



University
of Glasgow

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>

Theses Digitisation:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/research/enlighten/theses/digitisation/>

This is a digitised version of the original print thesis.

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS AMONG
ENGINEERING SHOP STEWARDS
ON CLYDESIDE.

AUTHOR: JAMES LEE BROWN

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY,
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
MARCH 1981.

ProQuest Number: 10646031

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10646031

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Class Consciousness Among Engineering Shop Stewards on Clydeside

The study was carried out between 1975 and 1978. A sample of 100 stewards who were Members of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Engineering Section) was drawn, and they were interviewed between September, 1976 and August, 1977 (See Appendix 1). This sample constituted 5% of the A.U.E.W. (E.S.) shop stewards in the Paisley and Glasgow Districts of the Union. The interview consisted of a structured sequence of 50 questions, divided into 8 sections (See Appendix 3).

The sample was divided into two groups on the basis of membership or non-membership of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Twenty five of the stewards were members of the C.P.G.B. The sample was deliberately biased to ensure a significant number of Communists. This dichotomy in the sample allowed the effects of various independent variables to be isolated and examined.

The purpose of the study was to examine the forms and contents of class consciousness among the stewards. Why the shop stewards of the A.U.E.W. (E.S.) on Clydeside were chosen is explained in the Introduction.

A Marxian orientation was used to develop the theoretical premises which directed the study. It was on this basis that generalisation and assertions about class consciousness were made. In Chapter One alternative approaches to the study of class consciousness were examined, but asserted to be less strong than the Marxian one adopted.

From the Marxian orientation adopted, shop stewards were viewed as objectively working class because of their position in the social division of labour. This position led to them having a class interest which expressed itself in understanding the need for political class struggle, an awareness of the nature of the state, and a strategic comprehension of how to realise a society which would satisfy their interests.

This expression of class interest was asserted to focus on the nature of the solidarity shown by the stewards. By examining the scope of solidarity the stewards believed should be given to other workers, a means of differentiating their class consciousness was found. Class consciousness was seen as modes of understanding and representation learned by workers entering into the process of production and the formal and informal relations which develop.

Hypotheses were drawn up, on the basis of the Marxian orientation adopted, concerned with determining the stewards attitudes and behaviour by certain experiences. These were:

- (1) Conditioning by the family's political beliefs and practices;
- (2) Opportunities for social mobility;
- (3) The effects of aspects of the class struggle;
- (4) The political generation belonged to;
- (5) The size of the factory worked in.

They were to be 'measured' against the understanding of class interest shown by the stewards. This 'measuring' was the substance of the study.

In Chapter Two the basic characteristics of the shop stewards were examined to assess their similarities with other studies. This involved examining their back grounds; how and why they became stewards; and how they functioned as stewards.

In Chapter Three the election addresses of those who have stood for full time office were examined to help delineate the ideological positions which exist in the Union. This allowed six forms of consciousness to be outlined amongst candidates for office, and among shop stewards in the sample. This connection was made by examining the stewards attitudes to issues found in the election addresses, e.g. amalgamation, the role of trade unions.

Chapter Four examined the types of solidarity actions the stewards had been involved in. This allowed judgements to be made of how far they had overcome the fragmentations and divisions between workers, and so approached realisations of their objective class interests.

It was shown that awareness of a common identity as workers, and an opposition to employers existed, though limitations were also found. It was suggested that the roots of this awareness are to be found in themes of moralism and egalitarianism developed from the stewards life experiences and their reflections upon them.

In Chapter Five the focus was on the strategic perspectives for fundamental change in society held by the stewards. This was suggested as the rational theme in class consciousness. It was investigated by considering how far the stewards were able to suggest paths for altering society in a Socialistic direction.

This revealed elements of Socialist class consciousness among a majority of the stewards. However, its development in coherent and substantive forms was shown to be limited to a small group of stewards.

Chapter Six, on the basis of limited biographical data, attempted to trace the causes of shop stewards developing specific forms of consciousness. Through pen portraits of six stewards it was shown how some stewards have been blocked from developing a fully coherent Socialist class consciousness, and how others overcame the obstacles. The themes of moralism, egalitarianism and rationalism were shown to exist in different strengths and combinations among the stewards.

The development of Socialist class consciousness was suggested to depend upon the stewards having been involved with others who can reinforce environmental and background factors favouring deviation from dominant assumptions.

The value of this study lies in its contribution to understanding the strong traditions of solidarity in unionism, and the different scope and meaning given to it. It develops knowledge of forms and contents of class consciousness and shows the importance of themes of rationalism, egalitarianism and moralism. These give different political goals and can lead to contradictions and competitive struggles between workers.

A vital defining feature of Socialist class consciousness was shown to be a strategic perspective. Its development was linked to the encapsulation of the steward in oppositional environments which reinforce elements in their background.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Introduction	1
Why Study Shop Stewards	2
Why Study the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section)	9
Why Study Engineers on Clydeside	16
Notes	28
Chapter One: Class Consciousness	38
Weberianism	44
Phenomenology	50
Phenomenological Marxism	53
Freudianism	56
Freudian Marxism	58
Class Consciousness	68
Notes	82
Chapter Two: The Characteristics of Engineering Shop Stewards on Clydeside	93
The Background of Shop Stewards	94
The Shop Stewards' Ages	100
Length of Time worked in the Factory	101
Length of Time a Shop Steward	102
The Reasons for Becoming a Shop Steward	104
Conclusion	115
The Enjoyments of being a Shop Steward	116
The Power of Shop Stewards	119
From the Shop Floor	120
Management Attitudes	120
Shop Stewards Charisma	121
Government Legislation	121
Are Shop Stewards Troublemakers	122
Opposed for Office	124

CONTENTS	PAGE
Conclusion -- Insight into Class Consciousness	126
Notes	130
<u>Chapter Three:</u> Forms and Contents of Class Consciousness	135
Forms & Contents of Consciousness found in Election Addresses	139
Conclusion	147
The Role of the Trade Union	148
Amalgamation	155
Strikes	162
Conclusion	172
Notes	176
<u>Chapter Four:</u> Solidarity Among Engineering Shop Stewards	180
Workers' Rights: The Closed Shop	184
Managements' Rights	188
Solidarity Within the Factory	190
Solidarity With Workers in Other Factories	198
Specific Instances of Extra-Factory Solidarity . . .	202
Solidarity With Foreign Workers	209
The Labour Party and the Conservative Party	214
Conclusion	223
Notes	226
<u>Chapter Five:</u> Ideological Attitudes of Shop Stewards	229
The Causes of the Crisis and the Social Contract . .	233
Inflation and the Social Contract	239
Workers' Control	254
Socialism in Britain	261
Conclusion	272
Notes	277

CONTENTS	PAGE
<u>Chapter Six:</u> Some Causes of Class Consciousness . . .	282
Conclusion	316
Notes	322
Conclusion.	325
Notes.	331
<u>Appendix One:</u> The Sample	332
Notes	339
<u>Appendix Two:</u> Questionnaire.	340
Conflict Within The Factory	342
Attitude Towards the Employer	344
Attitude To the Union	345
Attitude to Other Workers.	346
Attitude to Society and Change	347
Ideological Attitudes.	349
Class Situation and Biographical Data.	350
<u>Appendix Three:</u> The Shop Stewards.	351
<u>Bibliography</u>	355

Introduction

The aim of this study is to describe and explain the forms and contents of class consciousness among Shop Stewards of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (A.U.E.W.) on Clydeside. The roots of the study lie in my undergraduate thesis. This was started in 1973 at a time when class consciousness was arousing academic interest which was reflected in a spate of books and articles (1). I was caught in this atmosphere and sought to contribute to understanding.

The atmosphere of interest was created by the upsurge of working class protest in Western Europe which highlighted two areas. Firstly, given the range of apparatuses and practices which sought to mould consciousness, why did protest take place. Secondly, why have there been no Socialist revolutions in the West, no mass revolutionary consciousness, and few instances of the detachment of key sections of the working class from dominant ideologies. This suggested to me that it was necessary to examine how working class consciousness emerges and the qualities which constitute it.

On this basis I decided to examine a group in the working class which one can see exhibiting different forms of class consciousness in their actions. While the areas of interest suggested a range of questions which could be asked, e.g. about workers' views of crisis, Socialism, etc. In the following pages I will justify my choice of A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section) Stewards on Clydeside.

Why Study Shop Stewards

The main assumption behind the choice of shop stewards was that they, their organisations and their practices are forms of the expression of the consciousness of workers. They can be considered a cultural creation arising from workers' struggles. From this perspective stewards can be viewed as 'institutions' linked to the consciousness of workers and so reflecting differences in class maturity, coherence and preparedness to use different forms of struggle (2). In addition by studying shop stewards one has the advantage of dealing with workers with at least a consciousness which sees the need for, and value of, trade unions. The examination of the forms and contents of consciousness may be made easier by looking at people who consider themselves working class, consciously belong to a workers' organisation, have experienced some aspects of struggle, and can assign functions to the working class and its organisations. An examination of the development of the 'institution' of shop stewards will illustrate these points. However, before doing this it is necessary to look at some terms which will be freely used in this Introduction. The terms 'Right' and 'Left' will be used to describe ideological positions within the Union. These terms cover political and ideological trends which are a compendium of socio-economic views and practices.

A further difficulty is added to the defining of them, by the fact that they are used to describe tendencies over a long historical period. 'Right' and 'Left' have elements of continuity and discontinuity internally over this period which makes definition both general and specific. They are general around principles of the function of a union, the role of the rank and file and stewards, the purpose of strikes, and so on. They are specific around issues which arise at particular moments. What constitutes the general and specific elements of 'Right' and 'Left' will be examined more fully in Chapters Three and Five.

From the 1850s stewards had existed in militant areas of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers (A.S.E.) as organisers of non-unionists and encouragers of others to maintain their membership (3). However, it was not until the 1896 Delegate Meeting that powers were given to District Committees to appoint shop stewards. This suggests that they had an 'ad hoc' existence previously, and had been growing in numbers (4).

The formalisation of their position may have been related to changes which were taking place in the position of engineers from the 1870s. The increased mechanisation in the workplace was bringing in non-skilled workers in a new way. They were no longer just 'fetchers' and 'carriers' for the skilled, but semi-skilled machine workers. Linked to the mechanisation there were a number of changes in workshop practices which affected the status of time served men e.g. clock-in, non-productive supervisors, factory 'police', speed-up, etc.

These changes hit the established culture of the workplaces and led to frictions (5). The old craftsmen had had some control of the work environment because the employer had depended on his organisation of the work, his personal skill, planning and inspection. Machinery threatened this by putting the emphasis on interchangeability rather than accuracy.

In opposing these changes time served men had used their traditional weapons of demarcation, refusing to allow 'dilution' and getting agreements on conditions for introduction of machinery. However, they were meeting strong and coherent determination from employers, which resulted in lock-outs in 1895 and 1897-8. The defeat of the A.S.E. in 1897-8 does not seem to have been fundamental, but did mean some loss of control of work and the acceptance of new methods (6).

In the wake of defeat the number of stewards grew in engineering centres with the aim of improving the "fighting quality" of the A.S.E. (7) The stewards also served as movers for amalgamation through working locally with members of other Unions in practice, and on Amalgamation Committees (8). Though this latter action was opposed by many rank-and-filers who sought to keep the A.S.E. a craft exclusive Union (9).

Pribievic outlines the struggles in the period from 1910-14 and shows that the events of the War had important precedents in traditions of industrial and political struggle (10). The development of the various Workers' Committees in particular localities meant the emergence of the working class in a new way (11).

An organisation had emerged which took responsibility for independently leading workers through stewards in the place of work. Previously District Committees had been dominant because of the residential basis of branches. However, the failure of officials to represent interests adequately, plus the disruption of branches by conscription, overtime working, and growth in membership meant stewards took it upon themselves to fight for the well being of the A.S.E.

Though the 'revolt on the Clyde' must be linked to a whole complex of factors e.g. 'slave clause' of the Munitions Act, dilution, inflation, worsening conditions etc., its roots must be seen in the previous thirty years (12). It was not a spontaneous movement, nor were its leaders thrown up in struggle. Bell, Kirkwood, Gallacher, Muir, Messer, Wheatley, and MacMillan had been involved in the Clydeside labour movement for years (13). The story of the 'revolt' need not be related here, rather one can look at the effect it had on the 'institution' of Shop Steward. By 1919 many stewards had a different conception of Trade Unionism from that of officials (14). At its most developed this conception was changing them from good, militant unionists into 'Bolsheviks'.

The role of the steward had been clarified by activity in dealing with shopfloor grievances. They filled the gap between the officials and the members, and provided a solution to the dissatisfaction of the members with the course the Union took in the War (15). Their increased role was established in workers' minds by experiences and syndicalistic propaganda.

However, it must be noted that the stewards did not successfully resolve any of the fundamental problems facing workers or oppose the War in a class conscious way as a movement. Its achievement lay in its ability to prevent the skilled workers being mobilised through a series of unconnected strikes (16). The more ambitious demands seem at times to have been a bargaining counter for this since no provisions were made to back them up.

Part of the reason for this may lie in the fact that support for the Clyde Workers' Committee was based on craft workers seeking to protect rights and practices. This meant there was a tendency towards narrowness and isolation, though the democratic structure of the C.W.C. and the ideologies of the leaders pulled it in an opposite direction (17).

Both Hinton and Pribievic point out that this progressive tendency was itself divided into two groups. The smallest was the revolutionaries opposed to capitalism, and in favour of workers' control. The second group was not coherent or consistent in its demands, but supported the first in the circumstances as the best way to protect themselves from management (18).

In the post-War period with mass unemployment there was victimisation of militants and the break up of the stewards' movement. Yet the period of development in the War when stewards had been consulted by a Prime Minister seems to have left a sediment in the awareness of some workers in some industries. A new aspect had been added to the culture of the working class which made more explicit the identity of belonging to a class with distinct interests in society which were in conflict with other sections of society.

Though the mechanisms for achieving interests in anything but day to day matters remained crudely understood in general.

In the period 1914-21 the functioning and position of shop stewards reached its highest development. The consciousness of the working class, it could be argued, has never again reached the level of that achieved by sections of the class in the particular complex of events which formed the background to the stewards' struggles. Many of the problems faced by this initial movement had to be faced at each resurgence of the movement.

In the 1920s the stewards' movement was wiped out in many places, while others had to risk their job to be stewards and hold the Union together (19). The militants were brought together in the National Minority Movement which attempted to instil a Socialist understanding among elements of the working class (20). Even in the wake of the General Strike, when all industrial struggle was against the wishes of the leadership, militants continued to be important in the Union Branches and large factories. It is from this time that C.P. influence began to be re-established in the factories, as some of its members were elected stewards because they would stand up to management. It is from the 1930s that the beginnings of the modern shop stewards movement can be found. From this time the wage level came to depend less on national agreements and more on what the organised in each factory, shop and machine could gain. A strong shopfloor organisation became vital, and this was linked to the willingness of stewards to fight, and on how far they could develop factory solidarity (21).

The Second War saw the influence of shop stewards grow. The master-workers relationship was challenged as stewards were elected to Works Committees, and the strength of organisation in some places allowed them to hold meetings, to argue the politics of the War, and call for restraint.

An Engineering and Shipbuilding Shop Stewards National Committee was formed, which though unofficial was accepted because of its strength. Stewards were able to extend the range of collective bargaining, and so gain new authority and a new status (22).

They were the chief recruiters and demonstrators of the value of Unionism. While the strength of organisation in many places meant that the new rights gained were not given up, it is these themes of wage fight, defence and extension of rights, and development of cohesion which have dominated the practice of stewards to the present. This is not to claim that all stewards are left wing. Right wing stewards do exist (and will be shown to exist, and their views examined in subsequent Chapters), and can act, in what is described as, militant ways on some issues (23).

This section has shown that the 'institution' of shop steward has varied with the consciousness of the workers they represent. From the presence, or absence of certain attitudes and forms of behaviour among the stewards, one can infer the extent to which they have developed a consciousness of class required to attain the objective interests of the working class (24). This means stewards can be seen, as one described them, as the "intelligensia" of the working class. They are 'organic intellectuals' whose activities are devoted to administering some of the affairs of the working class (25). Or, as McCarthy and Parker describe them, the most "union orientated" members in a workplace, most concerned with maintaining the union presence (26).

Since the working class is not homogeneous, but a complex of different strata and groups, one would expect differences in the type of stewards who represent different groups of workers. These differences should allow one to investigate different forms of class consciousness among organised engineering workers.

Why Study the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section)

The A.U.E.W. and its predecessors, the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and the Amalgamated Engineering Union have a tradition of organised electoral groupings and fiercely contested elections for Full Time Officials (27). The candidates for these offices are nearly always shop stewards, and from their election addresses one can pinpoint different tendencies in consciousness. This makes the A.U.E.W. a useful area of study for those concerned with the forms and contents of class consciousness in a Trade Union context. The continual election campaign means 'battle lines' are clearly drawn and ideological positions appear more coherently worked out in debates over the collective traditions of the Union, the requirements of the coming period, and the nature of the crisis (28). (See Chapter Three: Forms and Contents of Class Consciousness)

The results of the 'battles' for office result in changes in the actions of the Union. Thus, when the study was started the A.U.E.W. was in the vanguard of the labour movement in opposing the Industrial Relations Act of the Conservative Government, while in the middle of the study it was a leading force in gaining acceptance for a Labour Government's Social Contract.

This Right/Left split has existed in the Engineering Union for the last 80 - 90 years at least, and its roots can be traced, and the choice of the A.U.E.W. explained.

The A.S.E. was founded in 1851 by Unionists with a tradition behind them of building Unions (29). It was a Union of a new type involving the key men of a new phase of industrialisation, whose skills were needed for the production of machinery (30). Its formation occurred at the end of a period of great social movements in which Britain had led the world in mass organisation, political consciousness, and anti-capitalist ideologies. It marked a phase where Britain led in Trade Unionism and a "narrower form of class consciousness which simply consists in recognising the working class as a separate class, whose members have different (but not necessarily opposed) interests to other classes" (31).

The A.S.E. was a 'model Union' for the next forty years, because of its stability and efficiency. Underlying its actions was an acceptance that labour was a commodity to be bought and sold. Hence, the best price should be gained through making it scarce (32). This was to be done through a concentration on Unionism, using it as a weapon to end unemployment and improve conditions by reducing hours, ending systematic overtime, controlling apprentices and setting up co-operative workshops. This led to the 1852 'Lock-out' by the employers of Lancashire, London and Yorkshire to smash the A.S.E. This was justified as part of the doctrine of 'laissez faire', and by the necessity to maintain the rate of profit needed to bring capital into the trade (33).

The A.S.E. exemplified the division of the lower classes into sectional groupings under the ideological influence of Capital (34). This does not mean it was not involved in struggles, rather that these struggles were confined to struggles by trade, and the aim of the A.S.E. in them was 'Defence not Defiance' (35).

The uneven development of regions and industries meant a fragmented movement of segments resulting from these struggles. Despite this these craft Unions were a step forward for labour since they recognised the need to limit competition among labour (36). While their concern with the allocation and availability of policy benefits meant they involved themselves in agitations in the political arena e.g. over voting reform, Master-Servants Act, legal status of Unions.

In this period the A.S.E. became the leading element in the labour movement. It saw itself as an adjunct of Gladstonian Liberalism. Its General Secretary from 1874 - 1886, Burnett, campaigned openly for Gladstone, and said that the A.S.E. had identical interests to the employers (37). In this period the A.S.E. had a friendly society nature: between 1851 - 89 it paid out £3 million on friendly benefits, and £86,000 on strike benefits (38). It seemed that the concomitant of centralised Unionism was a conservatism in action. However, changes in Britain's economic position in the World, and changes in the organisation of industry were reflected in changes within the A.S.E. (39) Among tendencies in the A.S.E. there was a desire for political action. This can be seen in resolutions to conferences from 1885, and the General Secretary elections from 1891 (40).

Those seeking overt political action received stimulus from the labour unrest from 1887-8 among unskilled workers.

The continuing emergence of semi-skilled workers coincided with the move of the A.S.E. to the left. This movement was accelerated by the defeat in the 1897-98 'Lock-out'.

The left growth was not even throughout the Country as the changes in industry had a differential impact (41). While the contents of this leftness may be open to debate since defence of sectional interests may be covered by a class rhetoric which poses narrow interests as those of the class (42). Against this view one can show the A.S.E. trying to develop a wider unity. Thus, in 1899 it had been involved in setting up a General Federation of Trade Unions to try and develop solidarity in action. Though it failed to join the Boilermakers' inspired Federation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Trades in 1891.

In 1900 it was the largest Union at the foundation of the Labour Representation Committee. While throughout the 1900s it tried to develop amalgamation through local committees. Though this was opposed by some within the A.S.E. who felt it would weaken the Union. Nor should it be thought that all members of the Union recognised the decline in the position of skilled craftsmen. The gap in earnings between them and the rest of the labour force did not decline between 1890 - 1914, and so the gap in standards of comfort remained (43).

It was the War which brought about qualitative changes in the attitudes and relationships of workers. The formation of the A.E.U. by the A.S.E. and nine other Unions reflected a "new militancy and sense of power" (44).

This was reflected in its motto 'Unity is Strength' and its aggressive actions until its defeat in the 1922 Lock-out, and the depression which resulted in mass unemployment among engineers. Thus, between 1922-35 the minimum unemployment among engineers was 8% and the maximum 30%, i.e. 300,000. This unemployment was unevenly spread, with the old centres in collapse, while the Midlands grew (45).

The lock-out and depression increased the influence of the left within the A.E.U. The Communist Party increased its influence in some areas through its actions in support of engineers, e.g. in 1922 the Red International of Labour Unions held a Conference of 200 to extend solidarity. While the National Minority Movement had District Metalworker Committees in thirteen engineering centres (46).

It was in this period that the A.E.U. began to provide a militant edge to what was the orthodoxy of the labour movement. In 1928 it called for industrial unionism at the T.U.C. though still faced with internal opposition. It opposed the Mond-Turner talks held by T.U.C. leaders and monopolists (47). Throughout this period the A.E.U. lost membership, and this led to it developing an 'Engineers Charter' in 1929 to rally the membership. It called for £4 a week in wages, 44 hours, no systematic overtime, Stewards in every factory, 100% Unionisation in the metal industries, control of the number of apprentices, paid holidays, and sick pay.

However, the collapse of 1929-31 saw the A.E.U. on the defensive. The Executive Committee accepted a pay cut demanded by the Engineers Employers' Federation without consulting the membership. The E.C. was afraid of striking in a depression (48). However, membership continued to fall and reached 192,000 by December, 1932. It was only in 1934 that the A.E.U. went on the offensive to restore the cuts of 1931 through negotiations. The call for 40 hours, holiday pay, and the right to negotiate for apprentices provided the rallying points for the membership. The latter demand resulted in an apprentices strike in 1937 which led to them being linked to the A.E.U. and not management.

The offensive was given a stimulus by the rearmament programme which made engineers a group in demand (49). It did not stop the leftward trend in the A.E.U. Thus, in 1936 at the Labour Party Conference it had called for the affiliation of the C.P.G.B. and the formation of a United Front (50). While in 1941 it had supported the Peoples' Convention for a Peoples' Peace. This trend grew in strength during the War, and with it demand for a new amalgamation (51). From the mid-1930s the A.E.U. had been in the van of the new forces operating in the labour movement. However, in the post-1945 period there was a move toward the right, confirmed by the election of Carron, a Catholic, anti-Communist in 1956 (52). From 1946 the right had been seriously organising for elections to remove all left officials. That the left still had its reservoirs of strength can be seen in the continued progressiveness of the National Committee in the 1950s, though the E.C. was right wing.

Even with the election of Hugh Scanlon to the position of General Secretary in 1968, the right trend continued to dominate the E.C. The shift to the left in the 1960s was confined to limited groups of workers in certain regions, and in the 1970s this has proved vulnerable to a counter-offensive. The limited nature of the leftward movement was seen in the lack of impact it had on the Labour Party. While the high unemployment from 1972 weakened the power of Unions and alarmed the leaders. This could be seen in Scanlon moving towards passivity and opportunism in considering only the narrow, short term interests of A.U.E.W. and refusing to condemn public expenditure cuts since it did not affect the A.U.E.W.

The importance assigned to the A.U.E.W. can be seen by the concern of the press to ensure the victory of candidates standing for 'moderation'. This led to Union elections becoming mini-general elections with T.V. coverage and press reporting. It is a symbol of the fact that the A.U.E.W. is the most powerful Union in Britain, with its members manning the toolrooms and maintenance departments of every major firm.

The shop stewards in this study are all members of the Engineering Section of the A.U.E.W. This membership can be assumed to be a principal component of their class consciousness (53) (See Chapter Four: Solidarity among Engineering Shop Stewards). The Stewards get some of the information which help form their ideologies from the debates within the Union. It can be seen from the above that the Union helps develop different modes of understanding and representation among workers.

Thus, it is an important determinant of the forms of consciousness developed in so far as it sets parameters to the experience of Shop Stewards.

Why Study Engineers on Clydeside?

Clydeside can be described as a 'declining urban economy'. (54) Implicit in this is the fact that at one time it was an 'ascending urbanising economy' (55). Both these features have an impact on the type of employment available, the attitudes of employers and the response of Unions within the area (56). From the period of ascent there are cultural traditions of radical activities by a minority (57). The nature of these activities has been given a new content by the facts of decline. Nevertheless, one would expect to find some continuity in contents of consciousness. This is the advantage of studying working class consciousness on Clydeside. One can trace a historical process of development and see what new generations have added to the foundations laid in the past. This addition can be considered to be selective, with different selections being made by different people (58). Thus different traditions can be chosen from different reference points adopted and different 'opinion formers' listened to.

One can consider the forms of consciousness existing and the process of their creation by looking at the historical development of the organisations of the working class on Clydeside, though because of the scope of this study interest will be focused on engineering workers.

However, this will not be exclusive since prior to the 1830s engineering barely existed in the area.

From the late eighteenth century the spinners and weavers of Renfrewshire, Lanarkshire and Ayrshire were organised in autonomous local societies co-ordinated by delegates. In and around Glasgow, where wages were lower than in Manchester, combinations took on a militant and sometimes violent character. It was from the weavers of Paisley, Glasgow, Perth and Dunfermline that the United Scotsmen drew their membership between 1797-1802 (59).

This was the first stage of Scotland's industrialisation and cotton was the principle driving force. The manufacturers were autocratic, employing handloom weavers throughout the area, and setting up factories (60). An industrial sector was developed in a rural traditional society with a strong folk culture of the land (61).

The struggles of the weavers was constant and continually drew in new forces. In part the motivation for this came from psychological reactions to the changes, and a desire for a better life based on old rights and privileges. It was not an ideological commitment based on seeing themselves as belonging to a "wider and more meaningful group than their own particular trade" (62)

By the 1830s spinning was reorganised as a factory industry using steam power (63). Attempts were made to form Unions e.g. 1834 Paisley Cotton Spinners was formed. However, they could not control entry into the trade and their position collapsed during the mid-1830s.

Their importance lay in creating a tradition of popular radicalism in Scotland. They developed a confidence which led to continual re-organisation of Unions after their collapse. Despite their limited numbers they developed aspects of a democratic culture based on gaining political representation for themselves and having rights to organise Trades Unions (64).

A problem that this culture faced was the continuous inflow of immigrants from different ethnic backgrounds into Clydeside. By 1800 Glasgow was the biggest Highland settlement in Scotland, and there was also a large Irish population. This meant a complex mix of cultures, especially when communities sought isolation to protect beliefs (65). The different religious denominations of the groups led to conflicts which cross divided an already divided working population. This was especially true for the Irish, and every phase of Irish politics was reflected in Glasgow (66).

From the 1830s a second phase of industrialisation was under way as a metal industry developed and coal and iron became vital. Resources were increasingly going into heavy industry and away from textiles. A number of developments in smelting techniques and machine making made Clydeside one of the major industrial centres of the World in the 1850s. Scotland's natural resources were utilised in such a way that it could sell iron for 10/- less than elsewhere. It was an era of relative prosperity and falling living costs (67).

This may help explain the different traditions of Scottish Chartism, and its strong religious and ethical basis, while the Poor Law was not altered till 1845, removing this factor from the general irritants important in England. The Scottish working class was in general content, while the Irish were better off than in Ireland, and able to get work in the expansion. Only three groups were fundamentally discontented: the Highlanders driven from the land, the weavers of Renfrewshire, and the coal miners whose status was collapsing (68).

The conditions help explain the moral force orientation of Scottish Chartism. It supported co-operative schemes, and hoped to enlighten by educational work and persistent effort (69). However, by the late 1840s it was being dropped by sections of the working class for organisations which promised more immediate economic improvement, such as Unions (70).

A new working population of skilled engineering mechanics had been developing (71). They formed a hierarchy of workers based on the protection of skill through organisation, e.g. Journeymen Steam Engine Makers Society, Greenock, 1820s, Operative Turners and Shuttlemakers of Glasgow, 1831 (72).

The continuing expansion of engineering crafts co-existed with an inequality of work with its train of consequences. Behind the craftsmen accumulated a 'reserve army of labour', partly immigrant and partly native, who were badly housed, casually employed, and ill paid. This was made worse by the influx of migrants in the 1840s.

Nativist hostility continued to exist and sought to resist competition. The Irish filled the unskilled jobs while the lowland Scots moved to skilled work (73).

By the 1860s Scotland had a proletariat in its second generation which formed the core of the working population. A number of divisions existed in this population. Thus, immigrants brought in values and traditions which were not congruent with those of the core. Further, at this time the working class was divided along a continuum of 'respectable/rough'. The 'respectable' were characterised by ordered living, comfort and decorum, connected with a Church, and with aspirations for their children. They were able to have this style of life because of the higher wages their organisations were able to win them. The 'rough' were spiritually indifferent in want and constantly in danger of sinking into starvation (74).

The Unions helped develop the style of life of the 'respectable' as a means of gaining acceptance in a hostile environment. The discipline and sobriety were seen as essential in ensuring survival (75). Previous decentralised, almost spontaneous Unions had failed, and it was in reaction to this that new values and practices were adopted. The Unions accepted capitalist economics and private enterprise and struggled within it (76).

A sign of the Lib-Lab politics was the formation of the Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society in 1868, as an organ of working class self help (77). It mirrored the organisation of capitalist enterprises. Though it did have a positive value for the democratic aspects of working class culture in showing that workers could organise production and distribution.

The religious influence in Scotland was still strong, particularly in the small towns. It exercised control through education which instilled discipline and morality (78).

It was a period in which the working class appears to have been less politically involved than they had been in the 1800-40s period. In Scotland there was a Liberal Ascendancy which reflected a lack of class hostility or feelings of injustice and solidarity of workers (79). However, organised labour did make important advances in respect of united action. In particular trades councils were formed (e.g. Glasgow 1858) demanding 8 hours, extended franchise, emigration aid, public works etc.

The 1870s marked the last phase of industrial expansion in Scotland. It precipitated another population explosion on Clydeside with migrants from Ireland and the Highlands e.g. in 1891 the population of Glasgow was 565,839 and 10.3% were Irish born. Overcrowding was the norm e.g. 1914-18 47.9% in 1-2 room houses compared to 7.1% in England.

It was a period of rapid growth based on an industrial sector interconnecting iron and coal, and centred on shipbuilding (80). Economic success came because industries supported each other. A new industrial confidence existed which was cumulative, and reinforcing. Firms were moving into the area to get the benefits of facilities and skills e.g. Singer 1870, Babcock and Wilcox 1890s, Yarrows, etc.

Socialist influence began to spread among the working class.

In the 1880s Socialists were still a small minority in an indifferent population carrying out propaganda work (81). They were trying to supply a local leadership of working class individuals in the communities and factories.

The pattern of work in the shipyards and the consequent insecurity led to an anti-authoritarianism among some Glasgow workers (82). The layoffs as sections of the ship were completed led to a sense of injustice and hatred of employers which would be taken into the next job, which could be in any branch of heavy engineering. It was among these men that Unionism was a deep tradition by the 1900s.

In 1888 a Scottish Labour Party had been formed through the coming together of previous agitations; Highland Land League, Land and Labour League, Irish and Scottish Home Rule (83). In 1894 it helped form the Independent Labour Party (84). From the mid-1880s the Social Democratic Federation had a branch in Glasgow which did pioneering work in propagandising (85).

However, it was not until the 1900s that Socialism 'took off' in Scotland as a range of factors coincided. Scottish heavy industry changed the social structures through its labour intensiveness and increased the number of unskilled workers (86).

While social polarisation in the cities and towns was intense, with few middle class suburbs and little social mobility (87), it was a time also of periods of high unemployment. In 1906 a Glasgow District Unemployed Workers Committee was formed and Glasgow Trades Council and the S.T.U.C. called for 'work or maintenance' (88).

Some writers have sought to explain the coincidence of factors and the intensification of the class struggle by the tendency for the rate of profit to fall. Heavy industry with its low organic composition and low productivity faced special difficulties which employers on the Clyde tried to solve by new techniques and dilution of labour (89).

Politically, Glasgow had workers' representatives on the Council from 1889 (90). A Workers' Municipal Election Committee existed and brought together the Trades Council, Unions, the I.L.P. and the Irish National League. By 1914 it had seventeen councillors. The whole left seems to have been growing (91). By 1906 the S.D.F. had forty branches and the I.L.P. fifty. While in 1903 the 'Impossibilist' tendency in the S.D.F. had split to form the Socialist Labour Party, which emphasised Marxist theory and propaganda. Its main membership lay in Glasgow, and its main influence through its talented members and the Industrial Workers of Great Britain (92).

It was the I.L.P. which was the biggest left group in Glasgow. It seems to have recruited from the 'respectable' working class on the basis of moralism and pragmatism (93). The S.D.F. and S.L.P. competed with the I.L.P. for influence, and ideological interventions were being made by Socialist propagandists in the factories and communities of Clydeside.

These quantitative developments seem to have become qualitative changes in consciousness in the War. By 1915 there was a developing Anti-War movement, and a spread of Socialistic ideas in the Shop Stewards Movement.

It was in this atmosphere that the two Russian Revolutions had their effects on sections of the working class. Support for Soviets and working class power grew among militant Trade Unionists. It changed the thinking of all left groupings, caused a questioning of theoretical precepts and a growing interest in Bolshevism (94).

On Clydeside groups of workers developed revolutionary consciousness. They provided a constant resistance to capitalism and sought to bring about revolutionary change. Other groups remained more parochial in outlook, but still saw the desirability of more unity.

The developments in consciousness can be seen in the '40 Hour Strike' of 1919 by engineering workers in order to reduce unemployment with its manifesto, 'To all workers - A call to arms'. Its defeat meant a diminution of industrial struggle. This was accentuated by the collapse of Clydesides basic industries as exports fell. By 1932 20% of the workforce was unemployed, and in engineering it was 30%.

The lasting effect of the developments in the War, and the 1920s was to give the Glasgow working class a political identity. This was expressed in voting Labour for the broad mass of workers (95). Among the most class conscious it expressed itself in membership or support of the Communist Party.

The high points of consciousness reached in the immediate post-War period have not been reached again. Labour domination has been largely maintained from 1945 showing some ideological commitment among workers to anti-Conservatism (96). The consciousness of Clydeside workers is still that of a subordinate class, which accepts the present structure of society. (See Chapter 1: 'Class Consciousness').

It is only among a minority that revolutionary forms of consciousness exist. Rarely are they able to connect with the mass of workers and raise the consciousness of this mass in the way they did for some periods between 1916-19.

By studying Stewards on Clydeside one is looking at an area with cultural traditions of radical and revolutionary consciousness among sections of workers. This group coexists and interacts with other groups who have other forms of consciousness. (See Chapter Three: Forms and Contents of Class Consciousness, and Chapter 5: Ideological Attitudes of Shop Stewards). The existence of these various forms of consciousness should make it possible to come closer to understanding the constellation of factors which make up the contents of consciousness and the forms taken.

Having explained the cultural traditions which led to the choice of A.U.E.W. Stewards on Clydeside as the subjects of this study one can describe what the following Chapters will contain. The study will begin with an attempt to define class consciousness and outline the methods which will be used to measure it. This will be followed by a look at the basic characteristics of shop stewards in the sample, and comparisons and contrasts with other studies.

This will involve considering the reasons they became stewards, and how they see the office affecting them by altering their relationships with others.

A Chapter will then be spent describing the forms and contents of class consciousness existing among shop stewards. This will be based on a comparison of the stewards' attitudes with those found in the Election addresses for full-time positions.

After this there will be attempts at analysing how far the Stewards have developed attitudes which unite workers in solidarity actions, and provide the basis for altering society in a Socialistic direction. In part this means seeing how far they have developed moral attitudes which lead them to act from estimates of the interests, rights and dignity of others, as well as themselves. A final Chapter will examine some factors which might cause class consciousness.

This study will not be of an exhaustive character since its focus will only be on a small part of the activity of the stewards.

Whole areas which are important for understanding class consciousness will be neglected e.g. attitudes to race, to women, to nationalism, etc. (97) Thus, it cannot claim to be a definitive study. Rather it is a contribution to the process of developing understanding of the mechanism of class consciousness.

To help in this task a deliberate bias was built into the sample of Shop Stewards. The majority of the Stewards were contacted by sending out letters to every Convenor in the Paisley and Glasgow Districts asking them to participate, or to pass it on to some of their Stewards who might be interested.

