgow	Blackpool
Wigan	Sheffield, Rotherham, Barnsley
Leeds, Bradford	South East
Merseyside	Stevenage
North Staffs	Nottingham
North Wales	

CHAPTER V

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS

In less than five years the International Socialists—a Leninist organisation often referred to as the IS—has built an “industrial apparatus” which is in some respects even more extensive than that controlled by the Communist Party.

Bearing in mind that for close on twenty years this same organisation struggled on as a comparatively insignificant revolutionary group, peopled mainly by academics with little support from industrial workers and not even a toe-hold in the unions, the transformation in such a short space of time is no mean achievement; particularly under circumstances of keen competition from other “ultra Left” groups such as the Trotskyists.

During its lean years the IS leaders overcame a great deal of internal dissension and maintained a realistic approach to industrial disputes. They accepted the fact that they were not themselves strong enough either in numbers or organisation to start large-scale strikes. But they learned a lot about how to exploit them.

Wherever and whenever an industrial dispute was in progress IS members were quickly on the spot offering—allegedly without political strings—“servicing” facilities to the strike leaders. These services included the writing of propaganda material, advice on fund raising, help in the setting up of strike committees, the provision of transport and where necessary assistance on the picket lines.

In 1970, however, the IS began to make real progress on the industrial front. In the early part of that year Tony Cliff—the leading theoretician of the Group—produced a book called “The Employers’ Offensive—productivity deals and how to fight them”.

It purported to prove that increased productivity was against the interests of workers and that “techniques such as Time and Motion Study, Measured Day Work and Grading Schemes are aimed at ‘disciplining’ the workers and undermining the power of the shop stewards”.

Cliff’s book was backed by Len Brindle, a British Leyland con-
vener of shop stewards, and Mike Cooley, then an executive
committee member of the draughtsmen’s union.

Later in the year the IS played an active part in the strikes that hit Britain’s docklands. A special publication called “Socialist Docker” was produced and widely circulated. It attacked the official union leadership and advocated that “militant pickets” should “visit possible scab ports” (another way of describing the “flying picket” technique used in later major disputes).

The IS was also heavily involved in an unofficial strike of Yorkshire miners. As one of the miners involved put it:

“When the strike began people came from pits in the Doncaster area and for a time we just did not know who everyone was. Some of these ‘Trots’ came along as well and for a time we believed they were miners. For a couple of days a school-teacher (a supporter of the International Socialists) was using his car to take pickets out to pits and he was drawing petrol from the Brodsworth home coal depot, which we were using for official pickets cars”.

Towards the end of 1970 it became obvious that, like other extremist groups, the IS was finding it easier than ever to raise money. To quote from its journal “Socialist Worker” of October 24, 1970:

“This week we have a bigger and—we hope—better ‘Socialist Worker’. We launched our weekly paper in September 1968 from a tiny office in North London with a staff of three—one printer, one typesetter and one journalist.

“Today we have four-storey premises for a modern printshop, bookshop, editorial offices and headquarters of the International Socialists”.

Since then, as will be shown later in this chapter, the expansion of IS activities has proceeded at an even faster rate.

Early in 1971 the International Socialists began "drafting" members to "understaffed" parts of the country. The student sub-committee of the Group was instructed to prepare a list of members and supporters leaving the universities and colleges so that they could be urged to seek jobs in industrial areas specified by the IS leaders.

Advice was also circulated on ways of getting into factories and obtaining information about companies that could be used as a basis for agitation. It was explained by Chanie Rosenberg, described as the "London full-timer", that it was easy to get into factories by approaching the security officer and "asking to see the convenor (preferably by name)".

She explained how by posing as the representative of a publishing house she had taken some strikers into factories for collections and had used this to create "a further bond in the factories with IS".

Coincident with these developments was the participation of the IS in the operations of the Free Communications Group (FCG) which got off the ground with the help of a grant from the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust Ltd. The avowed aim of the Group was to establish "workers' control" of the means of mass communication—the press, radio and TV.

At an FCG conference held in 1970 Paul Foot—one of the most important of the IS leaders—was reported as saying that the "system" must be constantly challenged and that it was important to "spread control—first to print workers, then to workers outside the industry". He urged the FCG to get into the unions and to work "militantly". He added that journalists must break down the old idea of "loyalty to the paper". (At the time this booklet was written the FCG appeared to have been put in cold storage.)

It is important to note that at this stage in the progress of the IS "industrial apparatus" it was also intensifying activities in such professions as teaching, social work, the civil service and local

government. They were actively building a bridge between the academic revolutionaries and shop floor agitators in the most important industries. On May 3, 1971, the Economic League issued a report containing the following statement:

"Currently the International Socialists are planning to extend their industrial operations. This was made clear at a conference in London during Easter. Some 250 delegates—plus a similar number of "visitors"—took part.

"With this aim in mind the International Socialists are attempting to build an industrial machine based upon the pattern established by the Communist Party.

"It involves the setting up of action committees which will control the operations of groups or 'fractions' installed at industrial and plant level.

"At present the leaders of the International Socialism Group have directed their members to give priority to the establishing of such 'fractions' among teachers, car workers, printers, power workers and draughtsmen."

By January 1972 the IS had advanced sufficiently in this direction to attract some 700 delegates to an industrial conference held in Manchester. Among them were car workers, electricians, engineers, busmen, miners, dockers, printers, post office engineers and power workers. Also present were shop stewards who led the "sit-in" at Fisher-Bendix, Liverpool.

The "delegates" decided to organise widespread opposition to productivity deals, to strengthen and set up "combine committees", to campaign for more factory "occupations" and for nationalisation under workers' control.

With an eye to the future they set up a fighting fund, one of the purposes of which was to raise money for the appointment of additional "full-time organisers".

In June 1972 a report based on a detailed investigation of IS activities in the North West revealed that a group of young teachers

were the prime movers in an attempt to penetrate every major factory in the area. It stated :

" Their highly organised subversive activities range from classrooms to car factories and from dole queues to docks. They aim at worker control and the destruction of the capitalist society."

One of them, Nigel Varley, was quite frank about their aim. He admitted that they used strikes because they were fertile ground for their political aims of destroying the capitalist system.

By the end of 1972 the IS had established itself as a force for disruption in industry and the professions. On January 15, 1973 we reported that :

" A noticeable feature of subversive operations in 1972 was the growth in the influence of the International Socialism Group (ISG). The signs are that the activities of this revolutionary organisation will be considerably stepped up in 1973.

" Last year the Group increased its membership and maintained a constant stream of inflammatory propaganda contained in a wide variety of journals, pamphlets and leaflets—some aimed at specific industries and others at particular companies and factories.

" The International Socialists are led by highly competent professionals, among whom are well known journalists such as Paul Foot and John Palmer "

It was clear, however, that the IS regarded its progress as no more than a stepping stone to setting up a centrally controlled revolutionary organisation that could operate simultaneously in every part of the country. The leaders were able to announce early in 1973 that they would be moving into new premises vastly more suited to newspaper production. A letter sent out by Paul Foot, Roger Protz (then Socialist Worker Editor) and Jim Nichol (the IS national treasurer) stated :

" We have also bought, at huge expense, a new machine which will print the paper better and faster."

