

THE CONTINUAL CRISIS IN INDUSTRY CAUSING
THE PERMANENT CLASH BETWEEN BOSSES AND
WORKERS, CAN ONLY BE SOLVED BY THE
ELIMINATION OF THE SIDE WHICH IS BOTH
SUPERFLOUS AND UNNECESSARY, i.e. THE BOSSES.

VOLUME ONE NUMBER THREE.

ARTICLE ON MAY DAY.

SOLIDARITY

GLASGOW

FOR WORKERS' POWER :: 6d

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

$$f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt + \int_0^x g(t) dt + \int_0^x h(t) dt + \int_0^x k(t) dt + \int_0^x l(t) dt + \int_0^x m(t) dt + \int_0^x n(t) dt + \int_0^x o(t) dt + \int_0^x p(t) dt + \int_0^x q(t) dt + \int_0^x r(t) dt + \int_0^x s(t) dt + \int_0^x t(t) dt + \int_0^x u(t) dt + \int_0^x v(t) dt + \int_0^x w(t) dt + \int_0^x x(t) dt + \int_0^x y(t) dt + \int_0^x z(t) dt + \int_0^x \dots$$

$$f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt + \int_0^x g(t) dt + \int_0^x h(t) dt + \int_0^x k(t) dt + \int_0^x l(t) dt + \int_0^x m(t) dt + \int_0^x n(t) dt + \int_0^x o(t) dt + \int_0^x p(t) dt + \int_0^x q(t) dt + \int_0^x r(t) dt + \int_0^x s(t) dt + \int_0^x t(t) dt + \int_0^x u(t) dt + \int_0^x v(t) dt + \int_0^x w(t) dt + \int_0^x x(t) dt + \int_0^x y(t) dt + \int_0^x z(t) dt + \int_0^x \dots$$

MAY DAY

THE UNOFFICIAL TRUTH

On May Day, the Labour Party and the Trade Union bureaucracy held their annual pilgrimage to Queens Park. The expected crowd of right-wing Labourites and middle-of-the-road bourgeois were there, proclaiming themselves as the labour movement. Mincing around in this pottage were the usual array of tame leftists all dreaming of the day they can throw out the right-wing and take control of the bureaucratic apparatus themselves, with the aim of 'leading' the workers along the way to their 'socialism'; the 'dont heckle George Brown' Communist Party, the 'stay in the Labour Party at all costs' Pabloite Trotskyists, the 'build the leadership' Healyite Trotskyists and 'the learn your Marx thoroughly' Socialist Party of Great Britain.

There were even some workers there. (Could this have been a mistake? Was this an oversight on the part of the officials?) One of them told an official that he wasn't in any trade union or any group affiliated to the Labour Party, that he was just an ordinary worker who wanted to come on their march. He was sent to the back. The labour movement, that is, the mass of the working people, were nowhere to be seen. Many of them would be in their pit sleeping off Saturday night's hangover. The few, who were out and about watched the rally from the sidelines.

DISSENT

A month before May Day, ' Scots Against War' began issuing a leaflet entitled 'May Day Do', inciting the labour movement to wreck George Brown's visit to the city. The leaflet emphasised an extremely important point. "May Day does not belong to the Labour Party or Trade union bureaucrats.. It is a workers rally." It finished, " The object of the demonstration should be to replace this out-of-touch political bureaucrat with rank-and-file working-class speakers."

The whole of the 'official' left reacted as expected!

Hugh Wyper, secretary of Glasgow Trades Council, a Stalinist, said, "It appears we are dealing with an attempt to incite trouble and I am quite sure, that none of the recognised organisations, which are associated with the May Day demonstration are involved." (Scotsman April 6th.)

MPs Buchan and Carmichael did their nut. Not publicly, but among their friends. Simpson and Marshall, secretaries of the Glasgow and Scottish Labour Parties respectively, began organising 150 stewards and informing the police and special branch. (Their police; the Labour Party is in power at George Square. George Brown's special branch; he helps rule at Westminster.)

Every police spy suspect in left-wing circles began asking 'disinterested' questions. Plain clothes snoops appeared in the Marland Bar, where most of the support for the demonstration was canvassed. (When will Glasgow police start sending snoopers we don't recognise.)

'Right' and 'left' in the Labour Party wailed in unison; 'Unity at all costs'. From the 'right', "Do you want the Tories in again." From the entrust Trotskyists in Govan and Gorbals YS branches came the usual hack recital, "The working-class forces are in the Labour Party! The working-class will eventually join the Labour Party!!!! Keep the Party intact and change the leadership! (to Trots of course.)"

King of the Communists, secretary Gordon McLennan said, (Scotsman, April 6th.) that the leaflet "was a completely irresponsible document and one that the Communist Party would dissociate themselves from completely." The Daily Worker, at that time was associating with the 'completely responsible' North Vietnamese government.

Geoff Shaw, member of the Labour Party and chairman of Glasgow CND "said his movement would dissociate itself from the proposal to cause trouble." (Scotsman April 6th.) All that is left of Glasgow CND is a committee of Labour Party members, so the Reverend Shaw was dead right.

Even the hierarchy of the Committee of IOU dissociated themselves at their meeting on April 8th.

In fact everyone who wants to go 'left' right, participated in a great orgy of dissociation.

UNITED THEY SHALL BE

The demonstration did not achieve its objective. It was hoped to let Brown 'have it' with bags of flour and in the confusion which was bound to arise, try and take over the platform, and have a meeting at which people representing the various shades of working-class opinion could speak. There was no chance of success, since only about 50 militants went into the arena, while far too many stood outside the hedge. As a result, the stewards, generalised by Simpson, the City Labour Party secretary, were able, by their overwhelming numbers, (with a hundred or so police waiting outside) to surround the militants and prevent them going for the platform. The situation became strained and a real rammy and punch-up was on the cards, as the stewards strove to protect their beloved Labour Party. One steward yelled at a demonstrator, "I'll mash your fucking face in." A moment later he said, he also hated Brown's policies, but, (you've guessed) dissension in the ranks would let the Tories in. So what price unity! Beat up someone you agree with, as long as the Labour Party is united.

Another steward flung a demonstrator on the ground. Since when was

it the stewards job to threaten to beat up hecklers who wont leave their meeting. Even better, when did the plain clothes police join the Labour Party and become stewards. Are even Labour ministers of the Crown so valuable that they must be protected from the very people , in whose interests they are supposed to be acting.

