

SOLIDARITY SCOTLAND

6^D

FOR WORKERS' POWER

ALL ABOUT US

We apologise for the long delay since our last issue. We assure you that we have been very busy helping

T H E B U S M E N

Glasgow Busmen are in militant mood. We have printed four bulletins for their breakaway union, the BUS CREWS ASSOCIATION. When the SOLIDARITY GROUP began in Glasgow our stated aims were to assist workers in their struggle with the bosses and the union bureaucrats; in this case the busworkers are struggling with the monstrous TGWU. Among other things, the officials of this union have stated that delegates from the branches in the city garages, can vote contrary to the branch mandate. What price a union vote. No wonder workers dont attend their branch meetings. The same officials claim their is a closed shop in the Corporation. This is untrue but they have one BCA member on a months notice and another militant is likely to get the push later.

With London Solidarity we intend to produce another pamphlet on the Glasgow buses, written by the busmen themselves.

S A L E S

With a great effort we managed to sell 600 copies of the last edition. Lets hope this one will push up even higher. More sellers is the answer. How about taking some for your mates.

T R A D E U N I O N I S T S D E F E N C E C O M M I T T E E

This committee, set up to oppose trade union legislation and to defend shop stewards and workers 'unofficial' actions, has got off to a very bad start. The last two meetings have been very low in attendance. Most of the 'left' factions, excluding the Communist Party, have attended the meetings; but shop stewards and workers independent of the factions have been very noticeable by their absence. Regarding this committee, it is evident to SOLIDARITY that the chickens have come home to roost. Those who called for conditional and critical support for the Labour Party (They are slightly better than the Tories; They are the party of the working class; blah! blah!) have been answered with a vengeance. The Labour Party broke the ice on trade union legislation- something the Tories had never dared to do. They, of course, are not so friendly with the TUC bureaucrats as the Labour hierarchy. Now many of these 'critical' supporters are having to organise opposition to the legislation.

Yet still the masochism continues as many of them are off canvassing for the Labour Party helping it to be re-elected.

G E N E R A L E L E C T I O N

What do anti-parliamentarians do? Some will spoil their votes! Some will campaign for people not to vote! Some will put up dissident candidates! We leave every body to it. We wont go into doctrinal and tactical differences. About twenty per cent of the population wont go to the polls - the so called 'apathetic' ones. Perhaps they take the same view as us - FUCK THE LOT OF THEM! For our own contribution we are reprinting with revisions the editorial of London Solidarity Vol.3 No 3.

And below we print an interesting leaflet that has been distributed in Pollok constituency.

VOTE PHOS FOR US

We urge you to vote. VOTE PHOSFORUS. A simple preparation of white phosphorus dissolved in a solution of carbon di-sulphide should be used as ink for marking your ballot paper. Within an hour the ballot paper will catch fire and will destroy all the papers in the ballot box. If this is done around 8.00p.m. the papers will catch fire after 9.00.p.m. when the polling station is closed. If this could be done in all the Glasgow constituencies, we, the ordinary disenfranchised people can have a real effect on the election..... GLASGOW ANTI-ELECTION CAMPAIGN.....

POLITICS

66

Once every few years we are invited to exercise our 'democratic' rights. We are asked to choose a new set of rulers. The choice is strictly limited. Tweedledum and Tweedledee both speak the same jargon. Both think the same platitudes. Both have the same tramlines in their brains. Prosperity. Expansion. Production. Efficiency. Competition. Discipline. Work. And power for themselves, of course....Both were chosen by their local party caucuses. Both are sensible, responsible, middle-of-the-road chaps, their heads stuffed with sensible, responsible, middle-of-the-road prejudices and cliches. Exports. Trade-gaps. The country's needs. Law and order in industry. Defence.....Both were vetted by their respective party machines. No heretics here. No muted sound of an independent or rebellious thought. Both party machines are in the hands of practised and self-interested minorities for whom politics is the second oldest profession.

Eton, Oxbridge, Sandhurst, the City - or a lifetime of double-talk and resolution-mongering in the service of the Trade Union bureaucracy - are the open sesames to the corridors of power.

The party machines are slick in the art of popular manipulation. Ideas don't count. Ideals are a drawback. Images count. Prime Ministers are sold like toothpaste and detergent. 'Have you MacHarolded your teeth to day?' 'Heath washes whitest.' 'For a scientific clean-up, use Wilson.' 'Someone isn't using Grimond.'..... Programmes and promises vary marginally. Basic aims and values are the same. Forget the posturing, the shadow boxing, the political hang-overs from the past. Today the parties have the same great objective; modernising capitalism - a twentieth century facelift to the ugly and endless reality of exploitation. In practise this spells speed-up, motion study, rationalisation, sackings, science and technology in the hands of those who manage production, 'better' organisation, more organisation, 'efficiency', new managerial techniques, snooping blacklights, hierarchy, incentives, differentials, the integration of each person into his particular little niche in the great bureaucratic pyramid, domination at work, control in leisure, manipulation in consumption, 'education', fair shares, a place in the rat race for one and all. With the Army and the Bomb, of course, to protect the lot from covetous and jealous neighbours.....who believe in exactly the same things.