They were also able to print a lot of other papers "better and faster". The raising of an additional £30,000 to finance activities presented no problems. One member from the Midlands sent £1,000, the money he had received from the local council as an improvement grant for his house. A student who had no money managed to send £50 by using a bank credit card. No wonder that at the 1973 annual conference of the IS held in London on March 17, Jim Higgins, then ISG National Secretary, described 1972 as an "exciting one" for the Group. They had, he said, made "significant recruitment" particularly among miners and dockers and had "intervened" in strikes affecting the gas industry, the hospitals and the civil service.

Higgins—previously a telephone engineer—laid it down that industry was the most important area for IS members and asserted that a high proportion of their branch officials were also shop stewards and convenors.

Prominent in the discussion on revolutionary factory organisation was Roger Rosewell, the IS organiser in the North West, who was for some time the ASTMS Divisional Officer in Birmingham. He said :

" A revolutionary organisation must be a disciplined one, concerned with power. Power is in the factories and that is why we must have factory branches."

When this statement was made there were no organised IS branches in any factories or other places of work. By August, however, a progress report given by Tony Cliff revealed that since the March conference 27 factory branches had been formed and that recruitment among industrial workers was increasing rapidly.

The branch established at Chryslers was publicised as an example for others to follow. "Socialist Worker" stated that although this branch had only been operating for two months it had 38 members.

The branch had doubled its size during the Chrysler dispute when, said "Socialist Worker", its members were active on the picket lines and in the Ryton Action Committee which more than anything else had "saved the strikers from a sell-out".

According to "Socialist Worker" the same branch had given the IS an impetus for all kinds of "new work" in the Coventry area. It had stimulated activities in other factories—including the setting up of a new branch inside a car plant at Leamington, and on the Coventry Trades Council.

By the end of the year the IS was ready to take the lead in forming a national rank-and-file organisation able to compete with the Communist-controlled Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions and the Trotskyist All Trades Unions Alliance.

The decision to form a nationwide organisation was made at a 3,000 strong "Socialist Worker" industrial conference held in Manchester early in November and the date of the "founding conference" was set for the spring of 1974.

The preparations were well planned and thorough in their implementation. A "Basic Education" pamphlet was issued emphasising that there was more to joining the IS than simply supporting its general aims. Membership, it said, was a "commitment to action". It went on:

"In most of the major industries and unions, we have fractions to organise our work and intervention in the industry and the trade union. All members should participate in the work of the appropriate fraction. Our fractions work in and sometimes have decisive influence in a number of rank and file papers."

A series of meetings and training activities was organised. On November 23 Paul Foot addressed a meeting at Lanchester Polytechnic. The 200 people present were told that the International Socialists "intervene" in disputes and build political strength through the factories.

His account of IS progress was a glowing one but not over-exaggerated. He reported that the number of factory branches had still further increased to 40 and dealing with the "Socialist Worker" he said that whereas five years ago it was a four-page paper with a circulation of 5,000, it now ran to 16 pages and the sales had risen to 31,000. (Since then sales of up to 40,000 have been claimed).

This meeting was followed on November 24 by a Day School also at Lanchester Polytechnic at which IS members were given instruction on agitation in the unions and on the shop floor. The final session was devoted to the development of "industrial work" in Coventry.

During the same weekend a Residential School for "leading militants in Lancashire" was held in Blackpool where the main speakers were Roger Rosewell and Andreas Nagliati (then IS industrial organiser).

Then on December 1 a "Factory Branch School" was held in London where the discussion on extending IS factory branch organisation was led by John Charlton, an IS executive member who organises its activities in Yorkshire.

The "founding conference" was held in Birmingham on March 30, 1974. The following list of journals said to have sponsored the conference indicates the widespread activities undertaken by groups directed by the International Socialists. It also sheds light on the range of papers being produced "better and faster" following the "huge" capital expenditure early in 1973.

Carworker	NALGO Action News
Case Con (social workers)	Post Office Worker
Collier	Rank and File Teacher
GEC Rank & File	Redder Tape (CPSA)
Hospital Worker	Steelworker
London Platform (buses)	Technical Teacher

For some unexplained reason the "Dockworker"—also printed by the IS—was not included in the list of sponsors.

A circular sent out by the IS Industrial Department stressed that the conference would be a test of how successfully they had penetrated the trade union movement. It instructed all members to provide "trade union addresses" to which letters explaining the conference would be sent and also said that all letters must be followed up by personal contact, that no union meetings were to

be missed and that they "must work **before**" these meetings to ensure maximum support.

The circular also announced three pre-conference schools for delegates. Those from the south were told to attend a school in London on March 10; delegates from Birmingham, Liverpool, Glasgow, etc. in Manchester on March 16, and from Yorkshire, Teeside, Tyneside, Edinburgh, etc. in Leeds on March 17.

In the same circular International Socialists who are also members of the TGWU "fraction" were called to a meeting on March 3 to plan their tactics at the forthcoming TGWU Rules Revision Conference. It was stated that "This meeting is only for IS comrades in the TGWU with considerable experience in the workings of the Union and anyone wishing to attend MUST ring the Industrial Department beforehand".

At the conference the 500 people present were described as elected delegates from 307 union organisations. These included 40 shop stewards' and combine committees, two strike and occupation committees, 19 trades councils, seven district committees and 239 trade union branches and chapels.

Among the largest groupings were engineers, building workers, printers, miners, public employees, local government officers, civil servants, teachers, post office workers and transport workers.

Care was taken during the speeches to play down the dominant role of the International Socialists. Indeed the following statement made in "Workers Press" can be described as fair comment:

"The conference was organised on the spurious basis of 'a group of rank and file papers'—all of them politically animated by the IS group. But the speakers from the platform were careful to avoid even mentioning the IS."

Prior to the conference, however, care was taken to ensure that IS members themselves were not misled by such manoeuvrings. They received a circular signed by the IS "industrial co-ordinator" Andreas Nagliati. It was, he said, "very important"

that all IS members not only read the circular but also keep it and refer to it "time and time again in the course of the next few months".

It was made quite clear in the circular that one reason why the International Socialists was forming its own "democratic rank-and-file organisation" was its failure to penetrate the Communist controlled Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions and to "influence it" from within with IS policies. Here is an extract from the circular:

"In early November we held a national Socialist Worker Industrial Conference in Manchester. About 3,000 trade unionists attended and voted for a resolution which made a firm commitment to hold a Rank and File Conference in the Spring. Our members raised the issue in the rank-and-file papers in which they are involved, and most of them have already agreed to sponsor the Conference. Quite clearly we see this Conference as a major effort."

To understand the full ramifications of the IS organisation it is necessary to take a closer look at some of the so-called rank-and-file journals that sponsored the conference on March 30.

Support for these publications is not confined to IS members (indeed, they include minority Trotskyist factions such as the International Marxist Group and Workers Fight). Nonetheless, no one—least of all the other revolutionary groups involved—has any doubt that these journals are dominated by the International Socialists.

Even more important are the "front" organisations based on these journals. They operate as unions within unions, hold their own annual meetings, nominate candidates for election to union posts and, like the Communists, go into action at trade union conferences as an organised force.

