

LAUNCH AN OFFENSIVE AGAINST RULING CLASS REPRESSION!

Last term many students were involved in actions against various manifestations of the capitalist education system, such as the keeping of files, victimisations (Swansea) and racism/imperialism (Liverpool). Following this upsurge, the ruling class, through the state and the various college authorities, has decided to suppress political opposition by a process of victimisations.

- LIVERPOOL - 1 student expelled, 7 suspended for 2 yrs. and 2 for 1 yr. 170 others have been threatened with charges.
- OXFORD - 1 student expelled, 11 others fined total of £150.
- EDINBURGH - 57 students for 'trial' on May Day.
- CAMBRIDGE - 19 students lecturer on trial on May 5th. on charges of 'riot' or 'unlawful' assembly.
- NOTTINGHAM - 5 students face "immediate suspension" for refusing to sign an undertaking not to 'promote, take part in, or in any way encourage a sit-in.'
- KEELE - Discipline charges pending against students who occupied.
- KENT - Students have been given a bill of £2,800 for "damages & costs"
- ESSEX - 3 students sent to Borstal for allegedly intending to bomb imperialist Barclays Bank. Also 30 face discipline charges.
- LONDON - 1 student sent to prison for 28 days for entering LSE premises. List of 12 students at U. C. to be removed for academic (political) and political reasons. Trial of 4 students on 'riot' for Senate House demo imminent.

This is only a partial list!

This policy was crystallised at two meetings in London; 13th. & 14th. April the Vice Chancellors and Principals met. 15th. April select Vice Chancellors met the Prime Minister and the Home Secretary.

WHY?

The Labour Government wishes to demonstrate to the ruling class that it is willing and able to maintain 'law and order'. The past two years have seen a huge increase in militant strikes by the working class and the development of a growing and active militant movement among students. Both have their roots in the very real economic crisis of British Monopoly Capitalism, and workers are marching forwards, joined increasingly by progressive students, to smash the capitalist system. The Labour and Tory parties are trying to outbid each other as apostles of 'law and order' who will suppress the workers and students. Each hopes to win the favour of the capitalist class so that it will enjoy the fruits of office for the next five years. To prove its worth the Labour Government has decided to hit what they consider the weakest sector — the student movement. WE MUST HIT BACK !

DEFEAT THEIR ATTACK WITH OFFENSIVE MASS ACTION !

The ruling class attacks will only be defeated by offensive mass action; mass action, conducted in an organised and disciplined manner, which hits back and shows them that they cannot get away with attempts at suppression. The counter offensive has begun; Liverpool University is responding to the severest sentences so far by calling a strike on May Day, and has called for a national response in the form of a similar strike as well as appropriate action. Let May Day be the beginning of the sort of offensive mass activity which defeats ruling class repression!

COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)

Student National Advisory Committee 155 Fortess Road, London NW5.

HOUSING-

THE COLLECTIVE BATTLE



The number of students left to sleep on the floors of refectories and Union buildings well into this academic session is testimony to the fact that the problem of student housing has grown more acute in the past year or two. This National Union needs a policy that will outline the areas of concern of its membership and provide a base around which COs can construct action within their own colleges.

Recent government legislation has extended the borrowing power of local authorities to enable them to buy up accommodation entering the market as a result of landlords reactions to the Rent Act. Obviously Conference would not oppose municipalisation, but we must recognise that, as students whose accommodation is owned either by education or college authorities or in the private sector, it offers no answer when councils fail even to house homeless families even under the 'points' system. There is no way the majority of students (single and without dependents) can accumulate enough points. How can council ownership prove an answer when the majority of vacant property is so owned? Local authorities have shown no great concern for the homeless, we must play our part in forcing them to do so.

A number of solutions to the chronic housing shortage have been presented, none of which are acceptable. Squatting and short term housing are inadequate short term solutions which force students into sub-standard conditions and which allows the responsibility for housing to slip from the college and local authorities, where it truly belongs. Occupation of suitable premises is a viable, if time consuming tactic to highlight the housing problem, but necessitates actions that could be detrimental to students academic work. The government have presented 'solutions' - limitation of student numbers, restricted regional intake of students, the only answers capitalism can come up with.

