

TEACHERS' SALARIES -

the way forward



International Marxist Group 5p

The National Union of Teachers has submitted a wage claim for a 25% increase on the overall wage bill. The aim of this pamphlet is to look at the ways in which the union has taken up the problem of fighting for wage increases over the last period, to examine their deficiencies and to suggest the kind of approach the International Marxist Group believes is necessary in the present period of wage restraint, attacks on the trade union movement and the cutbacks in educational expenditure.

The Campaign around the 1972-73 Claim

The 1972-3 salary claim submitted to the Burnham Committee by the NUT represented in essence a rationalisation of the existing salary structure with its 3046 separate salary points. In the words of Edward Britten, General Secretary of the NUT, the claim was ".... seeking two things - a simplification of the salary structure and the proper evaluation of the teachers' work where his job is requiring steadily increasing hours and steadily increasing standards of work."

The Wage claim was of course designed to maintain the professionalist wages structure with the largest increases going to those at the 'top.'

Endless criticisms can be made of that claim and the present one - the key question however was not just the nature of the claim, BUT how teachers should take up the claim and organise their forces to achieve it?

From the outset the claim was inextricably linked with the struggle beginning in London around the claim for a £300 London Allowance due to be paid from November 1972. The relationships between these two struggles was of immense importance and constituted the central problem for developing a way forward for teachers. To understand why we have to go back to the struggle for the 1969-70 'Interim Salary Claim' (in the days when claims were submitted once every two years). Then teachers won a substantial victory by obtaining £120 out of a claim for £135 and London teachers had been at the forefront of this fight in the union. It was London delegates at the 1969 national conference of the union which had imposed on the Executive of the union the task of fighting for an Interim Claim. London too was at the fore in taking strike action and winning for itself a leading reputation amongst all the militants in the union.

Of course the situation which surrounded the 1969-70 Interim Claim was entirely different from that faced in 1972-3 and radically different from the present situation. Since 1970 the Labour Government more open to pressure for educational expenditure, has been replaced by a Conservative one which by no means shares those sympathies; in addition the Tories are faced with an increasing

economic crises the product of the increasing international economic rivalry and the militancy of the working class attempting to maintain its standard of living.

The objectives of both Labour and Tory Governments however, has been the same; to change the balance of forces against the working class and in favour of capitalism, basically by attacking the trade unions and attempting to create divisions within the working class.

The first attempts to change the balance of forces saw efforts to draw the trade unions into a collaboration - 'self-restraint' was the watchword, a policy initiated by the Labour Government but this was rejected by the union rank and file. The integrationist line of the ruling class ended in mid 1966 with the Labour Government's moves against the seamen and was followed by the introduction of 'In Place of Strife' which marked the commencement of a confrontationalist approach. As the IMG has frequently pointed out the period since the advent of the Tory government has not been dominated by one single tactic but by a number of different approaches, Phases 1, 2 & 3. The Industrial Relations Act, use of conspiracy laws and most lately the attacks on picketing - jailing of the Shrewsbury 3, all having the same objective of curtailing the activity of trade unionists in their attempts to defend their standards of living.

Central to the tactics adopted by the Tories was the introduction of an 'incomes policy which had two specific goals

- a) to lay the blame for the increasing cost of living at the doors of the well organised trades unionists and thereby splitting the working class.
- b) to pose the government as the saviour of the unorganised and poorly paid workers.

This incomes policy has been developed through Phases 1, 2, & 3. Throughout all this period the trade union bureaucrats have failed to offer any perspective, any way forward by which workers can counteract the affects of inflation, rising prices, etc. It was in this fundamentally different situation that the 1972-3 NUT claim was made.

An alternative perspective was beginning to merge in the fight around the 1972-3 claim. In October and November of 1972 London teachers were engaged in a campaign to win the increased London Allowance: resolutions were passed calling for extended militant action, 77,200 teachers and 535 schools in Inner and Outer London were out on three days strikes. (Demonstrations were organised which brought 20,000 striking teachers onto the streets of London but by April, Easter NUT Conference the whole thing was over - WHY?

From the outset the union Executive kept the London and national claims separate; the militancy which existed in London was organised and prepared to take action on the national claim: but it was carefully channeled. At all times the bureaucracy laid great emphasis on the fact that the London claim lay outside the restrictions of Phase 1 and 2; that the strike action involved was not 'illegal'. At the same time no campaign was mounted on the national claim.