One of the most influential of the "front" organisations is the NALGO Action Group which was formed in 1969. One of its leaders is Will Fancy, an Executive Council member of the National Association of Local Government Officers. Indeed he acted as Chair-

man at the Birmingham conference on March 30. On February 23 "Socialist Worker" quoted him as saying that in 1969 they had forced the leader of the NALGO negotiators to resign and that "Those of us from London met enough people who were prepared to fight around the country to set up the NALGO Action Group". He emphasised this as follows :

" Now we have groups organised in each district of the union. In London we're very strong. We're big enough now to organise on a branch basis.

" At the union conference last year we held daily meetings of supporters of NALGO Action News and produced a daily bulletin. For the second year running, we got two candidates elected to the national executive who stood on the policies and programmes of our paper. Since then a number of other members of the executive council have become supporters of NALGO Action News."

In February 1974 this Group introduced a re-organisation plan designed still further to build its strength throughout the country. At that time it had Regional Contacts in the following areas :

Eastern	Wales
East Midlands (North)	North East (Teesside)
East Midlands (South)	North East (Tyneside)
London	North West
South East (Surrey)	Scotland
South East	West Midlands
South West (North)	Yorkshire
South West (South)	

The NALGO Action Group works in close association with a "collective" centred on the publication "Case Con" which describes itself as a revolutionary journal for social workers.

Although strongest in London, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow, it has Regional Organisers in North West and North Wales, Midlands, North East, East Anglia, South West and Wales, South, Scotland and London.

Prior to a "Case Con" national conference held in Edinburgh on May 25/26 a newsletter was sent out urging all supporters to become members of NALGO or the National Association of Probation Officers and to join or set up action groups in both organisations.

It was suggested that they should draw on the experience of other militants through a "national organisation" (obviously the one set up by the IS) and that links should be forged with "other rank and file groups (e.g. Rank and File Teachers, the Hospital Worker, Nurses Action Group), militant tenants groups and squatters". The aim was spelled out—to destroy our present way of life and replace it by a "Workers' State".

The "Redder Tape" organisation plans to hold national conferences every six months. A letter sent out by Mike Duggan calling on its members to gather at the Conway Hall, London, on April 27, 1974 was quite explicit about the purpose. There was, it said, an ever increasing need for a rank-and-file movement with a clear programme on how to fight. It went on :

" We need at this conference to plan our activities at the forthcoming Civil Service Trade Union Conferences and afterwards in the union branches "

"Rank and File Technical Teacher" was formed in June 1973. Its second annual conference was held in Birmingham on March 23, 1974. The whole of the morning session was devoted to its aims and its activities within the Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions. At the time of the Birmingham conference it had group secretaries in Beds & Herts, Bristol, East Lancs, Essex, London (Including Outer London), South East Midlands, West Lancs, West Midlands, Yorkshire.

Understandably this group works in conjunction with "Rank and File"—a journal backed by a 1,200-strong group operating among teachers. The circulation of its journal—called "Rank and File"—has during the past few years risen from a few hundred to over 9,000. At the 1974 conference of the NUT about 70 of the delegates were members of the group and three of them were elected to the union's executive. Two of the three are International Socialists.

In a report on the conference the education correspondent of the "Times" referred to the "disproportionate degree of influence" exercised by the unofficial group and described its "nightly cabals to decide policy for the next day and its flow of press releases" as being among the most impressive sights at the conference.

To summarise: In a short space of time, the International Socialists has created a national network of organisations criss-crossing unions, industries and the professions. It comprises factory branches, "cells" (its own description), industrial branches, "fractions" set up within major unions and the control of "front" organisations.

CHAPTER VI

TROTSKYISTS AND MAOISTS

In preceding chapters a number of revolutionary organisations operating in industry have been mentioned. In a booklet of this size it is not possible or necessary to deal in great detail with all of them.

That is not to suggest that they are without importance; they all have a capacity for mischief and they all contribute something to the subversive threat.

The smaller of these groups tend to be the most vicious and observers with considerable experience of assessing situations at demonstrations and on the picket lines are convinced that a great deal of violence is sparked off by the fringe groups described by the Communists as the "ultra Left".

It would, however, be complacent to dismiss the "Workers Revolutionary Party" (formerly the Socialist Labour League) as just another "fringe" movement. It is by far the most dangerous of the Trotskyist organisations in this country. It is larger, better organised and from the point of view of industrial agitation more intelligently led than its rivals such as the International Marxist Group (IMG), Workers Fight and the Revolutionary Workers' Party (RWP), all of whom claim to be the true interpreters of Trotskyist doctrine.

The Workers Revolutionary Party, which is understandably sometimes confused with the Revolutionary Workers' Party, was formed on November 4, 1973 at a London conference attended by some 3,000 Trotskyists associated with the Socialist Labour League (SLL).

The SLL had always been the force behind three organisations operating among trade unionists, young workers and students. These are the All Trades Unions Alliance (to which no trade unions are allied), the Young Socialists and the Young Socialists Students Society. The setting up of the Workers Revolutionary Party formalised the situation that already existed in the sense that the four organisations had always operated as a unified force under the direction of Gerry Healy, a highly experienced organiser of revolutionary activities. He has been the mainspring behind the rapid growth of Trotskyism in this country. He has, however, some extremely able followers such as Mike Banda and Cliff Slaughter—formerly a lecturer in sociology at Leeds University. Slaughter has played a major part in building and training the largest revolutionary youth organisation ever to have existed in this country.

To understand current Trotskyist operations it is necessary to take a quick look at the past. Up to 1956 they were a small, comparatively insignificant group but they gained heavily when, following the debunking of Stalin and the brutal Soviet suppression of workers in Hungary, there was a mass exodus of some 8,000 disillusioned members of the Communist Party.

Many of them with experience in industrial agitation joined the Trotskyists. This led in 1959 to the formation of the Socialist Labour League. At the inaugural conference it was avowed that top priority would be given to building an industrial base with the object of taking the offensive in every strike. It was emphasised that this meant "efficient, thorough and conscious preparation".

Between 1958 (when the SLL was being formed) and the end of 1960 the Trotskyists gained experience by participating in major strikes involving transport, building, the motor industry and market porters.

Splits within the SLL caused some decline in 1961 and 1962 and at the beginning of the following year their fortunes were at a low ebb.

Then came a remarkable transformation. In July 1963 the SLL was issuing urgent calls for financial assistance and its future appeared to be in doubt. Three months later it launched a series

of conferences in the main industrial centres, organised training schools and prepared costly plans for improving its journal "The Newsletter" (now "Workers Press").

These plans included the use of colour and the doubling of its size without increasing the price. Mike Banda was appointed Editor and it was announced that he would be leading a team of professional journalists.

Progress continued and in February 1968 "The Newsletter", previously a weekly, began publishing on a twice-weekly basis. In September, 1969 it became the first daily Trotskyist newspaper to be published in any part of the world, and its name was changed to "Workers Press".

On February 1, 1972, the newspaper was expanded from four pages to twelve pages and its format changed to tabloid shape which, it was said, will be "more suitable to the requirements of an ever expanding readership".