All the answers offered can only provide short term, inadequate fillers - solutions designed to alleviate the problem only or to divide the class. If all housing were municipalised, provision for students alone would have to be demanded; no government would embark on a crash building programme - capitalism would not wear it. In this context the campaign for accommodation is similar to the Grants/Cuts campaign; we will only make short term gains and sporadic successes and we must never be satisfied with these.

We must adopt a policy that will provide a basis for a ction, that will place the responsibility for housing with the local and college authorities, that is succinct and will give notice of our intention as students and members of the working class to seize the initiative and fight for what is ours. Homelessness and slums are just symptomatic of a system where profit is the motive force, a system that cannot provide adequate housing yey makes more building workers redundant. Such symptoms will only disappear when this system itself is destroyed and a new one built, one to serve the needs of the people - Socialism.

Student National Committee
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

E.E.C.



A Question Of Class

British capitalists have got their heads well screwed on in wanting to go into the common market. And British workers have got their heads well screwed on in wanting to get out.

The aim of the EEC is to equalise conditions throughout the market so that firms can operate freely over a wider field. The overall effect of this has been to force closures in sectors that cannot compete and rationalisation in the more profitable sectors. The result of the first is unemployment; of the second, productivity working. The net gain for capitalism is increased profitability; as usual, workers pay the human cost.

In the Market, not just single firms lose out, but whole regions. Notably the coalfields and old industrial centres of Northern France and Belgium have been run down, the least productive the most of all. Capitalism has shifted to more rewarding areas, especially the Rhine, where a skilled, disciplined workforce is much appreciated.

Of course, while conditions for industry are equalised, they see no reason for equalising rates of pay and conditions of work. On the contrary, the Market preserves differentials to allow firms maximum room for manoeuvre in dealing with their workforces.

Unemployment within the Market is now running at four million, or one in twenty. Their answer is, let labour move to where there are jobs. More than that, they congratulate themselves on giving us 'freedom of movement'! We see the Southern Italians made, with their government's connivance, into a cheap labour reserve for German capitalism, and they pass it off as 'freedom of movement'.

Firms are making full use of the opportunity to combine. Limited combination or full scale merger, the companies involved emerge stronger than before. The ultimate aim is to build up American-style techniques, notably that of incorporating union into management.

American capital has gained much ground in the Common Market and their purposes would be well suited if Britain were to remain in too. Preferring the conditions of an extended for their subsidiaries to operate in, they are postponing further investment in

Student National Committee
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

Britain until they see we are well and truly in. Already owning ten per cent of our manufacturing and hoping to own twenty five per cent by the early eighties, it would be most inconvenient for them if Britain were to get out.

On top of all this wheeling and dealing, we also have to bear the brunt of a policy of high food prices. Why does this operate? Simply because the French wouldn't join the Market unless they could make as much profit from their agriculture as the Germans would from their industry. To stop prices dropping the EEC steps in and buys up the surplus, which is then sold on the world market - at a loss - to bargain hunters like Brezhnev.

Therefore, not only do European workers have to pay unnecessarily high prices, they also have to subsidise losses made through sales on the world market out of their taxes.

FROM THE WORKER
NUMBER 6 1975

Nor should the issue be diminished to just an economic question - we all know the Common Market is bad economically. It is also a matter of politics and this should not be misconstrued, as the loss of parliament's sovereignty. That capitalist talking shop is irrelevant. The Thames could flood and sweep all the MPs into the water and workers would not miss them. Rather the sovereignty in question is the right for the working class of Britain to settle its own affairs with British capitalism without outside interference. If the working class were on the brink of revolution in this country - and the ties to Europe were still in being - would not our ruling class avail itself not only of moral but also material and physical assistance from capitalist Europe to settle our internal conflict under the auspices of European flags? We would face an array of nine capitalist classes instead of one. To force a withdrawal from the Common Market, the working class would be taking yet another step along the ideological journey towards complete self-reliance, to revolution, as well as inflicting a political defeat on the bourgeoisie of Britain and Europe.