The punch-up was only averted by a middle-aged Independent Labour Party member, who stepped in and accused the stewards of doing the same as the demonstrators, themselves, to non-socialists thirty years ago. This stopped the stewards and the militants then left the arena,

THE OFFICIAL VERSION

The press next day was generally wrong in reporting who had been in the arena. Oddly, none of them blamed the communists. (Are they beginning to realise that there are other left-wingers besides the Stalinists - and probably more dangerous.)

The Committee of 100 were blamed (wrongly) by the Express. Most other papers said (again wrongly) that it was the nuclear disarmers shouting Vietnam and anti-bomb slogans. In fact, those who demonstrated were Solidarists, Syndicalists, ILPers and a few people from the Young Communist League. (how long will McLennan allow them to remain in the Party.) Most of the heckling was about workers control, political bureaucrats and battery-hen 'socialism'.

The Young Socialists were obviously absent. (Perhaps they couldn't afford to have whats left of their Federation disbanded. There are resolutions to be passed you know.) The Socialist Labour League, or more definitely, the YS branches they have manipulated into existence, went off on their own to have a meeting on the nearby recreation ground, having previously laid claim to being the 'official' labour movement.

William Bargh, chairman of Glasgow and District Co-operative Society, denounced the demonstration (Guardian May 3rd.) as "organised hooliganism from a group of people who do not belong to the labour movement." If he means we dont belong to his mouldy old Labour Party he is dead right. If he means we are not part of the great mass of exploited workers for whom the Labour Party does nothing but hamstringing them for the benefit of the 'national economy', (for national economy read bosses.) then he is dead wrong.

Perhaps Mr. Bargh did not see his two nephews among those he thinks he can blithely exclude from the labour movement. They of course, only work in a factory, so one couldn't say they were part of the labour movement. Unlike their uncle who is right in the midst of the working-class struggle in his job. He is headmaster of a Glasgow fee-paying school for the children of wealthy businessmen.

FREEDOM TO SPEAK

The demonstrators have been condemned as undemocratic, as disruptive, subversive elements, who were impinging on Mr. Brown's 'right' to speak. This is not surprising. What these political bullies want is power for themselves and whenever they meet a challenge or threat at grass roots level that is, from rank-and-file workers (over whom they try to exercise their power.) they resort to fuming and bellowing and cries of 'undemocratic.'

What are the democratic issues involved? Brown was elected by 1000's of people like those at Queens Park. Having been elected, after a few weeks grovelling to us for votes, like all professional politicians, he melts away into the ornate and mysterious corridors of power around the cabinet suite, and remains generally inaccessible to the electorate. But May Day is one of the times of the year that the political 'elite' have to show their faces to those who elect them. This is an occasion when ordinary people can challenge these guys, when they come along, speak down to them and advocate measures which the majority disagree with. This was the case on May Day. Despite this Brown was able to use, what is regarded by many people as a platform representing working-class views, and with the aid of TV and press, which the capitalist state puts at the disposal of harmless social democrats, he put over policies which 80% of those at the rally opposed. (His 'standing ovation' the press told us about, came from about 400 blind loyalists, while the other 3000 stood in silence or booed.)

Those who demonstrated, did so, because they were part of the majority opinion which was anti-Brown in entirety. They were naive enough to think that democracy meant letting the majority case be heard.

PLAYING POLITICS

What is to be learned from the events? Why can 3000 people stand mute and listen to the prattling of a man, whose views they know are a load of social democratic shit. Here was a challenge a 'fight' that these so-called revolutionaries are always clamouring for, and yet when the situation arises in concrete viable terms, they stand by and watch stewards and police deal with fellow left-wingers, who attack the establishment they are supposed to hate. What kind of 'fight' do they want? A few tactical manoeuvres, an adept bit of resolution passing, which will enable them to grab power. With the mass of the people oblivious or excluded from what is going on. From the Communist Party these May Day tactics are to be expected! They never support left-wingers who don't want to go 'left' the same way as themselves. Better to sell them out to the class enemy than associate

with them. (This might explain why several stewards were members of the Communist Party.) The CP have sold out the Trotskyists and Anarchists in the past, so why not May Day hecklers.

And what about the 'tough' Trotskyists; Healy's crowd were in the recreation ground talking to themselves. Pablo's boys from Govan and Gorbals, ever endowed with their 'stay in the Labour Party' neurosis, would never be seen acting against the party whose policies they know to be so much crap. In a situation like May Day, the sole object of these sectarians is to preserve their faction at all costs, keep their nose clean, watch their image and not to provoke incidents between themselves and the right-wing leadership. To demonstrate might bring down the bureaucratic apparatus and when your objective is to capture control of that apparatus then you withdraw.

If like the CP and the Trots your aim is to control the working-class for your factional ends by capturing the reins of power then you must of necessity, sell out those who took action on May Day. Because the action was not simply against the Labour Party as such, but much more so against the bureaucracy it has created. Those who demonstrated had no factional line to push. They were politically conscious workers, whose intention is to join with their fellow workers and eventually try and destroy the bureaucratic power, rather than take control of it. That is why they stood up and were counted.

PARTY OR MOVEMENT

Despite the claims of the social democrats, those who attend the dull ward committees and dreary union meetings are not the labour movement. The labour movement is the British working people, approximately a third of whom give the Labour Party a cynical vote at election time, and all of whom contemptuously ignore the May Day rallies.

Despite what the frightened 'lefts' think, the Tories and bosses don't want to destroy the Labour Party, either by exploiting opposition in the labour movement or by any other way. They realise, obviously much better than these 'lefts', that the Labour Party is a necessary safety-valve, which diverts the pressure of the working-class offensive away from what must be its ultimate objective; the exclusion of the boss-class and the running of society themselves without the 'help' of the professional politicians of the 'left'. With the trade union hierarchy, the labour Party acts as a buffer which prevents the all out clash between the workers and the bosses.

The Labour Party can only be destroyed by a strong, conscious working-class. A working-class that will naturally deal with the Tories at the same time. When all of us in the labour movement realise it is a hindrance rather than a help, that we have no need of its 'protection', we will ignore it, by-pass its professional political careerists, make it redundant and thus its rotten old carcass will end up on the scrap

heap, and with it, we sincerely hope, will go all the little 'left' factions nibbling away like maggots in its belly. That day the workers might repeat what the hecklers told the stewards, "The bureaucrats can stuff their Labour Party up their arse."

George Williamson.

(The writer is an architectural assistant in a private firm in Glasgow.)

MEETING

A Meeting will be held on Sunday 27th June (Faslane week-end.) at 1pm at George and Paula Williamson's flat, 33 Kelvingrove St, C3. to discuss the ideas, role and organisation of Glasgow Solidarity and our journal, 'Solidarity'.