This was followed in March by the conversion of the Young Socialists' journal "Keep Left" from a monthly to a weekly publication. A new editor was appointed who had gained his experience as a "Workers Press" staff reporter. He was elected to this post at the "Keep Left" annual general meeting held on January 8 and attended by some 1,200 young Trotskyists.

Ambitious plans were formulated to build the strength of the Young Socialists and to provide them with greater experience in the organising and carrying out of revolutionary activities.

An example was the plan to initiate so-called "Right to Work" marches setting out from Glasgow, Liverpool and Swansea and calling at all major towns en route to hold demonstrations and pick up additional marchers. These took place and culminated in a mass rally at the Empire Pool, Wembley.

By 1973 the Trotskyist leaders were ready to form the Workers Revolutionary Party. In April the SLL launched a £100,000 Party Building Fund.

Of the first £4,000 raised, £3,000 came from two unnamed individuals. One of them donated £1,000 and the other fulfilled a promise to give £2,000 if a similar sum had been raised by a specific date. Predictably this initial target was reached, so to speak, just in the nick of time.

Equally predictably, the achievement of the £100,000 target coincided exactly with the founding conference of the Workers Revolutionary Party.

When the fund was launched it was made quite clear that the money would be used still further to extend Trotskyist activities. Not a penny was needed to pay off debts and there was no "financial crisis" in the day-to-day running of the Socialist Labour League. As the Trotskyist leaders put it :

" Our premises, workshops and printing facilities are swamped out. Just think of it—only a little over three years ago we installed an entire new plant. We've simply grown out of it.

" Now we need major extensions to our printing presses, because of the growing circulation of 'Workers Press'—at least 20,000 square feet of office space, an increase in the number of full-time workers, a list of technical equipment for propaganda and agitation purposes which is too large to enumerate here, etc. etc."

Throughout these developments a directive issued in 1966 that penetrating industry and the unions was the key factor in the progress of the movement has been emphasised over and over again. As long ago as that Healy said that revolutionaries were "in the era of the political strike" and added :

" We have carried out over the past year a serious attempt to turn our youth comrades towards the trade unions. As far as we can ascertain, in an organisation of several thousand members, everyone is a member of his or her trade union.

" Nobody at any time in our organisation has suggested that you can lead the trade unions from the outside, just by propaganda alone. **We have got to be inside and active.**

" Trade union militancy and syndicalism must be distinguished from what we believe to be the duty of a Marxist trade unionist.

" A Marxist goes to work for the purpose of winning members to his party and influencing the unions along the line of its policies. The possibilities for real, serious work in the trade unions are considerable. We must insist with all our comrades about this fact.

" There is opening up now the opportunity for real serious Marxist activity inside the trade unions and we must grasp this with all hands. **We must not think that work outside the factory gates is a substitute for penetration of trade union branches and factories and for giving leadership on the spot.**

" We have examples where our comrades have been able to do considerable work in their factories and industries. Because we had party members in a particular industry it has been possible to make important successes.

" Whilst we do not accept the argument of being outside the trade unions, nevertheless we understand and **recognise that we have to penetrate the trade unions and industry and place our people in key positions.**"

The industrial organisation, the All Trades Unions Alliance, first saw the light of day in the Oxford car plants. On February 1, 1967, 25 "leading shop stewards and other active trade unionists" formed the Oxford Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions. A leading figure in its formation and in its subsequent activities was Alan Thornett.

The original intention was to use this committee as a means of penetrating and hopefully of capturing the Communist-controlled National Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions set up in the previous year. When this failed, as it was bound to, the Trotskyists decided to establish a rival organisation to that controlled by the Communists.

In preparation for this the Oxford Committee held national

conferences in 1967 and 1968—two in Oxford and the other in Birmingham.

The first national conference organised by the All Trades Unions Alliance was in Birmingham on October 26, 1968. It was preceded by meetings in most of Britain's industrial centres at which local committees allied to this body were set up. The conference itself was attended by about 750 "delegates" and visitors among whom were "representatives" of shop stewards' committees, engineers, building workers, dockers, clerical workers, miners, railway workers, electricians and apprentices.

The Trotskyists made no secret of the fact that they controlled the ATUA. It was, they openly declared, their "industrial arm".

At an All Trades Unions Alliance conference in 1969, the 600 people present were instructed that it was the "task of training Marxist leaders in the factories and the unions which predominates over all others".

Alan Wilkins, an engineering shop steward in the aircraft industry, endorsed this. He said: "We have to fight constantly to train communists in the factories. Only this kind of leadership will be adequate". (He used the word "communists" in the sense of Marxist followers of Trotskyism.)

The line to be followed by these trained Marxist leaders was laid down by Gerry Healy. Here are some extracts from his speech:

"The drive for productivity is nothing more than the drive for speed-up".

"Workers should not be fooled by the 'Export or Die' Campaign."

"It wouldn't make the slightest bit of difference if every worker went into his factory and decided to work his head off. The harder you work, the quicker you put yourself out of a job."

"Once you begin to accept these systems of productivity, you come more and more into the hands of the man with the white coat, the stop-watch and the note-pad. He starts to control your life."

"When he takes decisions to make you work harder, he actually cuts down your life."

"There is no middle-of-the-road position here. The faster you work, the faster the crisis—and unemployment—will come."

"We must be opposed, on principled grounds, to all forms of productivity deals."

In December 1969 it became clear that the main Trotskyist concentration in the following year would be on the motor industry. A decision was taken to set up a ten-man advisory committee which would operate in conjunction with the ATUA and would consist of representatives from the major vehicle producing plants.

The conference at which this decision was made was held in Birmingham and an attendance report given by a car plant shop steward was reproduced in the Trotskyist newspaper as follows:

"Attending the conference were rank-and-file workers and shop stewards from British-Leylands Morris Motors, Oxford; BMC Service, Oxford; Tractor and Transmission, Birmingham; Pressed-Steel Fisher, Birmingham; Pressed-Steel Fisher, Swindon; Austin, Longbridge; Standard-Triumph, Liverpool; AEC, Southall; Delaney-Galley, Wellingborough and Leyland Motors, Leyland, plants.

"Contingents from Ford's Halewood, Southampton and Dagenham plants; Vauxhall's factories at Luton, Dunstable and Ellesmere Port and from Rootes, Linwood, were also present.

"From Coventry came workers at Rolls Royce, Massey-Ferguson, Dunlop and Coventry Radiators.

"The car components side was represented by stewards and workers from Morgan Crucible, London and from five Joseph

Lucas combine plants—Lucas CAV, Liverpool ; Lucas, Birmingham ; CAV, Acton ; Girling's Bromborough and Simms Motor Units, London."

The growth of the All Trades Unions Alliance continued in 1970 and 1971. Indeed in November 1971 yet another national conference was called by the Trotskyists and the 1,600 people present were given the clear message that their task was to turn ordinary industrial disputes into potential "revolutionary situations". Speaking at this conference a Coventry shop steward anticipated with obvious relish the disruption that would hit the motor industry if a strike of toolroom workers, which was threatened at the time, took place and was prolonged. He stated :

"Eight thousand toolmakers coming out means the whole Midlands engineering industries stop. This is an enormous confrontation which must be widened into a General Strike to defeat the Tories".