To a great extent the left militants in the union fell headlong into the trap prepared. Arguing that it was impractical to raise the question of opposition to the Government and unity with other workers against the Incomes Policy the leadership of Rank and File teacher for instance delayed several crucial months before raising these issues, from early November 1972 until February 1973. One or two Associations in which Rank and File was active were honourable exceptions to this pattern but by and large it was not until the Central Hall meeting of February 27 that the clear alternative perspective was put to the mass of London teachers and their response was overwhelmingly in favour

The most important developments which emerged in the process of this struggle were the initiatives at grass roots level to link teachers with other workers, most notably in hospitals and local government Public Sector Alliances and joint Action Committees sprung up all over London breaking sectional boundaries and bringing together workers. An all-London Conference of workers against the Freeze and against the Tories was organised which drew together trade unionists from a number of fields of work; local NUT Associations which had played an initiating role in relation to this conference were vehemently attacked by the NUT bureaucracy who correctly understood such actions as a direct challenge to their "leadership".

An all-London Ad-hoc Salaries Action Committee was formed to strengthen the links and co-ordinate initiatives. Proposals were made for an all London strike committee but this did not materialise because the struggle went into a down turn. Precisely such forms of organisation were necessary to put into practice the alternative perspectives and will again become necessary in the present period.

By this time however the situation nationally was already altering - the miners had decided not to strike, Ford's car workers had gone back and the struggle involving hospital workers was taking a downturn. Clearly when the 'heavy' brigades of the trade union movement decides to hold back, it is not likely that the 'light' weights will make much impression.

The NUT bureaucracy was thus able to regain the initiative, settle the national claim and impose a non-settlement on London teachers, and to instigate attacks on the Wandsworth 3. The Easter Conference votes overwhelmingly for the Executives proposals of acceptance; London teachers far from representing the vanguard of the national struggle as they had done in 1970 appeared to be pursuing their own sectional interests and even from the rest of the left nationally in the union, received little sympathy for their case or for the three Wandsworth teachers being victimized for the Central Hall fracas.

Defending the Wandsworth 3

The Executives attack on the Wandsworth 3 is no accident. The attack is designed to blund the growth of a body of teachers in the union with a clear understanding that teachers interests can best be fought for alongside the rest of the working class, against any incomes policy and against the Tory Governments and their attacks on the education system.

Specifically the resolution which was being put by the Wandsworth Association to the Central Hall meeting called upon the Executive to 'extend the campaign of militant action against the Governments wage freeze into and beyond Phase 2 of the Incomes Limitations Policy (and) in association with other unions similarly affected, to evolve a joint plan of action to break the freeze'.

The victimization of Eric Porter, Fred Soctt and Dave Whitely must be opposed by all those teachers who recognise that the past gains of the working class both in their standard of living and in the field of education can only be defended by the linking of the struggles of teachers with those of the rest of the working class.

Links must be built at all levels both local and national. The defence of the 'Wandsworth 3' has been built and gained support on the basis that these three militants were putting forward precisely such proposals and making practical initiatives for building such links.

The Executive understand this very clearly - that is why they do not know what to do with the three now, nearly twelve months after the events. If the Executive had a real case there were many other hundreds of militants, easily identifiable, who could have been charged. The mass pickets of over 200, the resolutions of support, the financial response to the Defence Fund all clearly indicate that the 3 do not stand alone. When Southwark Teachers Association supported Dave Whitely and Dick North for the NUT Executive elections in Inner London against Sam Fisher and Bob Richardson (both staunch supporters of Max Morris), it was further proof if proof were needed

that the line pursued by the Executive is clearly and decisively rejected by a large mass of teachers. The campaign which IMG militants have played an important part in building to smash this victimisation and witch-hunt carried out with the collusion of Communist Party member Max Morris is integral to winning teachers to a clear line of unity with other workers.

Teacher Shortage

One of the key questions which faces teachers at the moment is the problem of staffing shortage. Serious staffing shortage now affects 120 schools in Inner London and schools in 16 out of 20 outer London boroughs. Nearly 2000 teachers will be leaving London schools at Xmas and far fewer applications have been forthcoming to replace those teachers. In addition on a national level there are increasingly fewer students applying for college of education and post graduate training for teaching.