All militants, disrupters and subversives are welcome.

Some London Solidarists will be coming up for the meeting.

Buses from the city centre to Kelvingrove St. (8 mins);
1, 1A, 6, 9, 15, 16, 16A, 43, 43A, 44, 56, 57, 63, 64.

FASLANE

COME

ALL

YE

Glasgow Solidarity supports the Scottish Committee of IOG's demonstration at Faslane on Sat., 26th of June.

The action on this demonstration is a welcome departure from the non-violent suicides of the last two years, when people have been offered to the state, on a sacrificial plate for 'legal' processing by the courts.

This demonstration puts the Committee on the offensive. Their objective, stopping work on the base on the Saturday, can be achieved without 'casualties'. The action at Faslane and the visits to the weapons establishments at Glen Douglas, Glen Frui, Roseneath and Coulpport will put the authorities on the defensive and force them to employ thousands of police to guard these places at no cost to the demonstrators themselves.

SCIENCE AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY

Alan Parker.

Alan Parker is an engineering draughtsman, who has worked in the Midlands, the Potteries and Lanarkshire.

Much of his material in this article comes from reading journals like the 'New Scientist.' and similar publications from the USA and the UN. Being reformist-bourgeois publications they do not advocate solutions, which revolutionary socialists would agree with. Nevertheless, they tend to give a deeper and often more intelligent analysis of society and its problems, than much of the woolly and unsubstantiated writings of some 'left' journals.

It is estimated by the students of the history of science that 95% of all that is known has been discovered in the last fifty years. Most of this knowledge has not been practically applied as yet and new knowledge is coming into being at an ever-increasing rate. The emergence of a large body of men dedicated to the development of science and technology is a distinguishing sociological feature of this century in world history. In every country the end products of this knowledge are destroying the traditional ways of thinking and thus eating away at the established codes of personal, social and political behaviour. No one, as yet can clearly predict the shape of things to come, with the personal consequences on peoples lives, due to the intangibles in the scientific process and in the means of applying science. The development of nuclear and biological weapons have brought the prospect of world destruction. The development of 'social power' in the form of communication techniques may result in the acceptance of a universal death wish among peoples the world over. Increasing automation in industry with the object of controlling a man's work output results in his demoralisation with dangerous social and personal repercussions. The centralisation of state power, the drift towards World War 3 and the 'restless', troubled feeling of 1000's of men doing loathsome tasks in industry are symptoms of the uncontrolled and haphazard application of science, without regard for people. In human terms, the personal insecurity brought about by the rapid rate of change and the misapplication of science has resulted in a drastic increase in mental illness, pathological group behaviour, suicide and alcoholism, and these are most prevalent in the countries with the 'highest standard of living' ie, the biggest consumption of material goods. The vast majority are not 'consciously' aware of the rate of change, since the time scale and quality of their 'conscious experience' is so small and unrelated, that it does

not allow them to see the historical significance of the process they are unwittingly suspended in.

Another feature of this age is the unequal growth in the application of the social and physical sciences, as seen in the precocious development of automation and armaments and the primitive state of man's social institutions. Our awareness of the lack of development and application of what may be described as 'social knowledge' is constantly being reinforced in most spheres of human activity; the lack of control being the most obvious characteristic.

The ideological dogmas of the East and West and their social, political and economic systems do not and will not allow the creative ingenuity of men to flourish in freedom. National decision-makers, military and economic pressure groups and the mass of the people themselves, have an outmoded and anachronistic conception of human nature and their own 'needs', and as they collectively clamour for 'national' action, history marches on with science and technology used wrecklessly in industry and arms making.

We in the left are fixed in this social matrix, and too many of us think in 19th century terms. For many of us, our utopian conception of the society we want, is based on wishful thinking resulting from our unpleasant experiences of having to live in this mad world where science and technology run riot. We cannot, however, divorce ourselves from the real world of man the tool-maker, user of machines and creator of new material forms. One difference between us and medieval man, is that, with the tools and machines the average industrial man performs the work equivalent of 300 men under feudalism. It is this abundance of 'work energy' that has shaped the material conditions under which we live and the per-capita surplus of 'work energy' must increase if the future population of the whole world is to live decently.

As most of the raw materials will be replaced by the end of the century, by new materials with a higher 'work energy' potential, large scale industry is here to stay. The rural utopia of William Morris, the village handicraft society of Ghandi and the peasant communes of some anarchists have no relevance in the world, because they cannot generate the surplus of 'work energy' needed for the physical and social construction of world society. The 2000 million 'poor', who are on their way to propagating another 1000 million, are not going to be lifted out of poverty by their own efforts. Their future depends on the export of surplus 'work energy' in the form of men, machines and knowhow from the industrial countries.

As the end to which science is put is in industry, we want to see it directed towards creating a better world. We want to see science controlled at the source of power; in industry, at the work place. Despite the fact that the work place is suspended in a series of power relationships, evolved to suit the 'needs' of the 18th and

and 19th century, it must become the centre of economic, social and thus political decision-making before some order can be brought to the world. Science and technology, at present being used by the boss-elite to reinforce their 'social power' in industry and state, could be used by the workers to overcome the immense communications problems in establishing large scale industrial democracy and workers control in the industrial empires of autocratic capitalism. Just as atomic energy can be used to cure cancer and produce 'work energy', so can closed-circuit TV and computers be used to make 'workers control' effective, know matter how vast and complex the enterprise has to be due to the technical factors in the type and amount of work.

If workers control arrives, (as we hope it will) the institutions of party politics and big business, being merely the social 'junk' of a bygone age, will disappear.

MASS COMMUNICATIONS

Televising international sport and entertainment has contributed a little to the erosion of some of the uglier forms of nationalism by bringing some sense of identity amongst different nationalities. However power relations being what they are between the ruling elites, it is unlikely to become more than an identity for the moment. Nevertheless, hopeful that one day we might be rid of our rulers, the use of international mass communications devices, coupled with instant language translation by computer could produce a tremendous change in the attitudes, opinions and behaviour of men towards each other. These communications devices can be used to overcome the great communications problems, which would arise in a complex and vast scale if a workers controlled society, say the size of Britain were to remain decentralised and democratic. Hard-headed business managers, state bureaucrats of every communist and trotskyist persuasion and social democrats, all claim that real workers control is impossible in large scale industry. They claim it cant work technically; this is because they want power to remain at the top, ie. with themselves. It is fair to say that workers control would have problems, mainly difficulties regarding the feed-back of information for decision taking. But it is not impossible if there is a will. With modern communications, TV, radio and telephones, it is no problem.