By July, 1973 the ATUA was strong enough to convene a conference at Belle Vue, Manchester, attended by over 4,000 trade unionists. It was an extremely well organised affair with special trains bringing delegates from London, Portsmouth, Southampton, Basingstoke, Reading, Banbury and Oxford. Others travelled by coach from Scotland, the North East, Wales, the Midlands, Yorkshire and the North West.

They discussed the use of "flying pickets" during industrial disputes and the conference delegates were instructed to improve their training in Marxist theory and organisation so that they were ready for the "coming decisive battles" and to build a greater "revolutionary leadership" in industry.

The All Trades Unions Alliance, like the International Socialists, has special groups active within specific industries and professions. One of the most important is the Entertainments and Press Branch. It has played a large part in the development of the Young Socialists. Men and women, some of them internationally famous in the field of entertainment, have wittingly or otherwise helped to build the Trotskyist youth movement. Their support is one reason why extremist youngsters have been attracted to the

Trotskyists rather than to the Communists or any of the other revolutionary organisations.

Indeed it is a fair assumption that the glamour surrounding the entertainment industry has helped to recruit young people who might otherwise never have thought in terms of extremist politics.

John Gollan, the Communist leader, has frankly admitted the failure of his party to attract young workers. At the time of the 1973 Communist Congress, one delegate bemoaned the fact that out of the 3,000 members of the Young Communist League, only 30% were actually paying their dues.

By contrast the membership of the Young Socialists has been estimated as high as 50,000. This is almost certainly an exaggeration. Nevertheless, its members and supporters outnumber the Young Communists by at least ten to one.

The Trotskyists got off to a good start. First they penetrated the Labour Party's youth section, then itself known as the Young Socialists.

This manoeuvre was denied at the time but was afterwards frankly admitted. By 1964 the Trotskyist tactics had been so successful that the Labour Party felt compelled to take counter action. The known Trotskyists were expelled and the Labour Party's youth movement reorganised and given the title Labour Party Young Socialists. Inevitably, however, confusion stemming from the similarity of the titles still exists.

Despite the strong action taken by the Labour Party, the Trotskyist-controlled Young Socialists movement was able to begin its life as an open organisation with a basis of membership upon which it was able to build through campaigns comprising a programme of sporting and social events, skillfully blended with Marxist training.

The importance of discipline is a constant theme in this training. It is not just preached, it is rigidly practised. Reporting the 1965 Annual Conference of the YS, "The Times" stated :

" It was not, however, the content of the discussion as much as **the almost frightening discipline of the affair that made it significant to the outside observer.**"

At the 1970 conference—and at all those in between—the same point was stressed. The 1,500 present were told that the movement was "concerned with power" and that they must "fight as a disciplined revolutionary youth movement".

On February 14, 1971, well over 4,000 youngsters who were described as "the advance guard of the British revolution" were at a national rally at Alexandra Palace. They came from a wide variety of industries and from places as far apart as Belfast, Glasgow, Liverpool and Cardiff.

A team of some 50 actors and actresses supported the event and presented a series of sketches giving the Trotskyist version of Britain's industrial history over the past two hundred years. Employers were depicted as "scheming, cynical, unscrupulous and utterly self-interested types". The early trade union leaders fared no better in this gross caricature. They were portrayed as "strutting, pompous and filled with self-importance and hypocrisy".

These activities indicated the shape of things to come. In 1972 and 1973 more and more "disciplined" young revolutionaries became involved in the activities of the Young Socialists. For example some 8,000 people attended a rally at the Empire Pool, Wembley, on March 12, 1972.

Later in the same year 1,500 youngsters received training in the techniques of disruption at a "summer camp" held at St. Lawrence Bay, Essex. One feature which astonished some would-be observers was the tight security and strict discipline in force at the camp. Most of those who wanted to see what was going on had a difficult time. For instance an "Evening Standard" reporter found that the entrances were closely guarded. Similarly a "Daily Telegraph" representative was told "We don't want you here" and that if he did not leave quickly he would be escorted off the site. Describing the camp, which he stated had been professionally erected at a cost of several thousand pounds, the reporter wrote that :

" Discipline is strict. Everyone entering or leaving is checked by guards on continuous duty at the three entrances, which are floodlit at night ".

Two people—one of them a convenor of shop stewards in the motor industry—who had attended previous YS summer camps at the same site stated that they were "shocked at the stringent security measures and military, repressive atmosphere".

The Empire Pool, Wembley, was the scene of yet another Trotskyist mass rally in March 1973. This was "sponsored" by no less than 40 actors, writers and playwrights who according to a publicity hand-out "associated themselves with the working class movement". Certainly the list of sponsors included some names well known in the field of entertainment.

It is fair to say that the hand-out said that not all the sponsors were necessarily in complete agreement with the Socialist Labour League. Nevertheless they would have to be infantile in their politics if they were unaware that they were supporting an event designed to increase the power of a revolutionary movement. Indeed the real purpose was avowed by Roger Smith, one of the principal organisers, who said :

" The professional actors and directors will be involved not as 'professionals' but as members and leaders of a revolutionary movement.

" The pageant therefore becomes not a theatrical exercise, **but a weapon for education and struggle in the class-war** ".
(Our emphasis).

Here is another example. On August 4, 1973, "Keep Left"—the Trotskyist youth journal—carried the following report :

" The Young Socialists Summer Fair at Stockwell Manor School on Saturday, July 28, was a very successful step forward in the campaign to raise big resources for the launching of the revolutionary party.

" Not only did our Fair raise a large amount of money for the campaign but it enlisted the unstinting support and co-opera-

tion of a large number of members and supporters—young and old—of the Young Socialists.

"The presence of Harry Corbett, of Steptoe and Son, and actress Nyree Dawn Porter of 'The Forsyte Saga' at the Fair during the day provided an added attraction."

Given such support it is not surprising that the 1974 Annual Conference of the Young Socialists was the largest ever held. Among the 2,000 people present were representatives from Trotskyist organisations in other countries including a sizeable delegation from West Germany. A resolution passed at the Conference contained the following directive:

"It will be the young trade unionists in their factories and offices who will be in the forefront of the campaign to fight for socialist policies and build the revolutionary leadership—the Workers Revolutionary Party—to lead the working class to power.

"In this struggle it is of the utmost importance that every member of the Young Socialists joins his or her trade union, attends branch meetings regularly and leads fellow workers as shop stewards.

"Contest elections in your factory or place of work, fight for socialist policies, and expose the right wing and recruit to the Young Socialists and the Workers Revolutionary Party".

This was followed by another directive ordering a massive recruiting campaign in the summer of 1974. Every member was instructed that he or she must take part in the campaign by bringing their "school friends, work and college mates into the YS".

It was announced that a series of weekend schools would be held in various parts of the country and that those who attended would hear lectures on the "principles" of the revolutionary movement and the Marxist theory upon which it is based. They were also instructed to initiate an all-out attack on moderate trade union leaders and to accuse them of "betraying" the real interests of the workers.