Wilson and Brown reassure Big Business. Firms introducing automation will be financially rewarded. 'An efficient Labour Government is just what you need, and you know it works.' Not a word about those displaced by the machines.....Meanwhile Young Socialists sections which harm the image, are disbanded. Dissidents are expelled. Minister of Labour, Gunter, openly threatens the 'vested' interests of the Trade Unions. He makes no bones about how he'll deal with workers in struggle..... Suddenly it all seems to change. People matter. Our participation in politics is solicited. For years we've hardly seen our 'representatives'. Today they grovel before us offering us the moon and sixpence, begging our votes. For years they exclude us from decision taking in every way they can. Councils refuse to answer our questions about Civil Defence. Police met us when we protested about unemployment, rents, Royalty and THE BOMB. They used their law and their judges in vicious attempts to intimidate us. Now, for a month we are offered an illusion of sovereignty....Parties tell us what they will do for us; not what they'll do us for. At what cost - at whose cost - their 'promised prosperity'. How many will fall by the wayside as they usher in their mechanical millenium? Since when were production and organisation the be-all and end-all of human endeavour? Since when were the real decisions taken by the Hon Members anyway.....

OUR MESSAGE IS SIMPLE. You are robbed, manipulated, swindled, bullied, conned. You are threatened with annihilation. You are asked to threaten others with a similar fate. The cops, the judges and the Bomb protect the bosses' right to rule. Parliament is a fraud. The state is their state. The parties won't fight for you. They are part and parcel of the system. They won't help you. Your fate is in your own hands. Get Wise! Are you prepared to act with others who think as you do?

SABOTAGE

This article was sent to SOLIDARITY. We are printing it as a contribution to the discussion on SABOTAGE taking place in the Peace Movement. We are not necessarily in agreement with the views put forward.

Having read the account of the Committee of IOU discussion on sabotage, we find it extremely hard to accept this latest 'table talk', although we can applaud some people on their stand for non-violence against sabotage. In our opinion it is sadly out of touch with the man in the street. We haven't yet sold the idea of PEACE. Pacifist propagandists often make the mistake of assuming that the idea of peace is attractive to the public. People only value peace in time of war. Danger is still attractive. Safety First has never been the slogan of the young. (Glasgow has had six gang killings in less than a year and still the kids are at it.)

Was the Committee of IOU not formed in an 'Act or Perish' emergency. Was it not for expediency that this was done? The same expediency that they now accuse saboteurs of. Is the Committee going to proceed as if they have unlimited time to convert everyone on earth to the cult of non-violence. Surely if this is to be the new dogma, there are plenty of organisations more suited to this task than the Committee. Pacifism and ultra non-violence are permanent philosophies; war resistance is an immediate policy. Pacifists will usually resist war, but the majority of war resisters are anything but pacifists.

It is very easy to sit back and theoretically build mass movements based on non-violence, and as an excuse for inaction, pick holes in other ideas as has been done with sabotage. To say, that it is an illusion for the adherents of sabotage to think that they can in any way change US policy in Vietnam, and that sabotage is the tactic of the frustrated, is rich indeed coming from people whose main tactic has been to sit down in the street or at bases. (Which we have done ourselves.) Non-violence is nothing, if it is not active and its powers demonstrated to the public at large. Twenty people sitting outside the House of Commons shows how strongly they feel about Vietnam. But do they think it will change US or British policy. Non-violence has its weaknesses too. Thousands of us are no longer willing to take part in the actions.

Sabotage is not a military idea, but a working-class method of protest; originally by men against machines which threatened their livelihood. It should be appreciated that the progress made by the working class in their own defence in industry, has been achieved by so-called 'negative'

action, (eg. strikes, go-slows, opposition to technological change) rather than a 'positive' policy. How much better it will be, if workers can combine sabotage of the management's plans with a move forward to effective workers control of the job. Sabotage should be seen in this way, ie, as a prerequisite to building a new order on the ruins of the old. Demolition must come before Construction.

'How far are you prepared to go in your use of non-violence as a force against war preparations? Do you understand the full implications (death) of non-violence and if so, are you prepared to go to this point to achieve the non-violent society? (Bearing in mind that you wont be participating in the new society.) These are questions we would ask the so-called non-violent resisters. Looking at another extreme! Take road deaths? We know that each day will have its quota of deaths caused by car drivers. We and our non-violent friends may be the drivers involved. It seems perfectly logical to us, that if it wrong to sabotage the plans and instruments of mass destruction, because it involves (however slightly) the risk of harming people; then by the same yardstick of reasoning, all non-violent types who continue to drive are potential killers. If wars will cease when men refuse to fight; how about, road deaths will cease when men refuse to drive!

Some of the writers served a number of years in India with the internal security, during the so-called non-violent struggle for independence. There are a number of people in the peace movement, who fool themselves into believing that non-violence was the tactic used in the campaign. Sabotage was widespread. Communications between Delhi Cantonment and the Red Fort in Old Delhi were cut regularly. Dangerous obstacles were put in our paths during demonstrations. One of us was badly beaten up in Secunderabad by 'non-violent' Indians. Demonstrations were much more provocative than anything we have attempted in Britain. The whole campaign threatened mass violence and we soldiers had no illusions about 'non-violence'. It seemed to us that the ideal way to struggle against oppression is with a delicate balance between non-violence and limited violence.