FROM THE WORKER
NUMBER 3 1975

Grants and Education Cuts



A STRONG POSITION: A STRONG POLICY

From the very beginning of the Grants Campaign, we as a Party have insisted that there can be only one demand on the issue of grants - "Full Grants For All Full-Time Students" - and that for this demand to be successfully realised we must develop a total confidence in our mass strength as it is applied locally in individual colleges.

From the beginning also, many of the policies we put forward in order to achieve this end - the equal prioritisation of all the demands of the campaign, the adoption of guerilla tactics (i.e. those best suited to local conditions and developments), the rejection of Parliamentary forms of struggle, the use of economic sanctions against college authorities, the rejection of "easy ways out" like threshold agreements, etc etc - all these have been bitterly opposed (on the bases of conviction by some, dogma by others) and sometimes lost at National Conference.

However, over the course of the campaign, and particularly since the beginning of the fight against the cutbacks, the membership of our Union have indeed imposed their leadership on an often unwilling executive: the policies we have put forward have been taken up in areal way by the Union to an ever greater extent - both in terms of everyday, local action and in terms of Conference policy.

The inclusion of the following in today's main motion points to this mass leadership of the Campaign:

"Conference notes

'The resistance of students throughout British colleges to all manifestations of the cutbacks, and the successes achieved by Student Unions nationwide in the fight against the erosion of their grants by canteen and hall price increases through the use of tactics such as canteen boycotts, rent strikes etc'

This recognition of the locally organised character of a successful campaign however is not, unfortunately, reflected elsewhere in the main motion. Thus, the motion, largely based on the experiences of the membership, and incorporating as policy most of those points already mentioned, states quite clearly where we are going - a continuing fight for all the demands of the Grants Campaign and for the restoration of all the cuts - but does not state clearly how we are to get there!

It is precisely this inadequacy which enables certain groups in their

Student National Committee
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

"amendments", like the prophets of doom, to belittle our economic power and to suggest that we cannot win until the rest of the working class - other Trade Unionists - come to our aid and do it all for us. Is the NUS a damsel in distress to be rescued by the knight-errant of the rest of the Trade Union movement? Of course not, we have proved in the past that we can win victories - and if we continue to carry out our protracted campaign we can win more. The fact that they are not lasting victories is not the fault of our organisation, our strength or our determination, but rather an inescapable fact for as long as we live under an exploitative economic and political system.

TODAY WE MUST STATE QUITE CLEARLY:

- 1) That we stand by all the demands of the Grants and Education Cuts Campaign, and that all of these should receive equal priority.
- 2) That we reject any form of compromise on these demands, whether it be through the "Social Contract" or any other anti-working class move.
- 3) That we recognise that our strength lies in mass activity in individual colleges, in a protracted campaign based, where possible, on the use of economic sanctions against college authorities, such as canteen boycotts, eat-ins, rentstrikes, campus picketing, selective occupations etc., rather than in "set-piece" demonstrations and other "protest" action, which has only limited use.
- 4) That we reject short cuts or defeatist notions such as threshold agreements etc, which are designed to tie us to an inexorably declining standard of living.

We urge you to vote for the main motion and the amendment giving recognition to the local, guerilla action so vital to the future of the Campaign.

EXECUTIVE ELECTIONS



no to factionalism!

The elections of a Union executive should be a time at which the membership come together to decide who they think is most capable of carrying out their mandates: it should be a time when each individual is considered in terms of his past work and clarity on the direction of the work of the Union.

For the most part this has not been and is not true of the election of the NUS executive. Rather it has been a time for factionalism, disunity, 'back door' manoeuvring and, from many quarters, contempt for the membership.