The present structure of committees, both inside and outside the workers own institutions, with their layers of delegates are a load of rubbish, which dont work democratically, because they are cumbersome and prevent a genuine feed-back of information and decisions. Apart from the fact that too many layers of delegates cuts out the mass of the people from taking an active part in making the decisions and prevents them from being directly represented.

Anyone, except a bureaucrat, who has had the misfortune to try and work bureaucracy, which these committees with their delegate layers produce, know how rank and file members lose interest, because the procedure is dead and impersonal. He feels excluded, because there are no live decisions to make and no prior provision of information with which to make a decision. There is the correct feeling, that the whole thing is being 'worked' (which is usually true) by an 'in' group, who know the score, the bureaucratic stupidity and the red tape short cuts. (again, usually true) If they are lucky, the rank and file get an uninteresting and 'crummy' report. Whatever interest there was left having dried up long ago.

Consider the man who spends twenty years of his life in any large industry. He certainly never speaks to the managing director. He never has explained to him, the factual basis of decisions regarding the work he is doing. He gets money for his labours, yes! But an understanding of his work environment, no! His work, which should be his means of affecting the world has lost almost all meaning, so he never gets the opportunity. Communications techniques affect him in his leisure time and bring him in 'one way' contact with a vast majority of people and their ideas, but with regard to his work, he gets to know damn all.

Direct 'two way' communications between management and workers are out as far as the management are concerned. (after all the worker might want to have some control over his job and the management would have to answer 'annoying' questions!) There is only 'one way' communication and that is when the orders are given out through the hierarchical chain of command.

It is no wonder that workers feel themselves to be an expendable cog in an impersonal and disinterested machine; a disposable commodity called 'labour' of no value except as a button-pusher or machine-minder.

In practical terms, mass communications using the resources of science and technology to work out the patterns required, is an essential in a workers controlled society and in a world which is one great co-operative commonwealth.

The technical means are available for effective 'two way' communications in a workers controlled society, between the elected management and shop floor workers in the industrial enterprises, and between the nationally elected body and the workers councils, the consumers councils and the general population itself. For all major decisions not of a purely technical nature, plebiscites could be taken through the medium of television. Even technical decisions of a complex nature can be canned and edited with supplementary material provided to enable details to be as widely understood as possible. One could elaborate ad infinitum, but the purpose is merely to suggest the potential of these devices.

The working class struggle is not plotting the revolution over 10 pints of heavy in the Marland and folksinging it out of your system next day, nor is it participation in endless arguments about the rights and wrongs of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky, Bakunin, Proudhon or any of the other 'greats', and nor is it anything to do with whether 'syndicalism', 'socialism' or 'communism' has all the answers. It has to do with the activities of working people against the bosses.

Those who are interested in struggle rather than political in-fighting, in action rather than endless talk, are invited to help the tenants and Solidarity with the production and sales of the Housing Pamphlet.

REBEL SONGS OKAY!

REBEL ACTION BETTER!

Do you participate in the revolution from the safety of the folksong club?

Do you get your kick at society by reading 'Private Eye'?

If so, what you need is a subscription to

SOLIDARITY

GLASGOW c/o McLeod, Flat 76, 50 Kingsway Court, W4.
(16 (post free) for 6 editions. (bi-monthly)

LONDON 197 Kings Cross Road, WCI.
9/- (post free) for 12 editions. (monthly)

(both journals have different contents.)

Also available 'MODERN CAPITALISM AND REVOLUTION' (4/1)

ORGANISING AT REMINGTON

UNITED STATES VERSUS UNITED WORKERS.

* * * * *

* The writer of this article is a shop steward at Remingtons, *
 * who prefers to remain anonymous. He discusses in general *
 * terms, some of the history of the struggle at both Reming- *
 * ton factories, which has progressed favourably for the wor- *
 * kers due to the militancy. Solidarity between shop stewards *
 * and workers at Remington Shavers is such, that almost 100% *
 * walk-outs are guaranteed over any issue involving wages and *
 * working conditions. *

* * * * *

Early in the post war years, Scotland, with its traditionally high pool of unemployed labour, welcomed the influx of American Industrialists, who set up their establishments within her boundaries. Given the choice of areas in which to build their factories, the Americans invariably chose regions of high unemployment, (where they could get cheap labour) which were within easy reach of transport; both factors were of major importance in their programme for expansion of their industries in Scotland. With cheap labour in a steady flow from among the unemployed, it was possible for them to produce their goods; also since their plants were within easy reach of rail, road and air terminals, their products could be poured into home and overseas markets without much difficulty. One area most suitable for their project therefore, was the west of Scotland. It was an ideal location for their financial and business venture.

The older established American companies of the pre-war era, such as 'Singer' of Clydebank and 'Babcock and Wilcox' of Renfrew, flourished with success from a financial viewpoint, pursuing a policy, like all managements, of maximum output at a minimum cost of production. They were, at this particular period, able to dictate wages and conditions of employment to the workers, simply because the unions were weak and the men poorly organised. No doubt, their success, had in some degree influenced their post-war companions to invest their dollars in Scotland; and about 50 plus American companies did just that! Naturally these managements are anti-trade union, and they 'discourage' the workers from organising themselves. It is easy to see why friction exists between management and workers. Managements, which have been 'pressed' into accepting union conditions do so in order to keep the 'peace'.

They have shown on numerous occasions that they are masters at violating and breaking agreements, which exist between employers and unions.

It is indeed ironic, that these companies should attempt to suppress trade unions in an area which was one of the birth places of trade unionism. We workers on Clydeside will never capitulate to any employer be they British, American or anyone else. Our past history and tradition, coupled with the bitter struggles with the bosses through the years is part of the monument to rank and file trade unionism throughout the world. Any attempt to deprive us of our rights to negotiate for wages and conditions will always be violently resisted.

Many American managements advocate and practise hostility towards shop stewards and other active trade unionists; unwarranted acts of suppression and victimization are not infrequent.

The most notable case of recent years, was of course the victimisation of Calum Mackay, the AEU convenor at the Remington Rand typewriter factory at Hillington. It was an exceptional case, because it became an open battle between the Company and the Amalgamated Engineering Union. In its final stages, the dispute developed into a semi-political come religious come trade union brawl, chiefly through the adverse publicity in the national press. The Express in particular made vicious attacks on Mackay and the Remington workers. As usual they were bent on breaking the strike which followed Mackay's dismissal. Jack McGill, their self-styled 'leading Industrial Reporter', burnt the midnight oil, during the six weeks of the strike, writing vicious articles. Never have such violent attacks been directed against an individual as the Express directed against Mackay. They ignored important national issues of the period to give the dispute headlines. The full power of the press went into gear against Mackay, facts were either ignored or distorted completely; instead a personal vendetta on Mackay's politics, religion and pursuits became the prime function of the Express. McGill, judging by the muck he reported could make himself a fortune writing for one of the 'Sunday Rags'.