However, twelve Communist Stewards were contacted in order to ensure the representation in the sample of Stewards with certain attitudes. This meant that twenty five of the Stewards were Communist Party members, who can be asserted to have some form of Socialist consciousness. Their presence provided a comparison with other Stewards in the sample. This comparison is important since it allows one to point the similarities and differences between those with a Socialist consciousness, and those with other forms. Through this comparison one may be aided in describing the contents of Socialist consciousness, and the other forms of consciousness, by seeing if markedly different approaches exist on the implementation of ideas. (For more details of the sample of stewards see Appendix One)

NOTES

1. L.D. Epstein, 'British Class Consciousness and the Labour Party', Journal of British Studies, Volume 1-2, 1962-63; J. Foster, 'Revolutionaries in Oldham', Marxism Today, Volume 12, 1968; G. Lukacs, 'History and Class Consciousness', Merlin, 1974; I. Meszavos, 'Aspects of History and Class Consciousness', Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971; J.A. Banks, 'Marxist Sociology in Action', Faber and Faber, 1970; M. Mann, 'Consciousness and Action Among the Western working class', MacMillan, 1973, etc.
2. For historical analysis of this see W. Kendal, 'The Revolutionary Movement in Britain, 1900 - 1921', Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1969, and J. Hinton, 'The First Shop Stewards Movement', Allen and Unwin, London, 1973.
3. E. Roberts, 'Workers Control', Allen and Unwin, London, 1973, p. 79.
4. J. Jefferrys, 'The Story of the Engineers', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1945, p. 137.
5. Ibid, p. 128. See, too, A.U.E.W. Journal, October, 1975, p. 496. For a similar experience in the U.S.A. see M. Perlman, 'The Machinists', Harvard University Press, 1961.
6. A.U.E.W. Journal, ibid, p. 497. For the importance of the areas where defeat was less severe see Hinton, ibid, pp. 16-17.
7. Jefferrys, ibid, p. 166.
8. A.U.E.W. Journal, February, 1976, p. 18; J.T. Murphy, 'New Horizons', John Lane, London, 1941, p. 24.

NOTES

9. See E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Labour's Turning Point, 1880-1900' Harvester Press, Brighton, 1974, p. 106.
10. B. Pribievic, 'The Shop Stewards Movement and Workers' Control', Blackwell, Oxford, 1959, pp. 2 - 24.
11. J.T. Murphy, 'Preparing for Power', Pluto, London, 1972, p. 147 lists the localities with Workers' Committees.
12. Jefferrys, *ibid*, pp. 176 - 80; J. Hinton, 'The Clyde Workers Committee and the Dilution Struggle', Essays in Labour History, ed. J. Briggs and J. Saville, MacMillan, London, 1971, pp. 160-3; 'The Myth of Red Clydeside' Socialist Standard, April, 1976, p. 75.
13. This can be seen from their biographies, see W. Gallacher, 'Last Memoires', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1966; D. Kirkwood, 'My Life of Revolt', Harrup, London, 1935.
14. Jefferrys, *ibid*, p. 190.
15. Kendal, *ibid*, p. 152.
16. See B. Moore, 'Sheffield Shop Stewards 1916-18', Our History, 18, 1976.
17. Hinton, 'Clyde Workers Committee', *ibid*, pp. 168-9.
18. Pribievic, *ibid*, p. 166, Hinton 'First Shop Stewards', *ibid*, pp. 14-17, 332-337.
19. L.J. MacFarlane, 'The British Communist Party', MacGibbon and Kee, London, 1966, pp. 24-6.

NOTES

20. J. Klugman, 'History of the C.P.G.B. 1925-27', Volume 2, Lawrence and Wishart, London, pp. 337-8.
21. N. Branson and M. Heinemann, 'Britain in the Nineteen Thirties', Panther, London, 1973; see, too, A. Hutt, 'British Trade Unionism', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1962, pp. 119-44.
22. A. Henderson, taped recollections, held by Society for the study of Scottish Labour History.
23. See H. Wyper, 'Marxism Today', Volume 8, 1964, p. 186.
24. For the concept of 'ascribed' consciousness see G. Lukacs, *ibid*, and I. Meszavos, 'Aspects of History and Class Consciousness', Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1971.
25. See T. Patterson, 'Notes on the Historical Application of Marxist Cultural Theory', *Science and Society*, Volume 39, 1975-76.
26. W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Parker, 'Shop Stewards and Workshop Relations', Research Paper, 10, H.M.S.O. London, 1968, p. 57, found Shop Stewards more "Union orientated" than their members. Though Kendal, *ibid*, p. 142 discusses the weaknesses of Stewards in this area. See, too, T. Lane and K. Roberts, 'Strike at Pilkingtons', Fontana, London, 1971, p. 103.
27. Jefferrys, *ibid*, and K. Burgess, 'The Origins of British Industrial Relations', Croom Helm, London, 1975, p. 55.
28. J. Hughes, 'Should Party Systems Be Encouraged in Trade Unions', in W.E.J. McCarthy, 'Unions', Penguin, London, 1974, gives some reasons for this.

NOTES

29. Centenary Souvenir, A.E.U. 1951, pp. 3-7, W.H. Marwick
'A Short History of Labour in Scotland', Chambers, Edinburgh,
1967, p. 12 gives an account of early engineering societies
in Scotland.
30. A. Slaven, 'The Development of the West of Scotland, 1750-
1960', Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975, discusses
this process.
31. E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement',
Marxism Today, Volume 12, 1968, pp. 166-7.
32. Centenary Souvenir, *ibid*, p.5.
33. E. Wigham, 'The Power to Manage', MacMillan, London, 1973,
pp. 4 - 5.
34. For a discussion of this see J. Foster 'Class Struggle in
the Industrial Revolution', Methuen, London, 1974.
35. See D.C. Cummings, 'A Historical Survey of the Boilermakers
and Iron and Steel Ship Builders Society', Robinson, Newcastle
1905, for a union officials account of these struggles.
36. A. Lozovsky, 'Marx and the Trade Unions', Martin Lawrence,
London, 1935, p. 16.
37. Jefferrys, *ibid*, pp. 110-1.
38. Hutt, *ibid*, pp. 25-6.
39. Jefferrys, *ibid*, pp. 117-35.
40. *Ibid*, p. 112.
41. Hobsbawm, 'Labours Turning Point' *ibid*, pp XIV.

NOTES

42. M. Nicolaus, 'The Theory of the Labour Aristocracy',
Monthly Review, Volume 21, 1969-71.
43. E.J. Hobsbawm, 'The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth
Century Britain', in 'Labouring Man', Weidenfeld and
Nicolson, London, 1964, pp. 293-5. For biographical
evidence see D. Kirkwood, *ibid*, pp. 49, 60 and J.T. Murphy
'New Horizons', *ibid*, p. 23.
44. Jefferrys, *ibid*, pp. 191 - 4.
45. See J. Foster, 'British Imperialism and the Labour
Aristocracy', in J. Skelley, ed. 'The General Strike, 1926',
Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1976, pp. 14-15; Jefferrys,
ibid, pp. 187-9, 205-7.
46. MacFarlane, *ibid*, pp. 120-1; see, too, P. Kerrigan, 'The
Communist Party and the Industrial Struggle', *Marxism Today*,
Volume 14, 1970, p. 376.
47. Jefferrys, *ibid*, pp. 236-8.
48. *Ibid*, p. 241.
49. *Ibid*,
50. Centenary Souvenir, *ibid*, p. 29.
51. Hutt, *ibid*, p. 148.
52. H. Clegg, 'Trade Union Officers', Blackwell, Oxford, 1961.
53. P. Anderson, 'The Limits and Possibilities of Trade Union
Action', in 'The Incompatibles', Penguin, London, 1967.
54. See G. Cameron, 'Economic Analysis of a Declining Urban
Economy', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Volume
18, 1971. See, too/...

NOTES

- 54 cont., See, too, T. Byres, 'Entrepreneurship in the Scottish Heavy Industries, 1870 - 1900' in P.L. Payne, ed, 'Studies in Scottish Business History', Frank Cass, London, 1967; N.K. Buxton, 'The Scottish Shipbuilding Industry Between the Wars', Business History, Volume X, 1968, for some of the causes of the decline.
55. For descriptions of the ascent see H. Hamilton, 'The Industrial Revolution in Scotland', Clarendon, Oxford, 1932, and A. Slaven, 'The Development of the West of Scotland, 1750 - 1960', Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1975.
56. See, for example, D.J. Robertson, 'Labour Turnover in Shipbuilding', Scottish Journal of Political Economy, Volume 1, 1954, for an analysis of some of the trends.
57. For descriptions of them see T. Johnstone, 'The History of the Working Class in Scotland', Forward, Glasgow, 1929, and W.H. Marwick, 'A Short History of Labour in Scotland', Chamlen, Edinburgh, 1967.
58. T. Pinkus, ed, 'Conversations with Lukacs', Merlin, London, 1974, pp. 32-3.
59. See T.C. Smout, 'A History of the Scottish People'.
60. See Hamilton, *ibid*, Page 1 and Slaven, *ibid*, p.5. The behaviour of the owners was a method of developing time-discipline. See K. Thompson, 'Work and Leisure', Past and Present, 29, and E.P. Thompson, 'Time, Work Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism.'

NOTES

61. H.J. Hanham, 'Scottish Nationalism', Faber and Faber, London, 1969, p.17. According to Slaven, *ibid*, the West of Scotland had 181,000 people in 1750, half of whom lived in hamlets of less than 300.
62. Smout, *ibid*, p. 448.
63. See A.J. Robertson, 'The Decline of the Scottish Cotton Industry', *Business History*, Volume 12, 1970, for a description of the rise and decline of cotton.
64. L.J. Saunders, 'Scottish Democracy, 1815-40', Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1950, p. 103 deals with the attitudes of the spinners.
65. See W.M. Walker, 'Irish Immigrants in Scotland, Their Priests, Politics and Parochial Life', *Historical Journal*, Volume XV, 1972.
66. See J.F. McCaffey, 'The Irish Vote in the Nineteenth Century', *Innes Review*, Volume 21, 1970. Also, R.K. Middlemas, 'The Clydesiders', Hutchinson, London, 1965, p. 28; I.S. Wood, 'Irish Nationalism and Radical Politics in Scotland 1880 - 1900', *Journal of the Scottish Society for the Study of Labour History*, 1975; G.F. Best, 'Popular Protestantism in Victorian Britain', in 'Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain', R. Robson, ed, Bell and Son, London, 1967, pp. 116, 139 - 42.
67. Hamilton, *ibid*, pp. 9-12, 210-25.

NOTES

68. L.C. Wright, 'Scottish Chartism', Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1953, pp.10-19.
69. Ibid, pp. 106, 133.
70. Ibid, pp. 157, 174, and Marwick, *ibid*, pp.20-3.
71. Saunders, *ibid*, p.105; Hamilton, *ibid*, pp.201-11.
72. Saunders, *ibid*; Marwick, *ibid*, pp. 32-3.
73. Saunders, *ibid*, p. 107.
74. Ibid.
75. See J.D. Young, 'Scottish Miners, 1867-1976', New Edinburgh Review, 32, 1976.
76. Marwick, *ibid*, pp.20-46; Centenary Souvenir, *ibid*, p.11.
77. Johnstone, *ibid*, pp.386-7.
78. A.A. McLaren, 'Presbyterianism and the Working Class in a mid-nineteenth century city', Scottish History Review, Volume, 46, 1967, pp. 123-38; Walker, *ibid*, pp. 657; Hanham, *ibid*, pp. 19-20.
79. See, J. Vincent, 'The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-68', Constable, London, 1966, pp. 80-1; Johnstone, *ibid*, pp. 391-3, Marwick, *ibid*, pp. 47-9.
80. Hamilton, *ibid*, pp.220-5.
81. J. Young, 'The Rise of Scottish Socialism' in R. Brown, ed, 'The Red Paper on Scotland', E.U.S.P. Edinburgh, 1975, pp. 284-5.

NOTES

82. T.T. Paterson, 'Glasgow Limited', C.U.P. 1960, p.12.
83. Johnstone, *ibid*, pp. 393-4 tells of the importance of Davitts coming to Glasgow in 1884, and Henry George's Land Restoration League.
84. Marwick, *ibid*, p. 74. At this time it had 24 branches.
85. See, S. Pierson, 'Marxism and the Origins of British Socialism', Cornell, Ithica, 1973; H. McShane, 'Remembering John McLean', John McLean Society, n.d., p.2.
86. Hanham, *ibid*, p.21.
87. *Ibid*, pp. 22-4.
88. Marwick *ibid*, p. 21.
89. See H.J. Fyrth, 'Men of Iron', Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History', 32; Wigham, *ibid*; A. Tuckett, 'The Blacksmiths' History', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1974.
90. Marwick, *ibid*, p. 85.
91. McShane, *ibid*, p. 3.
92. MacFarlane, *ibid*, p. 27.
93. Middlemas, *ibid*, pp. 29-32; Pierson, *ibid*, pp. 235-7.
94. See, R. Stewart, 'Breaking the Fetters', Lawrence and Wishart, 1966, p.86 for an example of this attitude. Also B. Cowe, 'The Making of a Clydeside Communist', Marxism Today, Volume 17, 1975, p. 112.

NOTES

95. C. Chamberlain, 'The Growth of Support for the Labour Party', British Journal of Sociology, Volume 24, 1973, pp. 485-7.
96. Marwick, *ibid*, p. 105.
97. See, for example, S.L. Bartky, 'Towards of Phenomenology of Feminist Consciousness', Social Theory and Social Practice, Volume 3, 1975.

Chapter One: Class Consciousness

The central theme of this study is an inquiry into the forms and contents of class consciousness among Clydeside Engineering shop stewards. This means the concept class consciousness has to be made available for utilisation. The theoretical premises for doing this will be drawn from a Marxian perspective.

From this perspective, engineering shop stewards can be viewed as part of a working class which is defined by its place in the production process. It, thus, has an objective role which exists independently of the subjective wishes of the shop stewards. It is a role which defines the working class as a subordinate and exploited class who do not possess the means of labour, and so have to sell their ability to work to a dominant and exploiting class. Through this sale labour becomes a commodity, and through the incorporation of labour in commodities, surplus value is extracted from the working class (1). This is not to divide the working class into productive and non-productive labourers, since these are fairly abstract terms. In empirical research the point where a workers stops contributing in some way to the extraction of surplus value is difficult to pinpoint, and the concept of 'collective labourer' is utilised (2).

The structural position of the working class leads to it having objective interests which it would be to its benefit to realise to be rational.

These objective interests are produced by the structural determination of the working class in the social division of labour. They cannot be defined in detail or specificity, rather they are best understood as modes of understanding and behaviour which would stop the working class being a subordinate and exploited class, and lead to a society based on a more 'just and comradely system' (3).

However, a number of constraints have to be put on the use of the concept of objective interests (4). It is not self-evident what they are. This problem will remain so long as it cannot be shown how objective interests derive from deductions from observations of social relationships. It is a weakness in Marxian social analysis that this has not been done. The tendency has been to treat this area as one in which a priori intuition will suffice.

However, it is this objective class interest which can be in opposition to any subjectively held views of class interest, which is important in some Marxian definitions of the concept of class consciousness. Thus, Allen points out,

"A class of employees fully conscious of its objective economic position would revolt and acquire ownership of the means of production for the state and thus destroy the prime relationship which characterises a capitalist society." (5)

Thus, the concept of objective interests is a theoretical proposition, in the sense that it develops from attempts to explain behaviour which cannot be explained adequately otherwise. Objective interests are a necessary condition of what they explain. From a Marxian perspective the study of class consciousness involves examining the degree to which the shop stewards are able to show an ability to act on the basis of these objective interests. It seeks to discover how far a consciousness of class interest and of the capacity of the class to bring about change are present among a section of the working class.

Mann in his synthesis of Marxian writings on class consciousness provides a 'model' of the investigation of the presence of class interest through focusing on four components (6).

These are:-

- (1) Class Identity: which means defining oneself as working class and understanding that one has a common role in the production process. This exists in co-ordination with,
- (2) Class Opposition: which involves seeing the capitalist class and its agents as enemies of the working class.
- (3) Class Totality: this means that one realises that one's life in every sphere is determined by the objective position of the working class.

- (4) Class Alternative: possessing a conception of an alternative society which will realise one's class interest.

In this study these components will be used to consider the development of consciousness among individual shop stewards. Of course, this model has a number of weaknesses which one can outline and attempt to lessen. Firstly, it does not explicitly deal with class capacity. This means it does not look at how far the shop steward recognises the ability of the class to carry out its objective class interest, and possesses a strategy for achieving this (7). As a concept, class capacity allows one to see class consciousness as an active process which involves different forms of behaviour, as well as different forms of understanding and awareness. Implicit in the concept of class capacity is the existence of some agencies through which workers can realise their capacity. These agencies, e.g. political parties and trade unions, are developed in a long historical process, and reflect in some way various forms of consciousness. A second factor which Mann does not go into is the possible existence of tensions in forms of consciousness which may form poles of development potential. These tensions result from the fact that class consciousness does not exist in isolation from other forms of social consciousness. This is because class consciousness is not a direct product of structural and technological conditions.

The shop stewards, while members of Trade Unions are simultaneously part of other social entities - regional, national, demographic, etc. As members of these entities they take part in creating and spreading elements of consciousness which are different from the class elements. Thus, the sets of values internalised by shop stewards can be 'contaminated' by non-working class ideologies and interests (8). This can be thought of as leading to a continual dialogue between contents in a form of consciousness, which is linked to the environments of the shop stewards. A third feature which Mann does not deal with concerns the saliency of attitudes expressed by the stewards. Some studies have sought to solve this problem by asking respondents to compare the importance they give to class with that they give to nationality, religion, etc. (9) This does not seem an adequate solution since it does not operate at the level of actual behaviour of the respondent. From the perspective adopted here, one would have to establish that the attribute the respondent believed was most salient did actually affect his or her behaviour. This leads to problems concerning time span and conditions in which certain types of behaviour are possible. Thus, the shop stewards in this sample may have opposed the Social Contract when interviewed, yet seemed to be doing nothing to confirm this at that time. Yet three years later may be involved in actions against the continuation of the Contract. This involvement may reflect a change in environmental conditions which make action possible, e.g. the National Committee decision to oppose the Contract, and to support strikes against it.

Because of these features this study will make no definite attempt to assess the saliency of attitudes.

Rather a moralistic position is adopted, that the attitudes explored should be important to shop stewards since they seemed to be important to society, given the coverage of them in papers, and on television. This would suggest that they were subjects which shop stewards would have considered and have opinions about.

The Marxian model of class consciousness adopted here is not a definitive one which ends the use of all others. Indeed, it may be that there can be no definitive definition of such a highly complex process. As a concept class consciousness involves some obscureness in defining what actually constitutes it. All one can generally do is select some partial indicators of its supposed presence and test them. (The reasons for this will be discussed later in this Chapter.)

At the same time one must recognise that the means used to test it have the inherent dangers of actually inferring, rather than looking at direct attitudes and behaviour. Nevertheless, these tests do allow one to utilise a concept of class consciousness in empirical research by giving attributes to investigate the presence, or absence of, and hypotheses to consider concerning these attributes. However, before going on to discuss these attributes, and hypotheses, it is necessary to justify the choice of a Marxian model as the 'least bad' for this type of research.

This requires a critical examination of alternative approaches to the study of class consciousness. Since many of the researchers who utilise a particular approach often do not agree with each other on all aspects of analysis the main focus will be on the construction of generic types of arguments from the 'founding fathers'.

Weberianism

An important source of alternative approaches to a Marxian approach are the theoretical constructs of Weberianism. From this source can be drawn alternative definitions of class, class interests, how society develops, and conceptual tools of analysis. While praising Marxism for seeing the "structuring of interests rather than treating them as distributed at random". Weberians believe Marxian definitions are inadequate and partial. (10) Their definitions are believed to incorporate it in a more full and adequate definition. The Marxian concern with the ownership, and possession of the means of production is viewed as lacking any dynamic. Marxian social class is believed to be related only to the economic sphere of society, and so other stratifications have to be developed for other spheres. So Weberian sociology adds the stratifications of property class and acquisitive class which are parallel and external to social class. Marxian definitions are seen as economistic determinist (11).

However, Marxians would claim that the structural class determinations involve economic, political and ideological roles. The economic has a principal role in determining social class, since that fact that "there is a working class in economic relations necessarily implies a specific place for this class in ideological and political relations..."(12)

A Weberian definition of class is of a group of persons occupying the same class status which is the "typical probability" that a given state of (a) provision of goods, (b) external conditions of life, (c) subjective satisfaction or frustration will be possessed by an individual or group.

These factors define "class status", "in so far as they are dependent on the kind, and extent, of control or lack of it which the individual has over goods or services and existing possibilities of their exploitation for the attainment of income or receipts within a given economic order." (13)

'Property' and 'lack of property' are basic categories of all class situations. There is division within this on the basis of the kind of property available for returns, and the kind of services which can be offered. While those who have no property are also differentiated according to the nature of their services. From this definition the "connotation of the concept of class" is "the kind of chance in the market is the decisive moment which presents a common condition for the individuals' fate." Thus, the individuals 'class situation' is ultimately this 'market situations'. (14)

A Weberian analysis of class by the similarities of market chances implies viewing classes as empirical groups of individuals composed by simple addition and based solely on inter-personal relationships. The market situation is only very loosely related to the forces and relations of production, and so to objective relations between people which develop from these forces and relations independently of the wills of people.

A Marxian view would claim to take account of these objective relations, and so see the differences between the two major classes in capitalist society as one of quality. This contrasts with a Weberian view of classes, as having the same quality but differing in the manifestation of it. So for Weberians 'class interest' could be viewed as similar, and the differences reflections of positions in a hierarchial situation (15). This makes the Weberian definitions of class less accurate than some Marxian ones, since it tends to lead to studies of a wages hierarchy, while Marxian studies see wages as an effect of class determination, and attempt to analyse relations between classes (16).

A key concept of Weberian sociology is 'status', which is applied to a typically effective claim to positive, or negative, privilege with respect to social prestige. It rests on one or more of the following bases - (a) mode of living, (b) formal process of education, which may allow acquisition of corresponding modes of life, (c) prestige of birth or occupation.

Stratification by status is linked with a monopolisation of ideal and material goods, which provides the most effective motives for exclusiveness of status groups. This can hinder the market's operations and push into the background the power of property in defining class (17). Status groups can be external to, alongside, or above classes. They are dependent on the mode of appropriation of scarce resources. In a market situation this mode is dependent on occupation, and an occupational group is a status group, claiming honour by its style of life (18).

Weberian concepts of status are dependent on the individual's or groups' perceptions of similarity. In contrast a Marxian view distinguishes stratas of classes on the basis of differentiation in the economic sphere, and of the role of political and ideological relations. They are not external to, alongside, or above classes but rather strata of classes (19).

Weberian approaches using differences in occupational income to differentiate status groups disregard other aspects of occupations which are determined in the sphere of production.

A Marxian approach defining people in terms of work outlines two aspects people can be grouped in terms of the tasks they apply themselves to, in practical relations to the tools for transforming raw materials; and, the similarity in social relations they have to enter into in the course of application of the practical relations, which shows their relations to the employers who own the means of labour. It is within these relations that the basic qualitative distinctions of wage labour and capital arise, and a Marxian approach places the market relations between people.(20)

In Weberian sociology the concept of 'class interest' is ambiguous as soon as one moves beyond "factual direction of interests following with a certain probability from the class situation" The direction of interests are believed to vary (a) with the individual workers ability to pursue them; (b) with whether it is a communal action of a larger or smaller than those in the class situation (21). This leads to Weberian sociology excluding interpretations of class interest by any determination from objective relations. Interest is viewed as primarily individual and subjective, and class interests are found by averaging the independently based wills of members of a stratum, who are arbitrarily delimited from other strata. Interests are only means of pursuing given ends which tend to be static.

The particular Marxian variant adopted in this study defined class interest as coming from processes operating independently of people's wills. The main determinant was asserted to be the production process which structurally defined a group as working class with certain objective interests which can only be stated in a vague way. Though this does not mean that a stratum of the working class cannot take up a position which is in opposition to its class interest (22). This view of objective class interest does not mean the contents of class interest can be ascribed or absolutised at any given moment. The contents of class interest are historically specific and continually changing, though there are continuities.

It is this historically specific content and the continuous changes which make it difficult to use 'ideal types' in Marxian research, though this is not to deny the need to typify. Typification allows the approach to solutions to problems concerning the logical status of certain concepts which could not be described adequately in terms of available theories (24). Weberian ideal types are created by a one sided emphasis and intensification of one or several aspects of a given event or entity. They are descriptive, and instruments for classification through which the researcher can select facts, and provide a mechanism for specifying their significance. They are not true or false, only more or less significant.

A Marxian criticism of Weberian typification is that it is both formal and ahistorical. 'Ideal types' are not located in specific socio-economic situations, and so the problem of social relations are diminished since they are supposed to be nothing more than the distillation of elements existing in certain given cultural historical forms (25). Though this is not to imply that Marxian methos of typifying have proved more successful. Marxians attempt specific historical portrayals of typical characters in typical circumstances. This means they attempt to examine dominant traits of the lives of individuals in conditions of social conflict in a particular time and place. This has tended to result in stylised figures for typification, partly owing to the ambiguities and gaps in the Marxian method which demands typification, and at the same time calls for individuality and specificity as integral parts of it.

There is also the problem that what is typical depends on the researchers subjective evaluation. Since the complexity of reality in its linkages is impossible to grasp, selectivity becomes necessary and this tends to lead to crude characterisations of typicality. Thus, Marxian typifications such as 'trade union consciousness' may seem to Weberians to be subject to the same criticisms as their 'ideal types'.

Phenomenology

An approach which has as its main emphasis the study of consciousness is phenomenology. The philosophical basis for this approach was developed by Husserl, who conceived of phenomenology as an attempt to arrive at that element of subjectivity which is universal, i.e. transcends historically and culturally specific determinations. Through this reduction he sought to reach the invariant structures of consciousness which were the foundations of all sciences. To do this one needed to look beyond the individual's own experiences in order to reconstruct the stages of development of an objects manner of givenness, and through this its meaning (26).

This involved abstracting from the existence of the external world, from the contents of sciences, and from the immediate mental reflections so that a categorically unmediated element of experience was left. This is 'pure consciousness', directed at certain objects and possessing 'matter' and 'form' from implied meaning and a pre-given, unquestionable validity.

This element of consciousness is placed outside experience, and is seen as the initial element and creator of both knowledge and its object. The focus is on the attempt to reconstruct the stages in development of an object's way of existence, and hence its meaning. It is claimed that by the way of the everyday world one is in direct contact with intersubjectivity which is the ground for all meaning (27).

In sociology phenomenology was seen as a replacement for the sociological scientism of 'objective sociology' which missed certain crucial dimensions of social existence. Phenomenology saw itself as reconstructing social science by providing a subjective foundation for objective phenomena (28). It tried to study how a social order was possible by examining face-to-face interaction and the commonplace in the everyday world through a reconstitution of knowledge (29).

Phenomenological sociology tries to elucidate basic assumptions or presuppositions that there is a world and it is social. It tries to see the world as it is for others, and sees phenomenology as the proper constitution of objectivity. This means avoiding superimposed, preconceived notions and categories, and focusing on the intersubjective constitution of everyday life by moving from formal analysis to comprehension of the social world on the basis of commonsense knowledge. The concern to go beyond preconceived notions and categories illustrates the aim phenomenologists set themselves; make things whose meaning seems clear meaningless, and then discover what they mean by reconstituting them (30).

The conditions of existence of commonsense must be established, and the stock of commonsense notions added to by immersion in face-to-face relations and interactions. For phenomenologists common-sense is seen to be a highly complex abstraction constructed within the 'natural attitude' of everyday life. It is seen as vital to work out the conditions of existence of this commonsense, which is the basic component of everything that happens in society (31).

Philosophically phenomenology can be criticised because of its belief that the world is as we experience it. This would seem to make it a form of idealism, since classical idealism believed the world was as we cognised it (32). In addition, there is a tendency for phenomenology to reduce science to its most commonly known truths, and to believe the attitude epitomised by science is to be obtained only in science by the scientist. Alternative understanding of how science influences the way the world is experienced is possible, which would not follow phenomenology in believing scientific knowledge kills 'living life'. From a Marxian position phenomenology is seen as a transcendental philosophy separating transcendental truths from historical contingents, that is 'ways of thinking about experience' from 'ways of experiencing' (33).

Sociologically, it can be criticised for its tendency to ignore the structural dimensions of society, and their historical development. It ignores the production process and centres on motivational elements of individual human action.

This is because it starts from the individual consciousness as absolute, and on this basis believes the individual can generate reality (34).

A Marxian view is that the individual cannot do this, rather he or she can only generate ideas about reality, and these ideas must have some social and historical location.

Phenomenology starts with peoples everyday practices and focuses on the individual. This leads to it conceptualising social class as an ensemble of individual conditions and situations.

In contrast to this a Marxian position does not see the relations between people as interpersonal, but rather as coming from the places they occupy in an objectively determined structural position. It is specific politico-ideological practices which express the structurally determined economic existence which Marxian sociology looks at rather than individuals interpersonal relations.

Phenomenological Marxism

There have been attempts to accommodate phenomenology within Marxism. The basis for this synthesis has been to 'relive' the Marxist heritage through phenomenology (35). Marxism is seen as precatégorical, and only available by relieving experiences themselves, rather than accepting them as ideological conceptualisations. The method has been to try to discern Marxist problems, aims and methods in phenomenology on the one hand, and a transcendental phenomenological grounding in the theory of Marx on the other. It means drawing out 'implications' in the works of both Husserl and Marx (36).

In practice this had meant an ahistorical philosophy of relived experience with ambiguities over a critical versus an apodictic stance (37). The major difficulty the Phenomenological Marxist faces is the fact that Husserl, following Kant, considered the dialectic as an illusion to be removed from thought. Whereas, for Marx the concept of dialectic was the basis of his method. Phenomenological Marxism has attempted to analyse the question of why the working class "remains a dependent force" through examining the structures of domination to see how they are played out in the lives of individuals. This is an area of study in which it differs from 'orthodox' phenomenology. For them studying the organisation of the working class would be to examine 'second order constructs' about reality. Their concern seems to centre on organisation where commonsense is fractured and fragile, e.g. mental asylums, hospitals, prisons. The study of working class subordination would be no more important than any other deviations caused by established expectations breaking down so that adaption becomes meaningless (38).

To carry out research in established areas of interest for Marxism, Phenomenological Marxists have to redefine the concepts used by Marxism. The infrastructure or base of society is no longer the relationship between relations and forces of production, but instead is a socio-economic situation which determines one's life style and quality of life. Economic existence no longer has a priority, but is only a subculture within the total social culture.

While the definition of who constitutes the working class is changed from one based on an objective position in the production process to mean an amalgam of underprivileged groups, with the implication that being working class has now become an attitude towards the system (39).

A main factor behind 'revolt' is the libidinal demands of young people who are unwilling to sublimate their autonomous drives (40). This is based on a view of needs as a pre-categorical foundation upon which everything else depends. Everyday world of life is viewed as the world of needs and of their satisfaction by means of labour. Thus, class consciousness is defined in terms of the individual realising his basic needs, libidinally and the activity required to satisfy them and remove barriers to this satisfaction (41).

From the Marxian approach adopted in this study a number of criticisms can be made of Phenomenological Marxism. First, its definition of class is subjective and does not see class as determined by structural determinants linked to the production process. Secondly, its view of revolt and revolution seems to be transcendental, and so it adopts a voluntaristic notion of how change can be achieved, which ignores objective conditions (42). Thirdly, its definition of class consciousness relies on seeing the personality's main motor of activity as the reduction of tension. The general schema of activity is described as 'Need-activity-need', in which a homeostatic situation is created.

Activity only takes place to satisfy a need. The Marxian approach of this study would challenge this and see 'need-activity-need' as being dependent on an essence which has fixed qualities realised in action. This describes the reality of the essence of animals. However, man has to become man through the appropriation of the social heritage of society. Man's field of activity is potentially unlimited, and the expanded reproduction of activity is a structural effect coming from the relationship constitutive of human mental processes. This is the reverse of animal psychology, and implies a reversal of 'need-activity-need' into a historical schema of 'activity-need-activity'. This illustrates the historical nature of human needs and their subordinate position in the reproduction of activity. It is not needs which are fundamental but labour. A Marxian approach is based on seeing production, not consumption, as the decisive factor for human beings (43).

Freudianism.

The use by Phenomenological Marxism of a type of psychoanalytic view to develop a method for understanding class consciousness is based on a belief that social science lacks an understanding of human personality. Psychoanalysis was seen as a method to probe the mental depths and reveal the process of isolating and analysing motivating causes of a psychic nature which determine the behaviour of individuals (44). A factor in the spread of psychoanalysis was the fact that sociology and history ignored man's affective life, the gap between desired and proper spheres of life, problems of experienced and latent impulses, and of conflicting motives (45).

Freud's work is seen as providing a solution to these problems by way of what he called "the science of unconscious mental processes", the roots of which lay in a clinical method for treating forms of neurosis (46). However, from 'The Interpretation of Dreams' the purely medical phase of his work ended and it moved into an all-embracing psychological philosophy which sought to account for normal as well as neurotic, and for social as well as individual behaviour (47). Its main theoretical construct is a belief that everything mental is in the first instance unconscious. The 'Id' that "dark, inaccessible part of the personality", is all. It draws its energy from the instincts of the individual (48). This unconscious has no organisation and seeks only satisfaction. It is not subject to space and time forms because the laws of logic do not operate within it (49). Thus, irrationality is an important concept for Freudianism.

The unconscious is not an anatomical entity but a somatic one in which two basic instincts, Eros and Thanatos, interpenetrate to give rise to a whole variegation of phenomena of life (50). For Freud the main dynamic in the behaviour of an individual was played by sexual instincts. He investigated the memories of childhood found through his patients introspection, and believed he had found ineradicable traces in their personality growth of sexual excitation. The child was said to bring an "archaic heritage with him into the world, as a result of the experience of his ancestors". This led to him developing the concept of the Oedipal Complex, which was viewed as a universal law of mental life, and the main content of the unconscious system (51).

It is this concept which is utilised by a number of social scientists to develop understandings of the human personality types who are involved in politics (52). It is based on a belief that political conflict must be comprehensible in the same terms as man's inner conflicts (53). The political activity of individuals is studied to try and discover how repressed impulses and internal conflicts are managed by working them out in a political context. The examination is carried out in terms of oral, anal, phallic-Oedipal, latent and adolescent stages of sexuality, and the effects of external authority during each one of these (54). Particular emphasis is given to feminine influences on the child during the Oedipal phase, and somatic-psychoic traumas which have to be overcome by some type of reassertion of masculinity (55). All the studies utilising this method focus on feelings of rejection, aloneness, and reticence which is sharpened and fixated can lead to a desire for power to compensate for pain in the psyche (56). Further they give a 'reading' to momentary events and paroxysms in order to reveal the play of irrational impulses. (57) The conduct of the individual is seen as the consequence of biological and psychological features, the main fact of which is sexuality.

Freudian Marxism

Attempts have been made to synthesise Marxism and Freudianism. Freudianism is seen as completing the Marxist method by giving the concept of the unconscious as the dialectical opposite of the Marxist consciousness, and so allowing the human personality to be analysed.

An important theorist in this area was Wilhelm Reich, who tried to analyse the roots of authoritarianism, reaction and fascism in Weimar Germany. Reich sought to develop the materialist aspects of Freud's concept of libido by seeking the biological foundations of sexual drives. This led him to claim the discovery of bioenergetic functions, and develop orgasm theory which was said to lay the biological, scientific foundations for psychoanalytic theory. Unlike Freud, Reich believed in the sexual basis for every neurosis. When sexual energy was not released through orgasm stasis set in, giving rise to neurotic mechanisms (58).

These concepts lay behind his effort to trace the social causation of fascism in Germany. Hitler was seen as being successful because his programme "bears a resemblance to the average structure of a broad category of individuals". It was man's authoritarian freedom-fearing structure that enabled his propaganda to take root. Marxism had failed to take into account the social effect of mysticism on the character of the masses. This mysticism drew strength and energy from "compulsory suppression of sexuality" which led to unconscious anxiety which was concealed in traits which seemed asexual (59). It was this unconscious struggle against sexual needs which led to metaphysical and mystical thinking. Thus, notions of homeland and nation in their subjective emotional core are notions of mother and family (60). This led to Reich seeing Fascism as "the expression of the irrational structure of the mass man is orgasmic yearning, restricted by mystic distortions and inhibitions of natural sexuality " (61).

For Reich conscious and unconscious demands of sexual drives and their use and misuse in public life were more important than demands of an economic and materialistic nature in directing human society. So,

"sexual inhibition changes the structure of economically suppressed man in such a way that he acts, feels and thinks contrary to his own material interests" (62).

For change to take place the irrational motivations and cravings for authority by people has to be replaced by new motivations. It is Marcuse who outlines the type of changes needed, "a new sensibility, a vital biological drive for liberation" (63). A new sexual morality is demanded which fights against the material conditions imposed by capitalism. This depends on moral and aesthetic needs becoming basic and vital. The task is to overcome the Oedipus complex on political terms and free individuals libidinally from the "institutional fathers" (64). This would lead to the ascent of Eros over aggression: "It would express the decisive change in the instinctual structure; the weakening of primary aggressiveness" (65).

