

the worker

FOR A WORKERS' REPUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

EEC: BOSSES' ANSWER

To many people the referendum is immediate, even urgent, but the EEC itself is distant and abstract. Certainly the campaign on the referendum has brought more than its fair share of confusion. The mass of facts and contradictory arguments has clouded the real and immediate questions that are involved.

The majority of the arguments have been about developing Irish capitalism—whether this will happen better inside or outside the Common Market. Those who say that we would do best with a trading agreement, fail to see that entry into the EEC is absolutely necessary for Irish capitalism.

This is clear from the way the government's attempt to drag us in is already affecting day-to-day politics and economics in the 26 Counties.

FOR A WORKERS REPUBLIC



THE BUDGET

The Budget was recognised to be an 'EEC Budget', making allowance for EEC conditions for the first three months of 1973, and starting to bring agricultural policy into line with the Common Market. It was also a Budget for a capitalist economy which is running into serious difficulties and needs to boost profits and stimulate consumer demand in order to 'get things moving'. It satisfied the needs of the Confederation of Irish Industry (the bosses' union) which called for some of the things Colley included.

But the Confederation and Colley agree that the Budget cannot have the desired effects unless a new National Wage Agreement is forced through. If Irish industry is to remain competitive in the expanded free trade area of the Common Market, wages have to be held down, and productivity must be pushed up.

For the same reasons the government and the bosses are tightening control of the trade unions. As long as wage levels are decided by 'agreement' with union bureaucrats, the small group of men who control the economy can keep wage increases below the rise in prices.

The government has admitted that rationalisation will take place inside the Common Market. This has the same aim: to get more work for less wages. Rationalisation and productivity dealing are going on at present; they are part of the reason for the massive unemployment.




THE NORTH

Even Fianna Fail's attitude to the Northern crisis is determined by the need to pursue economic 'development' along present lines, and to get Ireland into the Common Market. If this country is to be an attractive place for outside investment, it must be politically stable. That means that Fianna Fail must move against republicans and other militants as and when the temperature lets them.

Entry into the EEC has been the aim—the necessary aim—of the main government policies over the past few years. For at least that length of time, the Irish ruling class has had no choice but to accept and encourage that reality. There is no important section of Irish business and big farming which is opposed to the EEC.

The problems facing Irish workers at present, and which are directly or indirectly caused by the strategy of entering the Common Market, will become sharper and more serious if Ireland does enter.

The Irish economy is marked by a combination of inflation and unemployment. The economies of Western European countries, in their own way, are affected by the same things. Workers in France, Germany and Italy face redundancies and wage-cuts. In Europe, as well as in Ireland, the capitalist state machines are trying to control the trade unions more tightly.



ALTERNATIVE

The alternative to the EEC is not simply to vote NO, letting the government find another way of coming to terms with its investment and trading problems.

The alternative is to resist the EEC by taking up the struggle against the attacks on our living standards and on our class organisations. It will take much more than a vote to find answers to our problems. It will take a sustained and concerted fight, a fight for socialism in Ireland, and socialism in Europe.

FOR A SOCIALIST EUROPE

Fight the National Wage Agreement

page 8

Trade Unions Organise Scabbing

page 4

Tory Thieves Fall Out

page 8

WHO ARE THEY TRYING TO FOOL?

John Goodwillie looks at pro-EEC propaganda

'It was political idealism rather than economic opportunism that led to the setting up of the EEC.' This claim by Michael Sweetman, Director of the Irish Council of the European Movement, is an example of the ludicrous heights of oratory which we hear from pro-Common Market propagandists. To think that the founders of the Common Market were not motivated by mundane, sordid considerations like the wealth of their countries, the prosperity of their businesses! No, they were idealists who embarked on a great crusade simply because they liked the idea of European unity!

Admissions

However, some of the arguments of the Common Market are worth examining, for two reasons: firstly, the damaging admissions they are forced to make in order to preserve a little credibility, and secondly, the distortions of the true situation which they indulge in.

They are, for example, unable to disguise the serious effects of free trade on Irish industry. The government's pamphlet on Industry and Employment talks of 'difficulties for certain firms... Some soundly based industries may find the going difficult during the period in which protection is being removed... EEC membership would cause problems for certain firms... The additional competition on the home market which will arise when we are within the EEC should not be serious for most Irish industries—this can only mean it will be serious for some. Michael Sweetman is a little more explicit when he writes: 'Inevitably, removing protection will involve some weeding out of weak and inefficient firms.' Yet the government's Into Europe states blithely: 'All sectors of the economy will benefit.' (And this gem of propaganda is paid for out of your pocket and mine!)

Jobs List

Opportunity: Ireland and Europe, published by the European Movement, admits that 'some jobs in industry must disappear.' It refers to the Committee on Industrial Organisation, who reported that, given adequate preparation, not more than 11,000 jobs in Irish industry were



threatened by free trade. Given inadequate preparation, presumably far more than 11,000 will be threatened. Yet a couple of sentences later, they are treating 11,000 as a maximum and saying it won't really be as bad as that.

Bonanza promised

The Common Market is supposed to be a bonanza for Irish agriculture. Yet the Government's The Common Market and Irish agriculture states: 'The clearest message on pig production is that the industry will have to strive for increased efficiency at the production, processing and marketing levels. It is possible that there may be some reduction in the rate of profit per pig.' Poultry and eggs: '... There is nothing that points to a higher price for Irish producers.' Horticulture: 'Under EEC conditions Irish horticultural products will be faced with keen competition... Producers may have to accept lower prices for some products.' All that the Government can advise in these sectors is greater efficiency. Otherwise these farmers will lose out.

Into Europe promises: 'The prices of some non-food items are likely to come down as a result of the greater competition brought about by free trade.' What this means is that we will be buying

slightly cheaper foreign goods instead of Irish-made goods as at present. What that means is that the Irish workers producing the goods that we used to buy will be out of a job.

To turn now to the distortion of propaganda, and come back to Michael Sweetman. He writes: 'It is simply nonsense to label the European ideal as undemocratic and bureaucratic when all the evidence shows precisely the opposite.' His 'evidence' is the 'democratic procedure' of 'qualified majority voting' by government representatives. He claims that 'within the EEC our influence will be increased.' Of course, it is not our influence he means, he means the influence of the Irish ruling class, which may once in a blue moon make an influential decision on the Council of Ministers, but which will be relieved of some of the burden of governing 'their' workers in Ireland. It is much more likely—and in tune with the nature of the system—that influence will go the other way: the more powerful and richer will gain, while the less powerful and poorer lose out.

The government's The Common Market and how it works gives us a lesson in civics: in each country there is a Parliament, a Government, a Civil Service, and courts: in the Common Market there is a Parliament, a Council of Ministers, a Commission, and a Court of Justice. This neatly conveys the impression that the European Parli-

ment is a body that matters, whereas in fact it has hardly any power; the law-making body is the Council of Ministers.

Funds

The European Movement's pamphlet, EEC and the West, refers to the capital which 'would be available from EEC funds to help finance public investment' and to the 'grants towards the cost of training workers for new employment'; but it makes no mention of the amount which will be received from these sources; naturally enough, since any money that the EEC may have to spare will only be a small fraction of the amount the Irish government is already spending. Yet Into Europe wildly promises that 'all the means and procedure of the Community, in particular its financial resources, will be available to help the Irish government in attaining their objective of ending unemployment.' There are plenty of poorer regions within the Community which will be competing for the money.

Mansholt

Opportunity: Ireland and Europe explains the Mansholt plan for reducing the number of farmers: 'Any farmer whether large or small who wished to continue precisely as he has always done would be perfectly free to do so and would get all the benefits of higher prices. These schemes are not designed to "drive the small farmer off the land".' Perfectly true, so far as it goes. But it does not mention that the Irish government will have to withdraw many of the grants and subsidies available to small farmers which form a considerable part of their income. It does not mention that only some products are getting higher prices. And it does not mention that high prices may not continue for ever. If farm prices come down (or if they stay the same while the general cost of living rises), the small farmers will have to leave the land, although of course formally they will be 'perfectly free' to stay there and starve.

Michael Sweetman says farm prices will not come down: 'farmers will insist on being paid a satisfactory living for their work in producing this food.' But the point is that at present price levels a large farmer in the Common Market makes much more

than 'a satisfactory living'. Once the small farmers have been eliminated and only large farmers are left, it will be possible to bring in a cheap food policy and the large farmers will still earn enough to get by.

Fisheries

The greatest misrepresentation of all relates to fisheries. Into Europe states that the arrangement for continued protection of most Irish fisheries 'is to be reviewed in ten years' time.' EEC and the West promises that 'after that any new arrangements would have the consent of the Irish government as a full member.' It does not point out that any new arrangements will have to have the consent of the other full members. The text of the agreement states that before the ten transitional years are up the Community 'will examine the arrangements which could follow the derogations in force until 31 December, 1982.' In other words the derogations end automatically on 31 December, 1982, but the Community promises to discuss in advance whether any new arrangements might be made for the period after that.

And that's all that Dr Hillery won for our fishermen.

Ireland and the common market industry and employment



the common market and how it works



MAY DAY

For over 80 years workers of all countries have chosen May Day as a day to demonstrate international working-class solidarity.

The first massive international labour demonstration was organised by the Second Socialist International to take place simultaneously in Spain, France, Portugal, Poland, and many other European and American countries. The Congress of the International had called for a downing of tools, and demonstrations in support of the demand for an 8-hour day.