Most of us know the history of the Rand dispute; Mackay, employed as a toolmaker for over 12 years, was dismissed without warning for allegedly being 'too slow at his job'. The workers withdrew their labour in support of their convenor, and for almost six weeks they fought the management for Mackay's reinstatement, and during this long strike period the AEU failed to give backing to the workers. Eventually they returned to work on the 'advice' of the union executive, who in turn took up the issue with the 'Engineering Employers Federation' of which Remington Rand is a member. The case was considered to be a 'stone-waller' for the AEU. Such issues are argued on facts, and the facts showed that Mackay had been victimised.

As convenor of shop-stewards, he had, over a period of years fought and won excellent pay and conditions for his members; in fact the wages paid in the factory were almost the highest in Scotland. Such an individual is a thorn in any management's side and has to be removed. The Remington management were not divorced from this line of thought. Mackay was sacked without warning. The management stated that they had watched him over a period of time and had decided that he was no longer up to their requirements. This statement is of particular interest and importance, because the bosses operate a 'pink slip' system, whereby workers are warned by issue of these slips of complaints against them by the management. The slips are issued for bad time keeping, bad conduct and work which they consider is not up to standard; and a worker who is unfortunate enough to receive three usually ends up with his cards. The management never had the opportunity of issuing Mackay with any such warnings. Instead they moved in with their false claim and sacked him.

The case went through the negotiating machinery as laid down and agreed by unions and management, and eventually at the final stages of the discussions the union officials and employers met in York prepared for battle. Despite overwhelming evidence supporting Mackay and despite a recommendation by the chairman of the Employers Federation, Remington Rand refused point blank to reinstate him. The fact that they refused to comply with the principal on which the 'agreement for avoiding disputes' is based, does in effect make all such agreements a farce. They had the audacity to victimise a union official and then give the fingers-up-sign to the executive of the AEU. The union registered 'failure to agree' and bowing backed away from the negotiating table.

Humiliated, frustrated and out on a limb, the union executive directed the workers to take strike action; this time tagged with the 'official' title. The workers refused; split within their own ranks by a few 'Judas' members, they voted against further strike action. 'Apathy' had crept in during the 'official' negotiations, plus the fact that the workers claimed there had been a sell-out by the officials, who had stood in the background, tongue in cheek while they had fought on behalf of their convenor for almost six weeks. If anyone utters the word 'betrayal' and points a finger, then let them point it at the AEU officials and a fraction of the Remington workers.

This case served one useful purpose; namely, shop stewards, convenors and active members of trade unions must be prepared to meet similar situations. If a management takes upon itself to attack trade union members, and in particular shop stewards carrying out their duties, they must be attacked in like fashion. In cases of victimisation, strike action, 'official' or otherwise is the only answer. Remington Rands sister factory, situated in Thornliebank has had a long and difficult struggle in securing a fully organised trade union set up. Prior to 1957 and the Engineering strike of that year, the 'Shaver' factory was in a turmoil, but from this

period shop stewards and other active members, have overcome the major managerial obstacles and the workers now enjoy favourable conditions of employment. In the initial stages of union organisation at Remington Shavers, shop stewards experienced very heavy pressure from the management; the convenors in particular. Some were sacked on false pretext or compelled to lift their books because of the policy of discrimination against them. The Remington Shavers workers owe much to those militants who were in the vanguard in the organising of the factory; men such as Tommy Mackay and Willie Andrews, both former convenors, also Charlie Moore, Neilly Mair and Andy Barnes a former toolroom shop steward. Unfortunately they have all been 'pressed out' or sacked by the bosses.

Managers have always been difficult to deal with, having shown themselves as experts at reversing decisions. However with tolerance and patience stewards and workers have made headway.

Having a 75% female labour force in the 'Shaver' factory it is not surprising, that of the 13 stewards about half are women. The stewards are efficient and effective in carrying out their duties; thus they have the confidence of the members which is of utmost importance in maintaining unity in the factory. Their prime function is to secure the best possible wages and conditions and in this field they can claim a good measure of success. We have no party political set-up within the shop stewards committee. (No steward is a member of any political party) Party politics, when integrated into the structure of trade union duties within a workshop can and does have disastrous results. Party politics like religion (especially in Glasgow) is very personal affair and to encroach on them is morally and socially wrong. (as well as tactically disastrous) Because it is in the interests of all workers to have a common goal and that means unity first; for it is our only guarantee for a 'square deal' with the employers. Industrial history in relation to trade unionism conveys its message to all wage earners; organisation is essential if we are to succeed in maintaining the working conditions and remuneration for our labour which we have fought for. Workers who are under the illusion that the executive council of their union will act as a fairy godmother to them have their heads buried in the sand. Those who fall into this attitude of complacency are placing their own and other workers heads on the chopping block and there are always, lurking in the boardrooms, an inexhaustible army of bosses ready to swing the axe.

"The executive bodies of our trade unions know of no greater loyalty than that of its shop stewards who are prepared to risk suppression, victimisation and sacking in order that they and their members can benefit from their efforts."

Yet the union bureaucrats regularly betray the shop stewards to the bosses!

SCOTS AGAINST WAR

16.

'WHO ARE WE?'

That was the start of a leaflet distributed by the anonymous SCOTS AGAINST WAR (SAW). The Daily Mail, after the 1965 May Day rally, described them as an 'extreme left-wing group'.

Who are they ? And what are they trying to say!

This is an attempt to analyse the message behind the SAW leaflets and actions.