Quite correctly the NUT Executive have seen the dangers of a further deterioration in the teachers working conditions (large classes, increased work load, etc.) and responded by advising teachers not to cover in cases where staff are not appointed. Some schools have for instance had up to 16 vacancies at one time. In London the NUT Executive has advised teachers to refuse to cover for staff who are away for more than three days, linking this to the claim for an increased London Allowance. In certain respects the Executive are to the left of their erstwhile supporters and some local Association secretaries have been somewhat reticent about implementing these proposals for fear of straining the "cordial relations" many have with Head Teachers and Local Authorities.

There are many obvious dangers in relation to a campaign on the question of teacher shortage. Like the sanction of refusing to cover for school dinners - a tactic employed in an earlier salary struggle - teacher shortage could become an end in itself providing a useful safety valve for the Executive which can be used as a regulator guiding teacher militancy along a diversionary channel. All the actions which have taken place in schools on shortage of staff have been under the guidance of the Executive and not of the Local Associations. The struggles have largely by-passed the mass of teachers who have in no way been brought into what is really a problem at the level of all London teachers and of course is related to the cutbacks in educational expenditure nationally. What is needed of course is a campaign explaining the link between the shortage of teachers and the pay which teachers receive.

The Executive had hoped that the pensions question might provide another alternative gambit for channelling militancy, however this

fell through. The planned rally at the Central Hall, Westminster on December 6 on the pensions issue would have provided a useful indicator of the level of militancy among teachers and could have provided a focus for rallying teachers on the salary struggle. The executive of course understood this and once Thatcher made the concession they moved with embarrassing haste to cancel the whole proceedings, doing so before they had even had time to inform their colleagues in other unions who were also supporting this move. Such is the trepidation with which the NUT bureaucracy views any gathering of the mass of teachers who they know only too well regard the 'fight' on salaries this year as merely a continuation of last years unfinished business.

Militants must be clear and unequivocal in their support for the NUT proposals and initiatives on shortage and to act on them; at the same time to explain to teachers the link between these struggles and the need to ally with the rest of the working class in a fight to bring this government down and to destroy Phase 3.

These actions should also be used as ways of explaining to the Labour movement in general that teachers are fighting to defend the gains made by the working class in the sphere of education.

This struggle must be understood however to be integral but secondary to the key question which teachers must take up at the present time namely the fight around the salary claim.

The Present Claim

- Two questions need to be answered in relation to the present claim:
- a) What is the context within which the claim is being submitted?
 - b) How are the NUT bureaucracy, the left, within the union, facing up to the tasks of fighting for this claim in this situation?

The Tory Government in an effort to increase the profits of capitalism is engaged in an attack against the working class aimed at depressing living standards. This attack is launched in a number of different ways but each attack has the same objective; to divide and weaken the strength of the trade unions and thus the ability of the working class to defend itself. The Phase 3 proposals; the State of Emergency; the jailing of the three building workers at Shrewsbury; the House of Lords ruling making picketing more or less illegal; the Emergency budget with its massive cut in public expenditure (£182 million off the education bill); the three day week; the formation of special police groups to deal with picketing; are all designed to intimidate, confuse and demoralise the working class.

If teachers are to mount an effective campaign against the cuts in educational expenditure, the staffing shortage and poor wages, they will need to link their struggles to that of other workers. By making such links they will multiply their own strength. Teachers need to realise that the best way to protect the education of their pupils, to push forward, increase and improve educational facilities is to ally with other workers and to build a united action, developing into a general strike to overthrow the Tory Government which has and will always put profits before the needs of the people.

The Bureaucracy

A trump card often used by bosses, capitalists and Tories alike is the trade union officials. The trade union officials depend upon the support of acquiescence of the majority of the rank and file to maintain their positions. They have many material advantages which they wish to hold on to. The General Secretary of the National Union of Teachers, for instance, is paid between £7000 and £9000 plus London Allowance of £144 (subject to review on 1st April 1974)!! Little wonder that they do not wish to upset the equilibrium which their existence depends upon.

The attacks upon Local Association autonomy, Wandsworth 3 and against the initiatives at rank and file level to link up with other unions were all efforts by the bureaucracy to ensure that this happy equilibrium was not disturbed.

Once again they are already preparing to sell teachers out either by diverting teachers attention from the claim - by making noises about pensions, education cuts or anything which comes to hand - or by allowing the Government to dictate terms - such as the reference of the claim to the Pay Board - and then throwing up their arms in horror and turning around with that look of "well-we-did-our-best" on their faces.