The two machines, the Broad Left, and the new, improved (definitely more pure!) Socialist Alternative (now NOISS) hold their meetings to decide how to swing the elections in their favour, and indeed after some internal bickering hold elections in miniature behind closed doors.

Electoral campaigns by the candidates have historically revolved around promises to do the work for the membership - the election of a general to direct and fight our battles for us - or have been based on the shape of the election propaganda sticker (round for the BL, rectangular for the IS): in other words, they hope their political label, the brand name of their avowed 'leftism', will be enough to see them home and dry.

It is time for us to grow mature enough to stop this petty party politicking: each candidate must be considered on his own qualifications for the job. Within the Union we have vast numbers of dedicated student trade unionists who, through lack of affiliation to either block, are automatically disqualified in the minds of some people. But it is precisely these people who in many cases could offer an excellent lead to the Union, and who would genuinely carry out mandates given by conference.

This year a member of our Party is standing for a non-sabbatical position on the executive: we believe you should vote for John Certy not simply because of his membership of the Marxist-Leninist Party, but because of his record as a Student Trade Unionist.

Our Party never has, nor ever will, joined any block, except that one united block which is our Union. Judge this candidate on his merits, on his programme and the clarity attached to it.

We do not ask you to abstain on all the other positions as some 'left' groups have in the past: neither do we suggest that the entire slate of one block is preferable to the other. Make up your mind after careful thought - who will carry out mandates, who has shown the ability to organise?

We, the membership are the leadership of the Union; do not give this leadership away to careerists, but rather elect people who are capable of the job.

**Student National Committee
COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST)**

COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)

STUDENT NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
155 Portess Road,
London, N.W.5

Dear Comrade:

NEXT MEETING Saturday July 1st, at 2 o'clock at the Centre. Could all London students and any others able to make it to London on that date please attend. The meeting has been arranged to plan a school on students in the autumn and a new pamphlet on students' struggle. Could out-of-London comrades please discuss these and send up any ideas they have for the agenda of the school or/and what should be in the new pamphlet.

Possible ideas raised at the last meeting were: a summing-up of the lessons of the past years' experience; or treating a specific issue such as the right to work.

These are the two sole items on the agenda, please try to think about them before you come to the meeting or send in your suggestions.

LAST MEETING Held early in the Summer term, attendance showed an improvement and more colleges were represented. The discussion highlighted several lessons from our experience:

ROLE OF THE PARTY The courage to act as Party members was felt to be a necessity. Are we putting the Party across in our work or do we appear to be acting as individuals. Cases were cited of carrying our Party's line among students but without identification of it as the line of our Party. Where there is more than one comrade at an institution they should attempt to act as a Party unit in at least meeting together regularly to exchange ideas and plan their work in all its aspects.

FOCUS OF OUR WORK How to begin and involve ourselves in student struggle is a common problem. Don't be over-ambitious, concentrate on those areas you know best, those areas around you. You can't move mountains before you move stones - and you can't decide which issues the students are going to fight on. Examples were cited at the meeting of growing departmental/school grievances. We need to give these struggles our strategy of guerilla action.

RECRUITMENT The meeting brought to light contradictions in our work: in certain places much activity and struggle was engaged in, but for some reason without recruitment; in others little real struggle was undertaken, and yet recruits were made. There seems to be no "law" regarding this, except that without due attention to this there will be little success.

STUDY GROUPS are being tried as one process in recruiting those near and interested in the Party. Questions were asked - how often do we sell these people the WORKER, Party documents and so on, and discuss these with them?

WE DO HAVE ECONOMIC POWER Examples given from struggles in various colleges show that students are beginning to find what powers they have, and reference was made to the developments made in this sphere, especially during the past year. (See enclosed Discussion Notes). Perhaps this might be one of the subjects of our forthcoming pamphlet.

ONE MEETING A TERM A decision was taken to limit the number of meetings to one per term, perhaps with an annual school, so as to encourage maximum attendance. Thus the July 1st meeting is seen as one to plan the autumn's school.