In the period before World War II, May Day was used to stress demands of this sort, as well as to emphasise working-class solidarity. During that period it increased in importance to the international movement. May Day demonstrations were often crucial land-marks in bitter class struggles.

CLASHES

The marches were not always peaceful. A Paris May Day march in 1918 clashed with police. Several hundred workers and policemen were injured.

Working-class defeats in several countries during the 1920's led to a fall-off in May Day demonstrations. Rising fascism made sure that any such demonstrations of working-class

To all whom it may Concern.

The WORKERS OF IRELAND have decided to Celebrate

LABOUR DAY

(THURSDAY, MAY 1st),

As a **General Holiday**

All work will be suspended for that day to demonstrate that the Irish working-class joins with the

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR MOVEMENT

in demanding a

DEMOCRATIC LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS

as the necessary condition of permanent peace based upon the

SELF-DETERMINATION

of all peoples including the

PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

For the National Executive of the Irish Labour Party and Trade Union Congress.

WM. O'BRIEN, Secretary.

Poster for Labour Day, 1919

solidarity were prevented.

In Ireland, May Day has not been celebrated consistently. There have also been differences between North and South on the manner of marking the occasion. In recent years the Northern Committee of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions has organised marches in Belfast, but has prohibited the carrying of political banners. The effect of sectarian divisions becomes very apparent on May Day in Belfast, where it is not possible under present conditions to organise a large-scale anti-ruling class

demonstration of workers in their own class organisations.

In Dublin, there is no regular pattern of May Day events. In the past few years a march has been organised by an ad hoc committee, which the Communist Party has made sure it dominated. The 1972 march is to be directed mainly against the EEC. It must mark the beginning of a concerted struggle by workers against the Common Market and against redundancies. That struggle must be fought internationally, if it is to be fought successfully.

Northern Notes

1

Paratrooper Mervyn Hall was given a two year jail sentence in a Belfast court recently for selling £600 worth of guns to the UVF, that fictitious force which we are constantly assured does not exist. The defending counsel's plea was that he had 'a history of mental instability. He joined the Paratroops in 1969, and was posted to Belfast in 1970, eventually joining the intelligence unit.' Makes you wonder what the ones who don't make the grade are like!!

2

While Brian Faulkner was wining and dining with the Bow Group in London, and boasting about the amazingly 'high level of material prosperity for all citizens' that the Unionists had brought to Ulster, 11 per cent of the employable workforce was rotting away on the dole—the highest figure in Western Europe. Those in work are lucky to take home wages 20 per cent less than a worker in Britain.

On the same day this letter appeared in a Belfast paper: 'I am an

old age pensioner, and have worked all my life. All I get is £6.40 pension and my rent from the Supplementary. As the flat is all electric I do not get enough to pay my way and have to half-starve myself and nearly freeze to death in order to save electricity.' Signed: Ex-serviceman, Belfast '7. Having done his bit for the Empire, he has been cast on to the rubbish heap.

Loyalist workers take note! No Bow Group dinners for you!

3

Brian added a claim which even the most credulous Bow Grouper must have found hard to listen to without a smothered snigger. He asserted that Stormont was not only an 'extremely efficient' state, (especially, he failed to add, when backed up by British guns, and when its efficiency was aimed at liquidating its opponents), but it was also 'one of the most democratically accessible anywhere in the world.' 50 years of uninterrupted Tory Unionist rule, 850 men interned, all serious opposition banned, protesters shot dead in the streets!!

Well, Brian wasn't far wrong: that's what lies behind every bourgeois democracy.

Batchelors lay off

Workers in Batchelors are faced with large redundancies on 1 May when the Carlsberg bottling plant in Cabra, Dublin, closes down. The bottling is to be transferred to Beamish and Crawford, who, together, with Guinness, have a monopoly in the brewing and bottling industry in Ireland.

Batchelors have told the Cabra workers that they were only given short notice about the change-over to Beamish and Crawford. Who do they think they are fooling? This deal must have taken months to go through. You can also rest assured that Batchelors were well compensated for their troubles.

Not so the 48 factory workers, plus four more from the transport division. The redundancy payments being offered them are miserable; it is not even certain that all of them will get what they are entitled to. The unions representing the workers, the Irish Transport and General Workers Union, and the Workers Union of Ireland, are in negotiation with the management, but these talks take place behind closed doors, so the workers don't know where they stand.

In an effort to break any solidarity in

the workers' ranks, both management and unions have been approaching individual workers, telling them that their particular job is secure. This psychological warfare is meant to make workers afraid to take any action to safeguard all the jobs, in case they jeopardise their own chances of being kept on, or fail to get their redundancy money.

Take-over

Since the British Oxygen Company took over Batchelors, conditions have deteriorated steadily. There has been speed-up on the lines, and workers laid off throughout the plant. Now the parent company, BOC, who are in control, add insult to injury.

All over Ireland workers are facing similar situations. Yet they often find themselves isolated, and without any fighting organisation. One successful fight-back against closures could have a radical effect. Perhaps Batchelors will bring a breakthrough.

KEN QUINN



BUTCHERS TAKE A CUT - IN LIVING STANDARDS

Few people eating their meat ever stop to think about the work that goes into getting it on to the table. It doesn't get in trees; it requires hard work in foul conditions.

It might be thought that butchers have a reasonable job, as they are not often seen picketing the shops in Main Street. It is six years since that last happened, not because of the bosses' generosity, but because of a decline in the trade, and the difficulties of organising.

Thirty years' ago, butchers earned considerably more than other workers. On top of basic wages, they had the 'wrap-up'. At that time, there was a five years' apprenticeship, but even before you got that far, you had to get into the trade at all. It was very much a family affair—and still is, to some extent.

The trade has now been opened up, because many butchers, seeing the trade decline, advised their sons to go into another trade. During this time, profits in the meat business have increased, but wages have shown very little real increase when compared to those of other workers. In one Dublin supermarket, the gross profit on the meat counter alone is over £6,000 a year.

Apprentices

Today, a first-year apprentice earns just over £6.00 per week, and works 48 for it. Eight hours of that time are not paid; he goes to Technical College as part of his training. In many other trades the apprentice is paid—but not in butchery.

A trained butcher works 40 hours for a basic rate of £22.84. There is no general sick pay throughout the trade, although some do pay it. Even there, it is always a

matter for negotiation. There is no pension scheme; and the days of the wrap-ups have disappeared.

The butcher's wages have gone up 50 per cent during a period when the cost of living has increased more than 200 per cent.

Organisation

Why have butchers not kept up with other workers? One reason is that they are not grouped together like factory workers, and are therefore less well able to organise for better conditions. They only meet at union General Meetings, where there is little or no opportunity to discuss their real problems. The agenda at these meetings are often largely irrelevant, and the union officials themselves make little effort to meet the needs of the rank-and-file.

Bigger slice

It is time butchers sharpened their knives to demand a bigger slice of the profits. There are many demands that can be put forward now. Most importantly, we must resist any further National Wage Agreement, and be prepared to breach it, if it is negotiated 'on our behalf'.

Butchers should organise for no less than £30 for a 35-hour week, for a shorter apprenticeship with three months' paid block release, and for the introduction of sick pay and pensions.

To achieve these demands the unions must be made into fighting organisations controlled by the rank-and-file. This means more frequent general meetings just for a start.

David Lloyd

Galway meeting against E.E.C.

500 people attended an anti-EEC meeting organised by the Socialist Workers Movement in Galway during April. The meeting was addressed by Bernadette Devlin, Brian Trench, of the Dublin branch of the Socialist Workers Movement, and members of the Galway branch.

The theme running through the speeches was that the problems facing Irish workers and small farmers would not be solved by a vote one way or the other. It was necessary to resist the EEC, to oppose the government's policy; but it was also necessary to fight the present effects of preparation for EEC entry, and to sharpen the struggle against redundancies, wages policies, and rising prices.

PARADISE

Fianna Fail tried to make out that the EEC would bring paradise, Brian Trench said. They claimed that entry into the EEC would bring 8000 new jobs per year. But last year we lost 8000 jobs. The government claimed that entry into the EEC would slow down the movement off the land, but last year the race accelerated. How do they imagine a YES at the referendum would reverse these things? They are engaged in a massive confidence trick, Brian Trench claimed, which can, and must, be exposed.

Bernadette Devlin explained that there was no easy alternative to the EEC. Voting NO at the referendum would not guard us

against redundancies and rising prices. Only a struggle on class issues, a struggle for the Workers' Republic, could begin to do this. None of the supposed capitalist 'alternatives' to the EEC touched the central issues—who controls? and in whose interests? The fight against the EEC must become a fight against the whole system, she said.

Noel Grealy, of Galway Socialist Workers Movement, detailed scandalous conditions in some local factories, saying that these were foreign firms, established in Ireland with the government's assistance. By trying to drag us into the Common Market, the government was proposing more of the same—and worse. To meet the attacks of the employers and of the government it was necessary, he said, to build a fighting movement of workers committed to the struggle for socialism.



ESB again

On the day before the Shift Workers' strike began, 20 ESB workers in the Projects Department at Poolbeg, Dublin, were served with redundancy notices. The redundancies were to take effect from the first week in May.

On the same evening as the notices were served, Moriarty, Personnel Director of ESB, appeared on RTE's 'Seven Days' to assure everybody that industrial relations were good, and improving, in ESB. 650 Shift Workers, and 20 workers in the Projects Department, had reason to think otherwise—as had most other groups in the industry.