Where is the evidence for this?

Phase 3 imposes a limit of 7% maximum increase of wages at the time when the last twelve months has seen a rise in the cost of living in the order of 10% (or more if mortgage rates are included - 14%).

The present NUT claim is based on the 1972 one but all figures have been increased by £360, although some head teachers and senior teachers have received larger increases. The IMG believes that if the claim called for the 25% to be divided equally among all teachers (amount to some £592) - that this would draw all teachers to the claim and help build unity among teachers. Both the 1969-70 claim and all London Allowance claims are of this nature and the record of struggle on these claims speaks for itself. Mr Edward Britten has

said of the attitudes of teachers: "Not since the early thirties has morale been so low. Never have teachers felt more strongly that they were not receiving fair treatment from the nation whose future lies in their hands".

Ignoring the Churchillian rhetoric about the "nation", whatever that is, one can recognise that even the general secretary from his ivory tower is aware that the rank and file of the union is concerned about their wages. Clearly teachers on their own, lack the militant tradition and economic weight to 'go it alone'. But that is not the full picture - miners, engineers and other workers totalling some 6 million all have claims in the pipeline.

Last year over the 1972-3 claim the NUT Executive quite correctly called a conference of public sector union representatives to discuss linking up a number of struggles. That was correct and an important initiative, however, after the meeting they claimed nothing could be done because the claims involved differing amounts of money and different negotiating bodies.

These transparent arguments will not do. Teachers pay involves widely differing amounts of cash and behind all public sector claims stands the same paymaster - the Government.

What is Britton's perspective for winning the claim in this context? 'Although the claim is outside Phase 3, he says, 'we got the impression that the local authorities want to play Phase 3 to the utmost.'

This quote appears on the front page of the "Teacher" of December 21, 1973 opposite a headline which reads "SAVAGED" and details how Barber, Chancellor of the Exchequer, has just cut educational expenditure by £182 millions. In other words he is asking teachers to ally themselves with a group of people who can't even defend their own economic position let alone, assuming they all wanted to, fight to improve the lot of teachers. Barber's emergency budget before Xmas halted all new educational building until July 1974; spending on education will fall by 2.3% instead of a planned increase of 2.1% capital spending will be cut by 20%; there will be a 10% cut on goods and services other than remuneration. In some cases it will in fact mean that local authorities will be faced with a choice between recruiting more teachers needed to fill posts, or to use the money saved to buy materials and goods necessary. By contrast the private section of education comprising independent and direct grant schools for 600,000 children, although receiving more than a fifth of its costs from public funds has emerged unscathed from the general cutback in expenditure. A clear piece of discrimination against the state sector. The NUT bureaucracy,

like their counterparts in other unions, covers in the face of the Tory Governments loud noises.

The Communist Party

Obsessed as it is with a desire to retain their influence of the Executive the CP hardly distinguishes itself from the right-wing 'professionalist' current. The present divisive salary policy is essentially a product of the CP. It does nothing to combat the fragmentation of a salary policy which even Edward Britten claims is probably the second most complex (the seamen's being the first in the country). The CP deny the necessity at the present time of fighting to win teachers to joint action with other workers. The CP teacher delegates at the 1973 NUT conference refused to put any weight behind a move calling for the NUT to join the TUC May 1st stoppage. They are concerned with maintaining 'unity' among teachers whilst at the same time acquiescing, if not actually participating in, a witch-hunt of the Wandsworth militants. In the NUT, as in many other unions, they view things from the point of view of their own standing with the bureaucracy and by and large this means in the name of some spurious 'unity' capitulating to the right wing of the union. Only a few of the CP militants have recognised that the situation which the teachers confront now is radically different from the fifties or indeed the sixties. Never before has this dilemma confronted the CP so sharply; they can no longer pursue a course of following the bureaucracy AND the rank and file of the union. Increasingly this will be a major problem for the CP not only in the NUT but in the AUEW, TGWU, etc. where they look favourably upon Scanlon, Jones and their ilk. At the moment their solutions for the teachers problems are no different to the bureaucracy of the NUT.

Rank & File

The Rank and File grouping and its paper, dominated as it is by the International Socialists, has a clearer and more realistic line for the claim but it is bogged down by its obsession of exposing the bureaucracy by continuously placing demands upon it and presenting a "more-militant-than-thou" approach.