What is needed is a movement which learns to understand the full implications of non-violence and violence and what it means to the bulk of the people; bearing in mind that not everyone who objects to mass murder can afford to sit down or be a saboteur. We cant afford to separate ourselves into good and bad war resisters by hoping that the police will deal effectively with saboteurs or deserting Stuart Christie because he was not a non-violent protester. Worse still, in their 'desire' for openness and honesty 'non-violent types' have mouthed the names of sabotage suspects in company which could include police spies. Would they have given the names of Jews to the Gestapo?

It has been the practise for some apprentices to throw pieces of metal into the radar systems of destroyers being built in Fairfields Yard;

people have broken into Army, Navy and Civil Defence Centres; and large numbers of unattached youngsters turned up at Lewis's store to throw stink bombs at the Army. This may not be the perfect action for building a non-violent image, but it is much more in touch with the way ordinary working class people feel and it is the way they want to act. When working class people poke fun at militarists, sabotage their expensive equipment and ruin their recruitment campaigns then real energy is being channelled against the Warfare State. People will show their disapproval of a policy in a thousand ways. It is not for non-violent types to condemn them if they don't operate in a way acceptable to them. The creators of a constructive conflict against our rulers and their warfare state, can achieve a great deal by stirring up the shit, treading on a few toes and thus trying to involve people in the struggle at all levels, non-violently or otherwise.

SCOTTISH EASTER MARCH

1. March begins at 11a.m. on Sat. 9th., at the road junction on the A. 823 at Pitreavie and will proceed past the NATO communications centre and on to RUSYTH. Lunch will be at the Dockyard Gates. (A 5 day fast is being held at the gates from Mon. to Sat. preceding the March.)
2. After lunch the March will proceed over the Forth Rd. Bridge and on to RSG Scotland at Corstorphine Hill, Edinburgh, where an inspection will be held.
3. March will leave the RSG at 5.00 p.m. and will continue to Edinburgh via Queensferry Rd. to the US-Scottish Memorial where a wreath will be laid for the Vietnam victims. Later a meeting will be held in the Ground.

Contacts:

ABERDEEN Ian Sutherland, 34 Kintore Place, Aberdeen.
 DUNDEE Eddie Quinn, 15 Duncorse Place, Charleston, Dundee.
 EDINBURGH Ian Healey, 47 York Place, Edinburgh 1.
 GLASGOW Alan Sinclair, Flat 3a, 39 Mallaig Rd., Glasgow SW1

 *
 * READ LONDON SOLIDARITY. *
 * *
 * 10/- for 12 issues...more or less monthly..... *
 * *
 * from Bob Potter, 197 Kings Cross Rd., London WC1. *
 * *
 * ..on the working class and anti-bomb struggle..... *
 * *

EDUCATION

FREEDOM AND AUTHORITY

Education ; what can I say about the subject in a few paragraphs ? The difficulty is that it is not so much a subject that has been ignored - for everyone demands more education these days - but one that has been considered to be outside the realm of politics almost. Anyone and everyone demands more education, better education, raising the school leaving age, having more teachers and the like, but these aren't demands that libertarians can support, for they are, in the last analysis, demands for better education of the same sort - a more efficient working of the present system.

We in Ilford wanted to say something completely different to this. And we wanted to use a completely different approach. We wanted to approach the vast majority of people who are involved in education, and "on whose behalf" everybody makes their demands for better education, but who are never in fact consulted. We wanted to approach the "proles" in the educational structure - those who from the day they enter school have no say in the running of their school lives. Yes we wanted to approach the pupils !.

We issued a leaflet which we distributed to pupils as they left the school. The leaflet did not call for more teachers, comprehensives or anything like that : it attacked the whole system of education that exists in this or any other country. It rejected the idea of authority and discipline in education - the idea that teachers always know best, that they must make the rules, that they should be in some way superior

and "respected" (i.e. feared) and that lessons should be compulsory. It ended by urging pupils to try to exercise some control over their school lives, by disobeying prefects, forming grievances committees and so on.

To say that the leaflet caused a sensation would almost be an understatement. The authorities went berserk. We were called every name under the Sun - by everybody. Both parties on the local council were united against us. A local International Socialism supporter, while criticising police behaviour said that never-the-less we were misguided. Why we had attacked the basic assumptions on which the whole system is based ; we had knocked everybody's sacred cows. We had incited pupils to rebel and take control over their own lives. This is O.K. with the workers perhaps - they're older, but pupils - they're different, too young, need authority, wouldn't go to lessons if we didn't make them, must be shown right and wrong !!?

"Real" lefts attack the way in which some lessons are taught in the schools. For example, they'd say that pupils are taught about the goodness of capitalism, or about the rulers in history. They'd change that - they'd teach a Marxist interpretation of history and tell children about unions as well as firms. But they still believe in lessons, still believe in authority and so still perpetuate the present system.

Why did we do it all? We did it because we reject absolutely the basic assumption on which the present educational system is based - the assumption

tion that authority and discipline is needed to make children grow and learn and develop.

Note that I do not say that the present system does not work. It does, it works well. It turns out the required amount of administrators, technicians, rulers and ruled. All of whom accept, by the time they finish school, whether they pass exams or not, whether they learn anything or not, the basic commonsense 'fact' that present society needs them to accept - that you've got to have rulers and ruled; that people cannot run the show for themselves. Even the rebels in school accept this. Yes, they mess around for a laugh, may hate most or all of the teachers, but they never actually question the system, and when they become parents it will be the natural thing for them to assume the very role they hated when they were kids. Not because of any conscious decision - but because its the 'only way'. Any other way has never been suggested. This is the obvious way in which the authoritarian educational system perpetuates present society.