This view has the dangers of seeing revolt everywhere. It would seem that if only the impediments to the instinctual drives were removed revolt would be widespread. Thus, the fetishism of commodities is dissolving and this can be seen in - "spreading wildcat strikes, in the militant strategy of factory occupations, in the attitudes and demands of young workers Acts of individual and group sabotage are frequent. Absenteeism has reached tremendous proportions."

Instinctual revolt is turning into political rebellion (66).

The moves towards a new sexuality challenge submissiveness to the authoritarian family and so eventually to the authoritarian state.

All those who use Freudian concepts to analyse human mental activities are open to criticisms initially levelled at Freud. Firstly, Freud did not develop a physiological theory of the unconscious to substantiate his method. In this he can be contrasted with Pavlov who reasoned on a physiological basis and tried to explain psychical activity with definite physiological concepts and terms (67). Secondly, and related to the lack of physiological grounding, Freud probed the products of the unconscious only "in translation into the language of consciousness". Thus, the inner dialogue is separated from the bodily organism and from connections with other people. By doing this Freud does not recognise that peoples' utterances may be determined by social situation and so by the sociology of people (68).

Freud defines consciousness in a philosophical way then transfers the contents of this definition to the unconscious. Thus, it might be claimed that the operations of the unconscious are not organic drives, instinctual repressions and inhibitions but-

"a vivid and diverse world where all presentations and images correspond with perfect accuracy to specific referents, where all desires are specifically orientated and all feelings retain their entire wealth of nuance and delicate transitions".

The unconscious in Freud is able to detect all the logical subtleties of thoughts and moral nuances of feelings (69). Yet the method of intra-psychic probing by introspection means it cannot focus on the material composition and material processes of the organism which may form the material basis of character formation. Even if the Freudian emphasis on the sexual instincts is taken as valid for some behaviour in some people, it is still something of a leap from clinically studied cases to inaccessible, politically involved people. It requires huge inferences to use this single hypothesis which focuses on reports of infancy (70). This fundamental concern of Freudianism with verbal utterances and the interpretation of them, means it is dependent on the conscious sphere of the psyche where utterances are constructed. By failing to discover the physiological or social roots of these utterances Freud had to 'project' certain objective relations of the external world into the world of the psyche. This is because it is objective relations which give shape and meaning to utterances. By ignoring these relations Freudianism is accused by Marxian psychologists of not seeing that Freud's unconscious is only an ideologically different expression of the conscious. It is a different level of the conscious, at a greater distance from the dominant ideological assumptions of society. This is an "unofficial consciousness" whose content and composition are conditioned by historical time and class. Hence, the character structure of individuals is influenced by class boundaries. This contrasts with a Freudian position which looks for universal, ahistorical explanations, and so reduces historical reality to anti-historical categories of instinct/...

instinct and ego defence, and so develops concepts of typical personalities which ignores the fact that personalities differ over time and space since the situations which help form them differ (71).

Finally, one might question the view that repressed ideas exist which can re-emerge in an unaltered form at any time. It is not clear how ideas can exist which a person is unaware of, since when ideas are not in the mind they do not exist other than in potential connections, which may or may not be used, depending on external stimuli (72).

Marxian psychologists do not deny that there is an unconscious but they define it differently from Freudians (73). They do not see the relationship between the unconscious and the conscious as only one of repression and inhibition. For Marxians the most outstanding feature of man is consciousness. However, beyond the limits of consciousness is a fund of knowledge and memory accumulated through life activity. The relationship between the conscious and the unconscious is multiform and changing. Both play a part in behaviour, and both are determined by objective circumstances. In their interaction it is consciousness which plays the leading role through its creative activity in thought.

The Marxian approach adopted in this study is one which does not consider it possible to use Freudian concepts for the analysis of the development of consciousness. This is not to say that this Marxian approach has developed an adequate theory of human personality.

However, from the works of Marxian social scientists it is possible to draw out an approach to the development of individual consciousness. This starts by seeing the individual as confronted with objective conditions and social relations which are independent of his will, and to which the individual has to adapt in some way. Each individual through his life experiences becomes personally involved in a particular synthesis of practical social relations which constitute the core of his actual being. It is these relations in which the individual lives, and they constitute his essence. Thus, from the Marxian position adopted here, it is life experiences within social relationships which determine consciousness. To put it crudely, consciousness is the outcome of the individual's living experience from birth onwards. However, this is conditioned by history since consciousness is the outcome of the individual's life experiences, which take place in the context of a particular time and a particular class. Hence, consciousness can be viewed from a Marxian position as the qualitative representation of the individual's total life history in the social environment (74). However, though consciousness is the outcome of life experiences, it cannot be considered to be a mirror reflection of them (75). Rather it may be viewed as an active and selective process of reflection. This would involve a process of great complexity involving a large array of structures and processes, integrated on many different levels and functioning within a highly complex physical and social reality. Not only are these structures complicated, so are the time relationships and sequences of operations (76).

Nevertheless, consciousness functions are organised by environmental experience. The manner in which conscious develops is determined by the interaction between the individual and the social class, or strata of class to which he or she belongs, or to which he lends his or her support. Thus, consciousness can be viewed as a process which goes on continuously, and is geared towards activity. This perspective would allow one to see a constituent of the selection function in consciousness. Everything an individual has learned plays a part in determining how the individual will act in each new situation, how consciousness will be focused by the class or strata interests to which they lend their support, via the mediation of social groups, and so what might be learned (77). Thus, lessons which are agreed with will be remembered more easily since they will fit into a pre-existing structure, and so be more meaningful. While those which are disagreed with will be reactively inhibited by previous learning which is stronger through the reinforcements built up over time(78).

The Marxian position adopted here sees changes in consciousness as coming from changes in the character of the activity the individual is involved in as the member of a social group.

From this position, the most vital component for producing new senses, and meanings in consciousness, is the introduction of the element of struggle into activity, so that relationships the individual is involved in have some of the opaqueness removed (79).

Without a necessary level of struggle the individual is able to accept what he or she perceives him or herself to be, since he or she faces no challenges to reassess his or her perceptions by any activities he or she is engaged in. Without the presence of struggles, the individual has no stimulus to examine the type of person he or she is, or to reassess the events around which he or she has defined him or herself in the past.

From this Marxian position, when consciousness seems unchanged it is because the individual is subject to the same basic social forces and engaged in the same type of social relations. So the individual's consciousness is determined along the same general lines (80). It is struggle which provides a creative element in activity which can lead to growth, development and change in the process of consciousness. However, the element of struggle can only give the potential for transformations in consciousness. In struggle a person can learn of the progressive interrelation and interdependence of workers, or continue to observe only the surface social phenomena of conflicts, depending on the awareness and the possibilities seen (81).

It is here that a Marxian position introduces the concept of an external social agency which helps the development of the individual and class consciousness. This is an organisation which seeks to represent what it believes to be the interests of the working class, and to voice and fight for these interests on the basis of some variant of Marxism which provides strategic tasks and means.

When this type of agency is absent some Marxian social scientists believe it is difficult for an individual worker to combine in his or her consciousness the struggle for his or her interests with opposition to the social system.

This is because it is believed that what is spontaneously produced by workers in struggle in the sphere of production in terms of consciousness, can also be spontaneously worn away. Of course, the existence of such an agency is not a sufficient factor for fundamental change. This requires the maturation of objective circumstances which make such a change possible, though not inevitable.

However, the existence of such an outside agency, and its functioning to try and generalise the four components of class consciousness listed above does allow dialogues to take place in which some workers can hear alternative political perspectives.

Class Consciousness

In the work of Volosinov there is a possible explanation of the links between individual self-consciousness and class consciousness. He points out that self-awareness means looking at oneself through the eyes of representatives of social groups belonged to.

Since one of the groups is social class self-consciousness can eventually lead to class consciousness, "the reflection and specification of which it is in all its fundamental and essential respects". This link is based on the assertion that an individual is born into an objective class position which determines his or her position in social relations.

The 'psychological individual' is also a 'class individual' involved in an objective process which determines his or her structural position (82).

However, not every worker has class consciousness in a Marxian sense.

It is not an attribute they are born with, but a variable process which has to be 'learned' by each individual worker, and each new generation of workers through their entry into the particular processes of production existing in each workplace, and the formal and informal relations between workers and others they come into contact with (83). It is on the basis of their position in the relations of production, and the conflicts which arise on this basis that class identity and class opposition develop. The visible expression of this is the existence of trade unions, shop steward, the fight for basic economic and political rights, strikes, and a range of other activities and organisation. Through the extent and development of these particular organisations and their practices one can gauge the expressions of the consciousness of the workers in a particular factory in a crude way.

In the absence of a full discussion of the meanings of the specific contents and forms of consciousness one can consider the dichotomy outlined in Marxian writings of 'trade union consciousness' and 'Socialist consciousness'. While doing this the criticism of Marxian typification given above must be noted since it could be considered that 'Socialist consciousness' is an ideal type which allows the characterisation of other forms of workers consciousness as in various ways bourgeois contaminated, and so results in an over-reduction in complexity.

A restricted form of trade union consciousness is described in a number of empirical works, where the perspective of identity and opposition are confined by the walls of the workshop and factory.

Its contents seem to include a crude discontent with their position, senses of 'justice' and 'fairness' which form the commonsense assumptions of workers. These assumptions reflect aspects of the experience of workers and are assimilated in a relative way through a prism of working class experience (84). Thus, they have a class bias however limited since this experience has antagonism and struggle at its core. This means elements in consciousness are developed which are continuous reminders of the position of the working class in the factory, and in society.

Trade union consciousness, according to Marxian social scientists, has as part of its contents a conviction of the need to combine in unions to oppose employers, and to compel the Government to pass legislation to the benefit of the working class within the confines of the existing system. Bottomore defines this form of consciousness as one which sees society as being divided between 'us' and 'them', which stresses the importance of labour in creating value, and has a sense of belonging to a community of workers (85). This is the way in which it expresses the identity and opposition of one class to another. It also has a conception of the capacity of the class which limits it to certain types of organisations and struggles, which Marxians believe do not challenge the assumptions underlying the continued operation of the system. This trade union consciousness is viewed as an embryonic form of class consciousness by Marxians. It has anti-capitalist tendencies, but the influence of bourgeois ideology confines it to elemental forms of opposition and awareness. The contradiction between 'us' and 'them' are seen at the factory level, but not at the general level of society since class interest is not fully grasped.

The development of 'trade union consciousness' to 'Socialist consciousness' requires that some understanding of the totality of class determination of life is attained. This means it gains some awareness of its status and conditions of existence, its relationship to other classes, and its 'mission' in history. Since Socialist consciousness develops from struggles at the level of class conflict against the State, and from struggles at the level of ideology it also involves an understanding of the need for political class struggle, an awareness of the nature of the State and a strategic comprehension of how to realise the working class objective interests. Its conception of the political capacity of the class is one which sees it as able to run industry and society by reconstructing them on new values based on the class's objective interests. It is a form of consciousness which involves a development of ideological clarity and a freedom from the catch-phrases of the dominant assumptions.

It would seem that one should differentiate of the levels of existence of Socialist consciousness, since it would seem likely that the degree of development of ideological clarity would vary. Since Marxism is an ideology, the workers awareness of its theoretical propositions will vary in there completeness and interconnection, and this will partly define the degree of development of Socialist consciousness.

Socialist consciousness cannot be imposed on the ideas and actions of workers rather it depends on the political atmosphere, the scope of the class struggle, the alignment of class forces, the influence of Marxist ideology, the scope of trade union and political/ . . .

political struggles and their acuteness, the actions of the outside social agency, and a number of other political and ideological prerequisites. When it has been assimilated it leads to new commitments, a different approach to life, and to new modes of thought and action. As a development growing out of new conditions it involves complicated reactions by individuals and is continually subject to doubts and subterfuges, and ideological 'contaminations' which can result in the retrogression of class consciousness (86). Its assimilation leads to new contents being given to class identity and class opposition. This means it is not just a quantitative addition of new contents on top of trade union consciousness. Rather it is a qualitative new development requiring a re-definition of contents in consciousness in relation to the external world so that a new synthesis is formed.

Though Marxian social scientists can discuss the movement between one form of consciousness and another, and to outline the contents of consciousness, they are unable to define in any detail what caused developments to take place in a particular individuals consciousness. This is because Marxian social science has no formula for the development of the individual's class consciousness. It cannot explain why one worker develops a Socialist consciousness rather than another one. This is because it is unable to understand or fully determine the events leading to the individual making conscious decisions. In a sense this is because Marxian social scientists are dealing with a creative issue in which every decision made is a new decision, unprecedented in some degree (87).

Nevertheless they have produced some accounts of the adoption of Socialist ideologies of various forms by working people. These have tended to stress the sociological and historical factors which have influenced the conversion to Socialistic convictions. They show how changes in the social structure produces strains which cause a state of dissatisfaction among certain strata of the working people (88). This dissatisfaction has as a component the break down of accustomed ways of relating what seems to be in society and what is. In terms of ideology the inherited modes of ordering experiences become ambiguous as alternative interpretations become possible. The changes incline groups to examine ideologies which are congruent with their traditional forms of actions over discontents, and which stress their dignity, equality and worth as compared to other groups. It can be assumed that the political allegiances are partly determined by the cultural formations people live in.

The point can be made that some working people have always in some way reacted against exploitation and oppression. One way in which this revolt was articulated in the past has been in forms of religious organisation and ideas. This has to be seen in the context of the virtual monopoly religious concepts had in forming and communicating ideas among people. The various 'protestant' upsurges can be viewed as attacking the ideological frameworks which held feudal society together. These upsurges expressed the "revolutionary opposition to feudalism", and religious mysticism and heresy served as "politico-religious ideas" in the struggle to restore a perceived Christian equality and the Kingdom of God on earth.

Millennial communism was preached by some of these heresays, and Christian phraseology provided a form of expression (89). Research shows that the people most likely to adopt a heretical position were those with a high level of social and economic insecurity at a time of religious and political upheavels (90). It would seem at these times that perceived deprivation and frustrations of expectations lead to a combination of despair and hope which results in the rejection and adaption of ideas as old answers no longer work. It was at these times of crisis that the relative passivity of people and their willingness to put up with certain levels of injustice is challenged by certain individuals (91). Whether it becomes a mass movement depends on whether social factors are moving in a way to support new ideologies and so can unite individual aspirations and redefine peoples consciousness. For religious heretics, like Calvinist sectarians, this redefinition of consciousness took the form of a belief in justification by inner conviction, which provided a self liberation and anti-traditionalism. It was given strength in the face of isolation by membership of a sectarian connection which could satisfy two needs: (1) it assured salvation by being a member of the 'elect', and (2) it offered solidarity against a hostile world (92).

However, in Britain the numbers taking this position have always been a small minority. They have only rarely connected with the mass of the population in struggles to challenge the system. Even empirical studies are unable to explain why it is that only certain people adopt anti-system ideologies when many others who had similar experiences do not (93).

This is because it is not clear which acts of an individual lead to returns in the form of psychological results. Though, as Foster points out, understanding the development of consciousness may best be gained by referring to incidents in an individual's life that were likely to have a bearing upon their politics (94). In this way the individual's motives flowing from personal characteristics and history can partly be seen.

Freudianism has proven to be a popular method for examining the intellectual development of political leaders. The opposition to this method has already been outlined. Among social scientists who have studied the process of becoming radical a number of factors have been suggested to be at work. Almond believed they were casualties of the acculturation and socialisation process (95). Though Horn and Knott while finding a lack of adaption suggests this does not imply a mental imbalance since they found radicals to be high in self-respect, self-sufficiency and concern for others, and low in ethnocentricity, passiveness and dependence (96).

For the actual process of becoming a radical Barker suggests three developmental routes towards Socialistic forms of consciousness: (1) a dramatic and sudden conversion, (2) long conditioning, (3) influenced by some charismatic individuals (97). MacInnes attempts to outline the situational aspects of someone joining an organisation which could be viewed as representing a form of Socialist consciousness: (1) a political choice via local problems, (2) an 'existential' choice of conforming with the milieu the individual is embedded in, (3) an ideological choice in the sense of agreeing with a party programme (98).

What this suggests is that people undergo development. It is difficult to reconstruct their psychological states. Ideas have their own import and meaning independent of what their creators may think. Thus, people can have a series of complex and contradictory positions. They are not manipulated by anonymous social and economic forces. Rather, people are affected only in so far as they want to be. This study will attempt to look at some of the reasons that class consciousness has developed differently among individuals. Before doing that it will try to specify the contents of forms of class consciousness by analysing and discussing the response of Shop Stewards to questions designed to measure levels of class consciousness. Despite the difficulties in saying what class consciousness is in a definitive sense Marxian theory allows one to make certain assertions about the concept which makes the aims outlined above realisable. To put it at its crudest, the Marxian view of class consciousness adopted here focuses on the nature of solidarity shown by workers. This is because an understanding of the interests of the class leads to the fullest development of class solidarity, since it is realised that this is required to change society. It is how far this understanding has developed that the questionnaire sought to probe. This means accepting that in answering the questions the shop stewards gave their true judgements, and so showed how things appeared to them, and what they had done in response. Though as Miliband points out this does not mean one must accept their class consciousness as fixed or irreversible. Rather it is to see it as process of understanding with uncertainties, tensions, contradictions, errors etc.

(99)

Class identity and class oppositon can be considered to lead to certain forms of solidarity and ideological frameworks to justify these forms. In this study the questions were designed to probe the class identity and opposition by considering a number of indicators of different types of solidarity. These can be outlined:-

- (i) Solidarity towards other unions in their factory when they are in dispute, and if this is formalised in a Joint Shop Stewards Committee. Also, how far they are willing to enforce union membership by a closed shop and challenge the ideology of freedom of choice.
- (ii) Solidarity given to workers in other factories when they are in dispute.
- (iii) Solidarity actions with public service workers and the unemployed, and their participation in token strikes and demonstrations.
- (iv) Political solidarity: how do they define the Labour and Conservative Parties, and what interests they serve?
- (v) Solidarity actions with foreign workers showing an awareness of common class interest across nations.
- (vi) Ideological solidarity showing a strategic awareness and an alternative ideological framework. This would involve a revolutionary perspective toward change. It would manifest itself in support for a range of policies to change the balance of wealth and power, bring about workers control of industry and achieve Socialism in Britain.

(vi) cont.,

Thus, it would involve having some idea of the ultimate end of the workers' movement.

It can be seen that the indicators of the nature of solidarity are not defined in specificity. As was said earlier in this Chapter, one cannot have fixed views on the nature of class consciousness (100). This is because new events open up new dimensions and possibilities. The most one can say is that Socialist consciousness is a conviction formed in constant struggle against the existing order. This conviction involves political viewpoints, a code of ethics, moral priorities and strategic awareness (101). The main underlying basis of this connection is the need to develop a unity of the working class to achieve its objective interests (102). This is the basis for differentiating the different types of consciousness. The first five are limited in their scope since they develop out of the economic struggles of workers. It is in these struggles that the possibility of unity is seen (103). It is the ideological solidarity which is shown by the Stewards which shows their faith in the potential unity of the working class to bring about desired effects.

It can be assumed that, generally, solidarity is harder to give as it proceeds from one to six. This is because the recipients of the solidarity are less visibly connected to the givers' needs and interests. Thus, it is easier to see the opposition to employers at an enterprise level, and the need for unity of workers than it is at a general level.

Each of the six types of solidarity as one goes up the hierarchy presented requires seeing more interconnection of workers and their unity having more depth. Ideological solidarity depends on seeing the world as unjust and exploitative, with a need to give the firmest solidarity to fellow victims (104). It can be considered to require an abstract understanding of the class identity of workers and their common interests. Thus, in the stewards' answers one is looking for the presence of a perspective which shows an ideological commitment to change. One is looking for answers which show an acceptance of the need for solidarity amongst workers so as to unify them against employers. A method used in other studies will also be utilised.

The researcher will seek to assess the level of class cognition (use of class terms and awareness), and class evaluation (seeing the class struggle as the method for making gains) which the shop stewards articulate in their answers to questions (105).

An 'aid' to class cognition and class evaluation judgements will come from an analysis of the election addresses of those who stood for full time office in the A.E.U. and A.U.E.W. (E.S.) in the post-war period. In these addresses candidates attempt to connect their ideological positions with their potential constituency through giving their views on subjects which are being debated in the Union. The importance of these addresses is that they draw out the key definitions and themes which help constitute the contents of consciousness. This will be dealt with in more detail in a following Chapter.

The hypotheses the study will seek to 'test' about the development of class consciousness can be considered. They are concerned with the determinations of the attitudes and behaviour of the shop stewards by certain experiences.

- (i) the ideological conditioning by the family and workmates;
- (ii) opportunities for social mobility;
- (iii) effects of some elements of the class struggle;
- (iv) the political generation belonged to;
- (v) the size of the factory worked in

These areas were chosen to investigate because they are often held to be important determinants of class consciousness by social scientists. As has been said previously British society has not often seen the emergence of Socialist class consciousness. Rather it has been confined to small groups. From this one might draw a conclusion that certain social pressures are needed to encourage individuals to become Socialists. Of course, it is not possible to make cause-effect relations concerning class consciousness since the same conditions can give rise to very different forms of consciousness. Nevertheless one can suggest that certain conditions are more likely to lead to the development of Socialist consciousness. Thus, one might suggest that those who say they came from homes where left wing politics were discussed would be more conditioned towards Socialism. They would not view it as deviant or unusual but have learned to see it as fairly natural (106). Secondly, it has often been suggested that social mobility dissipates radicalism by removing the causes of discontent (107).

It has also been suggested that the 'political generation' belonged to is important since it means that particular socio-economic pressures were at work on individuals. These bias the individuals in certain attitudes (108). Fourthly, it has been claimed that the particular social relations existing in certain types of large factories encourage a radicalisation of the workers in these factories. They become fortresses of Socialism (109). Fifthly, the main Marxian suggestion for the development of consciousness has been to see it as coming from constant struggle against the existing order by class organisations. It is the shared experience of the class struggle which shows the possibility of unity, and if certain conditions are met, leads to the development of Socialist consciousness (110). It is around the certain conditions that many qualifications to the development of consciousness are found in Marxian writings. This might lead to accusations of Marxian social scientists placing their bets each way. Thus, it is not all struggles but only those which have a political content; in addition, an organisation of some kind has to be there to help reveal to workers the nature of the situation, and so on.

The investigation of the 'measures' of class consciousness and the 'testing' of them will be the substance of this study. On this basis it will examine some possible 'causes' for the development of class consciousness in a Socialist form.

NOTES

1. See N. Poulantzas, 'Classes in Contemporary Capitalism', New Left Books, London, 1974, pp 18-20.
2. See the debate in A. Hunt, ed. 'Class and Class Structure', Lawrence and Wishart, 1977. between N. Poulantzas, B. Hindess, A. Hunt and S. Hall on this, and related issues.
3. For discussions of the concept of interest see I.D. Balbus, 'The Concept of Interest in Marxist and Pluralist Analysis', Politics and Society, Vol. 1, 1971; W.E. Connolly 'On "Interest" in Politics', Politics and Society, Vol. II, 1972; G. Wall, 'The Concept of Interest in Politics', Politics and Society, Volume V, 1975. For the importance of seeing these interests see B. Ollman, 'Towards Class Consciousness' Politics and Society, Vol. II, 1972; A. Schaff, 'The Consciousness of the Class and Class Consciousness', Philosophical Forum, Vol. 3, 1971-72.
4. For example, see B. Hindess, 'Economic Class and Politics' in A. Hunt, ed, ibid.
5. V.L. Allen, 'Contemporary Capitalism and Revolutionary Change', Marxism Today, Vol. 16, 1972, p.151.
6. M. Mann, 'Consciousness and Action Among the Western Working Class', MacMillan, London, 1973, p.12.
7. See A. Gramsci, 'Soviets in Italy', Spokesman, 1974.
8. Poulantzas, ibid, pp. 15-16.
9. S. Lewis, 'Class Consciousness and Saliency of Class', Sociology and Social Researcher, Vol. 49, 1964-65, pp. 175-6.

NOTES

10. Talcott Parsons, 'Essays in Sociological Theory', MacMillan, New York, 1964, p.323.
11. J.E.T. Eldridge, 'Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality', Michael Joseph, London, 1971, p.88;
R.T. Morris and R.J. Murphy, 'A Paradigm for the study of Class Consciousness', Sociology and Social Researcher, Vol. 50, 1965-66, p.297.
12. Poulantzas, *ibid*, p.15.
13. Eldridge, *ibid*, pp 86-7.
14. C.W. Mills and H.H. Gerth, 'From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology', Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1967, pp. 181-3.
15. G.B. Sharp, 'Mills and Weber: Formalism and the Analysis of Social Structure', Science and Society, Vol. 24, 1960, p.127.
16. This analysis of hierarchy can be seen in, e.g. J. Goldthorpe et al, 'The Affluent Worker', Cambridge University Press, 1968. For a Marxian critique of this see J. Westergaard, 'The Rediscovery of the Cash Nexus', The Socialist Register, 1970.
17. Eldridge, *ibid*, pp 91-2.
18. Mills and Gerth, *ibid*, p.193.
19. Poulantzas. *ibid*, p.24.
20. Sharp, *ibid*, p.129.
21. Mills and Gerth, *ibid*, p.183.

NOTES

22. Poulantzas, *ibid*, p.15.
23. J. Foster, 'Class Struggle in the Industrial Revolution', Methuen, London, 1977, p.5.
24. M. Weber, 'Basic Concepts in Sociology', Peter Owen, London, 1962, pp 14-15; P. Honingsheim, 'On Max Weber', MacMillan, New York, 1968, pp 115, 120-1.
25. P.Q. Hirst, 'Social Evaluation and Sociological Categories', Allen and Unwin, London, 1976, pp 66-67.
26. E. Husserl, 'The Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness', Indiana University Press, 1964.
27. H.R. Wagner, 'The Scope of Phenomenological Sociology', in G. Psathas, ed., 'Phenomenological Sociology', Wiley, New York, 1973, pp. 61-3.
28. G. Psathas, *ibid*, Introduction; P. Lassrhan, 'Phenomenological Perspectives in Sociology', in J. Rex, editor, 'Approaches to Sociology' Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1974.
29. Wagner, *ibid*, pp 65-69.
30. Lassman, *ibid*, p.132.
31. Wagner, *ibid*, pp 69-70.
32. R. Ingarden, 'On the Motives which led Husserl to Transcendental Idealism', Nijhoff, The Hague, 1975, pp. 34-38.
33. D. Binns, 'Beyond the Sociology of Conflict', MacMillan, London, 1977, p.60.

NOTES

34. Ibid, pp 61-62; Lassman, *ibid*, pp 128-130.
35. See F. Dallymayr, 'Phenomenology and Marxism', in Psathas, editor, pp 308-9.
36. Ibid, pp 331-2.
37. Ibid; see, too, D.M. Levin, 'Reason and Evidence in Husserl's Phenomenology', Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1970, Chapters 4 and 5.
38. Wagner, *ibid*, pp 77-81. See, too, R. Jehenson, 'A Phenomenological Approach to the Study of Formal Organisations', in Psathas, ed. *ibid*.
39. Dallymayr, *ibid*, pp 333-6. For an example of this see S. Aronowitz. 'False Promises', McGraw-Hill, 1973, p.413.
40. See, for example, H. Marcuse, 'An Essay on Liberation', Penguin, London, 1972, pp 17-19, and 'Liberation from the Affluent Society', in D. Cooper, editor, 'The Dialectics of Liberation', Penguin, London, 1971, p.183, and 'Counterrevolution and Revolt', Allen Lane, London, 1972, pp 17, 51, 71.
41. Marcuse, 'Liberation', *ibid*, pp 187-8; 'Essay', *ibid*, p.57, 'One Dimensional Man', Abacus, London, 1972, pp 17-19. While Aronovitz, *ibid*, uses W. Reich's model of class consciousness in 'What is Class Consciousness', Socialist Reproductions, London, 1971.
42. Dallymayr, *ibid*, p.336; also J.J. Wiatr, 'Herbert Marcuse Philosopher of a Lost Radicalism', Science and Society, Volume 34, 1970, pp 322-3.

NOTES

43. L. Seve, 'Marxism and the Theory of Human Personality', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1975, pp 48-9, and B. Ollman, 'Alienation: Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society', C.U.P. 1971.
44. W. Hoffer, 'Psychoanalysis: Practical and Research Aspects', Williams and Williams, Baltimore, 1955, and R. Schaffer, 'The Psycho-Analytic Life History', U.C. London, 1975, p.5.
45. V. Salov, 'Psychoanalysis and History', Social Sciences, 1974, p. 179.
46. S. Freud, 'An Autobiographical Study', Hogarth Press, London, 1950, p.129 26-55, see, too, 'New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis', Penguin, London, 1973, p.187.
47. S. Freud, 'On the History of the Psycho Analytic Movement', Works, Volume XIV, p.26.
48. 'New Introductory Lectures', *ibid*, pp 105-6.
49. *Ibid*.
50. S. Freud, 'An Outline of Psycho-Analysis', Hogarth Press, London, 1949, pp 5-7. For a tracing of the development of Freud's ideas on this theme see M. Jahoda, 'Freud and the Dilemmas of Psychology', Hogarth Press, London, 1977, pp 59-60.
51. 'Autobiographical Study', *ibid*, pp 61, 102, 110; 'An Outline of Psycho-Analysis, *ibid*, p 28; 'The Future of an Illusion', Hogarth Press, London, 1949, pp 17-18.

NOTES

52. For example, see L.J. Edinger, 'Kurt Schumacher', Stanford University Press, 1965; E.V. Wolfenstein, 'The Revolutionary Personality', Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1967; R. Tucker, 'Stalin' Penguin, London; O. Mannoni, 'Prospero and Caliban', Methuen, London, 1956; R. Terchek, 'The Psychoanalytic Basis of Ghandi's Politics', Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 62, 1975-76; R. Endleman, 'Oedipal Elements in Student Rebellions', Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 57, 1970-71, E.H. Erikson, 'Identity and the Life Cycle', Psychological Issues, Vol. 1, 1959.
53. Edinger, *ibid*, p.296, and Mannoni, *ibid*, p.126.
54. Wolfenstein, *ibid*, pp 303-8.
55. *Ibid*; Edinger, *ibid*, p.10; Endleman, *ibid*, pp 455-69.
56. Edinger, *ibid*, p.296; Mannoni, *ibid*, pp 135-6; Terchek, *ibid*, p.225.
57. 'An Outline of Psychoanalysis', *ibid*, p.28, outlines the need to understand linguistic symbolism in dreams. See, too, L. Althusser, 'Lenin and Philosophy', New Left Books, London, 1971, pp 191-3.
58. See I. Ollendorff Reich, 'Wilhelm Reich', Elek, London, 1969, pp 9-13.
59. W. Reich, 'The Mass Psychology of Fascism', Souvenir and Academic, 1972, pp 35-40.
60. *Ibid*, p.57.

NOTES

61. Ibid, p XX-XXI.
62. Ibid,
63. Marcuse, 'Liberation', ibid, p 183.
64. 'Counterrevolution and Revolt', ibid, p 51.
65. Ibid, p 75; 'Essay', ibid, p 20.
66. 'Counterrevolution and Revolt', ibid, p 21.
67. See H.K. Wells, 'Sigmund Freud: A Pavlovian Critique'; Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1960, and F.H. Bartlett, 'Pavlov and Freud', Science and Society, Vol. 25, 1961, carry out comparisons and explanations.
68. V.N. Volosinov, 'Freudianism: A Marxist Analysis', Academic Press, New York, 1976, p 34.
69. 'An Outline of Psycho-Analysis', ibid, pp 19, 78-9.
See, too, Z. Behr, 'Consciousness and Practice in Rational Psychotherapy', Science and Society, Vol. XVII, 1953, p 208.
70. A. Starr, 'Psychoanalysis and the Fiction of the Unconscious', Science and Society, Vol. XV, 1951, pp 136-9 discusses the implications of accepting a Freudian unconscious.
71. Volosinov, ibid, pp 77-8.
72. Wells, ibid, pp 96 - 100.
73. See S. Cohen, R. Johnston, R. West, 'Marxist Psychology in America: A Critique', Science and Society, Vol. XXI, 1957, pp 101-8 discuss this.

NOTES

74. Z. Behr, 'Principles of Rational Psychotherapy', Science and Society, Vol. XVI, 1951-52, pp 300-5.
75. Cohen, Johnston, West, *ibid*, pp 113-5.
76. J.B. Furst, 'The Relationship of Form and Content in Psychiatric Thought', Science and Society, Vol. XXXII, 1968, p.358.
77. M. Lane, 'The Conscious and the Unconscious in Human Behaviour', Science and Society, Vol. XV, 1951, pp 308-10.
78. Cohen, Johnston, West, *ibid*, p.109.
79. Behr, 'Consciousness', *ibid*, pp 203-5.
80. Starr, *ibid*, p.143.
81. Lane, *ibid*, p.311.
82. Volosinov, *ibid*, pp 86-7.
83. M.A. Coulson and D. Riddell, 'Approaching Sociology', Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970, p.91.
84. See H. Beynon, 'Working for Ford', Penguin, 1973, for a study of factory consciousness. For the U.S. see H. and R.A.H. Rosen, 'The Union Member Speaks', Prentice Hall, New York, 1955.
85. T. Bottomore, 'Socialism and the Working Class', in 'The Socialist Idea', editors, L. Kolakowski and S. Hampshire, Weidenfield and Nicolson, London, 1974, p.125.
86. See G. Hicks, 'The Great Tradition', International Publishers, New York, 1935, pp 310-20.

87. J. Lindsay, 'After the Thirties', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1956, p.183.
88. See, for example, the studies by T. Judt 'The Origins of Rural Socialism in Europe' Social History, Vol.1, 1976, and D. Lane, 'The Roots of Russian Communism', Robertson, 1975.
89. See F. Engels, 'The Peasant War in Germany', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1969, and C. Hill, 'The World Turned Upside Down', Penguin, London, 1975.
90. M. Robinson, 'Islam and Capitalism', Penguin, 1974, p.186 and G. Steadman-Jones, 'The Originality of Engels', New Left Review, 106, 1977, p.87.
91. E. Hobsbawm, 'Revolutionaries', Weidenfeild and Nicolson, 1973, pp 247 - 8.
92. See B.S. Capp, 'The Fifth Monarch Men', Faber and Faber, London, p.94.
93. Capp, *ibid*, pp 97-8.
94. J. Foster, 'Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution', Methuen, 1974, pp 131-40.
95. G. Almond, 'The Appeals of Communism', Princeton, 1954, p. 394.
96. J.L. Horn and P.D. Knott, 'Activist Youth in the 1960s', Science, Vol. 171, 1977, p. 982. While J. Mitchell, 'The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist' Marxism Today, Vol. 5, 1961, believes radicals have the same qualities as other "decent workers" only more developed.

NOTES

97. D.N. Barker, 'Two Paths to Socialism', Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 11, 1976, pp 107-23.
98. N. McInnes, 'The Communist Parties of Western Europe', O.U.P. 1975, p.85.
99. R. Miliband, 'Marxism and Politics', O.U.P. Oxford, 1977, pp 35-6.
100. Ibid, p.35.
101. See N. Harris, 'Beliefs in Society', Penguin, London, 1971, p.236.
102. K. Marx, 'The Poverty of Philosophy', International Publishers, New York, n.d., p.189.
103. V.I. Lenin, 'What is to be done', Progress Moscow, 1975.
104. T. Lane, 'The Union Makes Us Strong', Arrow, London, 1974, pp 174-6, for a discussion of the difficulties in giving solidarity in different situations.
105. See J.C. Legget, 'Class, Race and Labour', O.U.P. London, 1973, p.39, and H.I. Safa 'Class Consciousness Among Working Class Women in Latin America', Politics and Society, Volume 5, 1975, p.379.
106. Almond, ibid, p.222; and D.T. Denver and J.M. Bochel, 'The Political Socialisation of Activists of the British Communist Party', British Journal of Political Science, 1972, Vol. 3, pp 57, 64.

NOTES

107. R.F. Hamilton, 'Affluence and the French Worker in the IV Republic', Princeton, 1967, pp 77-91, discusses attitudes towards mobility.
108. See D. Butler and D. Stokes, 'Political Change in Britain', Penguin, 1973, pp 322-34.
109. R. Urbany, 'Communists in the Factories', World Marxist Review, 1975, Vol. 18, pp. 10-11. See, too, G.K. Ingham, 'Size of the Industrial Organisation and Worker Behaviour', C.U.P. 1970, Chapter 2, for a discussion of this type of theory.
110. See Lane, *ibid*; R. Hyman, 'Strikes', Fontana, London, 1972, Chapter 3.

Chapter Two: The Characteristics of Engineering Shop Stewards on Clydeside.

The purpose of this Chapter is to outline the basic sociological aspects of the shop stewards and their motivations. The shop steward is the representative of the District Committee of the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section) in the workplaces. Officially he or she is appointed by the District Committee, or if elected by the members is subject to the approval of the Committee. It is the District Committee, with the approval of the Executive Council which defines the powers and duties of the shop stewards (1).

The Rule Book outlines them as:-

- (1) Examine and sign at least once a quarter the contribution cards of all members.
- (2) Use every endeavour to see that all men starting are duly qualified trade unionists.
- (3) Ensure all persons are receiving the approved rates and complying with the practices of the shop and district, and for these purposes to examine cards and pay tickets.
- (4) Report to the District Committee any cases in which the position is not satisfactory, and cannot be adjusted within the shop (2).