"What is needed is joint industrial action to break through Phase 3. (Correct - however the article then continues.) If the NUT Executive is serious about the claim, it should be arguing for such action (Where?) in the General Council of the TUC (!) Local Associations should demand of the Executive:

No acceptance of any offer from the management until agreement has been reached on the Scale 1 demand.

Organisation of the necessary action in conjunction with other sections of workers to win the claim." RANK & FILE No, 28, December 1973

It has to be conceded that inside the paper in ONE sentence it is said that "...it is not sufficient to send up resolutions calling for the Executive to organise joint industrial action. The links have to be made at rank and file level, through the building of local committees of all workers who are determined to resist the attacks on their living standards."

No one disagrees with the need to 'call' upon the Executive to do a whole number of things; what Rank and File has lacked however is a set of proposals for what teachers should be doing in the localities to prepare the mass of teachers for action along the lines suggested. Indeed when it was suggested at a national committee meeting of R&F on December 1st that a national conference of teachers be organised to discuss tactics for the claim the IS leadership of R&F opposed it arguing that the battle had to be carried through locally; they counterposed the two things in a quite false and one might almost say totally dishonest fashion.

Such a national teachers conference of the left in the union is essential; it could organise initiatives, centralise information, open up a much needed debate on the way forward for teachers, break the isolation of the R&F grouping from the other left groupings in the NUT and provide a platform for the left nationally against a bureaucracy which dominates the union almost totally.

Rank and File's line of exposing the bureaucracy however poses it with the problem of having to wait for them to do something first - R&F paid the price in the 1972-3 campaign in this respect, so far it looks as if it is heading in the same direction again -- with the possible qualification that when (and it is only a question of when and not IF) the Executive sells-out the R&F may reap some benefit by getting candidates elected to the NUT Executive themselves.

The key test of the Rank and File grouping, within which IMG teachers work giving support to Rank and File candidates for the Executive, is its ability to organise and develop the activity and organisation of the mass of teachers INDEPENDENTLY from the control of the bureaucracy. In a situation of widening and deepening struggle the key task is to organise mass meetings of teachers, strike committees elected in the process of the struggle and to build action committees cutting across sectorial boundaries with the aim of establishing Action Councils with delegates of workers engaged in struggle in a locality. To the extent that R&F understands these tasks and comes to grips with them it will remain what it is at the moment, the most important grouping on the left in the NUT.

Which way forward for teachers?

The general outlines of a way forward for teachers has been indicated above; the way in which teachers have to respond to the present situation is by building at grass roots level and at all levels throughout the union, links with other workers opposed to Phase 3. The IMG believes that means developing a campaign within the union to explain to the mass of teachers the need to build these links and to act in solidarity with other workers pursuing their own claims. Such a campaign involves taking the debate about the way forward into every staffroom; it involves finding out what other unions, factories and groups of workers in the locality have action planned etc. In addition it means building a campaign to explain to the parents and school students why teachers are taking the actions they are and winning the parents and students support for those actions.

However a new factor has entered the overall situation of which teachers must take account. The Tory government is seeking to blunt the attack of the working class by imposing even more drastic measures; the three day week, in effect a lock-out, is aimed at splitting the working class and throwing it into a defensive struggle. Though this is not an immediate problem for teachers the necessary response from trade unionists should be to unite in action all the forces of the working class to smash Phase 3 and to bring down the Tory government. To do this it is of crucial urgency to prepare and organise for a general strike and to build joint action committees at local level cutting across all trade union and sectional boundaries in order to weld together those forces engaging in such a strike.

In the field of teachers, Mrs Thatcher, the Secretary of State for Education, has thrown in the additional issue of placing the whole Burnham machinery before the Industrial Relations Commission at a time when negotiations over the claim may be coming to a head. The proposal that conditions of employment as well as salaries should be discussed by Burnham again raises the spectre of teachers becoming embroiled in a package deal in which the Tory Government could claim credit for the flexibility of Phase 3 and delude some teachers into thinking that they had got a deal outside of the Incomes Policy.

The task ahead is to win teachers to a line of pursuing their claim in spite of any "deals" and against Phase 3. As we have said before however teachers need to ally with other workers and this implies that if for instance the miners or the engineers took action before that planned by the teachers then it would be necessary to fight for the NUT to join that action IMMEDIATELY and not to hang back.