DEVELOPMENT

But there is an other much more subtle and more complete way, and this involves a more detailed discussion of our views. We believe in freedom in education (and in child rearing as a whole). This means freedom for children to learn and develop at their own rate, rather than at a rate decided -,"for the child's own good" - by some adults in authority.

The main feature of the young child (by this I mean one of Primary school age or younger) is his endless store of curiosity, energy, spontaneity and enthusiasm. Any Primary teacher will admit this. Kids are naturally curious and adventuresome: they desire to find out all about the world around them: They feel real excitement at each new thing their body is able to do. The whole world is one big discovery to them - discovery that they can pick things up using their thumbs, discovery that they can get up and down stairs, discovery that the girl next door is made different, discovery of friendship, and a million and one other things, which to adults may seem unimportant, but to children fill the world with interest.

Young kids want to play, to build, to paint, to act, to indulge in fantasy, to take things to pieces and see how they are made. In short they want to find out about the world around them. Instead of being allowed to do this they are made to sit through lessons and accept the values imposed by an external authority - the teachers, or rather the whole educational system. They decide that children must learn English or sums. They decide that the kids must line up in the playground in twos and threes. A 'progressive' school will allow much free play, but never-the-less between, say 12 and 12.30 or 2 and 2.45 freedom ends -

sums or spelling must be learnt. The result?, freedom is not a right or an approach, but something that the authorities allow at certain periods.

Another method, at 'very progressive' schools is to teach subjects through play and activity. This is all very well but once again derives from an adult assumption rather than from a child's standard - that subjects are important in themselves and so must be coated with sugar. I hold that it is not lessons that are important, but only the creativity and curious nature of the child. If this is orientated towards lessons O.K., but if it is not don't try to make it so.

The result of this system is that the natural curiosity, assertiveness and enthusiasm of the child is frustrated, or channeled each and every day. Thus we see the change from the young child, bubbling with energy and excitement, to the cynical, lackadaisical couldn't care - less attitude of the adolescent.

Yea, you can make children learn things, practice obedience, stand in twos, but as A.S. Neill says, you cannot do it "without to some degree converting them into will-less adults. You fashion them into acceptors of the status quo - a good thing for a society that needs obedient sitters at dreary desks, standers in shops, mechanical catchers of the 8.30 suburban train - a society, in short, that is carried on the shabby shoulders of the scared little man - the scared to death conformist". (Summerhill, P.12.)

DISCIPLINE

You can stop them reading comics and give them books, with the result that they continue to read comics (like Revielle) all their lives. You can stop the egocentric phase a child goes through and make him accept prematurely values of sharing, considering others, with the result that he grows up never considering others, or only when he has to. You can stop children's day-dreaming fantasies, with the result that they continue to retreat to fantasy all their lives. T.V. adverts linking a certain product with exotic living are thus very successful. You can impose standards and punish or withdraw approval when these are broken - with the result that you never see a real child (or person) but only the mask which he puts on to avoid punishment or to get the approval or love he needs. Most people thus grow up with this armour around their real character.

The case against discipline and imposed standards is nicely summed up by W. David Wills, in the Barns Experiment, P.26. He says "First it inhibits initiative. How can initiative develop in an atmosphere where all the initiating is done by the adults or others in authority, and all one is called to do is to conform? Then it prevents the growth of self-reliance - one learns to rely on the system instead of one's selfand shifts responsibility for one's actions on to someone else. In short it thwarts, cramps and starves and the only people who get any

good out of it are...the quislings of the system, who help the masters ...as prefects, monitors or what you will"

Thus people learn not to develop their initiative, and not to rely on themselves, but on others, the system, anyone anything !! The result? Mass political apathy, mass fear of decision taking, a population which can thus be ruled very easily, which accepts and desperately needs authority and discipline and organisation from above (This never completely succeeds though. Despite everything people try to assert themselves in many little ways every day. They break rules, do jobs in their way as they know how, they organose unofficially, have shop stewards committees, unofficial strikes, workers-courts, tenant committees and rent strikes, struggle against the bomb etc.etc. These are the fields in which revolutionaries should work). Thus, rather than authority being necessary it is this very authority which creates dependence on itself. This is the crux of the matter.

THE ALTERNATIVE

What do we offer as an alternative to the present system ? We offer one where children are allowed to develop at their own rate, creating when they want to create, playing when they want to play, learning when they want to learn, without adult authority and discipline, or those imposed standards which may seem perfectly reasonable to the adult imposers, but are just absolutely alien to children. This means that the schools should be run by all in them - the voice of the youngest child counting for as much as that of the oldest adult, and that lessons should be entirely voluntary. The children should thus be able to do what they want, regulated only by the rules made by all in the community. This sort of education enables kids to retain their brightness and enthusiasm; it produces bright keen people unfrustrated in their desires and curiosity, still full assertive people when reaching adulthood; people who are self-reliant and can take the responsibility of running their own lives and who can participate in the running of a different kind of Society, which allows people to be assertive at home, work and play, rather than just being recipients as in present day society.