These rules have remained virtually unchanged since the formal introduction of the position of shop stewards in 1896. In practice they have been developed and extended by the functioning of shop stewards in free collective bargaining situations. This extension varies from District to District, and from factory to factory (3). The formal rules can be seen to be concerned with the development of certain attitudes and practices in the workshop.

These are linked to the needs of workers in their relationship with employers and focus around the development of the social cohesiveness of engineers. The formal rules are concerned with the organisation of the workers initially into the Union, then to make sure they maintain this membership and do not undercut each others 'selling price'. If any anomalies or difficulties do arise which the shop stewards cannot handle through utilising the solidarity developed in the workshop then the Steward can turn to the wider solidarity of the Union. (How far this is done will be examined in Chapter Four) In addition it can be seen that the Rules of the Union have implicit in them concerns with fairness and justice for the members in their relations with one another.

The formal Rules of the Union focus on the shop steward as the main communicator between the extra-workshop Union and the intra-workplace Union. He or she is also the main communicator within the workshop between workers and management.

It is obvious that the extension of these formal rules will depend to some extent on the motivations of the shop stewards which have been developed by environmental pressures. It is possible to examine some of the factors which compose this environment.

The Background of Shop Stewards.

The shop stewards in this sample belong to a Union which recruits amongst sections of the working class who either possess specific skills or work in the Engineering Industries. They are members of the manual working class in present day Clydeside. In addition the vast majority of them come from families that have belonged to the working class for generations.

Thus, only 9 had fathers who were not manual workers, and only 10 grandfathers.

From this it would appear that the main change has been in the total number with some type of skill. The shop stewards in the sample remembered 33 of their grandfathers and 60 of their fathers having a skill, while 84 of them were skilled.

Table 1 Engineering Trades of Shop Stewards in the sample:-

Fitter	46
Turner	15
Mechanical Engineer	11
Toolmaker	8
Other Skilled Engineers	4

It can be seen that 'Fitters' make up more than half of those who had a skill, and nearly half the sample. These mens' jobs involve joining pieces of metal of varying sizes, shapes and material into a working mechanism, or to dismantle a mechanism.

'Turners' were the next most numerous group and their job involves the removal of the metal from the outside diameter of a workpiece to obtain one or more finished diameters. The 'Toolmaker's' job involves a versatility in order to produce a variety of tools and gauges, often of a specialised and detailed type. The definition of 'Mechanical Engineers' is hard to give since it was not clear from the interviews what they specifically did. The 'Other Skills' include highly specific skills such as aircraft maintenance (4).

It can be assumed that Table 1 gives a picture of the degree of skill required by each trade. That is, fitters require less than turners, who require less than mechanical engineers, and so on.

One problem that has to be faced here is that there have been changes in the processes in engineering which can devalue skills. To make a fuller assessment one would have to know such details as, what proportions are working on central lathes or on production lines. Unfortunately this information is not available.

Another factor in the stewards backgrounds is the area they were brought up in and which introduced them to the network of social relations in society through connections of family, locality, friendship, patronage, etc., which helped socialise and so helped them develop certain sets of value systems containing attitudes of an ethical nature and moral anticipations of behaviour (5). The areas that they were brought up in reads as the names of traditional Clydeside inner city working class housing aggregations built around aggregations of factories connected to Shipbuilding and Heavy Engineering Industrial practices.

Of course the political atmosphere of these areas varied as can be seen in the election returns for Parliamentary Elections in the pre 1945 period. Most of the areas the stewards were brought up in e.g. Shettleston, Tollcross, Camlachie, Springburn, Maryhill, Govan, were areas which returned Labour or Independent Labour Party M.Ps. Paisley was a Liberal town until 1945, while the rest of Renfrewshire was usually Conservative.

The areas the shop stewards now live in are away from the old centres of industry and trade unionism, in new council house schemes and new towns.

These houses were built to meet the needs of the growing population. Thus, nearly half the sample lived in these new areas:

Table 2 Numbers living in New Housing Areas

<u>Glasgow</u>	Wasterhouse	2
	Summerston	2
	Hutchiesontown	4
	Nitshill	7
	Drumchapel	3
	Castlemilk	2
	Penilee	2
<u>Paisley</u>	Foxbar	6
	Glenburn	2
<u>Barrhead</u>	Auchenbach	8
<u>Renfrew</u>	Arkleston	4
<u>New Towns</u>		3

This dispersion of the working class to new areas has been found to lead to a growth in individualised aspirations for consumer goods combined with a lack of community spirit. Though it should be pointed out that it has lead to a more solid labour vote in Clydeside (6). However, there has been a tendency for the vote to fluctuate at local elections, and to be eaten into by Nationalists at General Elections. In addition it has meant that solidarity has been confined to the shop floor. It is only there that they now meet, and there is no reinforcing by extra-factory common cultural organisations.

Another factor which forms the environment of the shop stewards is their education (7). All but 5 of the stewards left school when the law made it possible for them to do so.

The attitude to school can be shown by their answers to the question, 'Did you want to leave school when you did?'

Table 3 Attitude to leaving School

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Wanted to leave	69	16	53
Had to leave	6	3	3
Wanted to stay on	14	4	10
Stayed on	5	2	3

It can be seen that there is little difference in the proportion who 'wanted to leave' between Communists and Non-Communists. The main factor in the shop stewards leaving school when they did, was the lack of financial provision for further study. Thus Davie Wilson, 58, Communist, working in a Foundry said:-

"We were a working class family and all you wanted was work. My father was idle all during the Depression."

While Robert Brown, 47, maintenance in a Rope Works said:-

"I had great plans for myself but finances were just terrible. There were 10 of us."

The shop stewards were next asked if they regretted leaving school when they did. This gave the following distribution:

Table 4 Regretted leaving School or not

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Regretted leaving	42	11	31
Did not regret leaving	58	14	44

Once again the proportion of Communists and Non-Communists who 'regretted leaving' were the same.

For those who did regret it, the main factor was their desire for a better education. It can be seen that the majority 'did not regret' leaving. Why they did not regret leaving can be illustrated by comments:-

Robert Porterfield, 46, maintenance in a Gear Making Factory:-

"I'm not the academic type, I'm the practical type."

John Cunningham, 32, aircraft maintenance:-

"I wanted to leave, I wanted a trade."

David Mort, 46, heating engineer:-

"I hated school."

In part the differences shown may be due to different interpretations of the question. Follow up questions could have asked the first group if they regretted leaving because they "only" got jobs as engineers; and the second group if they felt that their educations were adequate for them to carry out their duties as shop stewards effectively.

From the above findings one might suggest that in the main the stewards in this sample were socialised into sets of values which stressed the importance of certain loyalties, and the importance of certain actions. This can be seen from the facts that they are union members and shop stewards. Thus, they have taken certain motivations from the environment which stress activism rather than apathy and demoralisation. While the fact that 42 claimed they regretted leaving school means that a group of actually, and potentially, discontented workers exists on this question.

This has led some of them to seek alternative sources of education e.g. The Open University (2) or through other Institutions e.g.

David Graham, 57, turner in a Boiler Makers:-

"I did regret it, but I got my further education in the Communist Party."

The Shop Stewards' Ages

An examination of the average ages of the shop stewards in the sample gave the following result:-

Table 5 Average Ages

	<u>Age</u>
All Shop Stewards	42.65 years
Non-Communists	41.10 "
Communists	46.30 "

Thus, it can be seen that Communists tend to be older than Non-Communists. This can be further illustrated by considering the shop stewards by age ranges constructed on the basis of the possible involvement in the apprentices strikes on Clydeside.

Table 6 Age Range of Shop Stewards

	<u>All</u>	<u>Communists</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Non-Comm.</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 32	30	6	20	24	80
" 42	24	4	17	20	83
" 51	15	2	13	13	87
" 60	28	9	33	19	67
Over 60	7	4	57	3	43

Communists are under-represented in all ages until it gets to the 52-60 and over 60 ranges. Though the range which is closest to the percentage they should have (25%) is the 'under 32' one (8).

These figures for the ages of the stewards can be compared and contrasted with the ages found in other surveys. Thus, Batstone et al found 60% over 45, Alexander and Jenkins found 64% over 40, while McCarthy and Parker found an average age of 45 for stewards and 43 for ex-stewards. From this it would seem that the Communist Stewards are closer to the typical found in other studies, while the Non-Communists are slightly younger.

Length of time worked in the Factory.

The shop stewards in the sample were asked, 'How long have you worked in this Factory?' This gave the following responses:-

Table 7 Average length of time in Factory

All Stewards	12.66 years
Non-Communist Stewards	12.29 "
Communist Stewards	13.37 "

The fact that the Communists claimed to have worked longer in their particular factories may be due to them being older than the Non-Communists. These figures can be put down into the ranges of time worked.

Table 8 Ranges of time worked

	<u>%</u>	<u>Communists</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Non-Communists</u>
0-5 years	19	6	81	32
6-10	22	4	78	18
11-15	47	7	53	17
16-20	11	3	89	27
21-25	43	3	57	7
Over 25	25	2	75	8

So Communists are over-represented in two range groups, 11-15 yrs. and 21-25 yrs. These findings can be compared with findings in other studies. Alexander and Jenkins found over 70% had been in Fairfields less than 5 years; McCarthy and Parker found that 51% of Union Members had worked for their present firm for longer than 10 years, and 62% of the stewards had also worked at the same firm for more than 10 years. The Fairfields findings have to be seen in the context of Glasgow Shipbuildings employment practices prior to the mid-1960s. When a ship was complete there would be large pay offs of workers, who would then move to other yards where there was work (9). From the McCarthy and Parker figures it is possible to say that the Communists with 60% having worked more than 10 years in the one factory, and the Non-Communists with 59% are typical of shop stewards.

Length of Time a Shop Steward.

The shop stewards were asked, 'How long have you been a Shop Steward?' Some had been stewards in other factories, and the total length of time they had served was taken. This gave the following results:-

Table 10 Average time a Shop Steward

All Shop Stewards	10.79 years
Non-Communist Stewards	9.22
Communist Stewards	17.27

It can be seen that the Communists had been on average stewards longer. This length of time served can be presented in terms of ranges of time:

Table 11 Range of Time a Shop Steward

	<u>Communist%</u>	<u>Non-Communist %</u>
1-5 years	8	48
6-10	5	19
11-15	1	9
16-20	2	9
21-30	5	9
Over 30	4	-

These figures can be compared with other studies findings:

Boraston, Clegg and Rimmer found only one steward in "South Marlshire" who had served over 20 years, and that most were new stewards; McCarthy and Parker found an average of 6 years service by shop stewards; while Lund in Denmark found the average tenure in office to be less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ years. So the shop stewards in this sample are not typical in regards to other samples. Some reasons can be suggested for this 'deviance', firstly, Boraston, Clegg and Rimmer point out that one has to take account of the organisational experience of particular workforces, and it could be asserted that Clydeside has a great deal of this experience in the Twentieth Century; secondly, Lund found that metalworkers tended to have stewards who served longer, and this sample was composed of metalworking shop stewards; thirdly, the presence of Communists means there are workers who might seek to hold on to the Office for particular reasons (10).

From the above findings on some of the aspects of the shop stewards backgrounds, one could conclude that the sample is reasonably typical of shop stewards investigated by other studies.

There are no really inexplicable differences between these stewards, and groups of workers in other samples, other than they live on Clydeside.

From these findings one can move on to discuss the moral and ideological factors which led to these men and women becoming Shop Stewards.

The Reasons for Becoming a Shop Steward.

The shop stewards were asked, 'How did you become a shop steward?' and 'Why did you become a shop steward?' From their responses one can outline a number of reasons for them becoming stewards:-

Table 11 Reasons for Becoming a Shop Steward

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
Organised the Shop	33	8	25
Opposed the existing Shop Steward	30	8	22
No one else would take it on	16	3	13
Pay problems	14	1	13
Ideological motivations	7	5	2

These reasons for becoming a shop steward can be illustrated from the comments of the shop stewards.

1. 'Organisers' This reason involved organising an unorganised shop into the Union. The worker who played the leading part in organising is then elected shop steward by the other workers. David Mort, 45, Heating Engineer. "Well, quite honestly, I've always been in the Union, but 6 or 7 years ago the lad who was Managing Director was an arrogant type, he would want you to touch your forelock.

So we didn't like what he was doing. The lads were nearly all in the Union, so we got Calum McKay, District Secretary, Paisley down. It was the only way, and we got organised. As soon as we got organised things were okay dokay. They couldn't single out any lad. As soon as the pressure was put on them they crumbled."

The main factor in the cases in this group seems to have been the stimulus caused by changes in the environment of the workers which ended states of acceptance of conditions of work. Recourse was made to a type of organisation which could seek to re-establish the state of affairs which most suited the workers' concepts of what was acceptable. The changes in the environment provided the necessary conditions for this organising but not the sufficient conditions. As can be seen from the moral tone of David Mort's statement, the interior feelings of the workers were affected and caused them to act. The descriptions of the changes in the environments include within them prescriptions of morality, and anticipation of this morality. This draws from their experiences in previous workshops, and in the wider working class community. What constitutes this morality will be discussed below, at the moment it can be said that it seems the stewards acted in a way designed to restore their feelings of security in the workplace (11).

A Variant of this reason for becoming a shop steward when conditions change is shown by those workers who enter into established conditions as new entrees to the shop. They seem to bring with them new perspectives of what ought to be, which can be mediated by organisation.

Bob Cassidy, 27, Chainmaker:-

"Up until I went into Wheway Watsons I was just, how would you say, the normal fitter working his job. You had your union card, but I paid no interest to union matters."

"When I went into Wheways I discovered it was a non-union shop - first impressions when I went in the door (pauses) it was one of those shops where anybody was doing anything. Demarcation just wasn't in it. You had a lorry driver doing an electrical job. I thought 'We'll need to get organised here.' It was very strange, you were used to working in a closed shop, so you were surprised and had no idea what was going on."

Here one can see previous working experience being used to judge the new job. This leads to the old job being seen as 'less bad' because a union organisation brought them certain things which were lacking in the new jobs (12). It could be said they had developed models of how a factory should be run. These models serve as ethical frameworks from which an individual can act if he decides to, and calculates that the circumstances allow him to do so. The existence of these ethical frameworks can be found in most research into shop stewards' actions and attitudes, and can be illustrated from the stewards' comments.

Peter Lyden, 54, Communist, Food Processing Plant:-

"It's just that I could see injustice being carried out and I would try and do something about it."

In some places you go into they don't have a proper union and you've got to help organise. Employers tend to exploit workers and somebody's got to speak out for workers."

George Rennie, 53, maintenance in a Pump Factory:-

"When I came in here the place needed organising. I felt there was a need for justice and there were various things happening in the early days."

Interestingly the shop stewards who followed this route to Office came from all age groups signifying that union spread has still a great deal of space for organising. The proportion of Communists and Non-Communists is approximately the same. Though the complex motives behind them organising may differ in important respects. Nevertheless, in all cases it involves taking action and becoming more than a "normal fitter". As Bob Cassidy explained:-

"If you had seen the conditions, coming out of a union shop with a strong movement into this was something different. It was unbelievable. You can take so much then you've got to speak out."

2. Opposing: This reason involved taking office through opposing an existing steward because of dissatisfaction with the incumbent stewards practice in some way.

Bill Quillan, 64, Communist, Toolmakers:-

"I became a shop steward just before the war started. The position in Langs was that there was a group of elderly engineers who were supposed to be shop stewards, but they didn't function as such."

They were very friendly with the Management. They were old A.S.E. men. There were never any meetings held, there was no agitation, there was no improvement of any kind in the shop."

Andy Fairlie, 29, maintenance in a Chemical Works:-

"There's personal reasons come into this. I thought the credibility of the Union within the Factory, this guy wasn't doing it any good. I didn't feel safe in saying that he was my shop steward. I didn't trust the fellow, and didn't think he warranted any respect as an Engineer or person. If he went into bargain or stand up for anybody, in the eyes of Management they would look upon him in the same way as we did in the shopfloor."

The main source of dissatisfaction with the previous shop steward centred on his relations with Management. Those who replaced him felt he had not been representing their interests firmly enough to Management. They sought to improve the organisation of the shop by changing their representation. Implicit in this desire for change was a recognition of some type of opposition to the employer. Though this opposition need not be viewed as a fundamental structural antagonism, rather it could be viewed as functional and resolvable with a new shop steward doing a better job (13). It would seem that here we have a confirmation of the findings of other researchers, that a shop steward must have certain qualities of personality in order to maintain his or her position (14). These qualities need not be permanently possessed by the steward but can be lost over time, and in losing them he or she will start to face opposition from the membership.

Thus the replacement of one shop steward by another can be "A long process of elimination" (Bob Downie, 28, maintenance in the railway), based on "a slow process of getting fed up with one bloke and seeking a change." (Charlie McNamara, 34, Communist, Boilermakers).

From those shop stewards following this route to Office one can begin to develop an understanding of the motives at the roots of their ethical systems. A major factor seems to be a desire for security in their relationships with management through being adequately organised. In the simplest terms the workers in this group, and the previous one, felt their safety and happiness were being affected by changes which were being allowed to happen, either by being unorganised or ineffectively organised. This motivated them to act in order to try and bring about or restore the feelings of security and happiness through the medium of organisational cohesion. Thus, they acted out of a self-interest linked to a moral necessity (15). This can be further illustrated:-

Willie Jordan, 45, Engineering Jobbing Shop:-

"The chap that had the job prior to me wasn't much interested in trade unionism. His conduct was so bad I felt if I was going to work in the place it was time I got interested in trade unionism and done a part in it, because the lad was a shambles."

This concern for self-interest need not be viewed as egotistical since it is possible that for these workers their self-interest and desire for security and happiness can only be met if they help others.

Then satisfactions are both direct and indirect through a sense of social responsibility.

Almost one third of the stewards followed this route to Office, and the proportion of Communists and Non-Communists was almost equal. The 30% in this sample taking office through opposing a steward, can be compared to the 29% who took part in contested elections in McCarthy and Parker's sample. Though their sample was drawn from a range of unions, including the A.E.U.

3. Pay Problems: The workers following this route to the stewards office felt that the wage payment they were receiving was inadequate and unjust. 14 took this route to the position, and only 1 was a Communist. It is here that one can say there is a distinction between the factors which lead people to become shop stewards, and their role as shop stewards, though of course there is an important interaction. Thus, Borstone, Boraston and Frenkel found 100% of their stewards saw wages and conditions as part of their role. Yet these may not be the leading motives for becoming shop stewards, though no doubt they are seen as contributing to the workers happiness and self-interest generally. For these 14 stewards pay problems were the leading motive in taking Office (16).

Frank Ellis, 61, Small Engineering Shop:-

"We were operating a piecework system, but we operated it in a pool system. You got paid by the gang, so many gangs throughout the factory. The system was archiac and confused, it required someone to look after the bonus system alone, to be steward, even if you weren't doing the Union."

Jim McLean, 45, Communist, Car Worker:-

"I've always had an interest. At the time I worked payments by results and workers have obviously always had to struggle to achieve results on times management set them. I always seemed to be on the forefront of that trying to achieve a bonus. That's mainly what your work revolves around working a P.B.R. System, trying to earn as much as you can in 8 hours."

On one level it is possible to see a concern by these workers to bring their wages into correspondence with their effort. Their basis for believing it was out of correspondence was that their calculations did not match that of management, so management was wrong. From this one can see a development of ethical comparisons for use in wages struggles which asserts that the workforce are in the right (17).

4. 'No one else would do it'. In some organised shops occasions arose when no one was willing to do the job of shop steward. 16 gained office in this way, 12% of the Communists and 17% of the Non-Communists. Other studies have found that as few as 5-8% of union members would consider becoming a shop steward, so perhaps it is surprising so few of this sample took this route to Office (18). Those who took Office by this route can have their motives more fully examined from their comments.

John McGarrigle, 39, Small Engineering Shop:-

"I became the shop steward when the previous shop steward retired and no one else would take it. I believed the workers should be represented."

I weighed up what I was letting myself in for.

Actually you let yourself in for nothing, because either you've got a principle in mind, you should be able to speak for the men. If they've got confidence in you then you should be able to speak on their behalf."

James Young, 34, Maintenance in a Food Processing Plant:-

"I felt it was necessary. There were two or three things you see which just aren't right and you think somebody's got to say something and the lads perhaps, I'll no say not prepared to do it, but weren't doing it anyway, so somebody had to do it."

These stewards were motivated by a feeling that workers should be represented in their dealings with Management. Why they should be represented varies with the ideological views the shop steward holds. Thus, John McGarrigle developed the "principle" he had in mind:-

"A shop steward is here to keep things flowing. He's no here to stop production or look for problems. He's there to solve problems, that's the point of shop stewards. Since I've taken this job it's always been my belief that it can settle any action or complaint through discussion without having to resort to threats or anything."

The reason why these particular workers should make the decisions to take the Office of shop steward is not clear from the statements of the stewards.

The causal network and the circumstances behind the decisions would require long investigation before explanations could be found, since on the surface their background relationships seem similar to other workers. All one can assert is that these men and women must have gained moral satisfaction from holding office, and as Hugh Allen, 35, Glass Maker, said, "put my money where my mouth is." That is, these workers had a heightened interest in the Union compared to other workers, and made this obvious to other workers. So when the circumstances presented them with an opportunity to prove their interest they had to take it or lose face with their fellow workers.

A variant of this route was given by two stewards who had taken Office because it was their 'turn'.

John Robin, 36, quality assurance:-

"Well the shop steward before me said he was going to stand down, and a couple of the lads said, 'What about your turn?' We'd all more or less had a turn. That was it, an arm twisted up your back and you took it, that was it."

When asked, "Why did you take it if you felt like that?"

He replied, "Simply because I believe there should be a shop steward. I believe the workers on the shopfloor should be represented, and if nobody else was going to do it, fair enough, I would."

So force of circumstances can pressurise some workers to become 'reluctant shop stewards' to ensure that they are represented.

This can be taken as an indicator of the value some workers place in shop stewards as an institution for the protection of their security. The absence of shop stewards is seen as a situation requiring drastic action, namely that they themselves take the Office and so ensure representation.

5. Ideologues: Some workers could be thought of as ready made for Office because their ideological convictions motivate them to seek it. Seven workers in this sample gave ideological reasons for taking Office, five were Communists and two Non-Communists (19). Office was seen as means for these workers to achieve aspects of the ends they seek.

Jimmy Caldwell, 62, Communist, Shipyards:-

"I became a shop steward because I was in the Party, and the Party at that time had 140 members in the factory, and there was a drive for the Party to get control of a very important political factory in Glasgow. It was very important we get that, and to get it we needed shop stewards, you see, and the Party discussed it and the Toolroom was a critical sector inside that Factory. So as a result of that, the campaigning and the work we put in there we were able to get myself and other people elected as shop stewards."

John Reilley, 63, Mine Equipment:-

"I've always been a reactionary. I have always opposed militancy."

I've taken the position as shop steward because I think that I can spread the gospel of trade unionism better that way, rather than if I was just a paying trade unionist. Because I believe our people are still willing to listen to a man who has ideas and can put forward ideas, and does not mix up ideas. Men are still prepared to listen."

What distinguishes these workers is the explicitness of the ideological motivations behind them taking on Office. It can be seen from the other stewards' comments that ideology is important in motivating them, but in a less explicit way. For these ideologies the concern is less with ensuring a return to a situation of security which solves their own private economic and social problems, and more with developing certain situation in which other workers can think and act in certain ways.

Conclusion

From the five reasons for becoming shop stewards given by the Engineers in this sample, one can see that an interaction of internal motivations and external factors are in operation. Union organisation, by bringing more social cohesion among the workers, is seen as a mediatory agency between their immediate self-interests and the realisation of these interests through actions limiting the employers' authority. The internal motivations behind taking Office involve ethical decisions by the individuals which embraced moral anticipations of what 'should be', based on perceptions of self-interest. The fact that they were moral motivations does not/ . . .

moral motivations does not mean that the actions were right in anything but an internal sense for the individual shop steward who made the decision to act in such a way. The basis of their judgements of what 'should be' lay in judgement of what it was in their self-interest for it to be so that their security and happiness were more likely to be realised.

Having established the reasons which motivate some workers to take on the Office of shop stewards, one can examine some related experiences they may have while functioning as stewards.

The Enjoyments of being a Shop Steward.

The shop stewards were asked 'Do you enjoy being a Shop Steward?'

This gave the following responses:-

Table 12 Enjoy being a Shop Steward

	<u>All</u>	<u>Communist</u>	<u>Non-Comm.</u>
Enjoy	65	22	45
Sometimes	9	1	8
Do Not	26	2	24

Thus, two-thirds of the sample enjoyed being shop stewards. The Communists seem more likely to enjoy it since 88% of them reported doing so as compared to 60% of the Non-Communists. Only 9% did not enjoy being stewards. These workers disliked the extra problems and pressures the Office brought to them. As Catherine MacDonald, 49, Light Engineering, said:-

"I work as hard as everybody else and I get everybody's problems into the bargain. So I don't think you can say I enjoy it."

Yet for other stewards, it was the handling of problems which gave them pleasure.

John Rogers, Maintenance in a Chemical Factory:-

"Och well, problems, I like getting involved in problems."

Ronnie Martin, 37, Compressed Air Engine Makers:-

"I think it's a diversion from the run of the mill jobs you normally do in a Factory. You get satisfaction out of it. You're successful in negotiations, even helping another person."

This help is not only with problems arising within the Factory, but also personal problems of workers. It involves them in almost social worker type activities, so that one Steward said he had been nicknamed 'Dada' because of his 'fatherly' actions towards his members. It is this aspect of helping which Beynon finds evident amongst Ford shop stewards, and which comprises "a central force of their ideology". It makes the shop stewards Office worthwhile in "contrast to their job on the Line". Nevertheless, dealing with other workers' problems can place a burden of responsibility on the steward, and this causes some to like it only 'sometimes'.

Alan Grimmond, 24, Communist, Boat Builders:-

"I don't enjoy the problems it gives you, but you have a sense of duty to the guys who elect you. You feel you have to do your bit, they're putting their faith and trust in you to use your judgement. That way I enjoy it. People have confidence in me."

From this it would seem an imperative operates which compells some stewards to act to help others.

Their reward is an increased sense of worth.

The greater likelihood of Communists enjoying the job may be related to their ideological views as to the utility of the Office for developing certain attitudes among other workers. For Bill Quillan the position fulfilled his desires "to fight for better things". While for Peter Lyden it gave satisfaction because:-

"I like to think I'm educating my fellow workers, knowing they are no very well up in politics, and I try to impart my knowledge to them."

For Non-Communists the main enjoyment, other than from helping others, came from two factors. Firstly, from being involved with management in negotiations.

Pat McGowan, 24, Maintenance in a Rubber Work:-

"I enjoy the discussions and the intrigues at times. You know each others minds and trying to pick out the flaws in one anothers minds."

Secondly, it allows a development of new qualities by being involved in educative situations:-

Andy Fairlie:-

"I find I'm learning all the time, and this might come in handy later on."

It may be that these two factors of enjoyment for Non-Communists as compared to Communist stewards indicates a difference in ideological motives between the groups, which will be reflected in activities

Thus, the attitude expressed by Pat McGowan can lead to collaboration with employers, since it plays down the degree of irreconciliability between Labour and Capital which Communists assert. Thus, Andy McParlane says:-

"You get talking to people you wouldn't normally get speaking to. It breaks down the barriers between Management and Workers. You can more or less go down and see them."

While the added education given by experiences would only be fully worthwhile as far as Communists are concerned, if it led the stewards to think in a more critical fashion about why certain situations arose, and how conditions could be altered to develop the cohesion of workers.

The Power of Shop Stewards.

Popular discussions on shop stewards often centres on the source and uses of power of those holding the Office. The shop stewards in the sample were asked, 'How much power do you think a shop steward has, and where do you think it comes from?' In answer to the location of their power, the stewards answered as follows:-

Table 13 The Source of shop stewards' power

	<u>All</u>	<u>Communist</u>	<u>Non-Communist</u>
Shopfloor	51	23	28
Management attitudes	26	2	24
Government Legislation	8	-	8
Stewards Charisma	15	-	15

It can be seen that only 8% of the Communists did not think the source of a shop stewards power lay on the shopfloor in the cohesion of the workers.

The largest group of the Non-Communists also felt this illustrated the basic strength of trade union consciousness with its sense of identity and opposition. This can be illustrated:-

From the Shopfloor.

Dick Duncan, 47, Communist, Heating Engineers:-

"Power? It's hard, his power is made up by the blokes who are behind him, the workers, and he has to explain the reasons for his actions to them. That's the source of his power, the workforce. The management realise this."

John Arbuckle, Food Processing Plant:-

"A shop steward is only as good as the men behind him. The management don't see you, at least not good management, he's looking to see what you've got behind you, what's coming from the shopfloor, the strength emanating from there."

Management Attitudes (20).

The next most numerous response was one which believed shop stewards power came from management responses to the Union. This illustrates a relative understanding of the changes going on in the Factory. They see some changes have occurred but do not give the credit for them to the workers' organisation.

Danny Gibb, Chemical Manufacturers:-

"I think managements too weak just now. They're no prepared to stand up even when they had a case."

Ian MacWhinnie, 29, Aircraft Maintenance:-

"I'm fortunate that my immediate superiors are very clever, intelligent people and I don't have to put myself in a position of power, simply because these people are intelligent."

Shop Stewards Charisma (21)

Those believing it is the shop stewards personal actions which are the source of his power also show a lack of recognition of the social cohesion needed by workers to establish the position of Shop Stewards.

Andy McParlane:-

"He can sway a meeting by leaving out a word here and adding a word there."

Government Legislation (22)

Those who believed the source of power lay in Government legislation were like those attributing to management attitudes, placing it external to the workforce.

Ronnie Martin, 37, Engine Makers:-

"I think you are in the era of the shop steward. You can criticise the Labour Government for a lot of things but they have something on the credit side as well which, eh, definitely makes our job easier. It gives you more say and you can demand more say now than you ever had."

From these answers one can comment on the different types of leadership the stewards provide for their members. For those who see their power as coming from the shopfloor it may be a matter of leading the workers where they want to go, and where the steward wants to lead them within this (23).

Stewards who see their power as limited by managements' strength will be limited in where they will be willing to lead members, since it is management who are the main force in their horizons. Those who see Government legislation as a key field of activity will also be circumscribed in where they are willing to lead members. While those who believe the personality of the steward is vital will see the stewards' role as very much one of leadership, which helps shape where the membership want to go.

In response to the question of, 'How much power do you think a shop steward has?' 21% felt the stewards had too much power. All of these were Non-Communists, and none included themselves amongst those who had too much power. Rather it was other stewards who had excess power. For Tom Potts, 60, Loom Maker, it was "motor industry shop stewards" while for others like Harry Murphy, it was stewards in "any big establishment". Thus, it was stewards in factories where the stewards felt at a disadvantage owing to their lack of 'muscle' or willingness to exert it.

Are Shop Stewards Troublemakers

A popular stereotype of the shop steward pictures him as someone who misuses his or her power, and so becomes a troublemaker. The stewards in this sample were asked 'Do you think shop stewards are troublemakers?' They responded as follows:-

Table 14 'Are Shop Stewards Troublemakers?'

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
'Troublemakers'	3	-	3
'Not Troublemakers'	59	14	45
'Some are Troublemakers'	38	11	27

The majority of stewards do not feel that shop stewards are troublemakers at all - 56% of the Non-Communists and Communists. Their judgements are based on their experiences:-

John Sweeney, 34, Communist, Steelworks:-

"I used to think that till I got involved."

John Reynolds, 37, Gear Maker:-

"Only from the management point of view. They classified me as a 'bloody communist plant', a troublemaker, and they were right at that time because they didn't recognise shop stewards as they do now."

Functioning as a shop steward can lead to a worker gaining an alternative perspective and understanding so that they recognise a source of the stereotype lies in their being representatives of the workers interest in opposition to employers. To them this is not causing trouble but "looking for a fair crack of the whip" (Hugh Allen, Glass Maker) i.e. justice (24).

Amongst those who thought 'some' stewards were troublemakers, particular examples were given:-

Willie Ramage, 57, Communist, Foundry:-

"inexperienced shop stewards who can make silly decisions and cause trouble."

Others felt it was "politically minded" stewards who were "bloody minded" or "idealist". While for a few it was just "human nature, you'll get people who'll complain about anything."

All stewards recognise that there is trouble in the workshops.

However, for those who do not believe shop stewards cause trouble the source of the problem lies with employers and managers. A developed account of this was given by Bill Quillan, who said:-

"Employers think because they own the means of production they can decide everything that goes on in the workshop without consultation." (25)

The knowledge that trouble is omnipresent and that they are going to be at the centre of it can lead to a form of 'battle fatigue' among stewards. So Jim Pearson, 56, Ship Repairer, points out:-

"Most stewards are no looking for trouble. They'll be back on the job because of that. I've seen a whole week no being able to get any work done because of disputes. So you're no going to go out of your way to make a dispute, the disputes got to be there." (26)

Opposed for Office

Shop stewards are democratically elected to Office. If they are not carrying out their functions to the satisfaction of some of their constituents they can be opposed for Office. As was seen above, a number of the stewards had gained Office this way. All the stewards were asked, 'Have you ever been opposed for the Office of shop steward?' (27).

Table 15 Opposed for Office

	<u>All</u>	<u>Communists</u>	<u>Non-Communists</u>
Opposed	48	16	32
Unopposed	52	9	43

Nearly all of those who had faced opposition had done so because of certain actions they claimed to have carried out as stewards.

Thus, John Reynolds got "flung out 4 years ago" because of "a thirteen week strike". While Jim McLean said he was opposed because:-

"I was supporting the struggle against the Industrial Relations Act, the Con Mech dispute and the Union got fined £75,000. I was in complete agreement with the Union. The workers I represented took a completely different point of view, that you should obey the law, that sort of thing."

The actions which led to them being opposed generally fell into what can be defined as matters of principle. It may be that these matters are of a type which causes sharp divisions in the workforce, and so temporarily fracture their social cohesion, behind a steward. This upholding of unpopular principles may explain why the Communist stewards claimed to have been opposed to a greater degree than Non-Communists. (64% to 42%) The fact that they held an explicit ideological position which determined a range of actions could lead to them defending unpopular decisions, or opposing popular ones, and so being opposed.

Among those who had not been opposed an important factor seems to have been the absence of anyone in the workforce interested in union affairs to a sufficient degree. Rather there was "apathy" and dislike for the job.

Conclusion - Insight into Class Consciousness

Although only 7 shop stewards gave explicitly ideological reasons for taking the Office a Marxian approach enables one to assert that all the stewards have some form of ideological orientation which they reveal in their responses. One can examine their descriptions of their actions and their attitudes for traces of ideology. Though the fact that these responses are not consciously refined ideological statements means that the researcher is open to accusations of forcing the material into 'a priori' categories without there being any checks.

From the shop stewards responses in this Chapter one can draw some conclusions regarding the qualities of class consciousness present. This can be done on the basis of examining the responses for 'class cognition' and 'class evaluation' (28).

A number of stewards explicitly used concepts of 'Them' and 'Us' in telling how they became shop stewards. In other cases it was implicit in their replies when they spoke of the need to be "represented", since this carries with it a sense of identity, with others who need representation and a sense of opposition to those whom they need to be represented against. However, the definition of 'Us' varies among the shop stewards since it was sometimes crisscrossed by different types of sectionalism. Thus, among those who took Office because of pay difficulties there were divisions based on the degree of skill possessed.

Thomas Keenan, (Whisky Bond) became a shop steward in Chrysler because "the tradesmen were looking after their own interests".

While Robert Stewart (Steelworks) became a steward because "we had a lot of disputes with the gaffers, joiners and that, over wages and were looking for a representative" (29).

Another type of sectionalism could be seen when the shop stewards talked about "troublemakers". A number of stewards said that the troublemakers were concentrated in the large Factories. Those in small Factories were free from any taint of trouble-making. At the other pole there were a few shop stewards who defined 'Us' in a wider, more sophisticated way. Thus, John Arbuckle became a shop steward because he wanted to do "something for trade unionism and the class you represent" (30). This sort of view could be seen in the reasons some gave for their being opposed e.g. Dick Duncan felt he had been opposed for "upholding trade union principles", and in why some enjoyed the job since it allowed them to try and develop political consciousness among their fellow workers e.g. Peter Lyden.

These differences would lead one to believe that differences would exist in the stewards understandings of the scope of struggles, and the relationships with employers. The understandings of the relationships with management and employers can be shown from the responses. Michael McEwan was asked to be steward because he had not served his time in the Factory, and the workers "thought that those who served their time might be on the management side".

The concept of "sides" was widely stated or implied by the stewards, however, the nature of the relationships between sides can vary. Peter Lyden described it as being based on the fact that "employers tend to exploit workers".

However, other stewards do not see the relationship as fundamentally antagonistic, but as functionally antagonistic, and solveable by discussions. This leads to different conceptions of what should be done to solve problems via the mediation of the Union. For the Communists the aim was to "link the political struggle with the industrial struggle", (Archie Cherrie, 53, Communist, Shipyards) and so educate fellow workers. For other stewards it is a matter of developing a strong organisation "without being militant or political", (Harry Murphy, 53, Compressor Manufacturers).