When ESB staff are taken on in the Projects Department, they are promised 10 years' work. If there should be a 'slack period', they are transferred to another department. In the cases of the 20 Poolbeg men, neither of these things happened. Some had only 6 or 7 years' service. They were offered no alternative employment.

Meanwhile, in the provinces, a number of electricians were threatened with being laid off. They were advised to apply for vacancies in Dublin. The 20 made redundant in Dublin had not been told about any vacancies.

Smooth talking won't hide you, Mr Moriarty. Good industrial relations, indeed; just a bad con-trick.

CIE: Where's the overtime gone?

Workers in CIE are now seeing the folly of depending on overtime to supplement their basic rates, and bring in a living wage. The very fact that a worker can bring home £30 or £40 per week by working overtime has always been an obstacle in the struggle for a decent basic wage.

This problem is not confined to CIE. It applies in the majority of firms. But in CIE the vast amounts of overtime have started disappearing recently. High unemployment is probably one reason. But the main reason is the refusal of the men to work the one-man double-deck buses.

Most of CIE's workers are now attempting to live on the basic wages. The management is, no doubt, planning to bring up the one-man bus issue again, hoping that the men will jump at the offer of a 25 per cent increase tied to accepting the one-man buses.

HIGHER WAGES

This is a stick which CIE hopes to use against the men. But it is also a stick which the men can use against CIE. The busmen should never again allow themselves to become dependent on overtime. They must fight now for a living basic wage and for a shorter working week.

Workers are not machines. They are concerned with more than sleeping, eating, and working. If we want to live—not just exist—we will have to fight.


W HUNTER

Irish fish from Grimsby

Over the past few months Bord Iascaigh Mhara has been bombarding the population of this country with ads on TV, radio, and in the press, telling them to buy fish.

When the housewife goes to the local fish shop, or supermarket to buy the much vaunted fish, however, she is told that there is a scarcity, and that there is only imported fish on sale.

The smoked cod she buys will most likely have been produced and packed by Drewery Bros, North Quay, Fish Docks, Grimsby, England. This cod is caught in Irish waters, sent directly to Grimsby, where it is smoked and packed, and then sent back for sale in Ireland.



that, they are charging higher prices to the shops in Ireland to subsidise their exports.

If Bord Iascaigh Mhara really wants us to eat fish, then it should take steps to halt this extortion, and should develop direct supplies from Irish fishermen to Irish homes.

The fishermen can start to change the situation by first of all rejecting the EEC, and by building a genuine co-operative movement which can do the job Bord Iascaigh Mhara does not want to do.

E.E.C.

No effort is being made to develop processing in Ireland. This is mainly due to the prospect of Irish entry into the EEC. The native capitalists are more interested in investing their millions abroad.

A central part of the Irish application to join the EEC concerned fisheries. The arrangement made would discourage any serious investment in processing in Ireland. There is Irish capital invested in processing plants nearer to larger industrial centres of Europe.

Meanwhile, the estimates for the Department of Fisheries show an increase of £1¼ million (over 50 per cent) from 1971-72 to 1972-73. What is happening to this public money? Any outlay on fishing boats is paid back by the fishermen. Is this another case of jobs and money for the boys?

Fishermen get little in return for the fish they catch—the wholesalers get the biggest cut (like John West). More than

Jobs for the boys

Jobbery is perhaps one of the most common features of Irish political life. Yet it has never been documented very accurately.

It was good to see the story about the appointment of a ratecollector in Donegal published in the 'Sunday Independent'. Mafia-man Senator McGlinchey, never known for his impartiality, managed to secure the post for a Mr John Cassidy.

Cassidy has none of the necessary qualifications—except that he is an organiser for Fianna Fail. What more does a selection committee need to know? The candidate who did have the exams, and fluent in Irish—which is fairly necessary in an Irish-speaking area—will have to search a bit more.

Jobbery is not the sole privilege of Fianna Fail, although they do their best to keep the monopoly. Recently, Maurice O'Connell, of Fine Gael, revealed that members of his own party had collaborated with Fianna Fail in making six political appointments of rate collectors. They did not even bother to interview the 273 genuine applicants.

One of the most notable things about jobbery is that for every one person who gets his job through a political appointment, there are two more who believe they have their jobs as a political favour.

The effect of it all is to tie people to the system, and to intimidate them. One more reason to change the system.

Fresh (Ford) meat

For over 6 months, fifteen workers at a Freshford, Co Kilkenny, meat plant have been locked out. They were sacked when they joined the union, and are now demanding re-instatement and trade union recognition.

The factory exports horse meat, and trades regularly with the North. Each week lorries come to Freshford from the Six Counties.

The Gardai, anxious to show their impartiality in the dispute, have been giving the lorries an escort on their journeys from the Border to Kilkenny and back. Just in case workers might feel a little grieved at being locked out, and get some funny ideas about direct action.

TRADE UNION CONGRESS

BREAKS ESB STRIKE

Even before a 'settlement' was reached in the ESB Shift Workers' strike a number of issues had become very clear. The decision of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions to instruct workers to fill in for strikers marks a new departure in the history of the Irish trade union movement. The principles of the movement were thrown overboard in favour of the supposed advantage of preserving the National Wage Agreement, and negotiating a new one.

The Shift Workers' strike was no different from hundreds of unofficial strikes which have taken place in the past. But the responses to it, both from inside and outside the trade union movement were different from the usual responses.

The press was hysterical. They accused the Shift Workers of sabotage, irresponsibility, ruthlessness, and much else. The officials of the ESB Group of Unions made their hostility very clear, and then gave it formal expression in the dramatic announcement to encourage black-legging.

Hysterical

The press did little or nothing to explain the Shift Workers' claim. When they made any effort in that direction, it was after they had made sure that the public were hostile.

The unions at no time attempted to explain where they thought the Shift Workers had gone wrong. If they thought they had made a tactical mistake, they had a duty to explain what they thought the mistake was. But when asked about this, they could only refer to the National Wage Agreement, accepting its restrictions completely.

In this situation the government could appear to stand above the dispute, keeping its hands clean of any intervention. All the ESB itself had to do was to feed the press with its slanderous outpourings, and with details of power cuts. It never had to explain why such drastic cuts were necessary so early, or how the re-starting of three generating stations had such an enormous effect on supplies.

Workers in the electricity generating industry have never been popular when on

strike. When they take this kind of action they always risk being isolated because their actions put others out of work. When the statements of the press and politicians are added to this, the pressure on power workers becomes a form of blackmail. During the 1968 strike, Mr Hillery suggested that picketing power stations had nothing to do with the right to withdraw labour. During the 1972 strike some papers came up with the idea that the ESB workers should be given civil servant status in return for forfeiting the right to strike.


The demands of the Shift Workers were mainly about status. They had been pursuing them for over two years through their respective unions and through the ESB Group. They were asking to be integrated into the salary structure which applies to technical and white collar staffs in ESB. This would mean a wage rise of about £3-£4, on their basic £22-£27, plus yearly increments. The claim had been taken up about 20 times by the unions, under pressure from the members. But eventually the unions came to accept that the claim would have to wait until the whole structure was reviewed in April, 1973. Being party to the Employer-Labour Agreement (National Wage Agreement) they could not use industrial action to force the pace.

Wage agreement

The response of some commentators to the Shift Workers' claim for upgrading was that they were quite dispensable, and getting above their station. But when they struck they showed just how important they were. The press had to change its tune, recognising that, even if other ESB workers had been prepared to do the strikers' work, there were not that many available who could do it.

Attitudes to the National Wage Agreement decided the day. For the government it is the centre of its economic and industrial policy. For the union bureaucracy it is a guarantee of more power over the rank-and-file. For the press its discipline is necessary if Ireland is to keep the favour of the E.E.C.

For the Shift Workers it is undemocratic agreement, negotiated without the participation of the rank-and-file,



and signing away the workers' fundamental right — the right to strike.

That is our attitude too. The Socialist Workers' Movement issued a statement of support for the Shift Workers on the first day of the strike. When the Congress called for official scabbing the S.W.M. issued a further statement of protest and picketed Congress House.

The first statement called on workers to resist cuts in earnings and not to work extraordinary hours. In this way, workers would improve their own position as well as supporting the strikers.

By the time Congress decided to organise scabbing, the press had succeeded in so isolating the Shift Workers that most people hoped only for an end to the strike. Kidney machines, lifts in high-rise flats, anything was a weapon to be used against the strikers. The fact that the Shift Workers Association had members working Poolbeg station in order to supply emergency services was confined to small print.

Liberalism

A number of journalists on the 'Irish Times' got hot under the collar about one sentence in the statement from the Socialist Workers' Movement which appeared to attack the prestige of that fine liberal newspaper. We stated that no paper had reproduced the press release from the Shift Workers. The 'Irish Times' did publish parts of it and paraphrase other parts, but the final paragraphs which explained how the Shift Workers had exhausted all other means of pursuing their claim, and how ESB's Personnel Director had attempted to intimidate them by means of personal letters to all of them, were left out.

Even where the 'Irish Times' attempted a direct quote it omitted words. The Shift Workers' decision to strike was made, according to their own statement, 'after long and strenuous meetings'. In the 'Irish Times' this became 'long meetings'.