Healy, the Trotskyist leader, has always understood that a revolutionary movement cannot succeed without industrial organisation and without harnessing the enthusiasm of extremist youngsters. He is a great believer in the statement attributed to Lenin that "he who has youth, has the future".

The Trotskyists have set out with some success to harness the enthusiasm of extremist youngsters and through discipline and training to weld them into a revolutionary force. In the years ahead they may become a greater menace to industry than the Communist Party.

The same cannot be said of the Maoist organisations such as the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) or the Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist).

Both are numerically insignificant but the former cannot be ignored if only because it has among its leaders men who hold influential positions in the AUEW. The best known of them is its founder and chairman Reg Birch who is on the Executive Council of the AUEW engineering section.

The programme of the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) is quite explicit. It declares that there can never be peace between employers (the exploiters) and workers (the exploited). The working class, it states, "lives in a state of perpetual guerilla conflict with the employers".

And how about the Labour Party? According to this Maoist group it has long ago signed away its soul in a compact with capitalism. Workers will never enter into a bargain with these creatures of the exploiting classes.

All good revolutionary stuff, you may think, but what the Maoists have actually done is to set out in forthright language exactly what all revolutionaries believe even if, for tactical reasons, some of them express themselves in less inflammatory phraseology.

CHAPTER VII

COMBATING SUBVERSION

To combat subversion it is first necessary to understand it. We must know the strengths and the weaknesses of those ranged against us—who they are, how they operate and what are their aims.

There is another vital point. We also need to probe as far as possible the minds of those who seek by undemocratic methods to overthrow our present way of life. What is it that makes them tick?

This is not the easiest of tasks even for people who have spent a life-time opposing the extremists and have often been in direct confrontation with them.

There are, however, things we can all learn from the real revolutionaries—as distinct from those who get caught up in their activities without fully understanding what it is all about.

Many of them are dedicated men and women prepared to make sacrifices to further the cause in which they believe. They are enthusiastic about their cause because of a strong, indeed unshakeable, conviction that it is just.

Further, they confidently believe that nothing can stop them from achieving their ultimate aim of destroying free enterprise and parliamentary democracy and establishing some form of Communist state. It is not as they see it a question of whether they will win, but when and how.

Why are they so sure? It is of course a fact that revolutionaries are by nature supreme optimists. Even in Britain, where

extremism has been repeatedly rebuffed by the electorate, the same conviction of ultimate victory is clearly discernible in all the revolutionary groups, particularly those that follow the teachings of Karl Marx, the German economist who died in England as long ago as 1883.

To them the advent of Communism is a matter of historical certainty. As self-styled "political scientists" they regard themselves as infallible readers of situations, always able to come up with the correct solution to any problem, local, national or international.

From the point of view of industry and commerce, the Marxist theory of surplus value is the one that concerns us most. It purports to prove that all profit is robbery and that it is the workers who are robbed. This is how it was explained in a booklet about Marxism issued by the Communist Party's Education Department in January 1974:

"The source of the profit the capitalist makes is to be found in the fact that the worker, by using his or her labour power, creates a greater value than is returned in wages. In other words the worker spends part of his or her working time creating value to pay wages and the rest of the time producing a surplus for which he is not paid. This is what Marx called 'surplus value'. And this is the root of exploitation under capitalism and the economic basis of the class struggle".

Writing in "Socialist Worker" of August 4, 1973, John Palmer—an International Socialist and Business Editor of the "Guardian"—put it this way:

"We have to deny the right of the employers to take profits—be they high or low. The full product of its labour belongs to the working class".

Shop floor agitators use the "surplus value" theory in a way which, although crude, can be effective in the emotional atmosphere of mass meetings. A Communist Party booklet called "The Money Game or How Much Do You Make For Your Boss?" said this:

" If you totted up the value of the materials as they went into the factory—enough, say for a week's output—and then you totted up the value of the cars themselves as they poured out of the factory during the week, you would find that the cars are more valuable.

" So inside the factory, the materials have been changed into something of greater value.

" It is this extra value that contains the secret.

" For it is the workers, giving their time and their skill to make the finished products from the raw materials, who create the value.

" Part of this new value is used by the boss to pay the workers' wages. Part is used to pay the boss's rent to the owner of the land where the factory stands, part to pay the interest on any loans he may have got from the bank and part for other expenses. The rest is his profit.

" It is as simple as that. The workers create new value, which is the finished product. Part of this pays wages and salaries. The rest stays in the hands of the boss and is the source of his profit "

This firmly held belief leads inevitably to the concept that any action taken to end a system under which the masses are allegedly exploited by the few is justified.

The Marxists repudiate any responsibility under "capitalist" laws. They do not accept moral or ethical standards stemming as they assert from "capitalist" education and "capitalist" control of the mass media.

They do not respect private property which—if one accepts the teachings of Marx—rightfully belongs to the "workers" who produce this property and they profess only one loyalty. That is to the "working class", of which all the revolutionary organisations are the self-appointed champions.

From these beliefs one gets the following impression of the Marxist mind—it is certain of ultimate victory, sure of its infalli-

bility, convinced that it has justice on its side and utterly intolerant of any opposing viewpoint. These characteristics are important. The consequence of an unwillingness even to consider the possibility that Marxism is fallible is the establishment of a dictatorship. The conviction that there can be no valid different opinions leads inevitably to the suppression of opposition where Communists rule.

The revolutionary cannot even accept the premise that his opponents are misguided or ignorant, so we find that every Labour Government in the history of this country has been accused of "traitorous" activities against the working class. So has every TUC General Council. Similarly it is not unusual for union officials who have settled pay claims with employers on what they honestly consider to be a realistic basis to be attacked—verbally and physically—as "collaborators" who have sold their members "down the river".

Such attitudes and activities are regarded as both logical and justified by all Marxists who believe in the theory of surplus value. They deny all loyalty to a country or government that, according to them, allows exploitation to take place, to employers who are said to be responsible for the exploitation, or to trade unionists who they allege do not fight hard enough against it.

All revolutionaries agree about that. Where they differ is on how to destroy our present way of life and even more about what to put in its place.

They will co-operate in any operation aimed at destroying our house but fight like mad over how to demolish it and what kind of building to erect on the ruin.

Some pin their faith on the Leninist concept that the best way to destroy a country is to debauch its currency. Their method, which they pursue with a fair degree of patience, is to undermine the national economy by national strikes, overtime bans and other forms of industrial conflict that impede the production and distribution of goods and services.

Even more insidious is their endeavour to stop industry and commerce from operating at peak efficiency. They seek to prevent

a company from reaping the full benefit of new methods and machines while at the same time supporting any action which will drive up costs and feed the inflationary spiral.

Other revolutionaries regard the process of seeking power through the gradual weakening of the economy as too slow and too uncertain. To them class warfare means exactly what it says—revolution including the use of violence if necessary. The words "general strike" for instance are seldom absent from a Trotskyist appraisal of any difficult industrial situation.

They avow their intention to use industrial disputes as a political weapon. It is their belief that only weak leadership on the part of the political and industrial sides of the Labour movement prevents the workers from rising against their "oppressors" and physically taking over control. The downfall of the Government—Labour or Conservative—would, they are convinced, follow as a matter of course.