These differences can be taken as indicators of poles within forms of consciousness between which there is a flux and struggle within each steward. The responses given above show the most coherent and developed expressions of ideological positions comes from workers who have aligned themselves at a particular pole for some time. These ideological positions are linked to the wider environment, and so are subject to pressures for adaption from this environment. This means they have to be justified when new events occur, or change to explain these events. The changes which have taken place can be illustrated by a comment from Andy MacParlane:-

"Well I used to be very, very left wing, very anti-management. Never trusted any management, any foreman. If I started in a job, the first guy I asked for was the shop steward, and even if I hadn't spoken to him right away he was a friend, and who was the foreman, he was my enemy.

But I've mellowed a bit. You even find management are becoming a bit more, they're giving us, they're discussing with us, rather than just coming out and sticking a notice on the wall and saying that's it".

From this type of statement one can see a shortcoming of trade union consciousness. By failing to penetrate to the roots of the antagonisms between workers and employers aspects of it can be undermined by changes in the operating of employers. It is this weakness which leads to some workers supporting schemes for participation with management that are for most Communist stewards a form of collaboration.

In the next Chapter the insights gained in this Chapter will be developed by examining the forms and contents of class consciousness which may be found in the A.U.E.W. and among the stewards. The election addresses of union members standing for full time positions will be examined to show the modes of understanding and representation which exist. These modes will then be shown to represent tendencies within the union, by examining the attitudes of the stewards to a number of issues.

NOTES

1. See J. Jefferrys, 'The Story of the Engineers', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1945.
2. A.E.U. Rule Book, 1970, Rule 13, pp 28-32.
3. For examples of this, see, I. Boraston, H. Clegg and M. Rimner, 'Workplace and Union', Heinemann, London, 1975; and A. Marsh, E.O. Evans and P. Garcia, 'Workplace Industrial Relations in Engineering', Kogan Page, London, 1971.
4. S. Hays, 'The Engineering Industries', Heinemann, London, 1972, pp 40-42, discusses some features of employment in engineering and the distribution of apprentices. Clydeside contains industries with the highest level of apprentices.
5. See G. Almond and B. Powell, 'Comparative Politics', Little Brown, Boston, p 71.
6. For the election returns see F.W.S. Craig, 'British Parliamentary Election Statistics', Political Reference Publications, Glasgow, 1968. For a narrative discussion of trends see, J.G. Kellas and P. Fotheringham, 'The Political Behaviour of the Working Class' in A. MacLaren, editor, 'Social Class in Scotland', John Donald, Edinburgh, 1976.
7. W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Parker, 'Shop Stewards and Workshop Relations', Research Paper 10, H.M.S.O. London, 1968, p 3 gives figures for educational background for the stewards in their sample.

NOTES

8. W. Kendal, 'The Communist Party of Great Britain', Survey, Vol. 20, 1974, p 127 makes the point on the "ageingcadres" recruited in the 1930s and 1940s.
9. See D.J. Robertson, 'Labour Turnover in Shipbuilding', Scottish Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 1, 1954, for an analysis of the catchment area for labour of shipyards.
10. Boraston, Clegg and Rimmer, *ibid*, p 171; R. Lund, 'Some Aspects of the Danish Shop Steward System', British Journal of Industrial Relations (B.J.I.R.) Vol. 1, 1963, p 382.
11. This is reflected in other studies of shop stewards: K.J.W. Alexander and C.L. Jenkins, 'Fairfields', Allen Lane, London 1970, p 226, say that shop stewards feel workers see protection as paramount; H. Beynon, 'Working for Ford', Penguin, London, 1973, p 104, believes the moral rights workers feel they have are important in their challenges to exploitation; T. Lane and K. Roberts, 'Strike at Pilkingtons' Fontana, London, 1971, p 97, say that Pilkington workers saw union membership as insurance policy.
12. W.H. Form, 'The Politics of Distrust', Studies in Comparative International Development, Vol. IX, 1974, p 34, believes workers compare their own present and past experiences, not future perspectives.
13. T. Lupton, 'On the Shopfloor', Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1963, pp 93-4 points out that workers can think a firm good but still criticise it. McCarthy and Parker, *ibid*, p 25, shows stewards dissatisfaction with 6 aspects of management, and found that A.E.U. stewards were 20% satisfied with 6 aspects of management, 30% dissatisfied with 1, 30% with 2 and 20% with 3.

NOTES

14. Alexander and Jenkins, *ibid*, p 230 give a list of qualities; Beynon, *ibid*, p 192 points out the importance of personality.
15. Beynon, *ibid*, p 119 stresses the moral aspects; see J.B. Goodman and T.G. Whittingham, 'Shop Stewards in British Industry', McGraw and Hill, London, 1969, for this emphasis too; Lund, *ibid*, gives a list of attractive features for Danish stewards, and Roberts and Lane, *ibid*, pp 164-5.
16. D. Butt, 'Men and Motors', *New Left Review*, 3, 1960, p 111 points out that in the car industry wages have functioned as a rallying point; Beynon, *ibid*, pp 101-2 points out that there is an awareness that workers are selling themselves and so want a say in the terms; Lane and Roberts, *ibid*, p 87 say pay levels were most mentioned by strikers; Lupton, pp 5-7 points out that a relationship exists between ideas of a proper days work and a fair wage; McCarthy and Parker, p 21 found $\frac{3}{5}$ of their stewards felt they could increase members wages by personal effort; though, March, Evans and Garcia, *ibid*, p 22 say management link increases to market factors.
17. R. Hyman and I. Bough, 'Social Values and Industrial Relations', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1975, Chapter 2, discuss 'A Fair Days Wage'.
18. J.A. Banks, 'Marxist Sociology in Action', Faber and Faber, London, 1970, p 144, reports that only 5% are interested in becoming stewards; McCarthy and Parker, *ibid*, p 16, found 8% wanted to be stewards.

NOTES

18 cont.,

Though, T. Topham, 'Shop Stewards and Workers' Control', New Left Review, 25, 1964, p 5 found that 82.6% thought they would be replaced if they resigned; and Beynon, *ibid*, p 195 says most stewards know who would replace them if they gave it up.

19. Banks, *ibid*, pp 120-2 gives an account of Communist aims and why they get support. See, too, P. Ferris, 'The New Militants: Crisis in the Trade Unions' Penguin, London, 1972, p 80 for other reasons. Lund in Denmark found 90% of steward elections displayed no political reasons, p 382.
20. The changes reported here may reflect changes outlined in A. Fox, 'Managerial Ideology and Labour Relations', B.J.I.R. Vol. IV, 1966. Fox pointed out that Managers should be educated to a more pluralistic outlook.
21. This is a constant theme in some commentators analysis of industrial relations problems, for example, S. Milligan, 'The New Barons', Maurice Temple Smith, London, 1976.
22. Marsh, Garcia and Evans, *ibid*, p 65, believe that Government legislation may bring a change in the balance of authority on the shopfloor.
23. Beynon, *ibid*, p 73 points out as does Goodman and Whittingham, *ibid*, p 14; McCarthy and Parker, *ibid*, p 29, gives figures for who makes decisions on the factory floor; M.G. Wilder and S.R. Parker, 'Changes in Workplace Industrial Relations, 1966-72' B.J.I.R. Vol. XIII, 1975, updates the figures.

NOTES

24. Alexander and Jenkins, *ibid*, p 230 points out that a Steward must show militancy when required to satisfy expectations; Beynon, *ibid*, p 98 defines militancy as standing up for workers' rights.
25. This statement can be compared with the 'Militants' in Lane and Roberts, *ibid*, pp 180-1.
26. Hyman, *ibid*, p 46 makes this point.
27. McCarthy and Parker, *ibid*, p 16 found 29% of their Stewards had been opposed.
28. See J.C. Leggat, 'Class, Race and Labour', Oxford University Press, 1973, p 39.
29. Banks, *ibid*, p 72 points out that skilled organisation often took place in response to the challenge of the less skilled. See, too, R.K. Brown, P. Brannen, J. Cousins and M. Sampheir, 'The Contours of Solidarity', B.J.I.R. Vol. X, 1970, for a discussion of factors which differentiated workers in the past.
30. Banks, *ibid*, Chapter 4. discusses the links between unionism and class consciousness. See, too, R. Hyman, 'Marxism and the Sociology of Trade Unions', Pluto, 1974.

Chapter Three: Forms and Contents of Class Consciousness.

The Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers (Engineering Section) claims to be the most democratic Union in Britain. A major factor in this claim is that all officials have to stand for election and re-election at regular intervals.

It is Rule 2 of the Union which develops the framework for conducting elections in 26 clauses. All members of the Union who have been members for longer than a specified time can stand for election if they receive the nomination of a branch. Those standing for full time office can submit a personal address of up to a thousand words for publication. These are distributed to branches in the proportion of 10 addresses for every 100 members. These addresses are supposed to be the sole means of communication by candidates with the branches. The Rule Book states "no candidates in any election, or members, shall issue or cause to be issued to branches or members, any additional matter", on pain of disqualification (1).

In an address the candidate is given an opportunity to tell who he is, what he has done, and what he will do. It is a means of creating support for himself amongst those entitled to vote. Each candidate tries to create a constituency for himself by outlining what are for him the key issues and problems to be tackled in such a way that his solutions have a resonance amongst others. At the same time attempts are made to categorise other candidates in order to negate their appeals.

It is possible to see the addresses as crystallisations of the class consciousness of the candidate, and an attempt being made to connect it with forms of consciousness existing among other Union members. The addresses contain modes of understanding and representation of situations facing engineering workers in the A.U.E.W., and attempt to give particular senses and meanings to them. They can be examined as ideological addresses in which one looks for the recurrence of particular words, phrases and themes which illustrate different forms of consciousness (2).

This study has linked the existence of different forms of consciousness to how far the objective interest of the working class have been understood and so provided perspectives for rational judgements. These judgements provide part of the contents of the ideological positions of candidates and the shop stewards in this study. It is on the basis of these judgements that the stewards and officials effective, intellectual and practical inclinations arise (3). Their answers and statements can be considered to reflect consciously, or unconsciously, the different forms and contents of consciousness, or of a mixture of forms and contents (4). This mix would arise because the answers given by different forms of consciousness to different problems were taken up by an individual, without the incompatibility of elements being seen. The forms of consciousness adopted will be considered to be the response to tensions within the Trade Union movement which lead to certain decisions being made which determine general attitudes towards problems (5).

This type of analysis requires simplification of the messages contained within addresses and answers so that they can be coded into broad categories. These categories are subjectively decided by the researcher on the basis of pre-existing notions of forms of consciousness based on the theoretical approach adopted and conversations with some of the stewards, and retired officials, who themselves have strong ideological views. Further it must be noted that in practice the election addresses are not the only means of communicating with members. Communication has an extra-union dimension through the press and television which have categorised certain candidates as good or bad through the use of key words like 'militant', 'extremist', 'moderate'. (6)

Election addresses are only part of the process of communication. Nevertheless, they do illustrate the choices the candidates have made about what to write on - and these choices can be related to the priorities of the candidates, which depend on their consciousness. The addresses operate by a process of repetition and innovation of themes. They must fulfil the expectations of those who read them, and at the same time take into account new experiences. The addresses do this by repeating certain forms and innovating through some of the contents. By repeating forms the candidates bring into play the associations of the past, and so improve the chances of getting the innovations accepted favourably by contextualising them.

The raw materials for this analysis are the Election Addresses for the positions of Paisley District Secretary (P.D.S.) from 1944, Division Organiser (D.O.) from 1949, Assistant Divisional Organiser (A.D.O.) from 1948, Executive Officer (E.O.) for Region 1 from 1946, National Organiser (N.O.) from 1948, and President from 1951. There are some gaps in the coverage but in all it amounts to over forty addresses for full time posts in the A.E.U., A.U.E.F., and the A.U.E.W. (E.S.) - over 200 candidates stood in these elections (7).

In the following section the forms and contents of consciousness found from the analysis of the election addresses will be presented. This will be followed by a section analysing how the shop stewards are distributed into the various forms of consciousness. The distribution will be judged on the basis of the stewards' answers to questions on amalgamation, the role of the Union, and strikes. Of course, there is a problem in establishing a link between some of the forms of consciousness and electoral groupings in the Union. For the 'Anti-Communist Right', the 'Broad Left', and 'Far Left' the link can be affirmed since these groupings have formal organisation and ideological platforms which can be identified, and so congruence established with stewards' answers. However, for other forms there is a lack of organisational shape and the consistency this can bring. In these cases the linking of shop stewards to forms of consciousness may be more haphazard.

Forms & Contents of Consciousness found in Election Addresses.

The addresses show the existence of a number of forms of consciousness amongst engineering workers. These are expressed in a series of debates over what the Union should be doing in order to improve conditions for the membership, what the functions of the officials of the Union should be, and how the rank and file should assert itself to support the policies proposed. It is on the basis of the inclinations among candidates to act to bring about some effect, object or result, that the analysis of the addresses revealed six forms of consciousness to me. These forms are in a constant flux internally. This can be seen in changes over time of the expression of contents so that new situations can be understood and interpreted. There can also be movements from one form of consciousness, depending on whom the opponents for the position are in a particular election. For whom one's opponents are can determine the emphasis given to contents and the associations brought into play.

By using the six forms drawn from the empirical analysis of election addresses one can go beyond the reductionism of the dichotomy into Trade Union consciousness and Socialist class consciousness. The use of the different forms of consciousness may allow an addition of detail to the components of Trade Union and Socialist consciousness. The analysis of these forms of consciousness will illustrate the variety of configurations possible within even the category of Trade Union consciousness. This is because all of the forms could be considered to exhibit the qualities of this type.

At the same time it is likely that the last two forms to be outlined below contain some of the qualities of Socialist consciousness. Though the most developed aspects, such as an awareness of theoretical propositions may not be present.

This section will not give an insight into the developmental aspects of class consciousness. This is because one can assert that candidates can be considered to have already formed, fairly fixed forms of consciousness which they express in addresses.

1. Anti-Communist Right: this form involves imputing motives to one's opponents based on membership or asserted membership of the Communist Party, which means that he "will indulge in other spheres" (A.D.O. 1949) and "be unable to observe all our commitments" because the C.P. directs all its "endeavours . . . toward political control of the Union." (N.O. 1950, President 1953). Those who are members of the C.P. are part of an "anti-labour organisation" which means loyalty to the A.E.U. is undermined (Paisley D.S. 1957), as is support of the Labour Party since the C.P. is in "opposition to the Labour Party" (President, 1951). The utilitarian desire of the Communists for office is asserted and compared with the candidates in this form of consciousness's desire for the job as "a sacred trust" (E.C. 1958). The premise of this position seems to be based on the categorisation of Communists, and others who can be tainted with it, as untrustworthy and Machiavellian people who will not be faithful to the Union.

No evidence is supplied to back up these claims, nor do any appear necessary, given the level of support this position has been able to maintain.

In describing their own politics emphasis is placed on their membership of the Labour Party over a long period.

Emphasis is put on their pride in using commonsense, grounded in experience, to judge political and Union matters. Thus, a candidate for Paisley D.S. in 1955 said:-

"I have always endeavoured to bring to bear on the problem, a sound commonsense Trade Union point of view, having complete regard to the principles of Trade Unionism, and the policy of the A.E.U. . . ".

(See, too, D.O. 1952, E.C. 1955, President 1953, 1957, 1967, 1977).

They even consider themselves as militants when the conditions demand it. This seems to mean in election addresses when a Conservative Government is in power. Thus, in 1955 the rhetoric is that "No Capitalist cries of 'crisis' should stop moves towards the control of industry by the community" (E.O. 1955). The Government is creating a pool of unemployment and production is stagnating according to an address in 1958, and the solution is higher investment and revised embargo list on goods to China (E.O.) and an "early return of a Labour Government pledged to Socialist remedies" (E.O. 1964). However, when a Labour Government is in power and fails to bring about remedies it is not criticised.

Rather the satisfaction of interests is postponed and the necessity is said to be for the Trade Unions to support a Labour Government to get the country out its difficulties, and then it can move towards a "just society". (President, 1967, 1977).

In the sphere of the economy this group are for the improvement of workers conditions and wages, in order to bring about a change in the balance of wealth and power. However, this change is postponed to a time when it can be done "orderly", which means it becomes more a matter of ritualistic repetition rather than a call to action (8).

2. Trade Union Right: this group has some overlap with the 'Anti-Communist Right' position since members of the latter may become members of the former when no Communist or fellow traveller is opposing them for office, and vice versa. Though there are some candidates who develop this form of consciousness as a fairly consistent and coherent position. Its main characteristics are to call for satisfactory wages, and an improvement of conditions without being explicitly anti-management. Thus:- "firms must be brought to realise that the right to organise has been won by the working class many years ago, and we are not prepared to tolerate them in our midst unless they are prepared to give us this right." (A.D.O. 1969, see, too, N.O. 1951, A.D.O. 1952)
- They are involved in the Labour Party but see politics as very much secondary in relation to Trade Unionism.

So the candidate for N.O. in 1951 says:- "I am a member of the Labour Party, although I put Trade Unionism first." They have faith in the Labour Party but unlike the 'Anti-Communists' are willing to criticise it for freezing wages. They also have as a key concern the development of organisation of the Union into new areas in order to increase its strength. (N.O. 1951, A.D.O. 1952, 1969)

3. Anti-Politics Populist: The major feature of this group is an explicit call for opposition to any type of political movement in the Union. Politics is believed to cause the Union to stagnate and be ineffective. So a candidate for President in 1953 says:- "It is deplorable that our Union should be the happy hunting ground for political parties instead of showing real industrial leadership." (See, too, N.O. 1950, President, 1967)

The main concern of this group is the wage fight which they believe only they can develop since their opposition to politics means they are for the full welfare of the Union. Thus:- "I also think it is about time we had a President who does not have to answer to any political, or religious organisation, but works entirely for the post he was elected for." (President, 1967)

From this view flows a willingness to criticise a Labour Government for its legislation. In some ways it can be best described as a form of consciousness which combines Leftist criticism of the Government with Rightist calls for sectionalism and exclusiveness.

4. Trade Union Left: what distinguishes this group from the 'Trade Union Right' tendency is their concern with militant action by the Union in pursuit of their claims. A main plank of their addresses is the knowledge they have gained out of being shop stewards. So a candidate for A.D.O. in 1949 says:- "My knowledge of the difficulties which confront our members has been acquired through my activities as a shop steward . . ." (See, too, N.O. 1950, Paisley D.S. 1957, 1967, President 1967).

This leads them to call for a development of the Shop Stewards Movement, in order to make up for inadequacies in the Labour Party to which many of them belong.

The main emphasis of their economic programme is the demand for higher wages, and a opposition to any Government which stands in the way of this. A hatred of the employers come through in their addresses. Thus, " . . . instead of taking advantage of the golden opportunities we are having at the moment . . . Fifteen years of unequalled bargaining opportunity has found the A.E.U. tied to the coat tails of the employing class." (President, 1951, see, too, N.O. 1950, 1951, and Paisley D.S. 1967).

5. 'Broad Left': this tendency differs from the Trade Union Left in that it sees the necessity of political involvement for the Union. Their final aim is a Socialist Society to end Britain's crisis, but feel mediations are needed between the present and Socialism in the shape of an alternative economic programme which will break the hold of monopolies on the economy.

Their main method of mobilisation is to call for a wages struggle since this is seen as the prerequisite for all other struggles. So the candidate for Paisley D.S. in 1967 said:- "The Wage Freeze Policy has been responsible for increased unemployment throughout the country, and lower standards of living - while workers' wages have been frozen, prices, rents and rates have increased."

For this group the Union is a mass organisation of the working class which should develop its strength through consolidating and developing the Amalgamation, and giving the rank and file more say. This leads them to criticise some of the present leadership for its perceived failure to do so. Thus, the candidate for President in 1977 said:- "Leadership is the ability to respond and guide the fulfilment of members' aspirations and protect them from the excesses of unemployment and exploitation."

This group consistently states that Britain is in crisis and locates the causes of it in low wages and the export of British capital abroad which has stopped the re-equipment and modernisation of industry. Their solutions involve bringing in some measure of planning by a Left Labour or Socialist Government, and extending public ownership. In addition, foreign trade should be extended by removing all hindrances to trade with the Socialist bloc and cuts in military expenditure should be made combined with a campaign for "Peace".

The necessity of developing the unity of workers at every level - factory, district, national, international - is stressed. This is part of their constant reference to the need for struggle to achieve ends (9).

6. 'Far Left': this tendency differs from the 'Broad Left' in the nature of the demands they raise which are based on the different estimations of the balance of class forces in Britain, and so the immediateness of revolution. They seek to develop 'transitional demands' which are acceptable to sections of workers, but which cannot be met by the system or employers. These candidates stand on the basis of "revolutionary socialist policies" (N.O. 1977). Of course, the 'Far Left' is not a single movement but a general term to cover a number of small, fringe political parties. Those who have been involved in elections have been the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist - Leninist), the Workers' Revolutionary Party and the Socialist Workers Party. In the main the reason for their contesting the elections is to gain propaganda for their organisations, or some of its 'fronts' e.g. W.R.P's., All Trades Union Alliance, S.W.P's. 'Engineers Charter'. Only the C.P.B. (M.L.) has had any success, and this may be partly due to the fact that their Full Timer held the position before the formation of the Party (10). These candidates oppose all the present Full Timers as - "right wing, the fake-lefts, and the Stalinists deliberately holding back the great political and industrial strength of workers . . ." (President 1977)

Or as another Far Leftist puts it:- "Our leaders have abdicated their responsibilities by leaving the wage battle to plant by plant bargaining" (N.O. 1975)

Their campaign to mobilise workers involves opposition to all closures, the nationalisation of banks, land & basic industries under workers' control. Thus, a candidate for N.O. in 1977 calls for:- "Fight sackings and closure with occupations

Fight for nationalisation of banks, land and basic industry under workers' control and without compensations.

Form Trade Union defence squads. Smash Fascism. Withdraw troops from Ireland. Disband the standing army and police...."

The aim seems to be to attempt to mobilise workers around a basic programme. On this basis they hope to lead those workers who support them on to more sophisticated issues (11).

Conclusion

All the forms of consciousness outlined here can be considered to be giving a different emphasis to parts of the contents of Trade Union consciousness. All of them involve calls for wage improvements because this is seen as the basic way of gaining support from the rank and file. It is in how they propose to bring about this wage improvement that they differ, and when they see it as taking place. Further differences can be seen in the conception given to the role of the Union, the rank and file, and the relationship between Full Time Officials and the rank and file. In part the differences in emphasis may be due to differing traditions of the Labour Movement being drawn upon.

Those on the 'Right' may be considered to be drawing on social democratic traditions which involve a belief in a mixed economy, practicalness and the use of established structures.

The 'Anti-Politics Populists' may be considered to draw on elements of this same tradition, but add to it some elements of libertarian traditions which distrust politics and leaders. The 'Left' seem to draw more on 'Statist Socialist' traditions involving an emphasis on organisation and leadership.

This section has established the existence of different forms of consciousness among those standing for elected office in the Union. The next section will examine how these forms are relevant to the shop stewards in this sample in relation to a number of questions.

The Role of the Trade Union.

As has been suggested the basis of Trade Unionism is a recognition of a community of interests and a common opposition to enemies. This need not penetrate to class differences or class struggle. A gradation of awareness of interests exists as a process in which different conceptions develop of the methods of struggle and forms of organisation required. A criterion for testing the form of consciousness of the stewards is the character given to Trade Unionism. In outlining the roles they believe a Union has, the shop stewards are illustrating their understanding of the needs, demands and goals of engineering workers. From the differences in definition one can assume differences in consciousness which show up in divisions into tendencies in the Union. These divisions have a historical presence among organised workers in the debates between craft unionism, and amalgamationism, and industrial unionism.

From these structures different methods of struggle could be introduced for different goals (12). Thus, in the roles given to Trade Unions by the stewards are sets of ideological, political and economic judgements from which conflicts and variations exist on the methods and objectives of the Unions. Though, of course, all the tendencies in the Union put emphasis on the role of the Union in bringing better conditions and wages. This is necessary since they have to be effective in the short term to gain support, and this implies some adaption to circumstances. From this basis they develop particular themes and emphasis which allows one to categorise the shop stewards.

The first question the stewards were asked was 'What do you think are the roles of a Trade Union?' The answers to this showed that two main functions were given to the Unions:

Table 1 Perceived Roles of Trades Unions

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
'Protective'	63	20	43
'Benefit'	37	5	32

So one can see that an awareness of opposition to employers led to the stewards in the main seeing the Unions as "primarily to protect the economic interests of the workers" (Jimmy Caldwell) Just over one third of the steward saw the role of the Union as gaining 'benefit' for members. This is based on not seeing the extent of opposition of employers that the other group does. For this group benefit could come from co-operation with employers.

The second question the stewards were asked was, 'Do you think Unions have a political role in Society?'

Seventy two of the stewards did think Unions had a political role. This included all the Communist stewards. It can be seen that most stewards believed that Unions should not be limited to the industrial field. To confirm this attitude the stewards were asked whether they agreed that politics should be left to the Labour Party, while Unions should concentrate on economics. Seventy two of the stewards did not agree with this (including all the Communists). It should be noted that of the twenty eight who believed Unions did not have a political role and the twenty eight who believed politics should be left to the Labour Party, there were twenty one who were consistent in their answers. Of the other seven, three were Labour Party members and Roman Catholics, while the other four were strong Labour loyalists. On the basis of their answers to the three questions outlined above the shop stewards forms of consciousness can be suggested.

Table 2 Forms of Consciousness by the Role of the Union

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Far Left	-	-	-
Broad Left	24	17	7
Trade Union Left	38	8	30
Anti-Politics Populist	18	-	18
Trade Union Right	18	-	18
Anti-Communist Right	2	-	2

None of the sample gave responses which could be characterised as 'Far Leftist' on the basis of the categories used in this study. The characteristics of the 'Far Leftists' involve an absence of immediate demands.

This is because the groups who stand candidates see themselves as in the process of creating a vanguard to lead the revolution. Elections allow them to propagandise in an attempt to extend their limited base of support.

Only two stewards were explicitly 'Anti-Communist Right'. The main tendency on the Right was the 'Trade Union Right' which stressed the importance of co-operation with employers, and Government, to gain improvements. As Ian Bonnar said -

"I think the Trade Union Officials and the Government getting round a table to govern the Country is a good thing, because the Government can see our point of view and we can see their point of view."

From this view can flow a conception of workers as one section of a community in which all sections are equal. This can lead to a dovetailing with the 'Anti-Communist Right' to defend British society as the best possible from those they consider to be its enemies. Collaboration is believed to be beneficial in itself, even if it has no guarantees. It is susceptible to calls for certain actions for a 'National Interest' such as the 'Social Contract'. It is a collaboration which limits the political role of the Union to areas where it is recognised as having a legitimate and special interest as a pressure group. (13) It precludes a general involvement in politics by the Union.

The non-involvement of the Union in politics was supported by eighteen stewards. Their answers placed them in the 'Anti-Politics Populist' tendency.

They felt political struggle was a diversion for workers in obtaining their demands because it was a 'game'. As Alex MacDonald said -

"It doesn't matter whether you have a Labour or a Tory Government, they're no going to work for the workers' interests."

For these workers the introduction of politics into the Union undermines everything a Union should stand for. This does not mean they are not radical or activist in their perception of the role of a Union. As Alex MacDonald goes on to say -

"I think the T.U.C. would be better to stick to confrontation with the C.B.I. because you've got to fight them anyway."

Politics in this case introduces distractions which get in the way of confrontation between employers and workers. However, differences exist within the 'Anti-Politics Populists'. Alongside this syndicalistic, direct action, anti-politics faction there is another one. This group is against politically involved shop stewards for reasons similar to those which inspire anti-communism among some on the Right. That is, political involved stewards are seen as out to destroy the Union for their own interest. Thus, George Rennie believed "political attitudes" stopped the Union being "really democratic". While Willie Watt felt that:-

"A Trade Union is to look after the working man on the shop-floor, meet delivery dates and try to keep unrest out of the factories. No play high politics."

For the first faction, politics stood in the way of struggle by the Union for their interests because it led to collaboration. For the second faction, politics stood in the way of collaboration by highlighting divisions between employers and employees.

In a sense they are talking about two different types of politics. The first faction can be considered to be talking about politics as practised by the Labour Government and most Union leaders. Social democratic policies seem designed to promote corporatism and isolate the shopfloor militants. The second faction is talking about the effects of the politics carried out by the militants on the shopfloor influenced by communism, syndicalism and leftism. These militants seek to bring to the fore the irreconcilable elements in the relationship between employer and worker. By doing this they can affect the harmony and teamwork of the workplace causing conflicts which others find upsetting.

It is these differences which make it possible that this group could be 'infected' from the Right and Left, in some circumstances, and its members pulled in either direction (14). On the other hand, in other circumstances e.g. political action has proved unconvincing, this tendency could be a resting place for disillusioned politically influenced stewards.

The largest tendency is the 'Trade Union Lefts' which contains thirty eight stewards. These stewards are ones who would probably describe themselves as militants. Certainly the methods they favour to gain their objectives could be described by this term (15). Thus, Jimmy Lee believes -

"At the moment the Unions should be hammering into the Government to get more jobs and more Nationalisation."

A Union is an organisation for struggle against employers, and sometimes Government. Unlike the first faction of 'Anti-Politics Populists', however, they believe in political involvement to pressurise the Government and try to make it change policies. Though it may be more containable than syndicalist direction action since it is through institutionalised channels, e.g. lobbys of Parliament, and tends to concentrate on specific abuses of the system (16).

The 'Broad Left' was the second largest groups found amongst the stewards on this issue. Its core was formed by Communist stewards who saw Unions as having short and long term goals of varying significance. As Davie Wilson said -

"To fight for better wages and conditions, to get the maximum, and a shorter working week. But that's no the end in itself, only through the political movement can we achieve what we're after."

The role of the Union for this tendency is to develop the workers' movement to the point where it can achieve Socialism. The Unions should be taking up the fundamental issues and linking them in a "fight for Socialism". This conception comes from aspects of an ideology which has historically expressed the thinking and practice of militant workers profoundly dissatisfied with the present system. It is among these workers that one finds elements of Socialist consciousness which has led some of them to join the Communist Party so as to be seen to be active in the class struggle.

From this section one can begin to see the heterogeneous composition of the Left made up as it is of, some 'Anti-Politics Populists', 'Trade Union Left', and 'Broad Lefts'

This means its coherence and consistency can vary fairly widely depending on the issue and the pressures to act in certain ways.

It could be considered surprising that only two stewards were categorised as 'Anti-Communist Right' when one considers the number of Full Time Officials who hold the views which characterise this tendency. A number of factors may explain this:

1. The sample bias may have excluded them;
2. The social base of the tendency may not be among Clydeside shop stewards, but more passive groups who are mobilised in a postal ballot;
3. Many in the 'Anti-Communist Right' can adopt 'Trade Union Right' rhetoric if circumstances require it, or vice versa;
4. It is a position which has been less strident in recent elections as fewer Communists have stood, and a more generalised attack on 'militancy' and 'extremism' has been developed;
5. The questions put to the stewards were not designed to bring out anti-communist opinions.

Amalgamation

The previous section dealt with the roles of a Union and this section will deal with the shop stewards conceptions of the scope of the Union. In the belief in amalgamation one can see a desire to limit the competition among workers and to develop a wider sense of common identity of interests. The shop stewards view of the form and content of amalgamation should illustrate their consciousness.

Historically all sections of the Union have supported some form of amalgamation amongst engineering workers. From the assertions followed in this study, it can be claimed that for the 'Left' the form of amalgamation sought has been industrial unionism, while for the 'Right' it has been an absorption of other Unions by the A.S.E. or A.E.U. and a continuation of demarcation as a weapon (17). While the Left have sought to realise the amalgamation by unofficial and informal contacts with other Trade Unionists, the Right have opposed attempts at amalgamation from below through contacts with non-A.E.U. members (18). Thus, if the perspectives of the Right are adopted, the demand for amalgamation is not necessarily an indicator of elements of Socialist consciousness. Rather it can signify a growth of the Union within the framework of sectional identities rather than common class identity based on a community of interests.

In the Chapter on 'Solidarity among Engineering Shop Stewards' it will be shown (Table 7) that though the level of contact with white collar workers is high, only sixteen stewards work in factories where the white collar workers are on the Joint Shop Steward Committees (19). This attitude to white collar workers is an obstacle to the development of Socialist elements of class consciousness. To further test this attitude the stewards were asked if they knew the composition of the Amalgamation. Only thirty five did, and twenty one of them were Communists. Though slightly more than this knew that T.A.S.S. was involved owing to the controversy over its participation.

The high proportion of Communists stewards involved may be linked to the fact that seventeen of the Communists were branch officials, compared with twelve Non-Communists. The Communist stewards took a more active interest in the running of the Union, and so were in positions where information on its structure were likely to circulate. In part this interest may be related to its efficacy for the 'electoral machine' politics of the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section). By manning the basic levels of the organisation the Communists could play an important role in determining who was elected to various positions.

Given the level of ignorance of the components of Amalgamation, it may be surprising that seventy five of the stewards (all the Communists) felt amalgamation was a good thing. This may be a judgement of the principle of amalgamation. However, it does not clarify the meaning the stewards give to amalgamation, which it has been suggested can differ with ideological perspective.

The stewards were asked if they favoured one Union for engineering. This cliché of the A.S.E. and the A.E.U. again resulted in a high favourable response, with seventy seven saying they did (again, all the Communists). The two groups giving positive answers to these two questions were almost identical, indicating a common interpretation of the questions. However, it is only by considering the stewards' statements that one can begin to see what the stewards meant from their answers, and what this says about their class consciousness. From their answers the following tendency distribution can be found -

Table 3 Forms of Consciousness by Amalgamation

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Far Left	-	-	-
Broad Left	23	17	6
Trade Union Left	34	6	28
Anti-Politics Populist	20	2	18
Trade Union Right	21	-	21
Anti-Communist Right	2	-	2

Once again the 'Far Left' category had no members. In part this may be because for the 'Far Leftists' amalgamation 'from above' is irrelevant. What they seek is a reconstitution of the Union around independent rank and file organisations of an unofficial nature e.g. Engineers Charter, All Trades Union Alliance. Only two gave 'Anti-Communist Right' answers which supported a different form of amalgamation from that which existed in an unconsolidated way at the moment. So they sought to exclude T.A.S.S. As Willie Jordan put it -

"T.A.S.S. have little in common with us. To me it's just a political ploy at a higher level to gain more teeth by adding the manual workers to it."

The ideal amalgamation for this tendency would be one based on a coming together of skilled manual workers' Unions. Skilled status is considered to be the defining feature of those they have an interest in amalgamating with in a Union. The ideal arrangement for an amalgamation would have its strength in an ability to protect through demarcation and division of workers.

The 'Trade Union Right' are differentiated from this group by the absence of a political emphasis on T.A.S.S. They believe "T.A.S.S. are kidding themselves on" but not that it is politically motivated. The real defining feature for this tendency is its emphasis in the importance of the degree of skill. In Harry Murphy's words -

"I think all skilled men within the Union should be amalgamated. But I've got reservations about the way our Union's formed at the moment. There are too many unskilled men within it. I think there should be two different Unions in co-operation, but no amalgamation."

Amalgamation is not seen as a means of developing unity and solidarity across skill differences. Rather it is conceived of as a means of maintaining the skilled engineers' position within the industry through the extension of spheres of influence. A fear of "dilution" still exists among some skilled engineers for they believe it weakens their market position. As Bob Cassidy says -

"We've got labourers coming in and within a year they can be drawing the same wages as me. Not doing the same job, but a job the management has assessed is worthy of the same rate."

This resistance has a militant edge to it and as Bob Cassidy's statement shows can take on a class rhetoric of opposition to management practices. An anti-employer form can be given to struggles designed to maintain skill exclusiveness at the expense of other workers. This type of action could lead to a continued fragmentation of workers by limiting the community of interests among workers.

Sectionalism can be justified by a class covering (20).

Some Stewards in the 'Anti-Politics Populist' tendency also opposed amalgamation. In doing this they may be considered to be reflecting an important theme in populist ideology, an opposition to 'bigness'. In Andy McParlane's words amalgamation was bad because when a Union -

"gets too big you get the careerist guys looking for full time jobs, the cushy numbers."

For these members democracy and accountability are believed to be dependent upon the size of the Union, rather than its internal structure.

However, not all in this tendency held this view of amalgamation, though nearly all had doubts on its value. It was felt that in national negotiations "the bigger the Union the less they seem to get out of it . . . " These stewards calculate between benefits gained as against those lost and conditionally support amalgamation. They believe that unity is an important factor in determining strength and support amalgamation for this reason.

The bulk of the support for amalgamation being consolidated comes from 'Leftist' stewards. They saw it as a guarantee of a stronger Union. For the 'Trade Union Left' it was a prerequisite for the further growth of unity among engineering workers. So John Cunningham supported it because -

"I believe it gives more unity and the Union's that bit stronger."

For this tendency the value of amalgamation approaches the status of an axiom.

Though they do justify it by their observations of other Unions' successes, e.g. the miners.

The 'Broad Left' stewards develop the possible political consequences of the amalgamation if it has leadership of the "right people in at the right time in the right position" (John Arbuckle). This type of amalgamation would have a positive effect on the whole labour movement. From this they adopt explanations diametrically opposed to the 'Anti-Communist Right' concerning the problems of opposition. They believe amalgamation "is being held up for political reasons" since, in John Lyon's words -

"It would strengthen the Left."