The paper took the view, after all, that the Shift Workers were incapable of giving

serious consideration to anything, incapable of presenting their case. If 'Irish Times' journalists are worried about attacks on their paper's liberalism, they need look no further than that paper's editorial on Day 2 of the strike. It began by claiming that the Shift Workers were too stupid to understand the effects of their strike. They were 'avid for privilege'; they showed 'industrial arrogance'; they were 'an unofficial, slap-happy group of men'; they suffered from 'elephantiasis of power'; and, the 'Irish Times' threatened, 'they will be long remembered throughout the length and breadth of the land'.

The thin mask of liberalism . . .

Discipline


The newspapers and the bosses greeted the Congress decision with enthusiasm. All of them had decided that the key to the situation was trade union discipline. By a strange twist, the 'Irish Press' found that democracy had won. The 'Irish Independent' had found an alternative to its call for special legislation outlawing industrial action by electricity supply workers.

The repercussions of the Shift Workers' strike will be felt for a long time. The Congress does not need to repeat its performance for some time; it has now stated clearly its opposition to unofficial action and its resolve to see the Employer-Labour Agreement upheld and extended.

Trade unionists will regret not having supported the Shift Workers. The pay agreement could have been smashed. The imposition of a new one would be a serious defeat for the working class. It is a means of making workers pay for the bosses' problems.

As the Shift Workers stated, 'the present sorry position of the official trade union leaders' attempt to make black-legging respectable is the inevitable result of a process which began when Congress negotiated the Employer-Labour Agreement.'

BRIAN TRENCH



Redundancies treat at Tynagh

Loughrea — like many small towns in the West of Ireland — never had secure employment. Businesses were small, employing ten or twenty persons. The less prosperous section of a backward boss class had never really been able to make the big profits that would allow them to expand.

As a result, thousands emigrated, and others worked for rotten wages as farm workers.

When the Tynagh mines were opened up near Loughrea, they were welcomed with rapture. They would 'give life back to the town', it was said. They would provide jobs. But Northgate Exploration Ltd., the Canadian company who opened the mine, did not come to 'provide jobs'. It was just that you need workers to create your wealth, to make your profits.

The Tynagh mines turned out to be the biggest lead mine in Europe. To facilitate the company's greed for profit, part of the mine was open pit. This means that the ore is just below the ground, and does not require so much heavy machinery to extract it.

In the five years of operation at Tynagh, Northgate has made a net profit of £1.5 million.

However, the company has now extracted the ore from the open pit and redundancies are likely in September.

Bonus system

During the past five years a massive con-trick has been played on the workers at the mine. Their basic pay was £19.25 per week, but the big carrot for working in the unhealthy mines was the 'bonus system'. Workers could earn up to £30 per

week on the bonus system.

The problem was that, in working this system, they were working themselves out of a job. Bonuses were given for the amount of ore dug up. The more you worked, the more you earned, the sooner the ore was exhausted. That was the main effect of the productivity deal negotiated for the mine. That deal is leading directly to 100 redundancies in September.

Meanwhile, the bosses are making an average profit of £194 per week from each worker. The workers get an average of £27 per week. In mining, wages are equivalent to about one tenth of output — a much lower proportion than in any other sector.

If job security is not guaranteed at Tynagh, the health and safety of the workers is even more precarious. Mining has always been recognised as dangerous and unhealthy — dangerous because of the high rate of accidents underground, and unhealthy because of the damage the ore-dust does to the mineworker's lungs. Tynagh mines are no exception. Two

miners have been killed, and there have been numerous smaller injuries and broken limbs. All the expense of treating these injuries is borne by the workers themselves; there is no special treatment.

No redundancies

Minimum demands at Tynagh would be for no redundancies and for a free health scheme. But this is not enough. Northgate Exploration Ltd. is a classic case of economic imperialism operating in Ireland. They invested in Irish mining, realising that they could more easily control the business in a country where the native capitalists cannot, or will not, invest in the resources themselves. To assist them, the Irish government has guaranteed cheap labour and tax-free profits for fifteen years.

Tynagh mines will be exhausted 13 years after the date of their opening. By that time, a net profit of £60 million will have been made from the mines. The vast majority of this — like the greater part of

the £250-£300 million net profit which will be extracted from the mines presently operating in Ireland — will leave the country. The profit created by Irish workers will not be used to build industry in Ireland.

Redundancies are threatened not only at Tynagh, but also at the Mogul mines at Silvermines, in Co. Tipperary. There is a need for a campaign to cover all Irish mines. We must demand their nationalisation under worker's control. This is the only possible way to deal with the situation that arises when the ore runs out. Under the present system, all the workers are likely to get is a lump sum as redundancy payment — probably just enough to pay the boat to England, or Europe. All the trade union officials will worry about will be the terms of the redundancies — not the principle.

As long as the wealth created out of the mines is not at the disposal of the Irish working class, the wealth will not be used to create the jobs and houses needed. The fight for a secure job and for better conditions is a fight for control.

Blame the Workers

Blame the workers for everything; that seems to be the moral of this story of bloody-mindedness.

It all started when the Manager of Penneys in Mary Street assailed the Shop Steward in the store about the attitude of the workers in the Sunbeam factory in Cork. He said the management of Sunbeam had informed him that their workers refused to put the Penney brand name on knitwear they were manufacturing. The Shop Steward got in touch with his union, the Irish Transport and General Workers Union, on the matter and they, in turn, contacted their Cork office to discover what was going on.

New story

In an interview with the union office in Cork, Sunbeam suddenly changed its story. It was not the workers who were messing up the works, but none other than the arch-exploiter himself (remember the court case a few years ago?) Mr Ben Dunne, of Dunnes Stores. They explained that Mr Dunne, a longer-established and bigger customer than Penneys, had informed them that he would take his business elsewhere if they supplied branded knitwear to his competitor, Penneys.

This is a standard tactic used to monopolise certain consumer goods. But to turn around and blame the workers for the boss's dirty-work surely merits Sunbeam Knitwear the award of Worst Boss of the month. Send in your nominations for next month's Worst Boss!

Last Words

The following extracts from interviews given by Faulkner and Craig to the German press show these two characters at their best (or worst).

Faulkner: 'Never in history, never in 50 years of Protestant rule has there been discrimination against Catholics.'

Faulkner: 'Why do you (reporters) keep harping on about the unemployed? Unemployment is not only a Catholic problem . . . it affects everybody. Anyway, the Catholics among us are doing very well.'

When asked about Catholic support for the IRA Faulkner answered:

'Only a small, really small percentage of Catholics support the IRA. Only where the IRA can intimidate the population has it popular support.'

Reporter: '32,000 people are on rent strike. Is this a result of intimidation?'

Faulkner: 'Yes, most of it is.'

On how to end the troubles: 'One can only fight gunmen with guns.'

Craig

Reporter: 'Do you want total war in the North?'

Craig: 'No. We want total victory. The IRA must be eliminated. If the security forces can't do it, we will. We have dozens with over 500 names. When the situation arises we will know who to get.'

Craig about Bloody Sunday: 'The army should have cleaned up the Bogside a long time ago. The paras were in there in January and had they stayed we would have law and order there now.'

On the possibility of UDI:

Craig: 'When we are convinced that our democratic rights have been taken away from us, we will take them back, and declare ourselves totally independent.'

'Nothing will stop me. I will not surrender. I will fight on for the rights of our people.'

SHOP-FLOOR STRUGGLE

Part 2 (concluded)

Good Work Strike

Workers in public service industries such as the buses and the railways, or anyone working in shops and the retail trade are often in an awkward position. When they strike they can hurt fellow workers, and this is used by the authorities to whip up public opinion against the strikers. One way out is the good work strike.

For example, shop workers can consistently give overweight and undercharge, or building workers put the best workmanship and materials into any working class houses they are building. In 1968 the Lisbon transport workers decided they would continue to run the buses and trams but stop collecting fares. The public were very sympathetic! To be most effective and to prevent the bosses locking out workers it would be better for this sort of action to be carried out suddenly without notice and for short periods and then repeat the same treatment later on.

Occupations and sit ins

The Civil War period in Ireland provided quite a few examples of occupations and sit-ins but with the notable exception of the successful occupation of their factory by the girls employed at Falcarragh in Donegal, there has been very little recent history of either.

In France and even more, Italy, factory occupations are a part of working class struggle. In Britain recently at Plessey's, Allis-Chalmers', Upper Clyde Shipbuilders and Fisher-Bendix there have been occupations. The British worker is beginning to learn the power of the sit-in although so far the sit-in has mainly been used as a means of defence against the threat of redundancies and closures. It can be useful against redundancies because strikes are not effective if the boss actually wants to stop production.

The workers at Fisher-Bendix (a factory near Liverpool producing washing machines, heaters and driers) also realised that if they were to



Workers at Laurence, Scott and Electromotors, Manchester, sit in during the wave of sit-ins in support of the British engineers' pay claim

occupy the factory, they must occupy before the machinery was moved out. When the workers took over on 5 January this year, they were in control of £200,000 worth of finished electric radiators, £50,000 worth of storage heaters and a dozen new stacker trucks as well as £2 million worth of plant. All these gave them a strong bargaining position. When the occupation ended on 1 February, the workers got a guarantee of all jobs until the end of 1973 (months of previous talks between unions and management had only got a delay in the closure to the end of May 1972), with the probability of jobs continuing after that date.

So far, all the recent sit-ins in Britain have been against sackings, in

by P. Davies

fact against the actual closure of the plants involved. None have yet taken place against specific working conditions or in support of wage demands. In a sense they have not yet shown the enormous power of the occupation as a weapon of struggle. A struggle against plant closure is not the ideal situation. But under these circumstances the most important bargaining counter of these men is their refusal to let the boss dismantle and remove the machinery. One day workers will take over a

factory in which management is keen to see production continue.