There are many questions still unanswered by this, but I have gone on far enough. I would be glad to receive criticisms of this article, and next time I will discuss these and also outline what I think it is possible for a teacher to do in the present educational system

RON BAILEY

The writer is a teacher from Ilford and is active in the Ilford Libertarian group. Last year they produced a leaflet on 'Do It Yourself' schooling. They are publishing a pamphlet on Education very soon.

YOUNG TEACHERS ACTION COMMITTEE

The writer of this article is a teacher in Renfrewshire, who has been active in the above Committee. Solidarity believes that the formation of the YOUNG TEACHERS ACTION COMMITTEE was an important step forward by teachers, who, like workers everywhere are very dissatisfied with the present union set-up.....

There are 3 official teachers' associations (unions) in Scotland.

Educational Institute of Scotland.(EIS) 30,000 members approx.
Scottish Secondary Teachers Association.(SSTA) 3,000 members.
Scottish Schoolmasters Association.(SSA) 2,800 members.

There are 18,000 teachers with no association at all.

The Associations have little in common. The EIS is huge, amorphous, slow moving and in spite of its size, timid. One gets the impression that in order to maintain its close relationship with 'the powers that be', the EIS often goes for a less than favourable settlement. For years they have had a virtual monopoly of 'say so' in salary negotiations, because it represents so many teachers. Its great strength lies in Primary schools, where it is the only union open to women teachers.

The SSTA has to date achieved very little for the teacher and recently has given the impression that it will achieve even less in the future. It is open to male and female graduates in Secondary schools. .

The SSa is a highly militant, well generalised and disciplined group. Its influence far exceeds its size. It is pugnacious and its aims are well defined. It enjoys a love-hate relationship with the EIS. (It loves the mistakes made by the EIS and hates the Establishment look about it.) The SSa has a remarkable strike record. It constantly champions the male graduates in Secondary schools. It is not open to women.

This then is the background to the teachers unions and the situation in which salary negotiations take place.

NEGOTIATIONS

Teacher salary negotiations are complex, clumsy and unsatisfactory. First of all, (perhaps surprising to Solidarity readers) the negotiations are carried out in secret! A body called the Scottish Joint Council (SJC), made up of teachers and Local Authority

Representatives, make recommendations to the Secretary of State for Scotland with regard to the size of increase. The discussions are 'confidential' and teachers have no idea of what is being done in their name. The S of S. accepts or rejects. (usually rejects) these proposals and then makes his own. A period of 40 days is allowed in which teachers can make further representations. It is usually hopeless to do so.

To understand the recent outburst by Scottish teachers, we must examine the composition of the SJC. All representatives on it are from the EIS except one from the SSTA. The SSA's one rep was removed because he refused to recognise the confidentiality clause, by the S of S. So the picture is clear. We have a union composed mainly of non-graduate women teachers in Primary schools, being virtually our only representatives on the SJC. Furthermore, teachers are not to know what these reps are trying for. (ie. how much and for whom?) One could be excused from thinking that non-graduate primary women would always be well looked after by the people who use their cards to gain representation on SJC. However one would be wrong; because primary non-graduate women are by far the worst paid of the lot. Why you might ask, do they join a union which does so little for them? Simply because there is no alternative. A teacher must have protection because of court cases etc. No other association caters for them.

This was the state of affairs in October 1965. The SJC had been in session for 4 months. Nobody knew what was going on. No whisper reached teachers of what the SJC might recommend to Sof S. What we did know was the figure which each association had told their SJC representative to push. The EIS said their reps were to push for 38% But the SJC recommended 15% to Ross. (ironically an ex-teacher) What happened to the other 13%. Nobody outside the SJC can tell. We also knew that from past experience the figure arrived at by the SJC would be pretty low one and in all likelihood, the award would be frozen for a period. Teachers have had no award since 1963 when the SJC agreed to accept 15% for 3 years.

THE FORMATION

It was at this stage that the unrest came to the surface. Letters appeared in the press asking why the SJC was taking so long to make its recommendations to Ross public. After they had been meeting for about 4 months.

A group of young teachers (primary and secondary) who knew each other only slightly, (indeed in most cases not at all) got together through mutual contacts. This meeting was to decide what the feeling was among Young Teachers with regard to their salary. All agreed their salaries were too low.

We defined a 'Young' teacher as any teacher who had not taught for more than 6 years. In teaching, yearly increments are higher after 6 years of service than before. In other words, it's felt if you last 6 years, you will last for a long time; but if you leave before 6 years then not a great deal of money would have been wasted on increases. What were the wages that we felt were too low? Here again the situation is confused. (nothing is straightforward in teaching!) This table of scales will help.

Year of Service	Honours Graduate	Ordinary Graduate	Primary Non-grad. 3 years trained.
First	£900	£820	£600
Second	£960	£850	£620
Third	£1020	£880	£640.

Some Primary teachers (after 3 years training) were taking home less than £10 per week. Ordinary graduates (after 4 years training) were taking home less than £13 per week. Only after 6 years, we felt did the situation pass the 'grumbling stage'. What could we do?