In this opposition the Right in the Union are linked with a support for capitalism, which is also seen as opposing amalgamation since as Bob McGerty says -

"it is a threat to the Establishment, which is capitalist."

So amalgamation is seen as having internal and external enemies which strengthen and reinforce one another. This is what the ideological orientations of the tendency prepare them for, and simultaneously provides them with a means to try and overcome these dual oppositions in the shape of an unofficial organisation which holds meetings and publishes an irregular broadsheet, 'The Gazette'.

The strength of the 'Broad Left' ideological commitment to amalgamation is such that they support it despite the leaders of some other Sections being "a lot of rag tags, a bad lot" (David Wilson).

Any negative features are felt to be short term, and likely to be outweighed by the potentials which can be released through struggles.

However, some on the Right and Left of the Union also support amalgamation for the reason that it would improve the industrial relations atmosphere by reducing friction over issues like demarcation. In all twenty eight stewards supported amalgamation because it would improve the 'harmony' of the workplace (seven Communists and twenty one Non-Communists). While forty seven supported it to improve the workers' capacity to struggle (eighteen Communists and twenty nine Non-Communists). Thus, three quarters of the stewards showed a desire to limit the competition among workers by some type of amalgamation. Differences were revealed in who they felt should be included in the amalgamation, and so united with and protected from competition. These differences had their roots in ideologically influenced conceptions of the correct form for amalgamation.

Though even among the 'Broad Left' the desire for an industrial union is postponed to the future. While amalgamations' extension is confined to skilled manual workers' Unions, such as the Boiler-makers. From this one might draw the conclusion that the coincidence of interest among the engineering workers in this sample was most clearly seen with other skilled manual workers.

Strikes

From the examination of the role and scope of the Union given above this section will move to an examination of attitudes to methods of struggle.

A Marxian view is that struggles are an intrinsic feature of every level of society because the structural determinations of classes leads to antagonisms over objective interests. At its simplest Marxian writers believe there is a constant and continual battle in the workshop between Capital and Labour over the distribution of the wealth produced (21). This section focuses on a particular aspect of this day to day struggle, the strike.

A strike is not a spontaneous response by workers to perceived injustice since it usually requires, as a precondition, the prior existence of some form of association among workers expressing a belief in common interests and opposition (22).

The process of striking shows the existence of some level of collective identity among workers. This gives them alternative obligations, enabling them to overcome societal pressures against unconstitutional actions challenging the rights of owners (23).

It is in the capacity to strike that the solidarity of workers can be tested, and the level of opposition to employers seen (24).

While the strike itself can bring about changes in consciousness if certain conditions are met which take the issues beyond immediate ones, to political ones. For if the strike is limited in its objectives only a limited consciousness will result (25).

A Marxian perspective would seem to make the possibilities for dispute between Capital and Labour limitless. Yet it can be seen that an appearance of peace dominates most workshops. Thus, McCarthy found only 4% of his sample had been in frequent strikes, while 40% had had only one.

Marsh reports that 80% of the Engineering Employers Federation considered themselves strike free, with 38% having no strikes and 40% less than two. While Hyman says that two in three of the workers he had information on had not been involved in strikes. The absence of strikes is something to be explained, especially since two thirds of McCarthy's stewards saw it as their most effective weapon in certain circumstances (26). In part the absence of strikes may be due to factors such as well organised factories not requiring to go on strike to gain their demands. However, it may also be linked to the attitudes of workers on the legitimate use of the strike. Though here one faces the problem that workers may prefer short stoppages to a single, long one, and view the strike as only one weapon to be used in co-ordination with other methods of struggle (27).

Of the stewards in this sample seventy eight had been involved in at least one strike (22 Communists and 56 Non-Communists). This would make it appear that the stewards in this sample have a far higher involvement in strikes than other groups of workers in other studies. This may be partly accounted for by Marsh's finding that Scotland was an area with above average stoppages in Engineering. The strike is a more culturally acceptable weapon to Scottish engineers, and a legitimate response to certain grievances, compared to other workers. Thus, one can examine the number of disputes they have been involved in.

Table 4 Number of Strikes Involved In

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
One	18	3	15
Two	12	-	12
Three	3	1	2
Four	3	-	3
"Numerous"	28	12	16
No Answer/Don't know	14	6	8

The largest single category was those who had been involved in 'Numerous' strikes. It can be seen that the stewards in this sample are workers with some experience of industrial action. It may be that this is because they are 'troublemakers' who provoke action. Or, to put it another way, they are conscientious workers who seek to maintain their established prerogatives and rights. Their involvement in these strikes may have an affect on their consciousness either by confirming beliefs or altering them in some way. This would depend on the nature of the issues the strike was over, and the result of the strike being such that it had a psychological effect. The type of strike they described themselves as being involved in can be considered:

Table 5 The Type of Strike Involved In

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
BASIC ISSUES - Wages	45	18	27
Hours	2	-	2
FRictionAL - Manning Levels	6	-	6
Holidays	1	-	1
Workmanship	2	1	1
SOLIDARISTIC - Unionising	13	3	10
Victimisation	10	4	6

Obviously one would like to relate the type of strike to the form of consciousness of the steward, and so say that those involved in 'Solidaristic' action are the most class conscious. However, this cannot be done since it is necessary to consider not only the type of strike but also the context of the strike. This leads to a more complex picture. For example, a strike on a 'Unionising' issue may reflect a previous weakness in class consciousness which meant the factory was unorganised. While going on strike over issues like 'Wages' and 'Hours' does not necessarily signify economistic and instrumental workers. As can be seen in the last stages of the 'Social Contract' it can lead to conflicts with Governments, and very militant tactics. 'Frictional Issues' resulting in strikes may again, be a reflection of poorly organised factories where the collective bargaining machinery is underdeveloped. Thus, context has to be established before the consequences that might result on consciousness from a strike can be established (28).

The shop stewards in the sample were categorised into tendencies on the basis of their answers to the questions, 'Why do workers go on strike?' and 'Why are there so few strikes?' The following distribution was found.

Table 6 Forms of Consciousness by Strikes

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
Far Left	1	-	1
Broad Left	25	17	8
Trade Union Left	35	8	27
Anti Politics Populist	9	-	9
Trade Union Right	23	-	23
Anti-Communist Right	6	-	6

It can be seen that these questions resulted in a growth in those on the Right, and a decline in the 'Anti-Politics Populist' tendency. It would seem that these questions polarised the sample more than some other ones, and showed how the stewards might move in certain circumstances. This may be because in dealing with strikes one is looking at an area where the dominant forces in society seek to isolate oppositional forces. This they do by, among other methods, seeking to camouflage the real interests involved, and instead define the struggles as between a group of workers and the 'Nation'. It is only where oppositional groups have an established presence that they can decode this message and then recode it in ways which highlight unity and struggle of the working class. By doing this the oppositional groups are able to overcome the attempts at 'cultural differentiation' by the dominant forces.

It was in answering these questions that the only 'Far Leftist' was found. This steward believed "there should be a general strike within the Country to jolt the Government". For this tendency, the act of striking has its own utility. No consideration is given to the workers' preparedness for this strike, all that matters is that the individual is ready for it.

The 'Anti-Communist Right' tendency were identified by their response to the question, 'Why do workers go on strike?' These men are the 'moderates' of the Union and believe strikes are caused by 'extremists' who mislead the men. As Harry Murphy says -

"Every factory's got loudmouths. Then there's political shop stewards who want to cause a lot of dispute and disruption. You get a lot of that."

Thus, workers are able to be whipped up by agitator's rhetoric to go on strike. It is not a matter of legitimate grievances. So no positive justification exists for strikes.

For the 'Trade Union Right' tendency this main factor in there being so few strikes is the change in management attitudes, away from a unilateral decision making to a position where workers are consulted,

"They are now willing to recognise that the people on the shopfloor are represented and want to know what's going on. I think that takes the heat out of the situation."

Thus, management through consultation which allows participation at a low level by workers, is seen as bringing about a new situation. Implicit in this is a belief that there were many strikes in the past. Though other 'Trade Union Rightists' rejected the view that there were "few strikes" today. As Ian MacWhinnie puts it -

"I wouldn't say there are few strikes. I would say there are quite a few strikes. More strikes than need be."

Once again, one can see an echoing of dominant ideological assumptions that there are too many strikes. For the dominant forces in society "too many strikes" may actually mean any strikes. The 'Trade Union Right' tendency makes no attempt to analyse why strikes take place, but make their judgements on the basis of the mass cultural institutions of society e.g. press, television.

These institutions provide information which put pressure on the ideologies of working people which reflect aspects of experience, and can result in them not questioning dominant assumptions. This attitude contrasts with the 'Trade Union Left' tendency which sees strikes as caused by managements' actions. As Murdo MacLeod puts it -

"Frustration's one of the main reasons. Things keep building up, and management try to talk them out of their grievances. They tend where I am, not to fulfil any obligations they take on. You tend to have to force them to fulfil their obligations."

Here one sees that for the Left stewards, management through consultation has its essence a willingness to talk but not to give anything to meet workers' demands. It is managements' intransigence which causes workers to resort to strikes. While the fact that there are so few strikes is the result of things like "good shop stewardship". Thus, they reverse the causes and credits of the 'Right'. This extends to their characterisation of the effects of a Labour Government. The 'Right' believe everything must be done to preserve this Government "because the Country seemed to be in a bad state". National recovery was linked to this preservation. However, for the 'Leftists' the Labour Government had "conned" workers and made them subordinate their demands. The Government had succeeded in its 'con',

"because of the economic stranglehold, workers can't afford to lose one week or two weeks with what they've got on their shoulders . . ."

The 'Broad Left' tendency is similar to the 'Trade Union Left' in refusing to blame workers for the occurrence of strikes and instead blame employers. However, the 'Broad Leftists' link strikes to the structural position of workers in society. So James Arbuckle says in answering why there are strikes -

"That to my mind is basic, obviously from the fact that they have been oppressed over the years."

This situation of oppression leads them to "no getting justice", and acting "to bring about some justice for themselves, as far as is possible in a Capitalist society". For the 'Broad Leftists' struggle is seen as a key means for gaining objectives. This struggle is not confined to employers, or even Government policy, but extends within the Union where in Davie Wilson's words -

"you've got to fight hell of a hard to get that support for action by the workers, despite a just cause, because of the economic situation."

Thus, it can be seen that the Right and Left differ on the issues of strikes, in where they place the blame for strikes occurring, and why they think there are so few strikes. The 'Anti-Politics Populists' are similar to the 'Rightists' in believing in the need for negotiations at all times as an alternative to strikes. They see the responsibilities for strikes as lying with "bad management and poor shop stewards". From this it would seem that this tendency believes all strikes could be avoided if the quality of workers' representatives and management was improved. The occurrence of strikes is not seen as being caused by structural factors, or by other unavoidable factors.

Nevertheless, they did not necessarily feel that strikes were unjust. The stewards' answers to the question on what caused strikes showed that three quarters of them felt strikes were caused by workers having just grievances. Only seven felt that the cause was militancy. It would seem that the 'Anti-Politics Populists' and Rightists, though believing strikes avoidable through negotiations, in the main believe workers get involved in strikes for just reasons. This result is not surprising given that seventy eight of the stewards had been involved in strikes and could investigate their own experiences to explain the motivations behind strikes. Those who felt strikes were caused by workers being led like "sheep" by militant did not include their own cases in this categorisation. Rather it was the stereotype of car workers who were turned to once again.

This section found that seventy eight of the stewards had been involved in at least one strike. They explained the motivations for these strikes as being legitimate grievances. This is similar to McCarthy and Parker's findings of how stewards justified strikes. 77% blamed management breaking an agreement, 70% an unreasonable delay in dealing with grievances, 78% to stop the discharge of a workmate, and only 23% to get what they wanted. Thus, most strikes are 'against something' and attempt to restore the equilibrium in the workplace, on the basis of what the workers consider 'fair' (29). They are essentially defensive in motive and involve limited demands for the rectification of situations (30). In this one can see the essentially modest demands of most workers which is particularly remarkable given the degree of potential power they have.

By confining themselves to strikes on 'Basic' and 'Frictional' issues the stewards are directing their energies at problems which continually re-emerge as symptoms of the employment relationship. These limited antagonisms against individual employers reinforces a limited consciousness of common identity among workers. Their awareness is not such that the majority of them see a need for a new society as anything more than a distant hope. In part this may be linked to the functioning of the stewards within a structural situation which limits their scope to certain parameters. There is a sense in which the stewards have to look for compromise solutions since complete victory is impossible so long as the factories remain in private hands with the mandated and ideological power this gives. The employer can always encroach in various ways on the workers' gains and attempt to wear down resistance.

Conclusion.

From the results in this Chapter one can see some validity for using the tendencies of class consciousness developed from the Full Time Officials' election addresses. The shop stewards in the sample echoed the themes of those who stood for office. This allowed one to see the diversities in consciousness which exist within the Union which express themselves in different attitudes to management, other workers, industrial action, political involvement, etc. Further one can show a fairly high level of consistency across the stewards answers. This suggests a process of structuration of inclinations to act in certain ways exists.

Table 7 Forms of Consciousness

	<u>Role of the Union</u>	<u>Amalgamation</u>	<u>Strikes</u>
Far Left	--	--	1
Broad Left	24	23	25
Trade Union Left	38	34	35
Anti-Politics Populist	18	20	9
Trade Union Right	18	21	23
Anti-Communist Right	2	2	6

Thus, fourteen of the Communists show 'Broad Left' inclinations for all three issues, and six are consistently 'Trade Union Left'. Only five of them mix their answers between tendencies, and three of these are fairly new recruits. The level of consistency among the Non-Communists is not quite as high, but still is impressive. Thus, four are consistently 'Broad Left', twenty one 'Trade Union Left', sixteen 'Trade Union Right' and six 'Anti-Politics Populists'. One can see that different tendencies exist with different ideologies and actions. Analogous themes are taken up by individual shop stewards in their inclinations to act consistently in their answers but rather move between tendencies. Given the findings of Nichols and Armstrong, and Nichols and Beynon, one might have expected to find more inconsistency than was found (31). It may be that the questions helped the stewards develop a consistency by all being within a 'domain' where the same ways of thinking apply. In addition it should be noted that the label inconsistent is one which is placed on the stewards' attitudes by a researcher. Others looking at the stewards' attitudes may be struck by the identity of attitudes.

Indeed all the tendencies are possible variants of 'Trade Union consciousness' even if containing themes which are opposed to each other. Opposition is not the only relationship between tendencies. Intolerance among tendencies on some issues can co-exist with co-operation and friendliness based on raising common demands. This is because all the tendencies in the Union have to show some degree of opposition to employers. In this way they recognise the necessary feature of a Union's existence is the antagonisms between workers and employers in production. Where the tendencies differ is the degree of acceptable collaboration with employers they see. This difference comes from the various tendencies conception of class interest.

The tendencies found among the shop stewards show that attitudes and actions exist among the rank and file which are similar to those found among the Full Time Officials. It would seem that there is a link between the two groups. To fully verify this link would require to know the voting behaviour of the stewards. Unfortunately, it was not felt possible to ask them this question. However, one can suggest that this link is based on the Full Time Officials representing the felt interests, and acting on behalf of the dominant faction of the stewards. It can be seen that nationally it is the Right tendencies which represent the majority of those who vote in the Union. The Right is better able to define the major requirements of the membership than the Left. It is the Right which has been best able to face the problem best, in the present socio-political environment, of the pressures operating in the factories against connecting economic struggles to wider struggles.

This Chapter has shown differences in the role of the Union, its scope and struggles which exist among the stewards. On the basis of these differences tendencies have been distinguished in the forms of consciousness. All those tendencies can be variants of Trade Union consciousness, though some of the attitudes found among the 'Broad Left' could be elements of a Socialist consciousness. Thus, this Chapter has added to the understanding of class consciousness by allowing one to look at the details of the forms of consciousness based on the stewards' responses. From this one can see that the tendencies in consciousness are not just individually formed, but also group mediated. The next Chapter will consider how far the stewards seek to develop solidarity through collective identity, and awareness of common interests.

NOTES

1. A.E.U. Rule Book, adopted at the Rules Revision Meeting, 1970.
2. E. Ions, 'Against Behaviouralism', Basil Blackwell, London, 1977, discusses some of the limitations of this method, see Chapter IX.
3. L. Goldman, 'Towards a Sociology of the Novel', Tavistock, London, 1975, pp 159-60.
4. A. Lunacharsky, 'On Literature and Art', Progress, Moscow, 1973, p 11; C. Caudwell, 'Romance and Realism', Princeton, 1970, p 33.
5. A. West, 'Crisis and Criticism', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1975, p 98.
6. See P. Beharrell and G. Philo, 'Trade Unions and the Media', MacMillan, London, 1977.
7. Definitions of these posts can be found in the A.E.U. Rule Book.
8. Analysis of the origins of the groups which make up this tendency can be found in P.T. Moon, 'The Labour Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France', MacMillan, New York, 1921; J. Fitzsimmons, 'Forms of the Apostolate', Dublin Review, Vol. 231, 1957; T. Sheridan 'Mindful Militants', C.U.P. 1975, pp 192-4.
9. Analysis of the origins of this tendency can be found in R. Martin, 'Communism and British Trade Unionism', Clarendon Press, London, 1969; A. Hutt, 'British Trade Unionism', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1964.

NOTES

10. Reg Birch, an Executive Councillor, was in the C.P.G.B. before the formation of the C.P.B. (M.L.).
11. Analysis of the origins and developments of the groups which make up this tendency can be found in P. Shipley 'Revolutionaries in Modern Britain', Bodley Head, London, 1976.
12. For discussions of these differences see V.L. Allen, 'Militant Trade Unionism', Merlin, London, 1966; J.T. Murphy, 'The Workers' Committee', Reprints in Labour History, Number 1, discusses the need for industrial Unionism; K.D. Buckley, 'The Amalgamated Engineers in Australia', Australian National University, Canberra, 1970, deals with the changes in a craft union. While J. Seldman, J. London, B. Karsh, D. Tagliacocco, 'The Workers Views His Union', University of Chicago, 1966, pp 242-251, outlines seven different ideological types of Union Members judged by their view of Unionism.
13. V.L. Allen, 'Trade Unions and the Government', Longmans, London, 1960, p 309.
14. See W.M. Chandler, 'Canadian Socialism and Policy Impact', Canadian Journal of Political Science, Vol. X, 1977, for a discussion of contagion.
15. Allen, 'Militant Trade Unionism', *ibid.*
16. I. Richter, 'Political Purpose in Trade Unionism', Allen and Unwin, London, 1975, pp 117, 144-5 discusses the political involvement of the Left.

NOTES

17. 'The General Strike for Industrial Freedom', I.W.W. Chicago, 1946, pp 25-8, discusses different types of amalgamation.
18. Thus, W. Carron attacked the Left in the A.E.U. for its links with non-A.E.U. members, A.E.U. Journal, Vol. 33, Number 7, 1966, p 272.
19. D. Connors and B. Passington, 'The Role of Shop Stewards', Marxism Today, Vol. 22, 1978, p 120 discuss manual workers' relations with staff.
20. See D. Connor, 'The Ford Strike: Where does it take us', Marxism Today, Vol. 23, 1979, p 35 for a discussion of sectionalism and the differentials problem.
21. See R. Fox, 'The Novel and the People', Cobbett, London, 1944, p 121; and J. Lindsay, 'After the Thirties', Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1956, p 171.
22. T. Lane, 'The Union Makes Us Strong', Faber and Faber, London, 1974, pp 35-6; R. Hyman, 'Strikes', Fontana, 1972, pp 77-82.
23. A.J. Banks, 'Marxist Sociology in Action', Faber and Faber, London, 1970, Chapter 4; Allen, 'Militant Trade Unionism', *ibid*, p 40.
24. H. Beynon, 'Working for Ford', Penguin, London, 1973, p 8; Hyman, *ibid*, p 54.

NOTES

25. K. Waddington, 'Revolutionary Consciousness', Marxism Today, Vol. 17, 1953, p 58. Also, T. Lane and K. Roberts 'Strike at Pilkington', Fontana, London, 1971, p 103 discuss the division between work and politics.
26. W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Parker, 'Shop Stewards and Workshop Relations', Research Paper 10, H.M.S.O. London, 1968, p 45; A.I. Marsh, E.O. Evans, P. Garcia, 'Workshop Industrial Relations in Engineering', Kogan Page, London, 1971, p 25; Hyman, *ibid*, p 53.
27. Hyman, *ibid*, p 70; see, too, G. Kerr and A. Segal, 'The Interindustry Propensity to Strike', McGraw Hill, 1954, for an analysis of the frequency of strikes. Also, R. Cherry, 'Class Struggle and the Nature of the Working Class', The Review of Radical Political Economies, Vol. V, 1975, discusses the duration of strikes.
28. J.E.T. Eldridge, 'Industrial Disputes', Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1948, pp 41-3 discusses the typification of strikes. As E. Shorter and C. Tilly point out in 'Strikes in France, 1830-1968', C.U.P. 1974, all strikes involve a power struggle of some kind.
29. W. Balamus, 'Efficiency and Effort', Tavistock, London, 1961, analyses workers' attempts to get fair compensation for effort.
30. See 'Shop Stewards in a Car Factory', New Left Review, 80, 1973, p. 40.
31. T. Nichols and P. Armstrong, 'Workers Divided', Fontana, 1976.

Chapter Four: Solidarity Among Engineering Shop Stewards.

In this chapter the responses of the shop stewards to the questions designed to investigate their willingness to show solidarity in different circumstances will be outlined. Of course, problems are faced when dealing with the concept of solidarity since it is both a descriptive and evaluative term. The meanings given to solidarity depend on the valuational judgements of the shop stewards on when circumstances warrant them giving some type of aid to others. It is the valuational aspects in giving solidarity which allows one to assert that forms of class consciousness may be revealed in the shop stewards' answers.

Since solidarity is not an automatic response to situations faced by workers in industry, showing it means having overcome the fragmentations and divisions amongst workers based on diverse work and the division of labour. The main form of solidarity for the workers in this sample is the Trade Union (as was shown in the previous Chapter). Though membership in itself does not guarantee that the unionists behaviour will show solidaristic practices. Nevertheless, from all perspectives Trade Unions are attempts to regulate the freedom of purchasers of labour to buy at will, in a situation where labour is a commodity to be bought and sold. By doing this Trade Unions are believed to affect 'capitalist political economy' in some way. From a Marxian perspective this leads to Trade Unions being viewed as having a dual nature since they incarnate the differences between Capital and Labour, while reflecting a refusal to be incorporated into capitalist society on capital's unilaterally determined terms (1).

It is one the basis of this incorporation/non-incorporation that one can begin to see means of testing the concept of solidarity in relation to forms of consciousness. Solidarity can be viewed as being dependent on the existence of some forms of class identity and class opposition, and of beliefs in the capacity of workers to act to affect situations in which they are involved (2). It is these attributes of identity, opposition and capacity which allow the collective action required for solidarity to take place.

While it is the extent and developments of solidarity which can be viewed as expressing forms of consciousness of class interest. More particularly, the forms of consciousness of class interest which will be considered in this section will be concerned with 'Trade Union consciousness'. This is because the questions asked in this section were designed to see how far the stewards had feelings of identity, opposition and capacity which could be described as being within the horizons of the politics of the factory floor. Solidarity was regarded as an end in itself, rather than as a means in the achievement of an alternative society. Thus, the extent to which solidarity is given will depend on how far interests and sympathies are seen as united with other workers, and so the degree to which they feel morally obliged to act.

Obviously there are a number of problems in 'testing' the content of concepts such as solidarity since it involves dealing with human intentionality, and so making moral value judgements. Solidarity is a highly complex process which though viewed in isolation here is intertwined with a variety of other complex factors.

In addition, it is a concept which involves some ambiguity in definition of what actually constitutes acts of solidarity.

While the means used to test it have the danger inherent within them of actually inferring rather than looking at direct attitudes and behaviour.

The only problem that can be faced by the researcher is the recognition of the value judgements explicit in the choice of criteria for testing the concept of solidarity. The type of questions used in this section were mainly drawn from the stereotypes of Marxian views of how workers should act, and from the dominant assumptions in society as interpreted by the researcher.

The method for interpreting the answers in terms of class consciousness will be based on:

- (1) how far they are free of the cliches of dominant assumptions;
- (2) how far they echo phrases and key words used by candidates in union elections who have already been categorised;
- (3) how far they show an adherence to 'working class principles' as a basis for giving solidarity.

The definition of all these, and particularly the last one, further illustrates the dependence on value judgements based on a variant of Marxian theories in deducing criteria for evaluating forms of consciousness. This is because in dealing with principles one is examining the moral rules the shop stewards have developed to guide their conduct. In deducing 'working class principles' one is concerned with how far certain qualities have been developed by the stewards.

These are developed around a series of questions:

- (1) how the element of struggle is viewed;
- (2) how they defin 'who are our enemies, who are our friends?';
- (3) how far they ask 'what is to be done, and how to do it?'

At its most general 'working class principles' should lead the steward to select his or her answers in a way which shows a profound faith in the strength of the working class, a will for militant action, and an understanding of the need to unify the class in struggle.

The following sections will deal with the different forms of solidarity which could be given depending on the circumstances. The order of presentation of results is based on a judgement of the 'difficultness' of giving a form of solidarity. This judgement has been based on an assessment of the degree of coincidence of interest which has to be seen in each situation for solidarity to be given. That is, how abstract and removed from the immediate environment of the stewards is the situation. Of course in a study like this, one is helped by the existence of other investigations of solidarity. From the work of Paterson (1960), Sykes (1967), Beynon (1973), Cotgrove and Vampleu (1972), one can see how solidarity has been developed in other workforces, its contents and strengths, as well as its limitations. Most studies find that workers are strong on solidarity because of the moral frameworks they possess which provide an alternative to those dominant in society (3). What this study will try to do is add more detail to the reasons found for workers giving solidarity. From this it will see how far these reasons are responsible for limitations being placed on the scope of solidarity through the Trade Union.

The results will be presented in the form of aggregate data. This means emphasis will be on the quantitative aspects rather than considering individual stewards in a more qualitative manner. Hence, what can be said about the forms of consciousness exhibited in the answers will lack some subtlety, since variations in responses of individuals may be subsumed in the aggregate.

Workers' Rights: The Closed Shop

The existence of the basic form of working class association in the workplace requires that a sense of identity of interests is present on the basis of which solidarity is seen as a legitimate response. It is this realised coincidence of interests and obligations which allows competition among workers to be stopped for general competition with the owners (4). The development of union association can be viewed as an organisational manifestation of the consciousness of the workers involved (5). Obviously, the extent of development of organisation varies with sets of circumstances, and so the contents of consciousness will differ. A reason for the variation in organisation may be the nature of the solidarity which workers are prepared to give within a particular workshop. The questions in this section are designed to examine examples of this solidarity in relation to the stewards' attitudes to developing a strong and cohesive workshop organisation.

Initially, the stewards were asked, 'Do you think all workers should belong to a Trade Union?' This provoked some debate over the definition of where the working class ended, and so whether managers should be unionised or not.

Given this debate, 97% of the stewards felt that "all workers" should be members of some Union. The three who did not, felt that workers in very small shops, who had personal relations with owners, need not be members.

Next the stewards were asked, 'Why do you think workers should belong to a Union?' Their answers centred on types of benefit belonging to a Union could bring. A majority of the stewards saw the benefits as essentially wages and conditions. The minority saw it in terms of security against management gained through unity.

Table 1 Reasons For Joining a Union

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Wages and Conditions	60	13	47
Security through Unity	37	12	25

Both groups recognised that any benefits gained depended on workers' unified in a Union. As one steward said, "only by unity do you have any chance of getting decent wages and the rest from management".

They were then asked, "Why are some people not in Unions?", to see the motives they imputed to non-joiners.

Table 2 Motives of Non-Joiners of Unions

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Think It Infringes Freedom	11	3	8
Religion	9	5	4
Never Organised	7	-	7
Political	19	4	15
Are 'Brainwashed'	7	4	3
Are 'Miserable'	10	-	10
Relationships with Managers	20	6	14
Don't Know/No Answer	17	3	14

It can be suggested that two categorisations were given by stewards to explain non-joiners. The first is fairly acceptable to some stewards, since they involve moral positions by some non-joiners. However, the majority of stewards attributed a certain immorality and malice to those who could not join. This can be illustrated:

* George Higgins - "I feel if they don't want to belong to a Union most of it's political. You find people who don't want to belong have right wing views".

Bob Cassidy - "You get some out for promotion, who to get themselves noticed don't join the Union".

John Arbuckle - "The political situation, the general political atmosphere, people are persuaded by the television, the press, that Trade Unions are all right in their place, and we know what is meant by their place".

* See Appendix Three for details of the stewards.

Those who do not join are seen as lacking the moral strength of those who do belong. Non-joiners are seen as trying to curry favour, or unable to think for themselves.

In these responses one can see a reversal of the dominant assumptions in society regarding non-joiners, who are pictured as martyrs and heroes against Union tyranny. This gives some evidence to support the existence of an alternative framework of assumptions among some stewards. The strength of this was tested by putting a question in terms of the dominant assumptions. 'Don't you think the individual should have the right not to belong to a Trade Union?'

Table 3 A Right Not To Belong

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	32	3	29
No	68	22	46

Two thirds of the stewards opposed the individuals right to choose in this situation. Of these forty, three gave moral reasons to justify their position.

Table 4 Moral Justifications For Opposing
The Right to Choose

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
'They shouldn't take benefits'	35	10	25
'A Right not to work with them'	4	2	2
Tell them history of Unions	4	3	1

This moral position is based on a recognition of the obligations to the collective by the individual which necessitates a limitation of individual rights for the collective benefit. From their comments, an imperative can be seen to guide behaviour.

Eddie Curran, "If they agree with me that they wouldn't accept any Union rises which we've fought by the Union, then I would agree with them to come into the factory."

Dick Duncan, "It's a matter of freedom. It's the freedom of people to have a Trade Union negotiate for them, and it is also their freedom not to work beside anyone who is not in the Union but are getting the benefits."

These stewards' comments show that they would seek to make the non-joiner act morally, and recognise a common identity with other workers organised in the Union. These stewards have a sense of fairness and equality which has been described as components of 'factory consciousness' (6). The strength of its development can be seen in the finding that twenty seven of the stewards said they would not allow non-unionists into their factories. As Robert Porterfield said:-

"We don't let them in. If they don't want to be in a Union they should go into a non-union shop, otherwise they are parasites."

Managements' Rights

Implicit in the collective bargaining practices of Trade Unions is a recognition that management has certain rights (7). In order to see how far the stewards recognised some rights of management to run the factories, they were asked, 'Do you think management should be able to sack and take on workers?' Only ten agreed with this sentiment, and all of them placed some qualifications within their answers.

Thus, James McGarrigle said:-

"Most of the time I'd say management have the right to do this if they are running the place well."

The others felt this was a right management should not possess since, "There's got to be a reason for things." Or as Bob McGerty said:-

"It's no democracy. It's supposed to be a democratic country. Who takes that decision? Somebody the workers have elected?"

These findings are similar to those found in other studies. Thus, Hill (1976) found three quarters of the dockers felt that Unions should have greater influence on management (8). While McCarthy and Parker (1968) found 78% of shop stewards felt a strike would be justified to stop the sacking of a workmate (9).

From these studies, and the findings in this study, one can see a recognition of the non-identity of interests on some issues between workers and employers. This provides the basis for the unwillingness to grant management unilateral rights to sack, since they may use it unfairly, without respect for the interests and sympathies of the shop stewards' members.

In this section it has been possible to infer the existence of feelings of identity and opposition amongst the shop stewards. This inference has been based on the moral attitudes most conspicuously shown in the stewards' answers. At the same time as seeing a basic identity and opposition exist, it has been possible to see variations in the contents of them which came out in the different posings of the questions.

Thus, ninety seven believed all should belong to a Union, sixty eight believed the individual should not have the right to choose, while twenty seven were willing to enforce unionism, by not allowing non-unionists into the factory. Of course, these responses must be viewed within the constraints the shop stewards believed they faced in trying to stop an individual exercising his or her rights in a particular shop.

Solidarity Within the Factory

A major method of organising for defence of a group of workers has been to demarcate on the basis of trade. This fragmentation of workers according to the labour tasks performed has led to competition amongst workers, which can have a dynamic based on memories, enmities, fears, prejudices and antipathies (10). The question then becomes, how far this fragmentation has been overcome by a sense of identity among workers, and an alternative focus of opposition. One method of probing this is to examine if solidarity has been given in struggles within the factory, and this might be viewed as showing common sympathies and aspirations.

The first question the stewards were asked was, 'Have you ever given aid to another Union in this factory when they have been involved in disputes with management?'

Table 5 Given Aid Within the Factory

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	87	24	63
No	7	-	7
Only One Union	6	1	5

Only seven had not given some type of aid to other workers in the same factory. The reasons these seven had failed to act in support of other workers in opposition to management, can be best illustrated by a comment from Harry Murphy:-

"No, definitely, no. I think they should fight their own battles. I don't believe in disputes. I've been in them three or four times, but I don't believe there is any just case for a strike."

For this group no moral justification is possible for workers striking against employers, so there can be no justification for giving solidarity.

Among those who had given solidarity, two reasons could be found by which they justified their actions. The first was one which saw solidarity as a reciprocal obligation involving responsibilities and rights. They believed that by giving solidarity to another group now, they were ensuring that they would have it refunded in the future. The second group gave solidarity on the basis of a perceived coincidence of interests based on a unity at the level of a labour movement.

Table 6 Reasons For Giving Solidarity In the Factory

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Reciprocal Obligation	44	4	40
Coincidence of Interest	39	21	18

From the distribution of stewards across the two categories, one can see a marked difference with the majority of Communists believing solidarity should be given because of a coincidence of interests.

This allows one to see a difference between the contents of Socialist consciousness, and 'Trade Union consciousness'. Socialist response can be seen in the comments of Davie Wilson:-

"Unions should co-operate because basically we are both members of the same movement, we have the same ends in sight. Hopefully, we are all working for Socialist principles."

Both categories exhibit an awareness that conflict between workers and owners is permanent. Thus, Pat McGowan, 23, maintenance in a rubber work, believed solidarity was essential since:-

"You never know when you'll need it yourself someday."

For those giving solidarity because of reciprocal obligation it would seem that the Union is a form of industrial insurance against uncertain future relationships with employers.

To see how far solidarity had been formalised organisationally, the stewards were asked if they had formed a Joint Shop Stewards Committee in the factories. As Beynon points out the formation of such a body depends on a common purpose being developed in struggles by workers (11). Only twenty three stewards in this sample did not have any formal contacts with other workers. The major reason for not having contacts was given by John Rogers:-

"There are too many old hands in the place, and they remember old scores and the like."

The development of formal unity with its institutionalised solidarity has its limitations in the involvement of grades of workers. This can be seen from the relations the stewards reported they had with white collar workers.

They were asked, 'Do you have any contact with the white collar workers in this factory?'

Table 7 Contact With White Collar Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Have Contact	59	17	42
No Contact	36	8	28
Not Relevant	5	-	5

For many justification for this lack of contact was said to be the fact that the staff were unorganised. Though one suspects the underlying reason was given by John Robin:-

" . . . very much a them and us attitude, very much a class consciousness. I don't know why, but the two shall never meet."

One can see in this statement the limitations of some forms of 'trade union consciousness' which define the 'us', which constitute the working class solely in terms of manual labour. This is a narrow, confining understanding, which some have described as corporate, since it limits the working class to certain types of organisations and struggles and fragments its potential unity. It is precisely this form of "class consciousness" as expressed by John Robin, that Marxian political workers try to change into Socialist consciousness with little success. To try to gauge how deep this contact was with white collar workers the stewards were asked, 'Are the white collar workers on your Joint Shop Stewards Committee?' (12).

Table 8 Are The Staff On Your J.S.S.C.

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	16	6	10
No	43	11	32

Thus, only a minority has white collar workers on their formal institutions of solidarity. Interestingly, the factories which have them on their J.S.S.C. are all ones which have been involved in struggles which have required a unity of employees, and in which this unity has been achieved. As one steward, Willie Watt, said:-

"During the redundancies we had T.A.S.S. and A.C.T.S.
in a combined effort to try and fight it."

Thus, the changes in their situation resulted in a new type of thinking among the stewards, since it allowed them to see an identity of manual and white collar workers plight in facing unemployment through redundancy. On this basis a common opposition was possible to employers.

However, the fear of insecurity has also been a source of fragmentation among workers, since it has led to the use of a traditional weapon for the defence of a trade, demarcation. This form of defence has been very prevalent amongst those employed in heavy engineering and shipbuilding. It signifies a factionalisation of the workforce based on splits in the production process, and means that the common identity and opposition of workers in the face of management is undercut by competition between workers. As a measure of this fragmentation the stewards were asked, 'Have you been involved in demarcation disputes?'

Table 9 Involved In Demarcation Disputes

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	68	18	50
No	32	7	25

The main reasons given for these disputes were concerned with 'Job Security' factors. As John Rogers put it, "It's the fear for jobs when redundancy is in the air." From this one might conclude that seeking solidarity with other workers is not necessarily a natural response by workers. Defence of their own position can lead to some groups of workers opposing the most visible group which seems to be threatening them. As John Reilley says:-

"Sometimes a skilled person will say, 'We're not doing that job', because they consider it beneath them. Eventually, when work turnover is decreasing they'll turn round and say 'We're taking that job'."