On May 1962, a report appeared in the press about a leaflet headed 'How to Obstruct, Disrupt and Subvert the Warfare State' distributed during a Peace Committee jaunt to the Holy Loch, which caused a stir, not only among the security, but among the 'protesters' as well. This leaflet not only suggested subversion but made stinging attacks on the hypocrisy of the Communist Party, the Peace Committee and the STUC and the bureaucracy which controls CND. (The leaflet was an 'edited' Scottish edition of a militant pamphlet previously produced by some members of the London Committee of IOO called BEYOND COUNTING ARSES) Most Sunday papers featured the message on the SAW leaflet; 'Sedition says Home Office. We take the gravest view of the distribution of such literature.' To endorse their own hypocrisy the CND and the Communists stated ' We would not incite people to such subversive activities.' Just what were the activities! According to the People, Sunday Mirror, Citizen, Times and Scotsman, ' The leaflet was the most blatant defiance of authority ever made by the nuclear disarmament movement and amounted to open revolt.' (we would say second to the Spies for Peace disclosures.) The press quoted the leaflet, 'Stop obeying! Be disobedient! We call on you to resist the Warfare State!' It urged 'ban the bombers' to sabotage the Polaris subs in Britain, to search for Official Secrets and publish them and to get soldiers to foment anti-war cells in the army. The leaflet went on, ' The work on the Polaris Base at Faslane must be blocked, by the trade unionists refusing to work and by outsiders obstructing any workmen who try to build it....obstruct any attempt to build these projects.... take up the struggle to obstruct, disrupt and finally wreck the State's war machine.' These were the statements in the press. On Sunday May 26, the day of the reports, five members of the Scottish Committee of IOO, Archie Smith, Walter Weir, Walter Morrison, Norman McLeod and George Williamson, were arrested at the War Department Proof and Experimental Establishment near Kirkintilloch. All had copies of the leaflet on them and all were charged under the 'Official Secrets Act'. Later, all charges were dropped by the Crown, without explanation, along with similar charges against David Todd and Sandy Small who had broken into the place three weeks later.

Later that year, at a National Committee of IOO meeting in Glas-

gow, the hierarchy and pontificators on the 'correct' road to peace joined in the criticism of SAW. Although at that time many radicals in and out of the Committee were considering new tactics panic was beginning to set in among many 'leading' figures in both Scottish and other Committees. After seeing the reaction to Pat Arrowsmith's 'Troops Against The Bomb' proposals and the behind-the-scene opposition to 'Beyond Counting Arses', there was a feeling that when the chips were down, the militants would be out on their own, while the rest waffled and prattled and condemned. This was very noticeable in Scotland, where the object was to avoid committing civil-disobedience (openly or secretly) and eventually to do nothing at all but condemn the youngsters who broke into civil defence establishments and army offices, who smashed recruiting office windows and who advocated and carried out sabotage. The Committee became a talking shop for sweetie wives, about the so-called non-violent 'new society' indulging in fantastic theories about openness, honesty and non-violence (for everyone but themselves) which bore no relation to reality. In a discussion with Naval Security Officers at the Holy Loch, they admitted to Walter Morrison that the Committee are easy meat for the trained caretakers of Polaris, that they enjoyed the friendly jousts with them and that the pacifist attitude fitted in with their psychological tactics, which was to reply with pseudo pacifist action to lull the demonstrators into thinking everything was nice and lovey-dovey. However SAW were a different proposition they said, and they were out to get them. This conversation was interesting from another aspect, because it proved that the name Scots Against War could not have been better from a rank and file autonomous non-hierarchy viewpoint for the creation of a movement in which any Scot opposed to War could operate independently. One of the security men asked Walter Morrison if he was a Scot Against War. To this he replied, "Are you against war?" The special said, "Of course!" He then asked, "Are you Scottish?" The special said, "Yes!" "Then that makes you a Scot Against War, too!" Exit special flabbergasted.

The Factory for Peace, though a commendable venture, was sapping the dynamic sense of urgency needed for the Committee's programme, and trying to draw the activists into a more conventional line of politics. As the factory grows its respectable image becomes more needed. For a time the Committee was completely non-revolutionary. They were far from happy with the formation of the 'spying group'; some complained of having their name on leaflets; others suggested projects and then took no part in them. Collective responsibility was a myth and the honesty and openness rubbish took its toll on willing members. All over Scotland people began taking action which was in line with SAW thinking, meanwhile the Committee hierarchy condemned. On the Faslane demonstration of June 64, a leaflet entitled, 'Is sabotage the answer?' appeared which later caused a stir in Committee thinking and put an end to its copyright for inciting civil disobedience. The leaflet had three main ideas, (1) To counter a police tactic of creating an anti-climax, that often

affects marchers, who see no sign of security. (2) To force the authorities to take costly security measures to protect the whole area from possible sabotage. (3) To create a new spirit and initiative which was needed because the Committee of IOO's contribution to Faslane was to blow up balloons and let them off.

On the final lap of the Faslane March an SAW leaflet called on people to make it an Anti-War protest and not a pre-election jamboree, and incited the marchers to break in and try and sabotage the site where the training launcher is situated. Here are some quotes, 'This is a call to action! Regain the initiative given by the 'Spies for Peace. Put real pressure on the warfare state and lean on them till it hurts!.... Let us abandon the worship of waffle and negotiations, that are contracted by the fact that the arms race continues. ... A new militant force for peace with a fresh approach, which does not, in its desire to be practical and realistic, evade the drastic choice which faces us..... the Revolutionary Act!' The following week these headlines appeared in the Mail and Express, 'Navy Secrets saved'. The site huts at Faslane had been set on fire!!

In July '64, the 'Who Are We' leaflet came out. This coincided with discussions on sabotage which were raging at Committee of IOO meetings and in their magazine 'Resistance'. In this leaflet appeared the revolutionary statement, 'We intend to demolish and destroy military buildings and equipment.' Six days later the pier at the Holy Loch was burned down. At the same time, the crisis in Vietnam was beginning, and a report on the Scottish News on the radio announced that SAW had painted and smashed in the doors and windows of the US consulate. A picture appeared in the Evening Citizen of the battered consulate. This action and the Holy Loch fire became subject to CID investigations and the Admiralty went to great lengths to allay fears of sabotage. The press were biting for a story and the public, contrary to what the non-violent image creators said, treated the action as a daring bit of work or as a joke. Comments like, 'Using your head and not your arse now.' were common. US sailors shouted at us in Glasgow, 'If you can't ban the bomb, burn the pier.' The Army and Navy recruiting offices had the front smashed in about ten times; a total of around £3000 in damage was inflicted. The Evening Times quoted an officer, 'It appears that someone is trying to put the Royal Navy out of business.' At present the Army office is protected by anti-riot fencing and the Navy have recently ventured to take the boarding down.