We were members of all associations, except for one person. So, we could not be accused of flying a kite for any one group. We elected an ad hoc committee and sent out circulars to as many schools in the Glasgow area as we could afford. Expenses were covered by ourselves. The circular asked all young teachers to attend a meeting in Glasgow to listen to speeches from other young teachers. About 400 turned up and in spite of the fact that some of us were experienced speakers, a motion calling for strike action, if we did not get a statement of some sort from Ross within 10 days, was easily carried. The ease with which this was carried surprised the Committee who had anticipated a lot of hard debating before it was decided. (It is interesting to note that 75% of our support were EIS primary women.) At the meeting we also asked for an immediate rise of 25%. This would have still kept primary teachers in their first year of service under £700 p.a. and graduate men under £1100. The day after the meeting the Daily Express lambasted us (a policy it was to follow during YTAC's existence). This publicity was most welcome and had a cheering effect on the group. No answer came from Ross and accordingly strike notices were sent out to supporters. The EIS immediately asked all its members to boycott the strike and right-wing papers gave us a rough time. About 800 teachers struck for one day and support came from Stirling, and Edinburgh; areas which we had tried hard to organise.

Strikers came from all 3 associations and several schools were closed altogether. At the strike meeting the YTAC presented a resolution calling for further strike action if necessary. Again this was carried with ease.

More circulars were sent out to schools stating our case and the EIS executive invited members of YTAC to meet them in Edinburgh. We jumped at the chance but although the meeting was friendly little emerged from it. The EIS attempted to dissuade us from further strike action. What they did not tell us was that the SJC had, that day passed its recommendations to Ross. We read this news in the press and felt betrayed and let down. We immediately called another one-day strike and this time 1200 came out. A protest march was held in Glasgow and a petition handed to Councillor Moore. This event received wide press and TV coverage. The Herald and Scotsman were scrupulously fair to us. At the meeting we decided on a work-to-rule policy, more strikes and various other schemes, which did not get off the ground. Ross then referred the teachers' claim to the Prices and Incomes Board; YTAC met the representative and until the report comes out our case rests.

THE REPRESENTATION OF SOCIALISM.

SOCIALISM is NOT Labour Party social democracy. Labour stands for control, exploitation and manipulation of the workers by management of private and state industries. This is exactly what the Conservative Party stands for.

SOCIALISM is NOT Communist Party state control. The CP of Russia, China and East Europe stands for control, exploitation and manipulation of the workers by state appointed management. This is exactly what the British Communist Party stands for. (In between its support for social democracy.)

SOCIALISM is NOT more efficient running of capitalist economy, as Labourites would have us believe.

SOCIALISM is NOT a system whereby workers can produce and consume more than under capitalism, as communists would have us believe.

SOCIALISM is about relationships between men in the organisation of their work and leisure without bosses, union bureaucrats and governments.

When workers act independently of these people and attempt to control their jobs this is a move towards true SOCIALISM

THIS IS THE STRUGGLE SOLIDARITY SUPPORTS.

There is an alternative for the people of EAST and WEST. To hell with our governments with their private enterprise and their state control. The third choice is WORKERS CONTROL. In Hungary in 1956 the workers chose workers control in opposition to state control. THEY DID NOT CHOOSE A RETURN TO THE WESTERN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM. This would only have been a jump from the frying pan into the fire.

WEST GERMAN PEACE MOVEMENT

JIM EVRARD is an american living in Frankfurt and is a member of the German "Council Socialist" Group, which has links with Solidarity and the "Facing Reality" group in America.

West Germany has not seen a militant peace movement since 1958. Why not ?

To non-German racists, the answer is simple. German inborn militaristic character etc. - you know the line as well as I do. But now that the great law-loving U.S.A. is murdering 'racially inferior' working people in Asia, and bombing hell out of a nation with which it is not at war, with the British mother of democracies giving full moral support, and neither people stopping their governments, this line seems somehow less convincing. Non-racists have a right to demand a better answer.

Part of the answer can be found in the lack of a democratic tradition of direct action in Germany. Twelve years of authoritarian Nazi rule were followed by several years of somewhat less authoritarian occupation by the armies of the 'democracies'. During this period, cases are on record where German workers striking against former Nazis being imposed on them as managers, were forced by the Allies to return to work. Popular pressure for socialism was so strong that even Adenauer's Christian Democrats felt compelled to state in their first post-war party programme that Germany could never revert to Capitalism. But the authoritarian allied occupation was followed by the authoritarian rule of Adenauer's party. Adenauer even stated publicly that his model of the ideal state was fashioned after that of the patriarchal family.

But even this answer is incomplete. Besides, Scots for peace may be interested in knowing if there are any elements in common between German and British experience.

TWO BASIC FAILINGS

In Germany, as elsewhere, two basic failings haunted the peace movement and contributed to lessening its relevance and effect. First, the rank and file allowed the bureaucrats to take over and sterilize the organisation from the germ of militancy. Second, the movement aimed at peace and opposition to the bomb as isolated goals. They refused to come to terms with the fact that preparation for war was an integral part of our social system. A brief sketch of the historical

development will show this clearly. For the first 15 years after the war, no country had such a passionate anti-militaristic popular feeling as Germany, except perhaps Japan. In 1956, the German Government under tremendous pressure from the U.S.A. railroaded conscription through the parliament. The overwhelming majority of the population was strongly opposed, although it did not move over to revolutionary action. Even today, ten years later, you rarely see a uniform in public. Large sums of money are still spent on propaganda trying to get the public to accept the military. The general tone of this propaganda is extremely defensive and apologetic, practically begging for public confidence... which has not come yet.