Yours Fraternally,

S N A C

DISCUSSION FOR SNAC..

Student struggle continues to develop. As it does new problems to be solved are raised, and things we didn't know or couldn't yet explain at an earlier stage are discovered and can be learnt. In one particular area a development to our Party's document STUDENTS INTO CLASS STRUGGLE can be made already.

Recent practice indicates that as students contradiction both with their colleges and the government grows, students are realising that to attain their demands or interests action or dispute has to be entered into, that nothing comes without struggle. At this juncture the question is raised, what power do we have as students to hurt our opponents in the struggle?

At the time in the document we said "In power and bargaining strength students appear seemingly weak", and asked the question "How can students with little economic strength in the sense of labour power to withdraw,.. change their position in the balance of forces with the ruling class?" Learning from negative example, often now one hears a line being proposed that students don't have economic power but they can be a "political" force because we can discuss ideas. But this is not true.

This year more than ever before students, often through their unions have brought to bear some economic weapon in their fights... ranging from withholding the payment of hall fees, boycotts of canteens, and others commercial enterprises, and other things. Besides these potentially in many places there is the power to stop research, to remove the unpaid labour of student teachers on practice. At a higher level some educational establishments have very expensive equipment which would be a very strong economic weapon if they were occupied as at Plesseys for example. So with just these few hastily thought of examples it can be seen we do have economic power, and that we are just beginning to find out what powers we do have. We may not be able to grind the economy to a halt overnight, but that is not the argument.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST)

Our society is a capitalist society; that is, everything within our society is geared towards one aim - the production of profit for the small parasitic class who own and control everything. This profit is gained from the exploitation of the working class and from Imperialist plundering abroad.

So what has that got to do with students? We are not workers and we are not capitalists; we are taught that we are neutral in the class struggle and our function is to study, presumably in a vacuum suspended above society!

The fact is that educational institutions in Britain have the same function as any other institutions. They are designed to serve the system of monopoly capitalism, whether they produce scientists, technologists and administrators to run the system, produce the culture which is a reflection of it or the ideologists to justify it. This is not only manifested in the meaningless hurdles which constitute the examination system - the employers quantity/quality control system, and the type and content of the courses with which we are so familiar, but more importantly is shown clearly by the events of recent years.

As the present crisis of British monopoly capitalism has developed it has increasingly cut the amount it is willing to spend on education. Holding down grants, developing the new Polytechnics for degrees at one third the cost and to serve the immediate interests of industry and directing the research in the Universities to the same end are all aspects of this. This process was developed and put into practice by the Labour government on behalf of the capitalist class.

We have seen during this period of Labour rule the beginnings of student resistance and rebellion against these moves of the state machinery of the ruling class, of which the educational institutions are a part, and we have seen the state machine used against these struggles. Witness the closing of LSE with the use of the police, the use of courts to obtain injunctions in an attempt to prevent the publication of material found in college files as well as the use of the discipline machine of the local college and grant authorities.

Quite clearly we are a part of the capitalist system, and quite clearly from the experience of the struggles against it in recent years, the necessity for organisation is paramount. Individual solutions and actions, or the reliance on spontaneity is a recipe for failure and increased repression from the ruling class. Mindless and Ultra 'militancy' can only rush up a blind alley and lead nowhere, just as reformism seeks to apply a plaster where major surgery is needed.

The real question is not are we a part of the capitalist system and the class struggle but, as students in opposition to capitalism and its education system, **WHOSE SIDE ARE WE ON.** If we are consistent in our opposition then we take the side of the working class, the class which is going to destroy capitalism and replace it with socialism! The destruction of capitalism requires the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist class and the destruction of their state machine, a task that will only be accomplished with a revolutionary working class party guided by the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism!