One of the major problems of occupations has been the tendency for a sort of industrial Maginot mentality to develop. The occupied factory is seen as a besieged fortress rather than a base for offensive operations. Too often (for example in France in 1968) workers have been trapped behind the walls of their self-imposed ghettos and isolated from events going on in the big bad world outside. Under such circumstances management may allow sit-ins to drag on and die in isolation and despair. This is likely to happen unless the workers in occupied plants take a much more aggressive attitude and attempt to spread their action to other company

concerns, and involve the outside community

One of the most common misconceptions about the sit-in is that it can only be attempted in the best organised factories. This is not the case, and mass sit-ins in America (in the thirties) and more recently on the Continent are there to prove it. Many of these successful sit-ins took place in poorly organised plants. The occupation of a key plant in a combine (for example a plant which makes components that other plants depend on) allows the militants to concentrate their forces and to a large extent does away with the problems of scabbing. It places, and keeps, the initiative in the hands of the workers.

The 'Normal' Strike

We often go into strikes with a feeling of martyrdom 'prepared to suffer anything to beat the bastards'. However, I would have thought it would be better to win a struggle without losing too much money yourself.

The Italian unions which have no strike funds have developed a whole new armoury of activities to minimise the cost of strikes to their members and get the greatest disruption. There is the chessboard strike, where every other department stops; the bushfire or articulated strike which over a period rolls through key sections of the workers; the pay-book strike, where every man whose cards carry an odd number is in dispute on Monday, Wednesday and Friday, while the even numbers fight out their claims on Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday; and the rather different variety of odd-and-even strike, where blue collar workers down tools in the morning but return after lunch, only to find (surprise, surprise!) that the white collar workers (Foremen and clerks) are now out, making all work impossible—thus achieving a full day's stoppage for only half a day's loss of pay.

The biggest criticism of the normal strike from a revolutionary viewpoint is that it does not challenge the boss's so-called 'right' to manage 'his' factory. We all go home and leave him in control which is in contradiction to our belief in workers' control. The factory should be under our control not the boss's.

We should decide how we are to work, what we are to make, and the decisions should be made collectively. One day the workers' occupation of a factory will be permanent and with the shift in power from the present ruling class to the working class, a new society will be born.

Fine Gael—party of law and order

'Fine Gael could not be worse than the present government'—that is an attitude which many people take. It might be useful, therefore, to take a look at some of the leaders of Fine Gael and their record.

Deputy Patrick Donegan, for example, who takes pot-shots at itinerants when they come near his land, said in early 1969: 'Staggering moves to the left have no place in Irish life.' But Mr Donegan is a company director, and possibly that has affected his judgment.

So let us turn to Dr Hugh Byrne, who on 9 January, 1970, received five members of the racially-selected Springbok rugby team in Dail Eireann, together with the team manager. Dr Byrne's constituents in Cabra and Finglas may hope that he would not support the exploitation of Irish workers the same way he supports exploitation of South African workers, but by his friends you will know him.

Sectarianism

Turning from racial discrimination to religious discrimination we find a prominent Fine Gael member, Mr Patrick Lindsay, condemning in February 1971 the idea of community schools as 'levelling': 'one cannot harness the opposing concepts of egalitarianism and freedom . . . If this planning goes on, or is allowed to go on, there certainly will be a massive fight. And it shall not be fought by the religious alone, because the parents of Ireland will march with them.' That is, fight to keep sectarian education. (In the event, of course, the Minister for Education surrendered to sectarianism before the fight had begun.)

Lynch has been hamstrung by contradictions in his own party in dealing with the republicans. On that question, and on 'law and order' in general, Fine Gael has

by John Goodwillie

the virtue of consistency. Speaking in the Dail in favour of the Prohibition of Forcible Entry and Occupation Bill on 2 February, 1971, Sir Anthony Esmond complained that the Duke of Devonshire's house had been occupied by people who objected to his monopoly of fishing rights. 'Even though this man happens to be the Duke of Devonshire, he is a property owner in this country. I understand he gives considerable employment.' No doubt he gives employment purely as a favour to the benighted peasantry of Lismore, and no doubt they are suitably grateful.

Sir Anthony continued: 'This Bill should be for the purpose of stopping in the name of democracy any hooligans from breaking the law. Democracy is the sovereign right of people to have title and to hold land and property.'

In other words, democracy exists to protect the men of property from the men of no property, instead of vice versa which was Wolfe Tone's idea. But then, Sir Anthony is a landowner and Wolfe Tone was not.

Similarly enlightened ideas about democracy were expressed the next day by Deputy Maurice Dockrell: 'We cannot permit law and order to be smashed down under the guise of a democratic process . . . We have seen not only in Ireland but in every country in the world the terrible results which have flowed from the breakdown of law and order.' The question, of course, is whose law? whose order? Maurice Dockrell's law and order exist to preserve property from homeless working-class families who might be tempted to squat.

The theme of law and order returns again and again in speeches by spokesmen. At the 1970 Ard-fheis Liam Cosgrave talked of people 'who are showing an increased disregard for the laws of the land.' On 13 July, 1971, the Fine Gael Party announced: 'A serious threat to the rule of law in our State now exists . . . Our Government has the responsibility for seeing that the Constitution is respected and the laws enforced . . . Let the Government do its duty if the rights and liberties of the people are not to be endangered.'

Felon - setting

Fine Gael were not calling for action against pickpockets or burglars: they were calling for action against the IRA—action which the Faulkner government took a month later when it introduced internment. Listen to Gerry L'Estrange in the Dail on 13 July: 'Surely the Government are not facing up to their obligations and their responsibilities in dealing with this illegal organisation.'

Two days later at Dundrum Tom O'Higgins referred to the 'simple question of whether the Government is prepared to enforce the ordinary law of the land against those who openly defy it.' There is a name for this sort of thing—felon-setting.

They don't only go in for felon-setting against Republicans. Republicans have been active on social issues in the South, as well as on the Northern question. This tough talk is a threat against any worker who squats in an empty house, or any workers who try to organise to gain their rights. The weapons which are used against Republicans can be used against the working class looking for decent conditions—and they will be, for the working class is what Fine Gael is most afraid of.



Cosgrave's front-bench reshuffle changes nothing in a party which has not forgotten its Blueshirt past

SUBSCRIBE NOW!

I wish to subscribe to 'The Worker' and enclose 80p for 1 year

Name _____

Address _____

Send to Socialist Workers' Movement, 30 Strandville Avenue, North Strand, Dublin 3

WHAT WE STAND FOR

SOCIALIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT

The SOCIALIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT is a revolutionary workers' movement, whose aim is the organisation of the working class in the struggle for power and the transformation of the existing social order. All its activities, its methods and its internal organisation are subordinated to this and are designed to serve this purpose.

Capitalism is a system based on production for profit, not for human need. This system is driven by the necessity to accumulate profit, which means that capitalists compete with one another, both nationally and internationally.

The capitalist class is a ruling class whose ownership and control of the means of production is based on the exploitation of the working class. Thus, a small minority rules society. In Ireland, 9 per cent of the population owns 90 per cent of the wealth.

The contradictions between competing capitalists, produce war, poverty and crisis. The struggle between the classes will produce the overthrow of capitalist society.

Capitalism needs the working class; the working class does not need capitalism. Present day capitalism is entering a period of stagnation and crisis; it attempts to solve its problems at the expense of working-class living standards and democratic rights.

This system is international: in the drive to expand it must extend its power over the whole world. 250 companies dominate the international economy. The search for markets and materials has led to imperialism — the brutal oppression of the peoples of two-thirds of the world and the effective strangling of those peoples' attempts to develop their societies.

Imperialism

International capitalism operates in Ireland through British imperialism's military, economic and political

domination of the whole country. Britain maintains a standing army in the North. British imperialism has divided the working class on sectarian lines. British investments throughout Ireland equal 50 per cent of all investment in manufacturing and commerce. The Dublin and Stormont governments are subservient to the dictates of the international system and thus to its agent, Westminster.

Imperialism dominates Ireland as a whole: it treats Ireland as a unity. The struggle to defeat imperialism, therefore, must be fought in a united way throughout the 32 counties. This involves the overthrow of the Orange-Unionist state in the North and of the Green-Tory state in the South.

Irish capitalism, Green and Orange, is wholly integrated into the world system. Because of this, the mere unification of Ireland, or the removal of British troops, cannot in themselves mean the defeat of imperialism in Ireland. There is no independent republic this side of the Workers' Republic. Only by the uniting of the working class can power be taken from the Orange and Green ruling class minorities and victory be won over imperialism.

It is the Irish working class and small farmers who bear the load of this imperialist domination. The contrast between Ireland, a neo-colony, and the Western capitalist countries is especially glaring:

- North and South:
 - 120,000 unemployed—the highest rate of unemployment in Europe;
 - 60,000 redundancies expected in the next four years;
 - 100,000 unfit houses and the worst housing record in Europe;
 - £9 per week net average income per rural household—the third lowest in Europe;
 - 1,000 political prisoners.

The working class has the capacity to end exploitation and oppression. In Ireland North and South the working class is now the predominant social class numerically and in terms of potential strength. The class has achieved a new self-confidence and militancy; this needs political co-ordination. Independent working class action can create a society based on production for human need, democratically controlled by the majority. By organising at the point of production and in the localities the workers can lead a struggle to the Workers' Republic. This would not mean merely a State takeover of the means of production, but workers' control of all aspects of society, local and national. Such a society does not exist in any country today.