Even revolutionaries have their "doves and hawks". For instance the Communists regard the use of sabotage and violence as counter-productive. Not so the Solidarists (most of whom originated in the Anarchist and Syndicalist movements). They go along with the "normal" methods of attacking industry but are prepared to go much further. In a booklet called "Strategy for Industrial Struggle", produced as a guide to all extremist agitators, they examined in detail and with examples six ways of more efficiently making industry less efficient. One of them was the use of sabotage. This, the Solidarists declared, is "undoubtedly a significant form of struggle" which has a "long and honourable history". They bemoaned the opposition of the "traditional Left" to the use of this weapon in the class conflict.

Nowadays the Communists who accept the "debauching the currency" theory go through the motions of acting as good trade unionists. They regard it as tactically sound to act with outward moderation when it suits their long-term planning.

The Maoists regard this as a weak, even treacherous, attitude. The Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) is quite forthright on this issue. This organisation—led by union official Reg Birch—has declared that :

" There will be no satisfactory settlement overall other than the complete defeat of the employers as a class : the destruction of the employers' class power and its replacement by the class power of the workers ".

The May 1971 issue of "The Worker"—the journal of this Maoist group—pinpointed the lessons to be learned from a large-scale strike in the motor industry. It stated that the workers had returned to their factories "to regroup, to choose their own time for the next attack, to continue by all means the guerilla war against the employers, striking back at all times while keeping their own forces intact". It added that those who led the strike had gone back to "their posts as shop stewards and convenors to organise continued struggle behind the enemy's lines".

The following statement made in the publication "Workers Fight"—the journal of the Trotskyist organisation of the same name—gives an insight into the attitude of mind of some of those aiming to overthrow our present system of society :

" THE KILLING of 5 innocent British working women in the Irish Republican Army bomb explosion at Aldershot is a tragedy which all sympathisers with the Irish Republican Army deeply regret. It was an accident caused by a mistake in the timing of a bomb, an accident regretted as bitterly by the Irish Republican Army as by us.

" That was ONE of the tragedies of Aldershot. The personal one.

" The other tragedy—the military and political one—was that the explosion failed in its objective to decimate the officer corps of the Parachute Regiment . . . "

According to "Workers Fight"—which is produced by a group of Marxists who, until recently, were members of the International Socialism Group—the IRA is "not a terrorist organisation". It went on : "incidents like Aldershot are not terrorist exercises IN ANY MARXIST DEFINITION OF THE TERMS". (Original emphasis).

Presumably to ensure that readers of "Workers Fight" got the message the writer added :

" The attack on the officers' mess showed that the IRA knows its enemy : not the British people but the ruling class and their armed and pampered mercenaries "

"The Red Mole" (now "Red Weekly"), journal of the Inter-Marxist Group, dealt with the Aldershot tragedy in similar terms. It referred to the "just violence of the IRA" and went on to say that :

" The fact that a bad technical error or tactical mistake meant that **unfortunately** British army officers were not killed by the blast, does not in the slightest alter the political content of the struggle of the IRA ". (Our emphasis).

The revolutionary groups are most dangerous when they are able to go into action with the backing of sincere people who, rightly or wrongly, believe that their "just" claims cannot be achieved by constitutional methods.

Often the genuine demonstrators and the subversives appear to have a common aim. In fact the gulf between them is enormous. The subversives are not interested in solving problems or rectifying grievances. They are skilled exploiters of situations and their aim is to destroy, not improve, our present system of society.

The role of the revolutionary groups has often been highlighted in official reports following thorough inquiries into industrial disputes in many of our important industries. The Cameron Report on "Disturbances in Northern Ireland" revealed how supporters of these same groups set out to use the deep-seated problems besetting Ireland as a launching pad for revolution. In an introduction to this Report the Commission said that :

"... it very soon became plain to us that in such a situation as we have described, politically subversive and mischievous elements could and in the event did, for their own purposes deliberately inflame passions on all sides and either irresponsibly or deliberately invoke violent incidents to their own assumed advantage. And we were not without ample evidence and information which have led us to conclude that such elements were and are present and were ready to foment and

exploit and did foment and exploit for their own ends genuine grievances or complaints "

Faced with well organised and heavily financed subversion and bearing in mind the mental outlook of those engaged in it, it is clear that anyone looking for an easy answer to the problem will be disappointed. It is a battle that cannot be won in the sense that subversive activities can be completely destroyed for all time. Yet the challenge has to be met, contained and rendered as ineffective as possible within a free society.

Exposing subversives is a necessary **first** step. The more people in every walk of life are aware of the danger the easier it will be for decisive, positive action to be taken.

Being the aggressors in the "class war" the extremists are almost always taking the initiative. They attack the weaknesses of society, of governments, of employers, of unions and of people.

They are often helped by well-meaning people who are ever ready to publicise problems but have little or nothing to say about progress. They are assisted by those who support strikes, even when they are unconstitutional or against the law, on the grounds that the "workers have a case". Further, those who have condoned violence, or even refused to condemn it outright because it is regarded as the product of "strong feelings" about this or that situation have a lot to answer for.

There is in fact no reason why the propaganda initiative should be with the extremists. The record of free enterprise within a system of parliamentary democracy is one of massive achievement. It is not by accident that the highest standards of living in the world exist in countries where the great competitive industries are in the hands of free enterprise concerns.

By contrast, in countries where Communists rule, freedom has been destroyed without even the compensation of living standards comparable to those enjoyed in the free world.

While not minimising the problems that exist (and will always exist in an imperfect society run by imperfect human beings), the

facts about the success of free enterprise should be taken to the people of this country, not in an apologetic way but with confidence that history has proved it to be the most efficient way of running industry.

The benefits of this ever-increasing efficiency can be seen in virtually every home in Britain where nowadays goods and services are used as a matter of course which even a short time ago were not available even to the wealthiest of people.

A long time ago Jonathan Swift put it in a nutshell when he wrote that :

" Whoever could make two ears of corn or two blades of grass to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together ".

The truth of this statement has been proved by experience. Free enterprise needs no further justification than a factual account of what it has achieved contrasted with the conditions prevailing where it has been destroyed. There is no reason why those who support it should do so in a defensive manner.

Subversion—both in the private enterprise and nationalised sectors of industry—normally manifests itself as an industrial relations problem.

Here again there is no reason why the initiative should be with the extremists. Management should aim to be a jump ahead, to see and handle a problem before it reaches exploitable magnitude. The proposition is " Anything that is good for industrial relations must be bad for the wreckers ".

The same point arises when it comes to good communications. This should be a continuing process and not seen simply as a way of answering misleading propaganda put out or circulated by extremists.

The practical problems of adequately putting workers in the picture differ from industry to industry and firm to firm. A common

point, however, is that information should be conveyed to both the ears and the eyes and it must be based on the concept of "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth". Only then will workers on all levels learn from experience that the information given to them can be trusted and that management is not trying to pull the wool over their eyes.