In 1957, another law was passed through parliament which paved the way legally for German Atomic Armament. Again, public opinion was very much opposed to this. Public Opinion polls measured 75 - 80% of the people as being against the law. Some of the German states started to organise a referendum on the question, but the Federal government in Bonn quickly got a supreme court decision declaring this unconstitutional. Parliamentary democracy had spoken. Hooray for me and fuck you ! Would direct democracy answer ? It tried to, but too feebly.

A GENERAL STRIKE

A "Committee to Fight Atomic Death" was formed, which was at first militant. In 1958, for example, as many as 100,000 demonstrators were on the streets of Hamburg alone. There was even some vague sort of feeble talk of a general strike, which scared hell out of some of the pacifists, and scared the establishment even more. The S.P.D. (Social Democrats) entered the committee - and killed it. Social Democratic parties have a long tradition and experience in entering militant movements and channeling their energy into more harmless directions. They did it again here. The usual bureaucratic methods were used, which British peaceniks know so well from C.N.D., and the rank and file let them get away with it. The crisis of the proletariat is not the crisis of its leadership, but that it has not learnt to stop trusting a 'leadership' and carry things out on its own.

One example from my own experience will show this. I was one of several non-germans on a committee founded at the University of Munich in 1958 by a certain Dr. Weber. We wanted to invite a series of doctors, scientists and other speakers to lecture on the bomb and atomic experiments. Not a very revolutionary undertaking, but since the C.F.A.D. had refused to do it on our suggestion, we decided to do it ourselves, and that is what you weren't supposed to do. Single-handedly, Dr Weber had collected hundreds of signatures of students and professors for the action, but the Committee and the S.P.D. succeeded by using the usual parliamentary democratic tactics in sabotaging it. And we let it happen. In the end, about 10 or 15 of us sent petitions and protests to the various national and international bodies that accept such papers, and went home - not with a bang but a whimper. This example is typical

of what happened to direct action in the German Peace Movement.

From the beginning the S.P.D. had warned against 'communist infiltration' in the C.F.A.D. and by 1960, the danger of militancy passed, they decided to 'turn it over to the communists'. They got out, ordering all their people out -- and threw in the red herring. To some extent it worked, and to some extent the peace movement itself was to blame. First of all, we live here under the shadow of the D.D.R (East Germany), which, in fact, stinks. Furthermore, there really was C.P. influence in the movement, although the C.P. never came anywhere near getting control of it. But the pacifists themselves never got up the courage to proceed to the clear socialist alternative to our society which the peace movement implies. They never got beyond conceiving disarmament as an isolated goal.

ALONG THE THIRD WAY

The reasons why this hurt them in Germany should be analysed in detail, because the principles involved hold for the peace movement in the rest of Europe and North America as well. Like the ruling class the general public rightly senses that the peace movement, reduced to its logical conclusions, implies the abolition of our present social system (Many peaceniks are afraid of this line of reasoning, but this only reduces their relevance, making it easier for the establishment to write them off as 'neurotic young idealists'.) As long as the peace movement ignores this and presents no positive alternative of their own to capitalism, it is easy for the establishment to foist the false capitalism-communism alternative on to the unengaged public in connection with the peace movement. As long as the movement itself does not formulate clearly its own socialist alternative to the present East-West mess, the Russian communist alternative can and will be imputed to it. The Public's correctly sensing that the movement implies a negation of capitalism will render this imputation credible to it - as long as a better alternative is not presented. In the U.S.A. today, for example, young radical groups have less fear of the red herring that ten years ago. One big reason for this is that they are moving towards a clear alternative to the East-West impasse. The German Peace Movement never succeeded in doing this, so it is not surprising that the public swallowed the red herring.

In connection with this, there was an important psychological point which the German Peace Movement - like many others - consistently ignored. As long as the false East-West alternative prevails, people will continue to see the bomb and armaments, despite their terrible destructive potential, as symbols of security. The pacifist, threatening to take his bombs and cannons away from him and to deliver him over to the Soviet Union unarmed, can only be seen as a threat to his security. Pissing and moaning that this is all irrational doesn't help any. Since when do only radicals and revolutionaries have needs ?.

Dont forget we live in a miserable, inhuman society, one of whose tendencies is the systematic neuroticization of everybody (except Jesus, Saint Charles / Marx /, and myself, of course). As long as the Peace movement fails to point beyond the East-West alternative, to a socialist programme which makes the bombs and cannons superfluous, it will remain isolated. To do this the rank and file will have to mobilise itself against its bureaucratic leaders. For them, socialism means only the end of their sinecures.

About 1960, as the S.P.D. left and sabotaged the movement, the Easter March began. In Germany, the Easter March never was militant. It was bureaucratic from the start. In the marches, functionaries censor the placards the demonstrators carry to see that they do not go beyond abstract pleas for peace. Nothing with socialist content appears. (As for the C.P., nothing distinguishes them from the peace-loving old ladies) For some years now the affair has been referred to as the annual Easter promenade. Unfortunately the expression is just. About the only movement in West Germany as socially irrelevant as the Easter march is the West German C.P. About the best characterisation of the attitude of the Easter March functionaries can be found in their own words. In 1964 and 1965, the functionaries' last words in the Sunday speeches were ... "WE NOW ASK YOU ALL TO GO HOME QUIETLY AND PEACEFULLY. WHEN WE NEED YOU AGAIN WE WILL CALL YOU."