The Socialist Workers' Movement stands for the nationalisation of banks and industry under workers' control and without compensation. To this end we actively engage in the day-to-day struggles of workers and small farmers and seek to build a mass working-class party which can lead the struggle to build socialism in Ireland as part of the struggle for international socialism. A Workers' Republic cannot survive without the aid of the British and Continental working classes and the international extension of the revolutionary fight.

The Socialist Workers' Movement opposes the E.E.C. to which the only alternative is socialism in Ireland, as part of a socialist Europe. The Socialist Workers' Movement opposes N.A.T.O. and all other international military alliances. We are independent of Washington, Moscow and Peking. We support all anti-imperialist struggles throughout the world.

Workers struggles

The Socialist Workers' Movement fights for:—

- full support for workers and small farmers in struggle;
- defence of the living standards of workers and small farmers;
- rank-and-file control and socialist leadership of the trade union;
- the election of all trade union officials, subject to recall;
- all strikes to be declared official if supported by the majority of the workers concerned;
- a minimum wage of at least £30 for a 35-hour week;
- equal pay for women;
- 100 per cent trade unionism;
- opposition to all anti-trade union legislation;
- opposition to all incomes policies under capitalism;
- against unemployment, redundancy and lay offs. We support the demand: Five days' work or five days' pay;
- repeal of all repressive legislation—e.g. Special Powers Act and Offences Against the State Act;
- extension of the Civil Resistance Campaign in the Six Counties;
- release of all political prisoners;
- evacuation of British troops from Ireland;
- defence of working class areas against military and sectarian attacks;
- freedom of worship for all religious groupings;
- total separation of Church and State;
- an end to clerical control of education;
- a secular and comprehensive education system controlled by teachers, pupils and parents;
- raising of school-leaving age to 18;
- free education to the highest level;
- full adult rights at 18—e.g. the right to vote;
- adult wages and adult rights for workers at 18;
- free and comprehensive health service;
- end to means-tested benefits;
- minimum wage for the unemployed and pensioners;
- one family—one house;
- emergency housing programme and expropriation of all building land;
- tenants' control of estates, including rents;
- full social equality for women;
- 24-hour nurseries;
- income for small farmers and agricultural labourers on parity with industrial rates;
- division of large estates under control of local farmers;
- the building of a genuine co-operative movement among farmers and fishermen;
- nationalisation of hunting and fishing rights.

The SOCIALIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT is a democratic organisation open to all those who accept its principles and objectives, who work in one of the units of the movement, agree to recognise its discipline and pay dues.

"Internationalism; to some people this is the great bug-aboo which frightens them off from socialism" (James Connolly). The struggle for a Workers' Republic in Ireland is inseparable from the international struggle against capitalism. The Socialist Workers' Movement fights to build a mass party of the working class as part of a revolutionary international of working class parties.

I wish to have further details of the Socialist Workers' Movement

Send to Socialist Workers' Movement, 30 Strandville Avenue, North Strand, Dublin 3

Name _____

Address _____

Education

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS — TO SERVE WHOM?

Padraigh Faulkner, the Minister of Education, is trying to introduce a 'comprehensive' system of education in the 26 Counties under the misleading title of 'community schools'. It is important that workers should understand why the change in educational policy is taking place, and who is going to benefit directly from it.

Community schools do not serve the interests of the community, but rather those of capitalism. They are an attempt to rationalise the use of present school resources, and to re-direct young students away from academic education to a technical-scientific education. This re-direction is made necessary by the bosses' need of better trained workers to produce greater profits in modern industry.


Technology

Dr Garret Fitzgerald, Fine Gael's spokesman on education, made this clear in a Dail debate:

"At the moment the pupils are being deprived of acquiring these additional skills, which is a disadvantage to them and to the country in which such skills are needed".

Due to technological change, industry has to review its labour requirements constantly, and in particular the level and kind of training which are most suitable. Barry Desmond, of the Labour Party, has suggested that there should be an 'academic public commission' which would do the job for industry, 'so that we should not produce children whose skills would be obsolete.'

These are the considerations behind the change in policy. The term 'community schools' is conveniently designed to cloud the issues.



Garrett Fitzgerald

Before Sean Lemass encouraged foreign enterprise into Ireland, the secondary schools ambled along educating the middle class children to become arrogant doctors, pseudo-genteel teachers, obedient bank clerks, and to fill other 'white-collar' positions. Industry was small-scale, and not very sophisticated; the economy was still largely based on agriculture. As the more complex industrial society began to assert itself over the agricultural and gombeen community, changes were forced on the educational system.

O'Kennedy, the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Education put it well: 'The trends of society are changing every day, and the structure of education must adapt itself to that change.'

The main obstacle to that change was the dominant position of the Catholic Church in education. But the more 'enlightened' of the hierarchy had recognised that change was inevitable, and that it was necessary for them to negotiate with the government if they were to retain their

influence. What then followed shocked even many conservatives in its degree of blatant sectarianism. The Minister, in drawing up his proposals, had not consulted directly with any interest other than the Catholic hierarchy. Their 'rights' of management were acknowledged, and strengthened.

Opposition from vocational schools, liberal and political quarters have since forced the Minister to modify his scheme. But its in-built sectarianism is retained. The people most directly involved in the education process, teachers, pupils, and parents, have no representation at all on management boards.

Socialists favour a comprehensive concept of education, co-educational, and breaking down the barriers between technical and academic education. They oppose the class bias in education, and the distortion of the education process which comes from this.

Control

It is the aim of socialists to make technology serve men, not to have it dominate us. In a socialist society the uses to which technology and science would be put would differ greatly from those to which they are put under capitalism. At present, they are made to serve profiteering of a small minority which controls society, to provide them with the equipment to plunder and to ravage.

When workers control the means of production and the means of education, social need will determine the priorities—not private profit.

DERMOT QUISH

Teachers decide on strike action

In April the Secondary, Vocational, and National Teachers' organisations all held their annual conferences.

The main issue facing the Secondary Teachers (ASTI) was whether to permit teaching priests, nuns, and brothers to join the union. Some argued that discrimination against 'the blacks' was undemocratic, and advocated the acceptance of the teaching clergy into the union. However, a majority of delegates took the view that in an educational system controlled by clerical managers, teaching clerics could act as a Trojan Horse for the management. In any serious dispute between managers and teachers nobody doubts where the allegiance of the clerics would lie.

Temperatures rose at the National Teachers (INTO) Conference over the number of pupils per class, particularly in the Dublin and Cork areas. Primary teachers are finding it impossible to implement a child-centred curriculum with classes of fifty and sixty students.

Many teachers find most of their time is spent in policing rather than teaching such impossible numbers.

Strikes

The National Teachers have decided to organise a series of one-day strikes to bring this issue fully to the Minister's attention. They are demanding a maximum of 35 students per class.

The Vocational Teachers Association has for some time been in dispute with a very unco-operative Wexford Vocational

Educational Committee. Here again it seems strike action may be the only way of getting results.

At the Vocational Teachers' Conference there was heavy criticism of the selective entrance examinations to secondary schools. This elitist entrance policy creams off the intelligent students (in so far as exams can be said to measure intelligence), and leaves what is left to the technical schools.

The Vocational Teachers called for parity of pay between teachers of technical and academic subjects. Technical teachers get paid less, although they are often highly skilled in their subjects.

Unity

Of the three unions, the National Teachers (INTO) is the strongest and has had most success in its dealings with the Department. But at the moment, the three organisations are at loggerheads with each other—to the delight of Minister Padraigh Faulkner. In the past he has been able to prevent strikes by playing one union off against another.

Teachers must wake up to the fact that strength lies in unity. They can only achieve their demands by combining their efforts. This might mean a single organisation, or a federation of teaching bodies.

Faced with such a powerful combination, Faulkner would be forced to pay heed to other interests besides those of Maynooth and the Industrial Development Authority.

International News

VIETNAM: NLF FIGHTS ON

Rarely can an imperialist power have made such heavy weather of holding on to territories as the USA in Vietnam.

The Vietnam war exploded into the front pages of the world's press in April with a new offensive by the North Vietnamese and the NLF forces, and bombing raids by the Americans using their largest bombers, B 52's, to attack Hai-Phong, the port of Hanoi.

In the run-up to the Presidential elections, Nixon is obviously interested in appearing to solve the problem of the Vietnam war. The plan for 'Vietnamisation', gradually handing over military responsibility to the Saigon regime, is intended to meet the growing discontent in the U.S. about the conduct of the war. What the most recent events clearly demonstrate is that the plan is an absolute non-starter.

Demoralisation

The South Vietnamese forces are too demoralised and too fragmented to take over anything. Support for the liberation forces increases steadily. Their penetration of American and South Vietnamese defences to the very edge of Saigon shows how complete it is. 'Vietnamisation' is an impossibility precisely for this reason: no government in Vietnam could survive without the support of the NLF. That popular support, and the leadership which

the NLF gives to it, hold the key to the future.

It is also that support which is provoking the demoralisation of the American troops. One group of soldiers, members of the 196th Light Infantry Brigade, debated for 1½ hours whether to obey orders or not. The NLF have understood how to exploit their alienation. There are messages left at convenient places for black American soldiers to see, drawing a comparison between their activities in Vietnam and those of the racist Ku-Klux-Klan in America.