From student/revolutionary rank Nov. 1970



Letter for Appointment Books -
Defense interests - Liverpool

Struggles do not wait for the party. Embryonic forms of organization develop in struggle. *Appointed Board - important in the way of taking care of employment amongst students - contribution etc. can be made by saying from school at work or college - daily - Paris*

We have sustained casualties. We are a guerilla force and the party is an army. *Should they be kept in line Mark 10-12 to go with REV. - ? A.D. 11 -*

It is not enough to imbibe people with Marxist-Leninist tracts and think we can avoid the drudge of work. We must avoid superficial work by people who are not rooted - people who are just passing through.

Students are transient. How do we maintain continuity? How do we advance those left behind? And how have influenced those who have left?

We cannot pick our ranks and choose our struggles. If struggles begin and we are not leading and we get involved and sustain casualties then this is bad. Why was the Cambridge struggle about Greece? We didn't start it but once in front we can't run to the back when the coppers come.

Are we now growing out of the infantile stage?

Monopoly development has led to increasing proletarianisation. Lumpen and illiterate elements do not constitute the working class - it's the question of who exploits and who is exploited.

Education equals the coming of age for the capitalist economy.

The central task is the ideological development of the working class who pick up their education whilst working. What is the students' contribution to this?

The notion of "Going into the factories" is wrong. It lacks humility. Involvement in manual labour intermittently is easy; it is hard when it is a permanent thing and you don't want to do it. Students must relate to the proletariat with the skills they possess - they must be good at what they are.

How can we assist the working class on fighting and winning? It is not a question of going to workers in struggle and telling them that is political; there is more to politics than panacea and formulae. We must begin to teach them that more exists.

Leadership will not come if we as a party do not provide it. We cannot just laud every strike: the Council workers' strike was backward. There was no participation. The "Labour Movement" did nothing on State intervention with troops.

"Education is bourgeois" - of course but this is not a great discovery just a statement of the obvious.

The Party must collectively make an economic analysis of Britain today. We must collect all the information on everything that's happening and new trends developing.

Heath and Nixon are beginning to find out that they do not possess a monopoly of violence. Terroristic violence by people who won't do political work, and want short cuts by extrovert acts, is no good.

Among students the going is slow. The odds are against them with no labour power to withdraw but we must guard against superficial violence. There is no substitute for grass roots political work.

'Power lies with the people' and 'it is right to rebel' is the quintessence from Mao and the best legacy of the Chinese people. We must learn that it is a guerrilla struggle - longevity is a bad feature; we must be in -and-out so enemy doesn't know what hit them.

We need apprentices of Marxism-Leninism who come out as journeymen. We must leave behind us academies of Marxism-Leninism. We are not the 'bovver boys' of politics.

Must be prepared to do drudgery - no glamour, no excitement.

How do we carry on the work; student programme a useful essay as far as it goes.

Summing up after Reports from Colleges.

Such a serious and absorbing meeting - why so few here; why literally students and Secretariat - why no industrial comrades. Must learn to perpetuate this forum and produce continuity for the Party.

If successful we will have built the best Party - the best collective theory of struggle. We are old enough now to realise that it is not just a question of espousing tracts. The Red Book has been perverted by dunces; we can't be mechanical.

The bourgeoisie realises there is a new revolutionary upsurge. The violence must be ours.

We must get rid of 'privileged student' conscience. Monopoly means 2 things; - they must suppress the working class and they must grope to find the petty-bourgeoisie to do the job. We must take this fight on now.

It is wrong to believe that to take up economic issues won't click. Survey the administration to see who is getting the fat end.

Not a question of fairness - we must attack the system.

We must be involved with our own line, on issues like S. Africa and come out with a line on British workers on it. We are not involved in a moral thing.

Students are going to be a new unemployed. The disappointed will veer to fascism unless we do our political work.

It is incorrect to be involved in students' Unions and it is right to demand autonomy of them.

Can't build 'bridge organisations' - These can turn into parallel organisations. It is correct where appropriate to encourage joining ~~Trade~~ Trade Unions.

Never lose contact with people worked on.

No need to worry about "Left" mish-mash - we must have our own line. Only survived due to our Marxist-Leninist line and the mass.