The NUT should oppose any reference of the claim to the Pay Board and refuse to participate in any arbitration schemes. It should draw up and begin to take action within 24 hours of any offer by the management panel being rejected by the NUT Executive. It is possible

that this could happen as early as the end of January, beginning of February. The strike action should be :

- 1) on a national basis to avoid the isolation of London evident in the last struggle.
- 2) indefinite; that is not the three day strikes of the last period which tended to demoralise and frustrate teachers.
- 3) the basis of schools selected in each locality by the Local Associations.
- 4) progressively escalated to a full national stoppage. Those teachers called out first on strike action should act as the organising nucleus making links with other trades unionists in the localities and preparing all teachers for a national stoppage.

Also in the course of a prolonged strike the present practice of paying teachers the full wages would cripple the strike fund in a short period (probably one week - if all teachers struck), therefore a levy of all teachers should be organised immediately to improve strike funds. During the course of the strike, strike pay should not be paid at full wages rates but at a rate based on Scale I which could sustain the struggle for a prolonged period; this should be carefully costed by a commission of delegates elected to examine the unions funds.

The actions which are necessary now and need to be developed are outlined below:-

- *Meetings should be arranged in all schools to discuss the way forward against Phase 3.
- *Schools reps meetings should be organised to outline the claim and plan action.
- *Special meetings of all teachers should be held in Local Associations to coordinate the struggle against the staff shortage and the way forward on the national and London claims.
- *NUT members should exchange speakers with AUEW, NUM, NALGO workers etc. who are putting in claims for national and London increases.
- *Leaflets and posters should be prepared for teachers, parents, trade unionists and for mass distribution on the teachers claim, the crisis in schools and Phase 3.
- *Joint union meetings with other workers in struggle.
- *Public meetings to draw support from parents, housewives and trade unionists.
- *Local mass meetings of teachers to plan strike action.
- *The election of local teacher strike committees to develop the struggle.

- *The election of joint inter union strike action committees.
- *Recall conference of the NUT to plan and coordinate action on a national level.
- *Recall TUC to prepare a General Strike to bring down the Tory Government.

UNITY TO SMASH PHASE 3!
UNITED ACTION AGAINST THE INCOMES POLICY
AND THE TORY GOVERNMENT!
FOR THE UNITING OF STRUGGLES LOCALLY AND
NATIONALLY!
THE PREPARATION OF UNITED ACTION OF THE
WORKING CLASS!
FOR A GENERAL STRIKE TO BRING DOWN THE TORY
GOVERNMENT!

THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST GROUP

The International Marxist Group is one of the younger and smaller organisations of the revolutionary left, but we believe that the correctness of our ideas will prove to be a more important asset in the coming struggle than the greater numbers which many other organisations possess.

The IMG now has members in every major trade union, has played an active role in many strikes, and has been an important force in bringing such struggles as the trial of the Shrewsbury 24 to the attention of the trade union movement as a whole.

We are part of an international organisation - Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938 - which is increasingly able to play a major role in workers struggles throughout Europe. It is our understanding of the importance of internationalism which has placed us in the forefront of campaigns in solidarity with the fight of the Vietnamese people against American imperialism, the fight of the Irish people against British domination and the struggle of the Chilean workers and peasants against military dictatorship.

Our views on the problems presently facing the working class in this country can be summarised as follows:-

- *For a general strike to kick out the Tories
- *For the formation of representative Councils of Action to lead this struggle and open the road to socialism.
- *To prepare now for a general strike and Councils of Action: for a miners-engineers alliance, meetings of shop stewards and workers representatives in every area to prepare the struggle, elected strike committees.
- *For the organised defence of the working class against attacks from the police and other forces of the state.
- *For the unity of the greatest number possible around the struggle of the organised workers movement: for all-out effort to ensure the involvement of women for an end to all forms of racism in the trade unions and all racist laws, for measures to organise the support of tenants and students.

The IMG fights for united action with all organisations of the working class movement on each and all of these policies.

If you agree with these policies you should find out more about the International Marxist Group with a view to joining us. This is the way in which you can most effectively contribute to a successful, socialist outcome to the coming struggles.

I WOULD LIKE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE IMG

Name

Address

Send to: 97 Caledonian Road, London N1