Failure

Nixon's efforts at persuading the American electorate that all was going well have quite obviously failed. His efforts at getting the South Vietnamese army off the ground have failed. The North Vietnamese and the NLF have opened up new fronts in the South. The American 'doves' - Nixon's opponents in the presidential race - are screaming about the latest bombings North of the Demilitarised Zone.

Can Nixon begin to salvage anything from this mess? He can only do so at the price of thousands more killed and many more villages razed to the ground. Having reduced the number of American troops drastically, he has to rely on the heavy machinery. But then that does not solve the political problem; if anything, it aggravates it.

In Vietnam, the international system of plunder reveals its ugly face more



openly and crudely than elsewhere in the world. The Americans may find in the end that they have retained control - of a graveyard. For power, profits, and prestige, the international ruling class will do just about anything. In the end, it is by a monopoly of physical force - or by superior force - that it retains these.

Oppression

A blow against that system struck anywhere in the world is a blow for the freedom of all peoples exploited and oppressed by imperialism. The crisis which U.S. imperialism faces in Vietnam opens up opportunities for attacks on its domination of other parts of the world. Because the system is international, we have a duty in Ireland to give support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle for freedom. Only if we consciously develop the struggle as an international struggle can we hope to end exploitation and oppression.

Spanish Strike

In the 35 years since the bloody suppression of the revolution the Spanish working class has been brutally exploited by the Franco regime.

In recent years however, the fascist leadership in Spain is finding it increasingly difficult to maintain its iron grip on the Spanish people as the recent wave of strikes and protest demonstrations prove.

Earlier this year strikes began in the state-owned shipyards in Franco's home town, El Ferrol. The workers came out in protest against the sacking of fellow workers who had been organising the fight for higher wages. Strikes are prohibited under Spanish law, and the job of the state-run trade unions is to see that strikes don't take place. The reaction of the management to the strike was to lock the workers out and to clear the yards with armed police.

The next morning 3000 workers began a march through the town. When the riot

police moved in to break up the march the workers replied with a hail of stones. In reply the police opened fire with sub machine guns into the ranks of the workers, killing two and wounding 38, some of them seriously.

For the first time in a strike since the Civil War the local population demonstrated its solidarity by closing all shops and businesses in the town on the following day. The police were forced to retreat to their police stations. Only when units of the army in full riot gear with armoured cars moved in were the workers forced to disperse. The strike spread over most of Northern Spain: in Bilbao, Madrid and La Coruna workers and students demonstrated against the regime and the state-controlled trade unions.

Only with the use of the army and riot police, and with the threat of drafting all strikers into the Navy, was the revolt suppressed.

Reviews

Theory Missing

P. Berresford Ellis: *A History of the Irish Working Class* (Gollancz, 1972), £3.50.

Many readers of this book will be irritated repeatedly by a feeling that they have heard it before somewhere. They will be right. What Mr Ellis has done is to put between two covers a lot of material and quotes originally published elsewhere. Only occasionally does he contribute anything new or original. Where that original contribution is interpretation it is usually very questionable.

Still, this is not a bad book. The collection of facts, quotes, and arguments is done quite intelligently. It is useful to have the material easily available for reference.

The title promises much more than the author can deliver. In the first place, he is very unclear as to the nature of the working class. Nowhere does he attempt a definition of that class in capitalist society, much less of the particular position of the working class in Irish society. Consequently, he includes a mass of material which, while it might belong in a history of popular movements, is not directly a part of working class history. Secondly, Mr Ellis seems at no time to have considered what the purpose of such a history might be, what sort of problems it has to confront, what sort of connections it has to explain.

If Mr Ellis had thought about that problem seriously he would not have written this 'history' without including some treatment of the rooting of sectarian divisions within the Northern, particularly the Belfast, working class. Equally, he would not have written it without an account of independent working-class action in the heat of the national struggle: the Irish Soviets movement of the early 1920's.

Perhaps the most significant parts of this book are the parts which have been omitted. Apart from theoretical reasons (or reasons of an absence of theory), the main explanation for the omissions seems to be that Mr Ellis only goes as far as the most accessible earlier research. He gallops through the last 50 years in as many pages - about one sixth of the book. The 1930's in the North - the time of the Unemployed Action - warrant a half-page; the formation of breakaway unions in the South only a half-sentence.

All of this reflects the poverty of writing on Irish working-class history, particularly the failure of the Irish Left to produce any adequate account of recent historical developments from a working-class viewpoint.

GAP UNFILLED

There is an enormous gap in our literature - only Rayner Lysaght's book on 'The Republic of Ireland' attempts to grapple with the period since Connolly's 'Labour in Irish History' from a socialist perspective - and it is a gap which Mr Ellis, a Celtic Nationalist from Wales, who writes about Scotland and Ireland, is unable to fill.

His political bias comes out in his amplification of Connolly's 'Celtic Communism' idea. Here he waxes lyrical, apparently identifying common ownership with communism. The experience of the Eastern European regimes, based formally on common ownership, should be sufficient reminder of the absurdity of this. Again, towards the end of the book, he

makes specific mention of the activities of left-wingers in relation to the Irish language and the Gaeltacht, greeting this as a break with 'concentrating excessively on the urban proletariat'.

If anything, Irish socialists have not concentrated anything like enough on the urban proletariat, or they have done it incorrectly. They have never become deeply rooted in that class. To begin to explain that is as much a historical as a political problem. It involves using concepts of class consciousness and political organisation - which are notably missing from Ellis' book. How else does one explain that the labour movement in which Connolly had played a leading part could so completely forget what he had taught, and demonstrated, about the relation between the national struggle and the class struggle? How else does one relate the enormous increase in the membership of the Transport Union after the 1916 Rising with the equally steady decline in active working class participation in the political struggles of the day? Those historical facts acquire contemporary significance if they are connected through concepts of consciousness and organisation.

To do that would be to deal critically with Connolly. This is again something which Mr Ellis is unwilling or unable to do. The inadequacy of his book as a history is, in fact, the inadequacy of his theoretical and political awareness. Even the writing of a good narrative history - a 'simple' account of events - requires, or assumes, some theoretical commitment. Some people have jumped to the conclusion that, because he has set out to write a history of the Irish working class, Ellis must be a Marxist. This is far from being the case - however long (almost three pages for one) his quotes from Marx and Engels may be.

It would require not only their kind of theoretical awareness, but also their sensitivity to the realities of class struggle to write a book worthy of the title.

For £3.50 you can have a summary of 'Labour in Irish History', a good selection of quotes from Marx and Engels, and a mass of useful and interesting bits and pieces from the history of the Irish nationalist and labour movement. A 'History of the Irish Working Class' remains to be written.

Brian Trench

International Socialism 51

The latest issue of the International Socialists' theoretical journal, IS 51, is given over to analysing the Irish crisis. It is a welcome sign that British comrades should devote a whole issue to Ireland, but unfortunately the journal as a whole is rather disappointing.

Eamonn McCann's article contains valuable insights and ungrudging self-criticism. As an analysis of the failings of the Left since the present troubles began in October 1968, it goes a long way. Let us hope the lessons have been learned and that the mistakes will not be repeated. Don't be surprised if you recognise this article. Eamonn didn't copy it; he wrote a slightly different version for the Irish Times last year!

John Palmer's article is a disappointment: it tells us nothing new. It does, however, put the present crisis in its proper context, in a clear and simple way. It is a useful introduction for anyone unfamiliar with the underlying causes of the troubles. It should be read and digested by a significant proportion of the British Labour Movement.

DISCRIMINATION

Paul Gerhardt brings together in a concentrated form all the necessary information about the discrimination in the Six Counties. There is little new here, but it is useful to have all the dirt at one's fingertips. Sections of this might be worth reproducing for the benefit of those who are still unaware of the extent of Unionist discrimination.

Brian Trench's article - a critique of the 'two nations' theory - is the most original and theoretically valuable. No doubt the mad little Stalinists will reply with volumes. Although the advocates of this reactionary

rubbish are growing in number, as left-wingers get more disillusioned and look around for ways out of their present dilemma, it is unwise to give too much credence to them. Comrade Trench does not do this, but the fact that the main theoretical contribution should have been devoted to them alone, is a weakness in the journal as a whole.

CRITIQUE

What was needed here was not less on the 'two nations' nonsense, but more on other issues, in order to strike a balance. Essential at this point in time is a serious and deep critique of the republican movement. An organisation with the resources of IS should have been able to produce something of value which would have clarified the issue with British socialists, who on the one hand tend to dismiss republicanism as either useless or reactionary or both, or, on the other hand, tend to be mesmerised by it, and to wallow in its heroic deeds.

Perhaps the greatest disappointment of all is that in spite of the Connolly cover, there is no mention of the man inside. The only original Marxist theoretician produced off the coast of mainland Europe (save perhaps John McLean) is sorrowfully neglected.

The value of this issue of IS will depend largely on the type of audience that receives it. It is clearly aimed at those who are fairly new to Irish politics, or at least to the Marxist view thereof. To anyone with the basics already imbued, it will be rather a let-down. M.M.

IS 51 available through the SWM at 30, Strandville Avenue, North Strand, Dublin 3. Price 20p, plus postage.

the worker

NATIONAL WAGES CON MUST BE BEATEN

Pressure is building up from bosses, banks and politicians for a second National Wage Agreement. The present Agreement expires for some sections of workers in June. For others, the second phase, 4 per cent plus 69p cost of living 'escalator', has still to be effected.