British Imperialism can't trample on the people of the world now so they are going to bring the gunboats up the Thames.

Two Tasks:

- 1) Establish a regular forum. Establish Student National Advisory committee (SNAC) directly under the Secretariat with no authority of its own.
- 2) Establish Study Groups. Prepare for Congress. From the collective experience of this forum, the delegates can reflect there the points raised.

To Delegates: Tony, ex. Dyke

work of the National Student Committee has developed steadily, both in terms of clarity and efficiency in the application of the party line.

During this period we have attempted to work in a more practical manner, rather than concentrating on the sometimes abstract theorizing which characterized so much of discussions in previous years. We have worked more as a disciplined group of communists in the same industry attempting to grapple with the destruction of education and the implementation of our line to remove this government.

Unevenness of development among student comrades has now greatly diminished. Although the number of comrades has not increased over this period, it can now be said that almost all contributed directly to the effectiveness of the party's work in the National Union of Students, with the majority having attended representative gatherings and achieving a measure of success in their own college unions.

Almost every N.U.S. conference, whatever its size, has been attended by at least one comrade who has always expressed the party's line. The majority of these conferences have also been covered by paper-selling, leaflets written especially, and at the larger conferences, a bookstall. Also over the last two years, we have held a public meeting at the two annual national conferences, and in 1981 at the sectoral conferences. These meetings have been well-attended and those supporters who came have always found them useful.

Our use of 'core motions' has to some extent been improved, although work still needs to be done in this area. Far greater self-reliance is now evident among comrades, who are no longer dependent on centrally-supplied motions to put to union meetings.

The essential points which comrades should include are worked out centrally, but the onus of adapting those points to local circumstances and putting them into effect falls on comrades working in their local unions. Although adequate policy does not yet exist on a number of crucial issues, such as Ireland and NATO, the fundamental problem has proved to be getting action at a local level on those good policies which are passed.

In 1979 great confusion arose over the question of overseas students. In resolving this problem we feel that communications within the party with respect to our committee have greatly improved, with direct, regular reports now being given to the appropriate bodies. The attendance of the party chairman at a meeting of N.S.C. in November 1980 added to this improved communication.

Although our work in the national union has been more efficient, the organization as a whole and the political clarity of students have developed only slowly. It must be stressed that there is a great and obvious difference between college unions in which comrades have worked, and those bereft of party influence. In colleges with comrades, some not insignificant gains have been made, in terms of the development of the union, the application of the line and of recruitment. The national union as a whole however, remains (in its most active moments) comatose. We have sought to gain general acceptance of the fact that students are workers and that our union is a Trade Union. However, pushing this obvious truth home has perennially proved a most difficult task.

continued over....

In the interests of class-unity we have always formed highly
alliances with other trade unions in action.

N.U.S. still maintains the mentality of the Social Contract.
It was always a little affronted that it was not considered a
worthy candidate for the real Social Contract, and so invented
one of its own, which it maintains even now with a Government
which plainly does not want one.

The lack of confidence which still persists in our ability to
fight as a union has led to a continual reliance on methods such
as lobbying and attempting to persuade ministers of the error
of their ways. The union's lack of success is therefore under-
standable.

Due to the high turnover of the membership of the national union,
a persistent problem has been that of maintaining party bases
and influence where once these were strong. This and the question
of standing comrades for the National Executive of N.U.S. which
is proving difficult, are organisational questions to which we
must address ourselves.

Over the past three years the party has gained much credibility
and trust within the National Union, and in many colleges.
Directing the union to address itself to the crucial issues,
before it has proved difficult. But we have been successful in
ensuring the adoption of good policies and the election to some
bodies, (notably sectoral committees) of good candidates.

At the last National Conference the emergent policies on cuts in
education and on grants were those which the party has been working
for over several years. This was a fundamental breakthrough and
reflects the fact that, the slight decline in numbers aside, the
structure and functioning of the National Student Committee have
continued to improve and are now in a healthier state than ever
before.

Chairman, National Student Committee.
8th September 1981.