This would make it seem that demarcating against other workers is a strategy which can be used by workers in a strong bargaining position against those in a weaker one. In a sense, this means the 'strong' group are choosing a 'soft target' to attack, rather than the 'hard target' of employers. So the main group the stewards in this sample had had demarcation problems with were Boilermakers (23 cases). This is a group in a stronger position in the Clyde-side labour market than engineers, and so can threaten their job security.

This situation presents a problem for class conscious workers in how to deal with it. Given that it is their job security which is being attacked by less class conscious workers, they have no recourse but to defend their position. To do otherwise would not help develop the consciousness of their attackers, since it would only confirm the efficacy of their strategy. Though, at the same time, defending their position would not necessarily make the attackers reconsider their ideas. It is a difficult problem for class conscious workers to overcome, and the method of doing so will probably differ from factory to factory. However, it can be done, as Murdo MacLeod says:-

" . . . management were dividing and conquering.

They were offering different sets of conditions to the Boilermakers and to us. I had some opposition from the Boilermakers, as far as the Committee (J.S.S.C.) was concerned, but they eventually saw the sense of it."

Further, it can be seen that the fact of demarcation disputes does not necessarily mitigate against solidarity. So sixty eight stewards reported demarcation incidents, but eighty seven of them had taken part in solidarity actions in their factories against management. This may be because the solidarity given in these situations did not affect the job security of the stewards. However, one can suggest it also shows that fragmentation is limited by class experiences gained in struggles against employers which leads to a belief in a coincidence of interests with other workers.

Thus, only five stewards said that the demarcation dispute had led to them going on strike, and even here it was linked to management paying different wages to the groups involved for the same work. This would make it seem that disputes between workers are seen as having a different content from disputes with management, and so lead to different responses. That is to say that the forms of class consciousness which exist among the stewards, no matter how lacking in development in a Marxian sense, are high enough to allow them to differentiate between those they have conflicts with.

It can be seen fairly clearly from the results presented that forms of class identity and opposition exist among the shop stewards, and are expressed with the factories in solidarity actions, contacts between workers and formal organisations. Some of the limitations of this factory identity and opposition when it is in the form of a restricted 'trade union consciousness' can be found in demarcation disputes, and the failure to develop contacts with white collar workers. Coincidence of interest is much more easily seen between blue collar workers than between blue and white collar workers because problems are not so easily seen to be shared, and so obligations to solidarity are weaker. This can even reach the extent that white collar workers are viewed as 'them', and so a group to be opposed along with employers.

This may be based on a lack of contact since only two demarcation disputes of engineers involved white collar unions.

Paradoxically, it may be that seeing someone else can do your job e.g. Boilermakers, can lead to a common purpose being seen more easily, and common aspirations developed. The fragmentation caused by these attitudes leads to a misplaced opposition which stops the development of a more comprehensive form of 'trade union consciousness', and even 'Socialist consciousness'.

Solidarity With Workers in Other Factories

An important element in going beyond a factory identity is seeing links with workers in other factories, which leads to the development of a common interest amongst workers in general against employers in general (13). It marks an awareness of a connection between the Union in the factory, and the wider network of Union associations. In a formal sense, organisations can be seen to exist, which do attempt these types of connections and symbolise solidarity e.g. Confederation of Engineering and Shipbuilding Unions, Trades Councils, Trade Union Congress, etc. While within the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section) the network of District Committees provide a forum for the discussion of factory problems (14).

This section sought to discover to what extent the shop stewards were involved in solidarity across factories. Nearly all the stewards had been asked for this type of aid from other workers (99 out of 100). Ninety four of them believed they should give this type of aid, and not 'mind their own business', and had given it.

These ninety four were asked, 'Why did you give this help?' Their answers can be put into three categories.

Table 10 Motives For Helping Other Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Coincidence of Interests	41	20	21
Reciprocal Obligations	16	1	15
Agreed with Dispute	37	4	33

A difference can be seen in the reason for giving solidarity here, in comparison with those found in Table 6, for giving it within the factory. This difference is that less see a 'Reciprocal Obligation'. This is replaced, in the main, by the motive of agreeing with the dispute. Obviously, within a factory the issues will be more specifically known, and reciprocal obligation more clear. Whereas, John Robin pointed out for other factories:-

"Basically you make the decision on the basis of the circulars that are sent round. You hand out the circulars and it depends what the men have read in the press and in certain cases they'll say 'Yes'."

For other factories, then, seeing a reciprocal obligation is more easily avoided. Since giving solidarity can lead to personal hardship, then it is possible that some will seek to avoid it if possible, if they lack the ideological perceptions to see a coincidence of interest. Thus, it was found that in seventy two of the cases of solidarity with other factories, the form of solidarity had been financial donations. This can be considered to be the easiest form of solidarity to give, and is given because as James Reynold put it:-

"Obviously, you don't go out, nobody goes out."

However, the fact is some people have 'gone out' in the past in support of other workers. It could be suggested that some do not go out because the other workers, asking for solidarity, do not ask them to, because they do not feel that the degree of development of their struggle demands. Nevertheless, another reason may be that they know other workers would not do so. As Michael McGoldrick pointed out, in regards to giving financial aid, he would give it as long

" . . . as our money isn't affected."

So it can be seen to have some elements of being an 'extra' about it, in that it is only given after a calculation is made of how giving will affect them. It is not something which is seen to flow naturally from a common position. For this group giving financial aid may be seen as a form of insurance. As Tommy Forrest said:-

"In Chryslers we gave help because we're so dependent on outside workers."

The negative side of this solidarity is that it is calculated. The positive side is that it implies seeing an interconnection with other workers, which can be developed into seeing a coincidence of interest in removing the causes of common problems.

For those who see a coincidence of interest, solidarity comes from explicit principles of collective aspirations. Thus, Ronnie Martin says he gives solidarity:-

"Even when we shouldn't, like McNeils down the road. It was like something out of the nineteenth century, the conditions they were in. I went down and I saw it, 'Save it' I said. 'You should be fighting to close it down'."

Why did you help then? "We've got to help other workers."

This articulation of a felt unity of interests and common opposition based on being workers was the defining feature of forty one stewards' answers. However, the extent to which a coincidence of interest was seen varied with how far calculative themes existed within it. For Robert Arbuckle it was not a matter of calculation but of showing an example:-

"They are brother trade unionists, therefore, we should support them in the same manner we would expect them to support us."

Others, however, did not see a coincidence of interest with workers outside their area because:-

"They know it's their own area and if they get into trouble it's their own area which would help them.

It's like putting money in the bank."

Here coincidence of interest is limited by instrumental advantage. The function of solidarity as an expression of brotherhood of workers and common struggle is undermined. The underlying themes in solidarity of egalitarianism and moralism are, thus, limited and in competition with ideas which fracture unity through sectionalism. Coincidence of interest is then seen with those who can be identified as being in the same strata as 'us'. This can lead to some refusing to give aid to other workers because, in Nichols words, they measure good causes against groups like the car workers. As Willie Jordan put it:-

"There's a strong resentment of our wage packet and human nature being what it is, when you see other factories getting up to £15 a week more, I'm afraid the men say, 'Any collection should be for us who are not on strike.' It's cynical really."

They fail to see that high wages are a sign of good organisation which is aware of its rights, and willing to struggle for them. However, their failures of solidarity do not lead them to see a harmony of interests with employers and managers. None of the stewards agreed with a statement, 'Don't you think this type of action infringes on managements' right to manage?' Since they either felt these rights did not enter into the question, or were rights which should be infringed. This helps confirm the findings of other studies of the existence of a different framework of interpretation of issues among workers. Though the development of this framework differs with the ideological level of the steward. As has been shown, for some it is undercut by instrumentalism and sectionalism. It is this factor of ideological orientation of the stewards which is of key importance since correlational analysis found no relationship between the giving of solidarity and size of factory which one might have thought would have been a determining variable since it is these small factories which have the poorest organisation.

Specific Instances of Extra-Factory Solidarity

In order to consider the nature of solidarity in more detail, the shop stewards were questioned on specific instances when they had the possibility of involvement in solidarity actions. The instances chosen were the U.C.S. 'work-in', the Chrysler redundancy fight, the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions token stoppage, the Assembly Against Unemployment, and the actions against the Cuts in Public Expenditure called by white collar unions.

Participation in these various actions required different levels of commitment to the concepts of solidarity based on differing views of the origins and nature of the problems and the prescriptions required. It would vary with the extent of common interests, opposition capacities of workers seen by the stewards, and of their willingness to take part in actions which varied in legitimacy in terms of societal assumptions.

Only fourteen had not participated in giving solidarity to the U.C.S. 'work-in', and six of them had been too young, while three were unemployed at the time. This can be compared with the findings for Chrysler.

Table 11 Solidarity for Chrysler Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Given	33	11	22
Not Given	67	14	53

Thus, two thirds of the stewards had not helped Chrysler, though twenty five said they had not been asked to give help. Nevertheless, in the comments of the stewards one can detect attitudes which fragment solidarity of workers, and have been found previously. These attitudes echoed the popular stereo-types of the dominant assumptions in Society. So Colin Adam, 23, small jobbing shop felt:-

" . . . Chryslers is too militant. They go out and strike for stupid things."

While John Dixon "wouldn't have anything to do with them" because "They've got more money than me."

This narrowness in thinking meant the interconnections of the local economy were not seen by these stewards. Rather their forms of class consciousness led them to view Chrysler workers as being at the top of the local hierarchy of wages, and so resented as not being part of 'us'. As Tom Potts pointed out:-

"Outside the motor industry, there's no much support for them."

These workers felt they were in competition with Chrysler workers for wages, and so could benefit if Chryslers was removed.

This immaturity of class consciousness contrasts with the awareness of other stewards of the importance of Chryslers. Thus, Peter Lyden said:-

"Obviously we take an interest because it affects all of us a local work like that closing."

For U.C.S. the wider implications seem to have been easier to grasp because of the circumstances and cultural traditions of the area. So George Higgins said:-

"I think there was a certain amount of nostalgia about shipyards on the Clyde by people. They thought there must always be a shipyard there."

While Alex Deakin pointed out:-

"The Clydeside is one of the strongest union places. If it went it would have meant a loss of jobs and a great loss to the Union."

So the great interdependence of shipbuilding and related industries on Clydeside added to the traditional ideologies and social institutions of the working class to produce the solidarity for U.C.S.

U.C.S. can then be viewed as the definite outcome of the historical developments of the working class movement on Clydeside. In addition, one must consider the importance of the ability of the politically conscious leadership to learn from past experiences and understand the need for a political popularisation of the struggle, to explain it, and develop links with other workers. The traditions and leadership were not so developed at Chryslers, and this added to the already existing forces towards fragmentation. It can be seen from the Chrysler struggle that workers' solidarity can be undermined by a belief that one is in competition with other workers. The rationale for not giving solidarity is put in a caricature of class conscious language, so that Chrysler workers become 'them', and catch-phrases from the media are used to describe their unworthiness as recipients of aid.

In continuing the examination of the shop stewards' recognition of coincidence of interests with other workers, they were asked, 'Do you think workers should take part in actions against cuts in public expenditure?'

Table 12 Act Against Cuts in Public Expenditure

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Should Act	77	24	53
Should Not	23	1	22

Thus, twenty three stewards were willing to accept the need for cuts and not oppose them. Only one was a Communist, and his attitude may have been shaped by his employment in Leyland and the pressures this put on him to accommodate himself to Government propaganda on the need to be realistic, and accept some cuts to save as much as possible of the industry.

This sort of attitude can be illustrated by a comment from

Michael McEwan:--

"Let's face it, no matter where they cut to save money they're going to hurt somebody. So what do you do in circumstances like that? If it's no us, it's somebody else."

A cynicism based on feelings of powerlessness, and lack of faith in the capacity of workers to affect things like Government cuts (15). Thus, Alex MacDonald said:--

"I would say if they've decided to do it they will do it because they have the power to do it."

These twenty three would not even consider getting involved in action against the cuts even in speculations. This number grew when specific instances were mentioned. First the officially backed action by the C.S.E.U.

Table 13 Involved In the C.S.E.U. Stoppage

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Involved	59	18	41
Not Involved	41	7	34

Thus, forty one shop stewards were unwilling to obey an official recommendation, or felt their shop was too small to get involved, or were in a continuous production process and could not stop. They were then asked if they had been involved in an unofficial action. 'Did you send delegates to the Assembly on Unemployment?'

Table 14 Sent Delegate to the Assembly

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	37	18	19
No	63	7	56

This unofficial action involved only thirty seven of the stewards, and since almost half of these were Communists one might suggest that ideological factors were important. For those willing to get involved in unofficial actions, the actions had an efficacy in themselves. As John Dixon put it:-

"Well somebody has to act. If somebody doesn't take a hand then nobody will know how people feel."

These actions have a value in expressing the feelings of workers to the Government, even if they are unsuccessful in altering policies. Among the Communist stewards there was a belief that action could have an effect, and could be a means to bring about changes through developing a movement. Thus, John Lyons felt:-

"It's important to strengthen the backing to the opposition to the Government's policies."

While George MacMillan says:-

"Any form of support we can give that is going to help in some way to bring about a change we will obviously consider and hope we can support."

From this one can see a difference in the attitudes of stewards coming from differences in their forms of class consciousness. Those with Socialist forms of consciousness seem to have a greater belief in the capacity of workers to carry out actions which can successfully achieve results in their own interests. For the Communists the defining feature for effective actions is in Eddie Gray's words:-

"If enough people are involved they will have an effect."

Thus, the contents of their consciousness can be seen to include themes concerning the possibility of changes through mass mobilisation and struggle. This contrasts with the tendency towards a cynicism about the capacity of workers to have an affect on policies once decided by a Government, unless actions are officially backed.

In this section the existence of a degree of instrumentalism towards solidarity has been suggested which leads to a fragmentation of unity. There is also a cynicism amongst certain stewards towards the value of collective action in some circumstances. Nevertheless, it can be seen that some basic feeling of common identity and opposition exist from the fact that ninety four had given some type of aid to workers in other factories. These feelings are not necessarily based on seeing a coincidence of interests among workers, but can come from a sympathy with other workers, or seeing the need to insure against future hazards. These latter basis are not always strong enough to resist being undermined by societal pressures which can affect the definition given to 'us', so that it is narrowed and restricted and intra-class differences promoted.

The forms of consciousness existing can also be seen to vary according to the type of struggle the workers are willing to engage in. The legitimacy of the action, as defined by its official backing by the union apparatus, meant it was more likely to be backed by the stewards. This vouching for the action by union leaders may inform the stewards that there is a coincidence of interests with other workers. For a minority the unofficialness of the action is less important than what the aims of the action are, and it is these aims which define whether the action is legitimate.

In this Chapter one can begin to see the importance of the ideological convictions of the shop stewards in determining what actions they would participate in. Thus, in every action of an unofficial kind, or against dominant assumptions, Communist stewards were more likely to be involved. From this, suggestions have been about the differences in the contents of forms of consciousness between Socialist consciousness and trade union consciousness.

In addition, correlation analysis found no relationship existed between the size of the workplace and attitudes towards solidarity. This is contrary to what might have been expected, since some studies have found those in small plants to be less militant. Part of the explanation of this difference may come from the nature of small engineering shops compared to other small factories. Unlike them, engineering shops can be characterised by a high ratio of tradesmen doing very skilled 'jobbing' work for larger factories. Research has suggested that the sense of union identification is strongest amongst tradesmen, hence this may overcome any personal relationships with employers, and ensure an adherence to basic union practices.

Solidarity With Foreign Workers

To give solidarity to foreign workers means having some sense of an international identity of interests among workers, as well as a belief in the capacity of workers in one country to affect the situation in other countries. Historically, there have been instances of British workers giving help to workers in other countries, though this has often been viewed as an act of charity (16).

However, it has been an action which has occurred with less frequency than solidarity within Britain. From a Marxian perspective, if sectionalism within a workforce can be overcome by extra-factory solidarity, then solidarity with foreign workers may involve a similar process of overcoming limitations of class consciousness caused by emotional nationalism, which leads to an ignoring of class divisions in society. To consider the existence of this theme in solidarity, the shop stewards were asked, 'Do you think workers in this country should help workers in other countries when they are in difficulties?'

Table 15 Help Foreign Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Should Help	75	25	50
Should Not	25	-	25

Thus, three quarters of the sample felt that foreign workers should be given help if they needed it. Only sixty eight of the stewards had been asked to give this type of aid (19 Communists and 49 Non-Communists). The stewards were then asked, 'Have you given this type of aid?'

Table 16 Have Given Help to Foreign Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Given Help	53	14	29
Have Not	15	5	9
Not Asked	32	6	26

Thus, almost 75% of those who have been asked to give solidarity to foreign workers have done so. Of the seventy five in Table 15 who thought help should be given, their reasons were:-

Table 17 Motivations for Helping Foreign Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Coincidence of Interest	30	16	14
Reciprocal Obligation	26	6	20
Agreed With Case	19	3	16

It can be seen that differences exist with the motivations for giving solidarity to foreign workers as compared with that within the factory and workers in other factories. Fewer see a coincidence of interest than previously, and less talk of agreeing with the dispute or case. This latter difference may be due to the fact that some of the solidarity given to foreign workers was not necessarily for strikes. Often it was for workers living under authoritarian regimes who were struggling for trade union rights. Thus, Chile was mentioned eighteen times, and Spain twelve as countries where solidarity had been given. James Young gave the rationale for this help:-

"When it's something like Chile, I think we should
give all the help we can."

So it is by seeing foreign help as a very special case, that some stewards can justify their actions.

Once again there was the view that giving solidarity was a form of insurance since it established reciprocal obligations. As John Cunningham put it:-

"We could have the same problems someday, and we
could need their help."

Presumably, this did not mean that a coup was visualised in Britain, but rather the need to help strikes in other countries, and so receive help when British workers strike. It can be seen that less saw reciprocal obligations with foreign workers compared to workers within their factories, but more saw it with foreign workers than with workers in other factories. In part this may be due to the difficulties in gaining information with which to judge the case for foreign workers. While it is also possibly related to the fact reported above, that their aid was given to workers under authoritarian regimes, which the stewards did not expect to be reciprocated for Britain.

It can be seen that the largest single group believed in giving aid, because they saw a coincidence of interest between workers which is not over-shadowed by nationalism. As Alan Grimmond, said:-

"You're united in one struggle, universally, all over the world. There might be guys round the corner in a wee factory struggling against management, it's the same all over the world."

For these workers a common class opposition makes them aware at some level of the existence of class divisions, and so the need to give solidarity to other workers. The unity of 'us' is viewed as being international in scope and consequence. As one might expect, those who belong to the Communist Party - the national detachment of an international organisation, in theory - are more likely to adopt this view. This would suggest that it is an attitude which is learned by shop stewards from their contacts with other workers and organisations.

Once again, the extent of coincidence of interest recognised varies and calculative aspects intrude. While George Higgins would give solidarity even if it meant his unemployment, others adopted the view which was expressed by Barry McLean:-

"If we were busy and had plenty of work I think we could give aid."

This tendency towards instrumentalism comes out even more clearly when the motivations for opposing solidarity actions with foreign workers were considered.

Table 18 Motivations For Opposing Solidarity

	<u>Non-Communists</u>
'Look After Ourselves'	12
'Aid is Political'	8
'They would not help us'	5

For these stewards, coincidence of interest is subsumed by a belief that solidarity to foreign workers would disadvantage them. The emotional beliefs that "the circulars we get asking for help are politically motivated", or that "We've got to help ourselves before we can help others" means that there is no concern with the identity of interests with foreign workers, and the justice of their cases. Rather the interests of 'us' is seen as best served by refusing to give aid to foreign workers. The results shown above indicate a fairly high degree of solidarity with foreign workers exists. From this, it might seem that the emotions of nationalism and the consequent engrossment in internal problems are kept under control by the awareness of class divisions internationally. However, it may be less that class consciousness controls national pride through giving a rational awareness of a common situation, and more a case that some solidarity is considered more like an act of charity to those less well off.

It may be that the real test of the existence of internationalism would be the stewards giving aid to workers better off than themselves, such as the West Germans, or United States Americans.

The shallowness of this form of solidarity may, perhaps, be gauged by the inability of many of the stewards to institutionalise it in International Shop Stewards Combines. Though at least nineteen of the stewards work for foreign owned companies, only three reported international contacts. These were at Olivetti, Singers and Dunlop, and the stimuli for contact had all come from Italian Unions. For the others, international links had not been formed, either because they were not considered necessary, or had not been considered. In many cases it seemed that the task of maintaining the internal organisations manning and cohesiveness did not allow consideration of 'esoteric' possibilities like international organisations.

The Labour Party and the Conservative Party

For Goldthorpe the political party supported is the criteria of political consciousness. Goldthorpe sees as a defining feature of 'proletarian traditionals' in heavy industry an almost instinctive Labour voting (17). Other sociologists, Lewis (1964-5), Glantz (1958), identify Labour voting as a sign of the political solidarity with other workers, providing Labour is seen as a class party (18). More recently, in the work of other sociologists e.g. Moorhouse and Chamberlain (1974), this automatic interpretation of voting and class consciousness has been challenged. Attention has been shifted to the shrewdness, scepticism and awareness of their own realities by working class people, which has resulted in their withdrawal from the party political arena to, on occasion, forms of direct action.

A Marxian perspective on the relationship of workers to non-Marxist political parties sees them as part of trade union consciousness. This form of consciousness has as part of its contents a belief in the need to force the Government to pass legislation which brings advantageous reforms, but does not challenge the structure or functioning of the system fundamentally. This perspective has more difficulty in assessing 'non-political' direct action and its relationship to forms of consciousness. It tends to lay great emphasis on conscious political action, in which the main theme is rational knowledge of what is to be done, and assess negatively action whose main theme is libertarian.

In this section the involvement of the shop stewards in forms of direct action outside the workplace e.g. tenants rights, will be ignored, and attention will be focused on their orthodox political views.

At some time the allegiance of every shop steward in this study had been to the Labour Party. When interviewed (1977) none were going to vote Conservative, though ten were considering voting for the Scottish National Party. Given the rest were going to vote Labour, one might consider that they were showing political solidarity with other workers through a structured allegiance to a political party. However, as was said, this depends on the shop stewards viewing Labour as a workers' party. To see if this was so they were asked, 'Do you think Labour is a working man's party?'

Table 19 Is Labour A Workers' Party

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	56	14	42
No	34	10	24
Don't Know	10	1	9

Over half felt Labour was a workers' party. However, the presence of ten Communists amongst those believing Labour was not a workers' party complicated the issue. One cannot simply identify Labour voting with political consciousness. Instead one has to consider the criteria for judging used by the shop stewards. If one considers those who thought Labour was the workers' party, one finds the following reasons:-

Table 20 Labour Is A Workers Party

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Links with Unions	17	5	12
'Nearest to it'	15	2	13
Left trend within in	9	6	3
No reason	7	1	6
Policies	8	-	8

Of the fifty six who thought Labour was a workers' party, only fourteen did so in an unqualified way, all the others gave some type of apology or disclaimer for its actions at that time. This is most clearly seen from those who thought it was the 'nearest to' a workers' party. A negative assessment was made of other parties in comparison to which Labour was the 'least bad'. As Robert Porterfield put it, Labour was ". . . the best of a bad bunch." Here it was less a positive commitment of the stewards to Labour and more an acceptance of realities.

This failure of positive commitment can be found too among those who talk of it being a workers' party because of an ideological trend within it, rather than because of its intrinsic merits.

As John Ainsbury said:-

"I think there are certain people inside the Labour Party who are very Left and I would support them.
But the E.C. is not for the working class."

Even those who drew attention to the link with the trade unions could be considered to be giving a conditional commitment in their judgements. As Dick Duncan said ". . . it gets support from working men so in that sense it is."

The only group who displayed a real positive commitment were those who judged it a workers' party on the basis of its policies.

So Tommy Forrest believed:-

"It's the only party which gives the working man consideration. You can see it in things like the Employment Protection Act and the Redundancy Act, and so on."

For this group the Labour Party's actions in office were for the interest of workers.

Among those who did not think Labour was a workers' party the following reasons were given:-

Table 21 Labour Is Not A Workers' Party

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Nature of Leadership	12	6	6
Policies	12	2	10
'No different from the Tories'	4	1	3
No Reason	6	1	5

For those who drew attention to the nature of leadership in defining the characteristics of the party, one can see an ideological judgement of what influences are strongest in the Labour Party. From the nature of the leadership flows policies inimicable to the interests of the working class. For Jimmy Caldwell, Labour was not a workers' party because:-

" . . . of the role of the Ramsay MacDonalds. There are opportunistic elements in the Labour Party - the whole philosophical and theoretical conception of the theory of gradualism."

These stewards criteria for judging a workers' party would seem to be based on it carrying out policies which would intensify the class struggle for Socialism. If it does not do this it is not carrying out policies in the interest of the working class. Among the Non-Communists, the main reason for viewing Labour as not working class concerned the nature of its policies. These were felt to be against the interests of the working class. As Murdo MacLeod put it:-

"At the moment, no. Their policies make them the international bankers' party."

This would seem to suggest that voting Labour, as part of a calculation of what is most advantageous, and which has been found in other surveys is present among the stewards. They would not accept the period of a Labour Government as one of transition in which workers had to sacrifice in order to get things going again. Unlike the Ford stewards, these Clydeside stewards expected returns from a Labour Government.

Given the findings of Goldthorpe that 34% of Luton workers did not feel it made a difference which Government was in power, and Moorhouse and Chamberlains finding of 60% believing this in London, it might be considered surprising that so few stewards in this sample adopted this view. In part this may be due to the change incircumstances which have occurred since the other studies were carried out. The existence of a partnership 'Contract' between Labour and the unions may have led to an increase in the incorporation of workers into the dominant political discourses. Thus, they might now be seeing the debate between Labour or Conservative on how best to implement bipartisan policies as being about issues of fundamental difference. Another part of the explanation for this difference may lie in the fact that in this sample one was dealing with some of the key activists of the Labour movement, who hold more class specific ideas than other workers. This allows them to see a potential for evolution of the Labour Party to political class struggle against capitalism. However, from another perspective it may seem that it indicates that they are more integrated into the system, which through increasingly sophisticated means of manipulation, has incorporated Labour, and so provided itself with a wider social base. Against this view, Marxians would highlight the social make up of Labour, which developed out of the workers' movement, and the presence in its ranks of people with sincere aspirations for Socialism. It is these elements which Marxians believe give opportunities for revolutionary influences.

It is, of course, difficult to assess the forms of consciousness shown by the stewards' attitude to the Labour Party.

It would seem that nearly all the stewards showed some form of trade union consciousness in assessing the Labour Party on the basis of how it represented their interests as workers. In assessing how far they go beyond trade union consciousness to Socialistic consciousness one faces the problem of the ambiguities in Marxian analysis of Labour. These come in part from how they define the positions of the Labour Party: based organisationally upon the workers' unions, but dominated by right wing leaders, and acting in support of the maintenance of the system. Labour marks the organisational independence from the existing capitalist parties. However, it does not mark an independence of programme, or policy, since Labour has sought to preserve, while modifying the system. Thus, a Marxian attitude to Labour has been to see it in its form of structure as a workers' party, which can be transformed in certain circumstances, into a genuine workers' party acting against the system.

This still makes it difficult to judge which of the stewards' comments are the most class conscious. One can narrow it down to those saying Labour is not a workers' party because of its leadership, and those saying it is because of its links with the unions. The former because it recognises the present situation, the latter because it recognises what typifies Labour and gives it a potential.

If political solidarity with other workers involves seeing Labour as in some way related to the working class, then the other side of this would be to see Labour's main opponents as representing the employing class. This would mean seeing politics as an expression of class interests in society.

To see if this type of awareness existed the stewards were asked,
'Where do you think the Conservative Party gets its funds from?'

Table 22 Source of Conservative Funds

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
'Big Business'	84	25	59
Supporters	12	-	12
Don't Know	4	-	4

This result may be one of the reasons the number seeing no difference between Labour and Conservative was so small. The stewards had an awareness of the source of Tory funds, and as the answer to the question, 'Why does big business give money to the Conservatives?', shows linked this to interests (19).

Table 23 Why Big Business Gives to the Tories

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
To Protect their Interest	44	11	33
Make Profits Easier	14	3	11
Party of Big Business	14	3	11
Capitalist Party	8	6	2
No Answer	4	2	2

All the stewards who gave an answer seemed to be aware of the opposition of their interests to those represented by the Conservatives. They were seen as very much ". . . the political aim of big business" out to preserve society as it exists.

Though the sophistication of the responses varied, the eighty four stewards who linked the Conservatives to big business seem to have seen it as a core institution of society. They expected it to act to help the wealthy, and displayed little bitterness about it.

What most of them did not expect, and were bitter about, was the Labour Party acting in the same way. As Davy Graham put it, after saying the link between big business and the Tories was based on them being the party "of capitalism",

"but by the same token why don't they give money to the Labour Party for at the moment they are a party of big business, though they shouldn't be."

It would seem that amongst the majority of stewards in this sample an awareness exists of politics being connected with class interest. This is seen clearly by the finding that eighty four linked 'big business' with the Conservative Party, on the basis of satisfaction of interest. It is not a finding that one should be too surprised with given the Tory offensive against organised labour from 1970 e.g. Industrial Relations Act, opposition to the closed shop, etc. The stewards can see that Conservative policies have been directed against them, and so can define their common identity as workers negatively in opposition to big business.

It is in defining their common interest positively in regards to politics that there is more difficulty owing to the actions of the Labour Party. These actions have led to confrontations between the unions and the Labour Government, and have shown that it is not an instrument of the organised working class.

This problem of a lack of positive definition is one which has been seen by those adopting a Marxian perspective as solveable by trade unions using their power to transform the Labour Party, and bring it closer to the aims and demands of the working class. This would require the trade unions taking a lead in the political fights and so challenge the assumptions that it is parliamentarians who know what is best for the working class.

How far ideas and attitudes exist which would allow this type of action to take place is the subject of the next Chapter.

To sum up, though voting Labour cannot be automatically identified as an indicator of Socialist consciousness, it is not without political significance. If one does not see elections in terms of individual candidates but as a measure of political affiliation, then a Labour vote is a sign of elementary class affiliation. It is at the very least a vote for the defeat of Toryism, and all this has been shown to signify for the stewards.

Conclusion

From the results found in this Chapter it is possible to suggest that there is an elementary awareness of a common identity and opposition among the majority of stewards. So -

- (1) 97% felt all workers should belong to a union;
- (2) 87% had helped other workers in their factories;
- (3) 77% had some formal intra-factory contacts;
- (4) 94% had helped workers in other factories;
- (5) 53% had helped foreign workers;
- (6) 84% connected the Conservatives to big business on the basis of common interests.

This would seem to show a willingness to act in a collective way against perceived common enemies so as to affect the situation. There would seem to be some degree of faith among the stewards about their abilities to be effective. This might be considered to be a strength in class consciousness coming from the themes of moralism and egalitarianism in solidarity.

These themes were most clearly seen in the answers the stewards gave to questions on managements' rights, and workers' rights, not to work with non-unionists (20). Here one could clearly see the variations in the moral code of the stewards compared with dominant assumptions. The value of group membership meant the collective had to be protected from the disruptive influences of those seeking to exercise excessive individualism. It was the moral attitudes flowing from this collectivism which partly explain why the stewards give solidarity.

However, one could detect certain limitations to the scope of solidarity given by the shop stewards.

- (1) 32% believed workers should have the right to choose not to belong to the collective.
- (2) 41% had no contact with the white collar workers in their factory.
- (3) 84% did not have white collar workers on their J.S.S.C.
- (4) 68% had been involved in demarcation disputes.

Societal pressures can be seen to have an effect on the stewards' attitudes and so undermine collective action. These pressures are no doubt strengthened by some experiences of the stewards in struggle where other trades and white collar workers have acted to their disadvantage. For the perceived advantage of the stewards can be seen to be an important factor, in many cases, for determining their actions. Though moralism and egalitarianism motivate, they do not fully define 'who are our friends, who are our enemies'. Here the shrewdness and awareness of strata position are important. For a number of stewards a series of calculations are made which can lead to a fragmentation of class unity.

The definition of who belongs to 'us' and should be helped is restricted and narrowed down to those who will reciprocate aid and who are not better off. In addition, aid is viewed as an extra to be given only if 'we' are okay, and will not suffer from giving.

For these stewards, solidarity seems to be a form of insurance policy on which they want to draw. This attitude can be differentiated from that of the minority of stewards whose forms of consciousness were moving towards new contents and commitments. For them solidarity grew from a coincidence of interests. 39% saw this within the factory, 41% with workers in other factories, and 30% with foreign workers. These stewards' calculations were less concerned with insurance and more with 'working class principles'. Hence, they differed from other stewards in believing workers should act at all times since it always had a value. In this they displayed a faith in the capacity of the class to develop the will to change things. It can be suggested that the roots of these differences lie in the more explicitly ideological orientation of these stewards. These will be examined in the following Chapter in more detail.

NOTES

1. R. Hyman, 'Marxism and the Sociology of Trade Unionism', Pluto, London, 1973, and P. Anderson, 'The Limits and Possibilities of Trade Union Action' in 'The Incompatibles: Trade Unions and the Consensus', Penguin, London, 1967, pp 264-8 make this point.
2. See A.J.M. Sykes, 'The Cohesion of Trade Union Workshop Organisation', Sociology, Vol. 1, 1967, p 142; and R. Hyman, 'Strikes', Fontana, London, 1972, p 54.
3. See, for example, H.F. Moorhouse and C.W. Chamberlain, 'Lower Class Attitudes to Property', Sociology, Vol. 8, 1974, p 388.
4. See Z.A. Jordan, editor, 'Karl Marx: Economy, Class and Social Revolution', Michael Joseph, London, 1971, pp 141-2.
5. J.A. Banks, 'Marxist Sociology in Action', Faber and Faber, London, 1970, p 46.
6. H. Beynon, 'Working for Ford', Penguin, London, 1973, gives a narratived description of the contents of 'factory consciousness'.
7. See, J.E. Mortimer, 'Trade Unions and Technological Change', Oxford, 1971, p 5.
8. S. Hill, 'The Dockers', Heinemann, London, 1976.
9. W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Parker, 'Shop Stewards and Workshop Relations', Research Paper 10, H.M.S.O. 1968, p 46. See, too, H.F. Moorhouse and C.W. Chamberlain, 'Lower Class Attitudes to Property', Sociology, Vol. 8, 1974, p 396 for respondents rejecting unbridled rights of owners; J. Goldthorpe et al, 'The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour', C.U.P. 1968, Chapter 4, for elements of divergence between workers and owners.

NOTES

10. Z.A. Jordan, *ibid*, pp 149-50; See, too, W.E.J. McCarthy and A.S. Collier, 'Coming to Terms with Trade Unions', Institute of Personnel Management, London, 1973, p 115, and R.K. Brown, P. Brannen, J. Cousins, M. Samplier, 'The Contours of Solidarity', B.J.I.R. Vol. 10, 1972, pp 14-25 for discussion of these divisions.
11. Beynon, *ibid*, p 105; See, too, H. Clegg, 'General Union', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1954, p 117.
12. P.J. Kemeny, 'The Affluent Worker Project: Some Criticisms and a Derivative Study', *Sociological Review*, Vol. 20, 1972, discusses the relations between manual and white collar workers.
13. Beynon, *ibid*, p 255; Hyman, 'Marxism', *ibid*, p 17.
14. I. Boraston, H. Clegg and M. Rimmer, 'Workplace and Union', Heinemann, London, 1975, pp29-30 discuss District Committee functions; See, too, S.W. Lemer and J. Bescoby, 'Shop Steward Combine Committees in British Engineering', B.J.I.R. Vol. 4, 1966, discuss other forms of linking organisations.
15. This feeling of powerlessness has been found in other surveys, for example, J. Horton and W. Thompson, 'Powerlessness and Political Negativity', *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXV11, 1962, pp 487-8, L. Lipsitz, 'Work Life and Political Attitudes', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 58, 1964, p 955.
16. See, for example, J.E. Mortimer, 'History of the Boilermakers' Society', Allen and Unwin, London, 1973, pp 160-2; and H. Collins 'Karl Marx, The International and the British Trade Union Movement', *Science & Society*, Vol. 26, 1962, p 407.

NOTES

17. J. Goldthorpe et al, 'The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour', C.U.P. 1968, p 75; see, too, I. Crewe, 'The Politics of "Affluent" and "Traditional" Workers in Britain', British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 3, 1973.
18. For example, O. Glantz, 'Class Consciousness and Political Solidarity', American Sociological Review, Vol. 23, 1958, pp 61-5.
19. See Labour Research, Vol. 65, 1976, pp 172-4 for information on Conservative funds.
20. It is these sort of themes which Hyman, 'Strikes', ibid, p 38, says workers break contracts with employers to support other workers.