The comments of the press on the ESB Shift Workers strike showed just how anxious the establishment is to coerce workers into a new deal which will hold down wages.

The 'Irish Banking Review', of March 1972, writes: 'It is vital that the present National Agreement which provides for an average increase of approximately 7 per cent over a 6-month period within the present year, should be adhered to, and should be replaced by a further Agreement which is aimed at containing inflationary pressures.'

Inflation

In order to persuade us of the need for such an Agreement the establishment representatives all maintain that the rise in wages causes higher prices. In that same article in the 'Banking Review' four other causes of inflation are given—none of which have anything to do with the actions of organised workers.

In the past year the prices of some essential commodities went up as much as 13 per cent. Over several years now the rate of inflation in Ireland has been twice that in advanced European countries. During that period the earnings of Irish workers improved relative to those of British and European workers. Manufacturers in Ireland have found that their advantage of being able

by Ken Quinn

to export at lower prices, because of cheaper labour, has become weaker.

They want us to pay for it. The first National Wage Agreement and the deal which they are pushing for now are designed to restore the level of profits at the expense of wages.

Initiative

Holding down wages is an essential part of the government's strategy for entry into the EEC. But there is another aspect to such Agreements which has to do with the EEC question also.

The union representatives at the Employer-Labour Conference are full-time officials. They have little or no responsibility to the rank-and-file. The Wage Agreement makes them even less responsible to the rank-and-file—and more responsible to the bosses' state. It takes away the initiative from the ordinary union members and gives it to the paid bureaucrats. Again, the attitude of the Congress and the ESB Group of Unions to the Shift Workers' strike shows clearly the effects of this.

In preparation for a new Agreement, the unions affiliated to Congress have been using all possible devious tactics in order to rope in the 'support' of the members for it. For instance, on 11 February of this year the workers' Union of Ireland called a special delegate conference for 17 February, only six days' away. Union

rules require that at least one month's notice be given for such a delegate conference.

Because of the short notice only 50-60 delegates turned up, instead of a possible 300 delegates. The union hierarchy had scraped its bureaucratic barrel to get along its paid officials. They carried the day and committed the Workers' Union to supporting negotiations for another National Wage Agreement.

The union bureaucracy is more than pleased with the effects of the first Agreement. In the review of the Agreement's operation up to January 1972 it is stated:

'In general, there was a noticeable improvement in the area of industrial relations during 1971, when the existence of the National Agreement and the operation of the new picketing policy of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions contributed to the promotion of industrial peace.'

Policemen

'Industrial peace' means more power to the policemen of the labour movement. Irish bosses have little need to worry about 'their' workers getting uppity, when they have a ready-made police force within the trade unions to do the job for them.

In the Warsaw ghettos during World War II there were Jews who did the Nazis' work for them, fingering fellow-Jews. They were called 'Yellow Police'.

We must resist the imposition of a new Agreement. We must insist on the right to strike. We should not feel bound by an Agreement which is not decided by the rank-and-file, but by bureaucratic manipulation.



On Stormont balcony

No-one expected the ruling Unionist clique to take their sackings lying down. When super-Tory Ted Heath decided that Faulkner and Co were lame ducks and a liability for British Imperialism, then it was hardly likely that Faulkner and Co would agree.

There was much talk of the Protestant backlash and of UDI and indeed neither of these is yet completely out of the question.

The signs are that the Unionist gangsters have been well and truly defeated by a bigger and better organised set of British Tory gangsters, and all the Faulkner gang is capable of, is weeping together. But no, they aren't even capable of that, for like thieves caught in the act the Unionist clique is now running around with each member of the clique blaming the other.

First there was Paisley, saying he supported the Heath takeover. Then there was Craig saying he would liquidate his enemies and then there was Faulkner saying Paisley and Craig were talking rubbish. This was followed by Paisley changing his mind and calling a massive demonstration to protest against Heath, but then he didn't even turn up and it was taken over by Craig's Vanguard gang.

Laughs

Even greater laughs were to follow as Faulkner tried to take over Craig's bunch, and Faulkner and Craig shook hands, only to be followed by Craig saying in the paper that he didn't want to shake hands with Faulkner. Then Paisley re-entered the scene by saying he favoured total merger with the Heath gang, and what do you know, Faulkner agreed.

Oh yes, then there was the Westminster branch of Faulkner's gang, but the leader, Robin Chichester-Clarke, was quickly bought off when he was offered a place in the leadership of the Heath gang.

It was all great fun, except that is for the ordinary Protestant who has seen himself betrayed time and time again in the last few weeks, and is beginning to wonder how he was conned for so long by so many. And as the dole queue in Belfast gets longer every day, will the Protestant worker feel any happier because some at least won't be joining the dole queue? Some like:

BRIAN FAULKNER: He may have lost his salary as Prime Minister, but he has still got his shirt factories and his chain of dry cleaners. As long as the British Imperialist Army carry on their terrorist campaign in the six counties, Faulkner will be doing all right, for not only does his shirt factory manufacture clothes for the BIA, but his Marlowe Dry Cleaners have an almost exclusive contract to clean the blood stained uniforms of the BIA.

HARRY WEST: In his previous period of office he was such a blatant swindler that even the ex-Captain of the gang, Terence O'Neill

When Thieves Fall Out

had to sack him. You can be sure he has lined his pockets again this time.

JOHN BROOKE: He is the son of the old dictator Lord Brookeborough. John is the heir, to, among other things, large estates in County Fermanagh, and the old man has a tidy fortune, thanks to his great work as a cattle smuggler during the war.

DESSIE BOAL: MP for Shankhill, who makes great play about his concern for the Protestant workers. He went so far as resigning from Stormont, and losing his salary. But a fair whack of that £400,000 which Scarman spent on whitewashing the Unionists was pocketed by Dessie, as he was one of the leading lawyers in the Scarman inquiry. Dessie hasn't yet sold his Alfa-Romeo sports car.

ROBERT BABBINGTON: Another lawyer and Queen's Counsel who was a Unionist MP. He earned a tidy sum for leading the prosecution against poor old demented Gusty Spence, whose only mistake, in the eyes of the Unionist establishment, that he started shooting Catholics too soon.

TOM CALDWELL: Another Unionist lackey, whose many varied financial interests include antique shops. He may even be thinking of opening one near Stormont Hill. And don't forget to ask **BILL CRAIG**, if you see him sober, what he did with all that money he collected for Vanguard?

Even if the Faulkner gang does run out of money, the Heath gang might be persuaded to share out some of their spoils. Like:

WILLIE WHITELAW: He could allow some old retired Unionist to graze on some of his thousands of acres of estates he has got in Scotland.

REGGIE MAUDLING: As he ratted on the Faulkner gang, he could help to pay for his faithlessness by giving the Orange Order some of the money he swindled while he was President of the Real Estate Fund of America, which was later taken to court for fraud. Courts in America are trying to get their hands on Reggie in order to charge him with swindling.

TED HEATH: The leader of the new gang could give poor Brian some of that £60,000 he is spending on a new boat, with which he hopes yet again to make a quick getaway whenever the Northern Ireland 'job' turns sour.

Another gang

But if the Heath gang doesn't want to help their old buddies, well there is yet another gang, who have been great friends of both gangs in the past and might be persuaded to cough up. This gang goes under the ominous name of TACA and its leader is someone called Lynch.

G.HILL

SHIPYARD WORKERS FACE PRODUCTIVITY DRIVE

Cash for Harland & Woolf

Tory principles only last as long as they bring returns. The 'hard line' which Heath's London government takes on the need for private enterprise to prove itself has now been dented quite a few times.

Lame ducks

Rolls-Royce is perhaps the best example. But even before that lame duck was saved, the Tory government decided to put more public money into Harland & Woolf shipyards in Belfast. It just would not do to have 8,000 loyal workers questioning their loyalty when they were laid off.

State aid to the tune of £14 million is to be made effective from May. The new managing director, Iver Hoppe, a Dane, will be allocating it, along with a team of consultants. Together they are to ensure that the millions are not wasted. The key to ensuring that is Productivity.

Output

The Belfast yards produce about one half of the output per man which yards in Japan and Scandinavia produce. The experience in those yards, as well as in



Building a new dock by night

other industries, will be used to get the Belfast yards into competitive shape.

The first thing Hoppe and the others will be trying to do is to streamline the second shift. Thousands of Belfast families can look forward to disruption of their family lives as this goes through. In general, the management is aiming for more work from each man. They may find more jobs over the next few years, but the shipyard workers will have to work harder for their places. Speed-up and re-manning are on the order of the day.

Hoppe, a model of efficiency, has already indicated that he takes a poor view of these political strikes. He has warned the shop stewards that they could lose British support by taking part in them.

In months and years to come, Harland and Woolf workers will probably have enough to do watching the work-study man to worry too much about the ranting and raving of Craig and Hill. The reward for their loyalism in this case is having a job at all—but it does not defend them against the bosses' drive for profits.

WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT

'THE WORKER' IS PRODUCED BY WORKERS FOR WORKERS. IT MAKES NO PROFIT. WE NEED YOUR SUPPORT TO PRODUCE A BETTER PAPER, ONE OF EVER GREATER RELEVANCE TO CLASS STRUGGLES IN IRELAND. TAKE OUT A SUBSCRIPTION NOW, OR SEND A DONATION TO 'THE WORKER' FIGHTING FUND. WE HAVE SET OURSELVES A TARGET OF £500 OVER THE NEXT MONTHS.