Unlike the press, the Committee were 'open and honest' in their condemnation of the SAW (and Stuart Christie). Their openness drove them to mention the names of suspects in places where the police snoopers were likely to be; Scottish and National Committee meetings and later dismissed them as paranoics etc. The following is the Scottish regional report to the National Committee of IOO meeting in Birmingham last year,

"We recently have had quite a bit of trouble, between Stuart Christie, Scots Against War and saboteurs etc. It may interest the National Committee to know that the so-called, 'Scots Against War' movement has already folded up. Firstly the committee's constant stand against sabotage weakened them. Next the secret police etc. put the fear of death in the so-called saboteurs (1) By following them. (2) By catching them on various points and giving them a thorough grilling and (3) Advising them that they knew all about their so-called secrets. The result has been that all those commenting about sabotage have now been more or less frightened to death. I think we have heard the last of these for a while." The moral seems to be, 'Three cheers for the police state! We have still got our bomb.' The Committee hierarchy can sleep safely in their beds now. Reports like the one above makes one wonder whose side the Committee is on and, that if, Polaris were 'banned' by any means other than their own they would be annoyed.

Scots Against War, far from being folded up is still responsible for a steady flow of militant literature. It was SAW which initiated the May Day demonstration against Brown, which incidentally the Committee withdrew from. In March of this year they broke into Faslane, uprooted numerous levels for the new road, damaged a lorry and severed the compressor for the silo. (Freedom, April 10 1965.)

Easter 1965, saw another SAW pamphlet. This time with a detailed explanation of their tactics and attitudes. The leaflet was entitled 'Attitude.' and says, "...It is therefore our contention that one way to put paid to these dangerous and wasteful projects, such as the one at Faslane, is their high cost. The original estimates in this case have been doubled, and unpopular though this may make us, we are delighted and would like to think that our activities there, contributed in a very, very small way to the added cost. For when people in high places ask the cost, they are bothered. When they go on to ask; Is it worth it? Then we are winning." They go on to suggest new tactics, physiological warfare against the authorities, localised guerilla groups of saboteurs, to save the Peace Movement from being lumped with the nauseating image of conventional politics

Their follow-up leaflet to 'May Day Do' distributed on May Day, showed a remarkable grasp of what goes on in the less affluent parts of Glasgow and had a welcome attack on the so-called 'socialism' of the Labour Party. They suggested that union funds be in the hands of the rank and file workers and should be used to further the case for workers control, instead of being dished out to pay high salaries to the union bureaucrats. "We want better and we should be prepared to take it" were fighting words, which are but an echo of former days, in the present organs of the

working class movement.

CONCLUSION

We have omitted to mention other valuable leaflets published by SAW people in the north east, such as, 'The Lives in Your Hands' and 'East Coast Secrets' which stirred things up in their localities, because of the wholesale burglary involved in getting the information from Civil Defence offices. There was even rumour of a plan to rob the payroll of the non-union D.C. Thomson newspaper group in Dundee, to provide funds, which are much needed.

What are the possibilities of SCOTS AGAINST WAR. Some of their recent pamphlets are welcome departure from a purely anti-war theme (eg. 'May Day Do' and the follow ups) into the important world of the labour movement and the industrial struggle. They have a revolutionary zeal, which is sadly lacking in those groups which would have us believe that they are the revolutionaries. Being an anonymous group they obviously don't want power for themselves nor do they wish to lead an offensive on the warfare state, but rather to help create the conditions for an autonomous rank and file movement to actively oppose the privileged boss class. This, they realise, can only be done by actively assisting in the struggle of the workers against the bosses. The anti-war struggle cannot be divorced from this greater struggle.

Unlike the Committee hierarchy, they are in touch with reality, being far divorced from the 'kiss the police' and 'pick flowers at Faslane' thinking of some Committee people. The Committee with its aloof, Band of Hope, anti-drink attitude stops them from coming to the pubs, where 90% of the militant actions are plotted. Although honesty and openness are desirable virtues, they invite consequences, few but the bravest (or perhaps the masochists) are prepared to face. From the previously quoted Scottish Committee statement, it seems that here in Scotland is a group of people, who are so devoted to non-violence, that they are prepared to go to their death rather than support sabotage!!!!!!!

We hope the SAW will be out and about at Faslane in June.

John Thomson.

* * * * *

STOP PRESS Ken Weller, AEU shop steward, from London Solidarity will speak on 'The Workers Struggle Today' at our meeting on June 27.

DOBBIE MCINNES

12 WEEK STRIKE

ARTICLE ON THE DISPUTE BY THE STRIKE COMMITTEE.

Would 'revolutionaries' please note, that the strikers need cash and some of your beer money would be welcome. Send donations to W. Christie, c/o AEU, 71 Carlton Place, Glasgow. C5.....

* * * * *

* The people on strike are receiving a miserable £2.10.0 a *
 * week from the AEU. Here is an issue of principle for any *
 * union, no matter how out of touch its officials may be; *
 * the right of workers to organise union activity in their *
 * factory. Perhaps the AEU officials feel they are doing *
 * well enough! Their advert in the May edition of 'AEU *
 * Journal' boasts of its million members and its £15 million *
 * assets. The strikers feel they are not doing nearly enough *
 * An AEU shop steward said that this is the time for a token *
 * Clydeside stoppage, but as the same steward said, 'Any *
 * time a steward wanted to lose a case, all he has to do is *
 * call the union officials in.' *
 * * * * *

EMPLOYER CAUSES STRIKE.

The affluent society, trade unions with too much power, workers on wildcat strike, disruption of industrial peace, communists, corruption of labour relations; these are the headlines, as 'labour' is decried at every turn, by a press only too willing to do so! Then we look at the other side. 'Labour' is attacked by an employer who denies civil liberties and refuses employees the right to organise in a trade union. BELIEVE IT OR NOT THIS IS A CURRENT STRIKE! There is a conspiracy of silence from the popular press; no mention of this wildcat employer and no condemnation of this ruthless attack on the 'right' of labour to organise a union. The firm is DOBBIE MCINNES of Govan, Glasgow.

TRADE UNION OR COMPANY UNION.

It is assumed by most people that an employee of any firm can join a trade union and participate in the negotiations as an organised group. This was the attitude of those employed at Dobbie McInnes. They merely began to organise their union. (Amalgamated Engineering Union) As regular procedure has it, a meeting was held of all male employees. It was agreed, without dissension, that they organise in the AEU. A shop steward was appointed by a democratic vote. The management on hearing of this decided to try and organise a 'workers committee', which would be under their control. Slips of paper with each workers name and works no. were handed out. Most of the workers rejected this rigged ballot, with its so-called secrecy and destroyed their papers. The management then 'counted' the 'votes'

noted who had voted for who, and declared the names of the 'elected representatives'. (some of whom had refused to participate in the ballot!) So some stooges were then appointed. Meantime the union officials of the AEU were attempting to gain recognition for the democratically elected shop-steward. In correspondence, the managing director completely evaded this issue.