Communications should not be regarded as a job that can be done adequately by an amateur. The effective use of words is a highly skilled business. In the hands of the inexperienced, words can be dynamite. As we have pointed out, the basis of class warfare is the fictional notion that profit amounts to robbery. It follows from this that a great deal more educational work is necessary on the question of industrial finance—what are profits, why are they necessary and what happens to them ?

Lack of adequate information and knowledge—which gives rise to misunderstandings and provides the opportunity for rumour-mongering and misrepresentation—is an ingredient upon which the extremist manipulators of opinion, particularly at mass meetings, thrive. This further emphasises the vital need for establishing good two-way communications.

The speedy handling of grievances is another factor. It cannot be overstressed that while subversives are adept at manufacturing grievances, their usual tactic is to exploit and magnify problems that already exist. Anyone who leaves inflammable material lying around is inviting the skilled agitator to apply a match. It is wrong in any circumstances for genuine grievances to remain unsettled. When there are extremists about it is not only wrong but highly dangerous.

Probably most important of all is the fact that subversives, like other people, feed on their successes. When blackmail in the form of strikes or the threat of strikes wins concessions higher than could have been achieved by negotiation, it is understandable that workers come to regard the extremists as astute leaders. More than this—under such circumstances it is hard to blame moderate trade union officials if they increasingly adopt "militancy" as their stock in trade instead of commonsense and moderation.

It is of course easier to captain a cricket team from the pavilion than it is on the field. Similarly it is easy for someone who does not have the responsibility for making important decisions when disputes are threatened or in being, to be critical of those upon whom the onus falls.

There is a thin dividing line between sensible compromise and concessions which, although they might purchase an uneasy and temporary peace, set the scene for even bigger troubles at a later stage. There is, however, no escaping the fact that if experience appears to show that more can be achieved by force than by negotiation, the subversives are bound to gain in prestige.

Finally, it can be said that the most important antidote to subversion is strong leadership, particularly on the part of management at shop floor level. Men and women respond to leadership and it is when good leaders are absent that the bad ones come into their own.

To summarise, the best reply to subversion is the maintenance of good industrial relations, the establishment of faith in the agreed procedures for settling disputes and first-class two-way communications between the boardroom and the bench. In the main, these depend on the ability to combine fairness with firmness—an essential ingredient of good leadership.

APPENDIX

EXTREMIST ORGANISATIONS

The Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB)

The largest and most influential of the revolutionary organisations active in this country. It controls an "industrial apparatus" based on branches set up inside factories and other places of work and has successfully penetrated some important unions at all levels from national executives, district committees, shop stewards committees and local branches. The "Morning Star" is the "voice" of the Communist Party.

The Young Communist League (YCL)

The youth organisation of the CPGB. It operates among apprentices, young workers and students. Its journal is called "Challenge".

The Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions (LCDTU)

A Communist "front" organisation set up in 1966 to campaign against the then Labour Government's prices and incomes policy and to oppose the proposals outlined in "In Place of Strife". Is supported by a number of union officials and it works in conjunction with other "front" organisations. The Building Workers' Charter Group is a notable example.

The Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP)

Formerly the Socialist Labour League, this is easily the largest and most active of the Trotskyist organisations. It publishes a daily newspaper called "Workers Press".

The Young Socialists (YS)

This is the youth movement of the Workers Revolutionary Party to which it is now officially affiliated. It works in close association with the Young Socialists Student Societies (also

affiliated to the WRP) and publishes a weekly journal called "Keep Left".

The All Trades Union Alliance (ATUA)

The industrial arm of the Workers Revolutionary Party. It originated among Trotskyist shop stewards in the Oxford car plants but has since developed into a national organisation with committees established in the main industrial centres. Among its members are a considerable number of shop stewards from important sectors of industry.

The International Marxist Group (IMG)

Another Trotskyist organisation. It is active on picket lines during major strikes and publishes a journal called "Red Weekly".

Workers Fight

A small but active Trotskyist group. It was for some time the "Trotskyist tendency" within the International Socialists. It now operates separately and has a journal called "Workers Fight".

The Revolutionary Workers Party (RWP)

The smallest and least influential of the avowed Trotskyist organisations. It does little more than publish revolutionary propaganda through its journal "Red Flag".

The International Socialists (IS)

One of the fastest growing and professional of the revolutionary organisations operating in industry and the unions. It has established "factory branches" in many large industrial concerns and "IS fractions" in some major unions. It has a weekly publication "Socialist Worker". The IS produces a prodigious amount of revolutionary material aimed at specific industries, professions and companies.

The NALGO Action Group

An IS-dominated organisation active among local government officers. It has a regular "rank-and-file" publication called "NALGO Action News".

The Redder Tape Organisation

Another IS-dominated organisation conducting revolutionary operations among civil servants. Its journal is called "Redder Tape".

The Rank and File Group

Also heavily influenced by the IS. It concentrates on teachers and works in conjunction with a similar group composed of teachers in technical institutes. Both issue regular journals, called "Rank and File" and "Tech Teacher" respectively.

The Case Con Collective

A group of revolutionary social workers, also IS-dominated. It publishes a journal called "Case Con" and works in association with the NALGO Action Group.

The Institute for Workers Control

Formed in 1968, having previously operated as the Centre for Socialist Education. It has the support of people—among whom are MPs and top union officials—whose views vary from "orthodox" Left-wing to avowed supporters of revolutionary organisations. Its aims have little or nothing to do with "consultation" or "participation". Its object is to achieve complete "workers control" of all industries.

The Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

The most active Maoist organisation in Britain. It was founded by Reg Birch, a leading AUEW official, and its main operations are centred on the North London area.

The "Militant" Group

A Marxist organisation active within the Labour Party, particularly its youth section. Publishes a regular journal called "Militant".

The Communist Party of England (Marxist-Leninist)

A small but virulent pro-Chinese organisation which operates mainly among students in London and Birmingham.

The Solidarists

This group is mainly supported by the more extreme elements in the anarchist and syndicalist movements. It maintains a very considerable output of journals and pamphlets in which guidance is given on the most effective methods of disrupting industry.

AREA DIRECTORY

A.C.E.—Area Chief Executive

Scotland :

A.C.E. : T. N. Douglas
Office : 7 Park Circus Place,
Glasgow G3 6AH
Telephone : 041-332 9108/9

North East Coast

A.C.E. : H. J. Lawrence
Office : Trinity House
Buildings, 12 Trinity Chare,
Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 3DF
Telephone : 0632-26878

Central Midlands

A.C.E. : G. P. Savill
Office : 108c Alcester Road,
Moseley, Birmingham B13 8EF
Telephone : 021-449 1594

London & South Eastern

A.C.E. : J. B. Knott
Office : 89b London Road,
Croydon, CR0 2RF
Telephone : 01-686 3596

Yorkshire & East Midlands

A.C.E. : A. Armstrong
Leeds Office :
44 Eastgate, Leeds, LS2 7JL
Telephone : 0532-39531

Sheffield Office :
53 Victoria Street,
Sheffield, S3 7QB

North Western

A.C.E. : K. G. Holdway
Office : 18 Museum Street,
Warrington
Telephone : 0925-54391

Western

A.C.E. : T. M. Braithwaite
Office : Bakers Row,
Cardiff, CF1 2AL
Telephone : 0222-22428