If the rank and file does not do something to take over the organisation and liven it up, or replace it with a new one, you can expect the movement over here to continue to sleep in peace.

THE BAR-L

During my stay of six weeks in Barlinnie Prison, Glasgow, I worked scrubbing floors and in the mailbag repair party where I spent about 6 hours a day talking and listening to other prisoners and for a month I shared a cell with two other prisoners. The block I was held in was supposed to be for first offenders, but in fact most of the prisoners I came in contact with were not in this category. If I was not a supporter of a non-violent organisation but a member of one which believed in violence, I could have done invaluable work in the procurement of explosives and building up an organised arms theft group.

There were several stabbings while I was in prison: in a cell 50ft away from mine, a man was found one morning with a 6" long nail-like object protruding an inch out of his back. I don't know what the precise statistics are but the Glasgow rumour that you can get a man stabbed for a half ounce of tobacco is based on fact. Most stabbings and slashings do not occur in a moment of anger, but are the result of a

"tobacco deal" through a "Baron"; they are planned in detail and the price haggled over. Apart from the fact that a good proportion of the acts of violence that do occur on the spur of the moment are over tobacco, most of the premeditated violence would not occur if there wasn't a shortage of 'snout'.

Now, the value that friends and relatives will pay the "Baron's" friends and relatives for tobacco varies from hall to hall in Barlinnie: from 10s an ounce as a minimum to 21s an ounce as a rather high price. This means that if a man can hoard $\frac{1}{2}$ lb of tobacco he can get anything from a couple of stabbings to a transistor radio. The wages are abysmally low in comparison with English prisons. I don't think there is anywhere else in Britain where 250 men sewing mailbags earn only 1/8d per week - enough to buy $\frac{1}{4}$ oz. of tobacco. The average in a London prison is double that in Barlinnie.

Some people may wonder that if tobacco is so scarce how do the "Barons" build up their stocks. This is easy to understand because the less tobacco you have at the beginning of the week the quicker you are going to use what you have up, and the more willing you are going to be to give your next weeks ration to the Baron, if he loans you some to get over the week-end. The week-end in prison is the worst part of the sentence, for most prisoners, because the time drags due to being locked in your cell all Saturday and Sunday (except for two hours). If you are in a single cell, it is like being in solitary confinement, especially if you eat in your cell and not in association with other prisoners. "Snout" is issued on a Tuesday and by the time the week-end has arrived most people have smoked their ration, so the Baron offers $\frac{3}{8}$ of an ounce to anyone who is willing to give him $\frac{1}{2}$ ounce on the following Tuesday. The Baron therefore makes 33% profit on all tobacco he lends and it is easy to see how he can get into a position of power, if he is physically tough and intelligent (they are!).

The most powerful Barons are usually doing sentences of more than 18 months, and employ runners who for a slice of the profits, pass the tobacco to and fro and hide the bulk of the "working capital". The really smart Barons may have their cells searched dozens of times but nothing is ever found. They can afford the luxuries of tranquillisers, pep pills and other drugs for themselves and for anyone else who can get the money to the Baron's friends or relatives, who in turn pay someone else to break into a chemists' shop to steal them. One man had a tin with alcohol in it equivalent to 3 gallons of whisky, when he was caught with it at his work place managed to wangle his way out of his punishment.

The Baron is also the agent through you settle old scores because he can make it worthwhile with payment of tobacco, drugs and alcohol for another prisoner to commit violence. For instance, man A grasses on man B to get a lighter sentence, and the authorities put him in a different hall or prison. Man A contacts the Baron and gets his friends

to send money to the Baron's friends or wife, and a few days later he receives a letter saying that a "long lost cousin" has sent him a gift to get him started when he gets out. He then fulfils his promise and gets someone to settle the debt.

The trouble with Barlinnie is that 'convict law', through fear of intimidation, is more powerful than prison law and its punishments. When the two conflict, the prisoner obeys convict law. What gives the convict law power over the prisoner is fear - not loyalty, because except for close friendships loyalty between prisoners does not exist and the saying that "there is honour among thieves" is just humbug. The Baron and his associates buy what they want and get people to do and say what they want, because they can buy 'violence' and can squeeze men where it hurts by denying them tobacco and drugs and threatening them.

One way to smash their power and control is to pay a wage to the prisoner that enables him to buy enough tobacco to last the week.

CALLUM ROBERTSON.

The writer has a wide experience of British 'Justice' and its penal system.

THE FOLLOWING LETTER APPEARS IN 'VOICE OF SCOTTISH INDUSTRY'
MARCH 1966 ISSUE (NO CONNECTION WITH 'VOICE OF THE UNIONS'!)

Computers can wreck you

Sir: My firm is in the electrical goods industry. By listening to people like Harold Wilson and press contributors we persuaded ourselves to rent a computer. It nearly wrecked our business. Customers' invoices were late, incorrect, and wrongly addressed. Production planning was fed with false data. Anarchy reigned in our spare parts service section.

By all means, do as the "experts" suggest and get a computer. But do it after your competitors have ironed out all the problems which will arise from using it."

H. Coster.

Our Comment:

CAPITALISM PRODUCES ITS OWN GRAVEDIGGERS!