THE ORGANISATION ATTACKED

The management made the next move by mounting an attack on our organisation. They declared three members of the AEU redundant, while overtime was being worked. Scab labour worked this overtime two nights of 3½ hours, Saturday morning and all day Sunday. Our three members were called in just before stopping time one Friday and given wages in lieu of notice. We answered this with a work stoppage on the Monday. While the workers were on strike, the Managing Director contacted the AEU officials and a meeting was arranged for Thursday 11th March. On the basis of this meeting the workers returned to work on the Tuesday. A vicious bit of intimidation was then began by the manager, his wife the manageress and a self-styled technical director. These three have conducted a petty tyranny which is now being challenged. At the works conference this trio and the Managing Director refused to discuss the position of those dismissed as redundant. They mounted instead an attack on the shop steward (who had accompanied the Divisional Organiser) and then dismissed him for 'bad work'. This is the now familiar pattern and the classical way of dismissing shop stewards. By this action they hoped to destroy the organisation. They mistakenly thought they would frighten the workers into submission.

WE WILL FIGHT

When the workers heard of this latest attack (on 11th March) they stopped work. The AEU declared the strike 'official'. The District Committee of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, along with individual unions have endorsed the strike. All 'labour' recognise this strike must be won. If this management get away with this gross denial of rights, then the outlook is grim for organised labour.

SCAB LABOUR

Some of the weaker workers succumbed to intimidation and scabbed on their fellows. They received 1/- an hour more as the bosses endeavour to brake us. The Sheetmetal Workers and Coppersmiths stopped two of their members scabbing. One of them had received 30 pieces of silver to scab. They were declared blacklegs and expelled from the union. We will not forget those who sold out, and lack the moral courage to resist the encroachments of this anti-working class employer. This spineless bunch will soon see the power and wrath of organised workers to their everlasting shame.

EMBARGO

All organised labour must now 'black' Dobbie McInnes; nationally and internationally. This firm makes ships instruments, diesel valves, recording instruments for engines etc. We must weed out these neo-nazi bosses. THIS STRIKE MUST BE WON! IT CAN BE WON! IT WILL BE WON!

SUPPORT FOR THE LINWOOD MEN

LEAFLET published by SOLIDARITY (Glasgow) c/o McLeod, Flat 76,
50 Kingsway Court, Glasgow W5. May 19th 1965.

'If employers are to expect maximum production for minimum wages then it is equally valid for workers to demand maximum wages for minimum effort.'

SOLIDARITY admires and supports the men at Linwood, who by their determined action brought to focus, 'the right to work'. It is the courage of the men who stayed in the factory and their fellow workers and shop-stewards, who are giving them financial help, which restores some of the character to the trade union movement, which has been destroyed by the bureaucratic manoeuvres of our overpaid officials. The men brought back some of the seemingly lost, working-class fighting spirit, which is continually being suppressed by the full-time union officials as they regularly sell out the men to the bosses by deserting them and declaring rank and file action as 'unofficial'.

For years, the Tory, Labour Party and Trade Union bureaucrats (and when it suits them, the Communists and Trotskyists as well) have been criticising 'unofficial' wildcat strikes. Now the gloves are off! The true face of the boss class is apparent. Police were called in. NOT because men don't want to work. But because they do! This is a wildcat lockout.

We see just whose side the police are on. We are certainly not naive enough to think that workers could call in police to arrest employers who refuse them work. There are those who are spurred and there are those who are saddled.

The struggle at Linwood has gone on for a long time. It is time it was written down and the actions of the bosses, the management and the trade union officials exposed and publicised. The story could be written by the shop stewards, members of strike committees and rank and file workers not by full-time union officials or professional politicians of the Labour Party and other left-wing factions. SOLIDARITY has already published pamphlets on the workers struggle with the management and trade union bureaucrats at Vauxhall, Standard Triumph and British Light Steel Pressings (Rootes Group.)

*****ABOUT OURSELVES*****

THE WORLD IS DIVIDED INTO THE TWO GREAT BUREAUCRACIES OF EAST AND WEST
Each hates the other's guts, because each is a threat to the other's power. Some time in the future, if action is not taken, the working people subjected to these monstrous machines are going to be blown sky-high, in the name of Western 'freedom' or in the name of the Peoples' 'democracies' depending on whose side you are on. We believe the societies of East and West are basically the same; both have order givers and order takers, oppressors and oppressed, bosses and bossed; both are bureaucratic societies, ie, societies which are manipulated and controlled by a few, while the masses look on; both have bombs to protect the rulers right to rule. We believe that the only way, that the people under the heel of these power elites can save themselves from a bureaucratic doom and probable nuclear annihilation, is by organising at rank and file level in factories, farms, docks, shipyards and offices to overthrow them. To do this, the working class and the left-wing must build from scratch; beginning by ignoring such warped institutions as the Labour Party and Trade Union hierarchy, which are (despite the pretensions of far off days) part and parcel of the bosses' state machine; disregarding such groups as the Communist Party and the Trotskyist Movement, who are trying to take over the state machine and manage it in their bureaucratic fashion, ie, with the mass of the people excluded. (This is not to be taken as an attack by us on those individual communist and trotskyist militants, who have done excellent work as rank and file agitators.)

The revolutionary 'left' must be based in industry; and should not waste its time trying to get to the Westminster talking shop to 'represent' the workers. A strong shop stewards movement is a first essential and they should receive our full support. Union bureaucrats should be ignored, since their first loyalty is to the Labour and Communist Parties and often the bosses, instead of their union members. In the Communist bloc, the objective must be real workers' control and the destruction of the powerful state control of the Communist hierarchy. The uprising in Hungary in 1956, against state control with the demand for workers' control was a start.

Here in Glasgow, we, rank and file workers have our part to play in the struggle. The libertarian left is utterly disorganised; impotent and in disarray; lacking contact with the mass of the workers and without a desire to make contact. A bit of waffle goes on among some 'in' groups. A few papers from London, with little local news, are sold. Sometimes, 'way out, utopian propaganda is distributed to mesmerised people in the city. Unlike the trots and the CP, we are not trying to lead our fellow workers. Their struggle, fight and interests are ours. WE WIN WHEN THEY WIN. That is why we have started a SOLIDARITY GROUP. We need help from people who will write articles, make contact with shop stewards and workers, help duplicate the pamphlet, sell it and give us any spare cash.

(Volume One Number Three) Published by Glasgow SOLIDARITY c/o McLeod,
Flat 76, 60 Kingsway Court, Glasgow w4. MAY 1965.