Chapter Five: Ideological Attitudes of Shop Stewards

In the previous Chapter the criteria for evaluating the concept of solidarity were various value judgements on the extent to which the shop stewards showed awareness of common identity and opposition. It was asserted that realisations in some way of these interests led to imperatives being felt by the shop stewards, which resulted in actions of collective solidarity. The main themes of this solidarity were those of moralism and egalitarianism. In this Chapter the theme of rationalism will also be considered. This is because a presupposition of this study is that the interests of workers are objectively determined by their position in the relations of production. These relations are based on exploitation and oppression. Hence, the objective interest, i.e. the rational interest of the working class is viewed as the removal of these relations, and the replacing of them by a more 'just and comradely' system (1). In this Chapter an investigation will be made of how far the stewards realise these interests by recognising their social position, who exploits them, and the type of action and convictions required to remove exploitation. The concern is with how far they have developed a political solidarity, so that they view their own material interests not in isolation, but in relation to the concept of an alternative society achievable by struggle.

The extent to which objective interests are grasped by shop stewards varies. Trade Union consciousness depends on the recognition of a common interest with other groups of workers against employers. This can include attitudes critical of society in some respect, concerning certain aspects, but it need not penetrate to the cause of these aspects.

Since the basic interests at the core of unionism are complex one can expect a gradation of awareness of objective interests (2). Hence, the motivations for giving solidarity and the meaning in its giving are affected by how far there is recognition of objective interests as ends.

It may be objected at this point that too much emphasis is being put on rational behaviour, and there is a need to consider peoples' irrational, their fantasy and dream worlds. Recent studies of ideology and everyday life have focused on the 'irrational' behaviour of individuals and groups, using the methods of psychoanalysis to probe peoples' subconscious (3). However, this study starts from the assumption that people act to achieve their best interests, and that the method they use to do this is rational. Rationality gives them the best chance of achieving their best interests (4). It is the method they use when problems arise and they need to choose solutions which minimise negative results. Of course, they use not only rationality but other considerations, e.g. morality, but these too are designed to achieve their best interests (5). So, if a Marxian perspective has not been adopted by the stewards it is because it is not believed to be in their best interest. Other theories are satisfying their expectations at the moment, and so do not need to be questioned or replaced.

This Chapter will probe how far the ideals of alternatives to what exists are grasped by the shop stewards. It does this by projecting the appropriate interests which should flow from the objective class position of the stewards as questions (6).

From their answers to these questions the forms and contents of the stewards' consciousness will be inferred. The methods for this inferring will consist of the three outlined in the last Chapter:

- (1) Freedom from dominant 'catch-phrases';
- (2) The ideas found in the election addresses;
- (3) Adherence to 'Working class principles'.

In addition there will be judgements of the strategic perspectives for changing society outlined by the shop stewards. Through this it is hoped to see how far the stewards commitment to common identity and opposition goes beyond an emotional instinctive response to certain stimuli, so that all relations are viewed as class relations. This is necessary because 'class instinct' is viewed as an anti-social phenomenon arising spontaneously, and almost unreflectingly, from elemental experiences in class conditions. It is determined by these experiences and leads to actions which are viewed as the most suitable for the protection of 'us' within the present set up. As was shown in the last Chapter, the way 'us' is defined by some workers tends to fragment the class into groups which seek their own preservation at the expense of other workers as well as employers. Class Instinct preserves the corporate identity of the working class within society by failing to see the inter-connections at a societal level of class experiences. In this study Socialist consciousness has been described as something which is learned. It is a higher form of consciousness than others because in its combination of elements the rational is dominant and spontaneous subordinate (7).

Some writers have suggested that the Marxian emphasis on a strategic perspective for the transformation of society may be unnecessary for the working class so long as some 'vanguard' element has it (8). This may be true in a 'revolutionary situation' but is probably less relevant at a time when fundamental events do not seem on the agenda. Further it is necessary to discover how far a 'vanguard' exists at all among key groups of workers.

A second consideration on this point is concerned with the relation between means and ends. It could be suggested that if fundamental change is brought about by a 'vanguard' with understanding directing a spontaneous mass, then the type of society resulting will reflect the elements which brought it about. A Marxian perspective could demand that the bringing about of an alternative society should be the result of conscious and rational action by the vast majority of people (9).

This Chapter may be considered a test of a thesis put forward by some writers, that there has been a decay in the political consciousness of workers in the post-war period owing to class interest being viewed as the gaining of more consumption. This shortened horizon is said to be expressed in a decline in the conceptions of capitalism and crisis, and a loss of any ideas of an alternative society (10). These conceptions cannot be considered to have been general among British workers at any time. Rather it has been confined to groups of workers in some areas, like Clydeside, and carried in representative organisations which sought collective ownership and working class state power. So long as these conceptions are confined then the prospects for altering society are remote.

Those who have the conceptions can be considered the most conscious workers, best able to understand their class interest and the most willing to struggle against capitalism. They form a 'vanguard' group who through their cultural level, and political and moral authority try to rally the working class movement around themselves, and make its aims the transformation of society. This can be seen to involve the creation of a new personnel of leadership at all levels of the movement to replace those who do not resist capitalism. This involves the 'vanguard' moving from agitation and propaganda to organisation and leadership in the class struggle. Until this leadership is accepted by the majority of workers there can be no bringing about of change. Socialism demands class consciousness, the unity of workers and their ability to manage their own affairs.

The Causes of the Crisis and the Social Contract

At the time this study was carried out it was accepted that Britain was in its worst crisis since the 1930s. It is around the nature of the crisis that divisions can be found in the election addresses for union officials in the Engineering Section of the A.U.E.W. (See Chapter 3) Those on the Left characterised it as a crisis of the capitalist system requiring fundamental solutions of various types. While those on the Right looked upon it as a crisis which could be solved by workers' temporarily sacrificing along with other sections of society, and supporting the Labour Government's Social Contract (11). To probe the stewards' beliefs they were asked, 'What do you think are the causes of the present crisis?'

Table 1 Causes of the Present Crisis

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
Lack of Investment	26	8	18
Capitalist Crisis	16	11	5
Imperialist Problems	5	2	3
Management Attitudes	6	1	5
Management and Workers Attitudes	4	-	4
People Not Working Hard	3	-	3
Causes External to Britain	8	-	8
The Government	14	1	13
Conservative Governments	5	-	5
Excess Government Spending	3	-	3
Don't Know	7	-	7
No Answer	3	2	1

From these answers it is possible to see who the shop stewards blame for the crisis, and so infer the political solidarity of the stewards to other workers and their attitudes to employers. It can be seen that two groups take up particular variants of the dominant assumptions on the causes of the crisis. Thus, 8 shop stewards put the blame on world wide forces outside the control of Britain. No blame is assigned to forces inside the country. While another believe the causes of the crisis lie with the workers being lazy or workers' and managers' attitudes. A second group, which could be thought of as corresponding to the 'Anti-Politics Populists' blame Governments in general, and their spending. Another 5 corresponding to 'Trade Union Right' or 'Trade Union Left' blame Conservative Governments.

The differences between these two positions can be illustrated.

In the first case, Andy MacParland said:-

"Every Government that gets in is just conning us because it's one crisis after another, as soon as they solve one we get into another."

Whereas, for Pat McGowan:-

"I think the Tories left the country in quite a shambles and left Labour to take over."

Another position adopted by those who are 'Trade Union Leftists' is to blame management alone for the crisis. It is inefficient and unable to run industry in a way which would allow the crisis to be overcome.

These three positions in their characterisation of the crisis to some extent accept the distribution of economic power, and then place the blame within this context. They do not explicitly raise questions which challenge the functioning of the social system. However, 47 of the stewards do raise causes which could challenge the distribution of economic power. For 26 it is a failure of big business to invest which has caused the problems. So James Cassells believes the crisis "is because of an investment strike." Thus, the rhetoric of the dominant assumptions is reversed and instead of workers' strikes being blamed it is employers. Five stewards place the problems of Britain in the context of the break up of its imperialist hold on areas of raw material supplies. As some of the ex-colonies have taken a more independent road, Britain has suffered.

"These countries want a better life and will not supply Britain just for buttons like they used to have to."

For 16 stewards the cause of the crisis was linked to the functioning of the capitalist system. It was "a normal capitalist crisis", and as Davie Wilson, Communist, described it:-

"a crisis of capitalism. It's man made, we're watching a dying system."

These 47 can be thought of as corresponding to the 'Leftists' in their conception of the crisis. They place the blame for the crisis on the people who run the system, and so show a political solidarity with other workers and an opposition to employers. The development of this opposition is greatest among the 16 who define the crisis as one of capitalism, and so question whether a real solution is possible without altering society (12).

To further test this political solidarity the stewards were asked, 'How can the crisis be overcome?' Through their answers to this question one can see who the stewards feel should bear the brunt of the sacrifices required.

Table 2 Solutions to the Crisis

'LEFTIST' SOLUTIONS	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
Nationalise Big Firms	3	2	1
Nationalise Financial Institutions	3	-	3
Socialistic Policies	18	12	6
Freeze Prices	2	-	2
'RIGHTIST' SOLUTIONS			
Work Harder	4	-	4
Cut Public Expenditure	3	-	3
International Agreements	3	-	3
Keep a Labour Government	2	-	2
Social Contract	1	-	1

Table 2 cont.,

USED BY BOTH GROUPS	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non C.P.</u>
Stop Capital Outflow	15	5	10
No Solution	3	1	2
Don't Know	14	-	14
No Answer	30	5	25

Thus, 26 gave answers which can be considered to have been 'Leftist' based on challenging the employers' influence over the economy. As Bob McGerty, Communist, said:-

"The crisis can only be overcome by Socialist measures.

The Government taking control of the cash in and out of the country."

Obviously there are variations in the understandings of those who put forward 'Leftist' solutions, just as there are for those giving 'Rightist' ones. It can be seen that those giving 'Leftist' solutions are larger in numbers than those giving 'Rightist'. However, it can be seen that neither group is as large as those who did not know how the crisis could be solved. This group accounted for almost half the sample, and it can be considered that many of those in it had given 'Leftist' comments on the causes of the crisis. This group had fallen from 47 to 26 when asked to move from assigning blame to giving positive solutions. Once again, the limitations suggested concerning the contents of the stewards class consciousness can be seen. It may be that this limitation is caused in this area by the stewards feeling of powerlessness in an area where they cannot have an immediate effect by their own energies.

The fact that only 5 Communist stewards fall into this category as compared to 41 Non-Communists suggests some differences in the contents of consciousness. It would appear that being a member of the Communist Party and so having the influence of the ideology of the organisation on one can lead to a strategic perspective. This can overcome the fatalism of simply waiting for something to turn up. Of course, the strategic perspectives held may not on all cases lead to the stewards feeling tactical imperatives to act, or to adequately worked out solutions to problems. However, they do make both of these more likely to occur.

The 12 Non-Communists who possessed strategic perspectives had a tendency to work in factories where there was a developed shop stewards organisation with a Communist presence e.g. Rolls Royce, Shipyards. Thus, when these workers talked about "The Party" they meant the Communist Party, signifying the important position the Communist Party had in these factories, in giving definitions of strategies. Of the 5 Communists who did not give answers 3 were relatively new members who might not have been fully integrated into the ideology. The other 2 Communist stewards were not recent recruits so the explanation given for the other 3 are not relevant. Nor would any other reductionist solution that one could give be adequate without a probing of the 2 stewards, e.g. they may have been in the process of leaving the Communist Party and no longer considered its 'answers' adequate.

It can be seen that elements of political solidarity do exist among the stewards in who they blame for the crisis, and their solutions to it.

How accurate their assessments of the crisis causes are is less important here than in what the responses tell us about the sense of common identity and class opposition. By placing the blame for the crisis on employers the shop stewards would seem to show an awareness of opposition of interests between themselves and employers. However, the depth of this awareness is shown by the fact that only twenty six gave 'Leftist' solutions to the crisis which implied irreconcilability with employers.

Inflation and the Social Contract

In January, 1973, the Labour Party published 'Economic Policy and the Cost of Living' in which the demands of the T.U.C. for the repeal of the Industrial Relations Act were linked with the acceptance of an overall economic strategy. It was not initially linked to wage norms. This only occurred when the rate of inflation rose to over 20% during 1974-75. From this time the overall economic strategy began to be placed in the background and the 'Social Contract' became identified with wage control by agreements. The strength of these agreements, when enforced by Trade Unions, can be seen by the fact that no major settlements broke through the wage norms till 1978.

The fact of the Social Contract agreements is an illustration of how serious the economic crisis was felt to be and how much stronger Trade Unions had become in the post-war period, since wage control required institutional means in order to guide the development of money wages in ways suitable to the regeneration of British capitalism. At the same time the Labour Government, through the Social Contract, made an ideological link between wages and inflation, and so the health of the economy.

For Trade Unions this meant a rejection of collective bargaining for wages and its replacement by politically determined wage norms.

From its inception, the Social Contract has been the subject of debate by social scientists. This debate has taken place around a number of issues e.g. whether wages do cause inflation (Devine 1974); what ideological tendencies within the unions benefit from the Social Contract (Goodman 1975); etc. In this study the perspective will be that a Socialist class consciousness would mean rejecting the Social Contract, seeing it as a way of reducing living standards and increasing profits for employers, and encouraging collaborationist tendencies in the Union.

Socialist class consciousness would aim for a return to normal collective bargaining procedures, where there are opportunities for the development of a common class interest among workers. To see how far the shop stewards had been influenced by the Government's ideological offensive they were asked 'Do you think wage rises have been the cause of inflation?'

Table 3 Wage Rises as a Cause of Inflation

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Do cause inflation	3	-	3
Some workers wages	4	-	4
A main cause	3	-	3
Not a main cause	15	4	11
Do not cause inflation	75	21	54

For these shop stewards answering during the second year of the Social Contract, there was a general belief among $\frac{3}{4}$ of them that wages did not cause inflation.

It was the experience of two years Social Contract which led to some stewards having empirical proof for their rejection of the proposition. Thus, Eddie Gallacher said:-

"The Government's argued that wages were the cause of inflation. That's definitely been proved wrong."

For other stewards the empirical evidence to reject the Government's ideological offensive was not needed. For them an alternative ideological framework convinced them that wages could not cause inflation, since in Danny Thompson's words:-

"Prices cause inflation. Prices make you go after wages."

For the majority of stewards inflation was not caused by 'wage pull' factors but 'cost-push' ones. This ideological assertion was backed up by a form of commonsense logical thinking by some stewards. Thus, Jim Pearson felt:-

"If wages caused inflation then countries like West Germany and the United States would have roaring inflation, and India would be the richest country in the world."

So different assertions can be seen to be in operation from those dominant in society. These different assertions may flow from the different practical experiences of the stewards, which provide them with different means of judging occurrences and assigning blame.

Only one quarter of the sample showed any adherence to the linking of workers' wages and inflation. Four blamed other workers' wages and so showed a fragmentation of solidarity. Once again, the stereotype of the car worker was chosen. As Michael McEwan put it:-

"I think part of it, say car people - I think the price of a car is ridiculous, and I think the pay they must be getting is ridiculous for the work they are doing."

Here one can see the rhetoric of popular stereotypification being utilised. The limited appeal of this rhetoric to the stewards can be seen from the few who adopted it. In part this is due to their experiences which make it more likely that 'leftist' rhetoric will be echoed by them. So Francis Divers felt inflation was caused by "pure profit making, that's the cause". While Alex MacDonald, saw it as:-

"A weapon which is used against the Trade Unions. I think it's a political ploy to get the workers to refrain from asking for more."

Thus, the majority of stewards refrained from blaming workers for inflation, but instead blamed the system in some way. For them inflation was a symptom of the economic crisis, rather than the cause of it. Given the stewards' answers in Table 1 on the 'Causes of the Crisis', which did not generally adopt the dominant assertions but showed political solidarity with other workers, one might have expected the answers in Table 3 to also reflect this solidarity.

In Table 2 it was shown that 26 gave 'Leftist' answers to the solution of the crisis, while 47 could not give any solutions. Labour's Election Manifesto in October, 1974, gave a possible solution to the crisis through the redistribution of wealth and power in favour of working people and their families. The shop stewards were asked if they agreed with this sentiment or not.

Table 4 Attitude to Redistribution of Wealth and Power

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Should Take Place	90	25	65
Should Not	10	-	10

It can be suggested that a number of presuppositions exist in calling for a redistribution:-

- (1) The present distribution is wrong, unequal and unfair;
- (2) Wealth and power should be taken in some way from those who possess it at the moment;
- (3) That working people should benefit from this redistribution.

So supporting it would seem to indicate some type of common identity with other working people, and an opposition to those with wealth and power. The extent of the support for it is not surprising, given that it is a slogan used by all the political groupings in the Union to give themselves a radical cover. When similar questions have been asked in other studies similar results have been found. Thus, Chamberlain and Moorhouse found 67% agreed that no one should have two houses till everyone was housed, and Goldthorpe found 74% believed their firm could redistribute a larger share of its profits to the employees (13). A test of the depth of the feeling was hoped for from the question, 'Do you think Britain is a fair and just society?' It was assumed that if one felt there was a need for redistribution it would be because one felt society was unfair and unjust.

Table 5 Is Britain Fair and Just

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Fair and Just	25	1	24
Not Fair and Just	63	19	44
Don't Know	12	5	7

Among those who thought Britain was 'fair and just', 12 (including a Communist) did so on the basis of comparisons with other countries.

As Thomas Keenan put it:-

"I believe in world terms it is reasonably fair."

For the others it was intrinsic attributes which made it fair and just. Thus, Willie Watt defined it so because:-

"You can say anything you like without being bothered."

Among the 12 who did not know the problem seemed to revolve round the criteria to be used to judge whether it was fair and just. No such problem existed for the 63 who thought Britain unfair and unjust. Their criteria were:-

Table 6 Reasons Why Britain is not Fair and Just

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Distribution of Wealth	40	11	29
The Functioning of the Law	15	2	13
Capitalism	8	6	2

It can be suggested that all the reasons centre on the distribution of wealth and power. For Andy MacParland it was :-

"too few people are getting too much of the cake."

While for John Dixon:-

"Justice depends on how much you've got in the Bank,"

And for James Arbuckle:-

"There is not a fair and just society in Britain. It's
a Capitalist Country."

On this basis, one can see that 63 sought a redistribution of wealth and power because they felt Britain was in some way not fair and just. The problem is to explain why the other 27 of the 90, who believed in redistribution did so.

It would seem that the use of a cliché of the Labour movement can gain an almost automatic response from the stewards, since it evokes a system of exclusion and rejections on awareness. This system is based on the relationship seen between 'us' and 'them' and is highly stable since it is institutionalised in the Union, and so historically rooted in prior experiences as well as existing situations and problems. In a sense, then, these clichés may be viewed as a means of avoiding solving ideological problems by providing the information needed to develop an attitude without taking account of means or new experiences. Thus, the internal cohesion of the cliché can be weak since it has not been rationally worked out by the steward. Hence, the development of political consciousness cannot be evaluated without considering how far the stewards have a strategic awareness concerning changes in society. In this study the stewards were asked, 'Do you think the Social Contract will bring about the change in the balance of wealth and power?'

Table 7 Social Contract Cause Change in Balance

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Yes	15	-	15
No	82	25	57
Don't Know	2	-	2

Other questions on the Social Contract gained similar responses. So only 18 thought it had been a "good thing" and all but 19 thought it should have ended in July, 1977. In all the cases the Communists displayed a coherence in answering, which would indicate the strength of their ideology in seeming relevant to them on this occasion.

This overall negative judgement of the effects of the Social Contract can be shown to have been something which developed over time. The stewards were asked, 'What was the Social Contract meant to do?'

Table 8 Purpose of Social Contract

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
<u>Positive Purpose</u>			
Stabilise Wages/Prices	37	3	34
Solve economic problems	14	3	11
Fairness in wage levels	10	-	10
Raise living standards	4	-	4
Help the £	1	-	1
<u>Negative Purpose</u>			
Lower living standards	21	8	13
Help Capitalism/Big Business	13	11	2

Initially, two thirds appear to have taken the view that the Social Contract was going to be beneficial to the country. Only one third, 76% of them Communists gave it a negative purpose. It would seem that the other 6 Communists had the relevance of Party ideology proved to them by practical experiences. In these responses one can see a difference between those with elements of Socialist class consciousness more developed and others. For the others 'fairness' can come from the operations of a Government in capitalist society, which are not aimed against that society. As Bob Cassidy put it:-

"It was meant for an even balance. It gave the Government and the people a chance to get back on our feet. We wouldn't pound employers for excessive wages and in return the Government promised to keep prices down."

In the statements of the two thirds who gave positive purpose to the Social Contract, one finds many examples of this touching faith in the actions of a Labour Government to "look after people who couldn't look after themselves" (Harry Murphy). This may help explain the bitterness in some of the comments on why Labour was not a workers' party (See Chapter Four). For the one third who gave it a negative purpose this faith was absent and the role of the Labour Government in helping capitalism more clearly seen. As Davie Wilson, Communist, described the Social Contract:-

"It was an attempt to restrict the working class and so help capitalism."

The current negative appraisal of the Social Contract and realisation that it worked against their interests, and in favour of the employers, can be seen from their answers to the question, 'What do you think has happened to business profits during the Social Contract?'

Table 9 Business Profits during the Social Contract

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Fallen	9	-	9
Risen	88	25	53
Don't Know	3	-	3

This assessment was based on a 'cost-benefit' analysis by the stewards. Since they were not benefiting then someone must be, and it must be those from whom their interests diverge. In this analysis an almost instinctive distrust of employers' information to workers can be seen. As Eddie Curran puts it:-

"They're trying to kid the British worker on that they're no making profits but they're making a fortune."

It can be seen that if the stewards have a strategic awareness it was not linked to bringing about changes through the Social Contract. The stewards were asked, 'How do you think the redistribution of wealth and power could be brought about?' (14). Thirty eight of the stewards, seventeen of them Communists, had some ideas of how to bring about change. The majority of stewards did not have any conceptions of how redistribution might be brought about which they wished to express. This 'silence' by the stewards leads to difficulties of interpretation. It has already been suggested that the 'silence' is caused by a feeling of powerlessness to change things. This has ideological factors behind it, since it is these which influence what the stewards recognise as possible. The Trade Union consciousness of these stewards sees the tasks of the organisations of the working class as defending interests within society, rather than fundamentally altering things. This is reinforced by their experiences, as Rose Ann McLoy put it:--

"The Labour Government hasn't the courage of its convictions. The capitalists, the small group of people in this country who hold the money, make it clear to any Government, 'We will not allow you to do this', and the Labour Government accepts it."

While an additional factor is that the intensity of the class struggle is not sufficient to shake the stewards out of their present beliefs and present opportunities for alternative ideological systems to be adopted as more congruent with their experiences. At the moment the stewards do not have to think deeply about 'problems' like redistribution of wealth and power, because it is still not seen by them to be a problem requiring a solution to be chosen.

It is oppositional organisation to the system, like the Communist Party, which struggle to force certain questions to be raised. This is reflected in the finding that 17 Communists made up the 38 having some idea of how to bring about redistribution, i.e. 68% of the Communists compared to 28% of the Non-Communists. The means for bringing about this change can be categorised.

Table 10 Means of Redistributing Wealth and Power

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Socialist Government+Union Action	22	11	10
Nationalise+Union Action	14	5	10
Revolution	2	1	1

Thus, more than half of these stewards believe change could be brought about if there were some type of Socialist Government implementing policies which they could fight for in the factories.

As Bob McGerty, Communist, describes it:-

"By the Government that was elected by the people carrying out its conference decisions. Then we could go into the factories and canteens, which is where change must come from, and say this is what we're going to do. On that basis we could mobilise a terrific mass movement."

This is a 'voluntaristic' view of how to bring about change involving ideological and practical work by shop stewards to explain, agitate and organise for mass actions so that the working class can emerge in a positive way to reconstruct society.

The next largest group linked change to a type of nationalisation which really took power from those who have it at the moment. This meant in Davy Graham, Communist, words putting in:-

"trusted, get my word, trusted representatives from that industry . . . , and we agitate among the workers for the campaign that's need to get to grips with the problems."

There is a sense in which this position may be contrasted with the first one, since it may embody different notions of Socialism. The latter may involve seeing Socialism as something brought about primarily by State action - a 'Statist Socialism', while the former sees it as the voluntary efforts of the working class to create a new society. Of course, these two definitions need not be viewed as exclusive to one another, and a convergence is no doubt possible through the ideological debates involved in the struggles to bring about change.

The third method of change used by two of the stewards involved, quite simply, a Revolution. As Willie Humphries put it:-

"We'd have to do what was done in any of the Communist countries, a revolution, and take the means of production away from them and put them under public ownership."

There is a sense in which this can be considered a simplistic solution which avoids a real analysis of what is to be done. Nevertheless, it does show a willingness to take up a theme in opposition to dominant assumptions, the need for revolution.

Among the 10 stewards who were against redistribution of wealth and power, one can detect a lack of faith in the capacity of workers to bring about change and repetition of variants of dominant assumptions. Thus, Ian MacWhinnie felt:-

"It was just your luck what you're born with."

and John Robin felt redistribution was hopeless because:-

"By to-morrow morning there will be rich and poor
again - because that's the way things are."

or, as Robert Brown said:-

"If I'm fortunate to work hard and get a business of
my own, even if it's only a wee sweet shop and I
expand till eventually I leave it to my sons as a
supermarket then I think it should be theirs."

In these remarks one can see that contradictions exist within dominant assumptions which conflict with each other. Thus, if it is "just your luck", how could working hard allow one to build up a business? These contradictions can be a source of strength since they mean that no matter the incident or event, a ready made answer can be found in the repertoire of assumptions. From this one can see that dominant assumptions operate, not by consciously defending monopoly capitalism, and the representatives of wealth, but by incorporating elements of popular ideologies (15). The dominant ideology carries out this incorporation through continuous struggles with other ideologies in which certain features are taken out of context and so lose content. At the same time within the dominant assumptions there are conflicts as factions of the ruling class struggle to give the emphasis they want to them. It is the existence of these conflicts and contradictions which weaken the internal cohesion of dominant assumptions and allows new experiences to shake its hold.

From the results in this section one can see some lack of adaption to existing conditions by most of the stewards. Their answers show an unwillingness to accept that workers are to blame for the crisis. This led to them not accepting the Social Contract. An alternative logical construct existed among the stewards which led them to select different causes for problems. A common identity with other workers exists which leads them to opposing actions which they consider to be adverse to workers and helpful to employers.

It was this feeling which led stewards to oppose the Social Contract eventually. It was suggested that this identity was based to some extent, and among some stewards, on an acceptance of cliches which focused a system of exclusions, divisions and rejections which can be assimilated in a ready form. In part it is these systems which help explain why only 38 of the stewards had a perspective of some type on how to redistribute wealth and power, and so close the gap between what 'ought' to exist and what 'is'. Given that change does not seem to be on the immediate agenda to see the possibility of it and have a strategy for it, requires a vision, confidence and hope in the capacity of other workers (16). It means going beyond the instinctive-emotional responses to ideological positions linked to ending social inequality. Thus, a higher proportion of Communists have a strategic perspective. These stewards possess radical ideologies of a substantive kind operating outside dominant assumptions and encouraging political activity for changes in line with conceptions of the political interests of the working class.

From some perspectives it might seem that there is a certain form of authoritarianism and corporatism in the ideologies of these stewards. However, it would be wrong to accuse them of authoritarianism since the egalitarian and moralistic themes in their ideologies make them opposed to it. On the other hand, it can be seen that they are not opposed to authority as such. Being anti-capitalist does not mean being anti-authority. Rather these stewards are for a new type of authority legitimised by institutions of working class collectivism and power. They are certainly not libertarian in their ideologies, but support rules and discipline which they believe would ensure working class power. Thus, it is not a blind support for authority, but one based on rationalism.

The difficulty, of course, is to explain why some Non-Communists had such a perspective, and why 6 Communists did not have it. For the former group it is relatively easy since it can be suggested that the Communist Party does not have a monopoly of those with a Socialistic form of consciousness. It is more difficult to explain why an oppositional group, like the Communist Party, which struggles to force certain questions to be debated amongst the working class fails to get them answered by their own members. Of course, the answer to this is highly complex and one can only make some suggestions based on impressions. Three of the stewards were fairly recent recruits to the Communist Party, and even though joining requires an ideological orientation, it would seem likely that their ideology is not fully coherent, but still has elements of formlessness and disorganisation. The introduction to new ideas from the Party environment as a recruit becomes integrated may even cause some initial confusion to orientations.

However, this does not answer the problem of why the older members did not give a perspective for change. It may be that a degree of disillusionment existed among these stewards which led them to feeling Communist stereotypifications for change were inadequate or not relevant. They may not be staying in the Party because they are persuaded by its ideological constructs, but because of an interaction of pressures e.g. friendship, habit, etc. Additionally, a factor affecting both groups is that the Communist Party is not monolithic and before a strategy is put into practice debates and discussion take place and different estimates developed. For some this may lead to confusion and doubts, especially if the contact with Communist propaganda is not great enough for them to make judgements, while high enough for them to be unable to ignore the new estimations of situations.

Workers' Control

From a Marxian perspective the concept of workers' control implies that employers' rights are to be restricted and employees responsibilities extended (18). As has been suggested previously the existence of Trade Unions shows an unwillingness to be incorporated on capital's unilateral terms. The existence of Unions in the factories and their use of collective bargaining procedures allows some control by workers on managements' unilateral decision making through the use of solidarity by workers. (19) It is this which allows a view to be taken of unions as institutions embodying democracy in the workplace, built upon the basis of defensive struggles against employers (20).

However, from another perspective workers' involvement in decision making in the factories can be viewed as part of a corporatist self-regulation through formalised co-option on to the boards of management (21). This depends on seeing society as a consensus body in which interests of workers, employers and the government are shared at a basic level, though a pluralism exists to debate the best method of satisfying the interests. So the Engineering Employers' Federation can say it "upholds and advocates the principle of employee participation" while opposing the Bullock Report (22). Thus, differences in definition exist. The point now becomes to find out what type of view exists among the shop stewards in this study. Do they see it as a matter of consultation and reaction to decisions through participation within the present structures? Or, do they view it as requiring the socialising of private property and the extension of democracy into the workplace on the basis of a belief in the need for workers' autonomy? (23). The different views on the nature of workers' control reflect different conceptions of the relationships existing with employers in society, and variations in the understanding of what is in the interest of workers in society. To see the beliefs the stewards had in the capacity of workers to run industry they were asked, 'Do you think workers could run industry through some kind of workers' control?'

Table 11 Could Workers Run Industry

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Could Run Industry	66	21	45
Could Not Run Industry	32	4	28
Don't Know	2	-	2

Once again one can see a small group of Communists who 'deviate' from the majority of their fellow-party members. These four were also part of the six who had had no ideas of how to bring about redistribution. So one might suggest the reasons given above may also hold here. Nevertheless, two thirds of the stewards in the sample did have confidence in the ability of workers to run industry. However, this raises the question of what the stewards meant by "workers' control" and from this gain some idea of the degree of capacity the stewards felt the workers had. The stewards were asked what they understood by workers' control.

Table 12 Understanding of Workers' Control

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Participation of workers and employers	46	3	43
Workers autonomously running industry	33	16	17
'Workers Co-operatives'	2	1	1
No Answer	19	5	14

As can be seen some of those who felt workers could not run industry were able to conceptualise workers' control. Six of them defined workers' control as the autonomous running of industry by workers which they felt to be impossible. To try and deepen the understanding of why some felt workers could not run industry the stewards were asked, 'Don't you think industry is too complicated for workers to run?' (24).

Table 13 Industry Too Complicated for Workers

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Is too complicated for workers	21	1	20
Is not too complicated	74	23	51
Don't Know	5	1	4

The main factors which led to this doubting of capacities were the lack of training, experience or education among workers. However, in general, there was confidence in workers' abilities. As Danny Thompson put it:-

"No problem. They think you're dumb because you wear a shabby old pair of overalls, but I don't think these guys (management) are anything exceptional. I don't see what should be looked up to."

In this type of comment one can detect a theme of aggressive egalitarianism which asserts the value and integrity of the manual worker. It refuses to judge by appearances, and instead looks at the ability managers have shown in their jobs, and from this draws shrewd conclusions.

However, believing industry is not too complicated does not necessarily lead to the stewards believing in workers' autonomy. Table 12 shows a number of them favoured participation with management. A qualification which has to be made is that 19 of the 46 who understood workers' control as 'Participation' did not see this as adequate. Rather 14 of them did not support it, while 5 saw it as only a first step towards their encroaching more control. As Michael McGoldrick said:-

"Rolls Royce think of it as workers' participation. They want to operate by taking you into a meeting in the factory and telling you what should be done and then we go away and tell the men. That's no the way we see it. We see it as the men taking part in the decision making of the Company as a first step to workers' control."

It can be seen that 27 stewards did still support collaboration with management and employers in pursuit of common interests, even if it was only "to keep the employers' viable and keep you in a job" (Andy MacParland). Or, as Danny Gibb says:-

"What I would like to think is that we have some measure of control, though maybe not as much as having a full say, but having a greater say in how the Company is run so everybody gets maximum benefit from the profitability."

This collaboration is seen as valuable in that it would give a fairer situation in the factory by improving decision making structures. In contrast to this position, some stewards linked workers' control to a new social system. So John Ainsbury, Communist, defined it as:-

". . . the workers' owning the means of production, distribution and exchange, Socialism and the workers gaining control."

For this group an irreconcilability of interests exists between workers and employers which necessitates a new society before workers' control can really exist. This is because measures in the workers' interest are not able to be fully implemented under capitalism.

As was suggested above many of the stewards felt confident about the workers' capacities to run industry because of their practical experiences, rather than because of a theoretical speculation. To see if these practical experiences included the examples of workers in other countries running industries and so incarnating their ideals they were asked -

'Do you think workers' control exists in any other countries?' In answer to this 48 did believe it existed in other countries (18 Communists and 30 Non-Communists), and 37 of them named the Socialist countries. So 72% of those who believed workers could run industries in Britain believed workers' control already existed elsewhere. For them the possibilities for workers and the illustration of their strength had a practical, as well as a theoretical basis.

To see if the beliefs in the capacity of workers was developed beyond a vague faith the stewards were asked, 'How do you think workers' control could be brought about?' From the answers to this one might see how many of the stewards had a strategic perspective in this area. Only 23 were able to outline strategies for change. Their answers can be categorised -

Table 14. Means for Achieving Workers' Control

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
A Socialist Government's Legislation	8	4	4
Encroachment through Collective Bargaining	5	4	1
A new type of Nationalisation	2	2	-
Revolution	8	6	2

So less than one quarter had any strategic perspectives for achieving collective ownership, and of this group nearly two thirds were Communists. Once again one can see a difference in notions of Socialism among stewards. The 'Statist Socialism' evident in strategies for redistribution can be seen again. Thus, Jimmy Caldwell, Communist, felt bringing about workers' control would require:-

"workers bringing into being by their actions a proper Socialist Government and corresponding legislation which favours workers' democratic rights to determine the whole line of industry."

On the other hand, there is the more voluntaristic notion of Socialism expressed by John Sweeney, Communist:-

"It's up to the workers in each factory, if they are strong enough, to take what we've got a step further. The old boss of the firm is disappearing. When we have a particular problem, foreby (sic) the day to day problems, I spend all my time looking after it through the industrial relations machinery. It's a matter of using our strength to extend this."

Though the basis for convergence between the two notions can be seen in the importance given to workers' actions in the process of change. The differences seem to lie in where they locate the site of workers' struggles, with the latter group approaching the syndicalist idea of seizing the factories. The results in this section show degrees of confidence exist among the shop stewards about the capacity of workers to exercise power. The two thirds who believe workers could run industry show a willingness to restrict employers' rights in a way which starts to break down the authoritarian structures which oppress them. In addition, they are undaunted by the problems of book-keeping and accountancy, and the other minutiae of organisation of the capitalist factory which lead to a mystique around management skills. Rather they see these skills as being attainable through training by workers like them.

Twenty seven of the stewards did not see workers' control in terms of the autonomous exercising of workers' priorities in production, but rather visualised a co-partnership with employers for limited changes. Nevertheless, even here there was not a belief in an identity of interests with employers. Rather, what marked much of the stewards attitudes was a theme of egalitarianism.

It can be seen that only 23 had ideas of how to achieve workers' control, and 16 of them were Communist stewards. Here one can see the effect of belonging to an oppositional group with a set of ideological constructs which provide the basis for a substantive radicalism for fundamental change. This contrasts with the radicalism shown by other stewards which was less comprehensive, more vague, and limited to the immediately possible. In this one can detect some of the differences in content between Socialist forms of consciousness and Trade Union forms.

However, again one has the problem of explaining the Communist stewards who seem to lack strategic perspectives. As in the previous section one sees the same mix of recent recruits and established members. In fact 5 of the 9 Communists with no strategic perspectives for workers' control also lacked it for the redistribution of wealth and power. The 'extras' in this case came from the established Party member category. From this one might assert a mood of caution exists after the defeats and stalemates in the class struggle from 1974 which has lead to disillusionment, hopelessness and bitterness.

Socialism in Britain

From a Marxian perspective Socialism can be seen as the goal to which objective interests should direct the stewards by the means of the class struggle.

It can be viewed as the inevitable end of a historical process and the desired end of the activities of the stewards, since it would bring an end to their exploitation (25). It is the 'ought to be' which should be taken as an imperative which arises out of a prescription of human requirements and 'objective laws of history'. It is these features which from a Marxian perspective leads to beliefs that capitalism should be ended, rather than only concepts of 'fairness' and 'justice'. This is because these concepts mean focusing on abuses arising out of the system and not on the essential relationships which are structurally determined (26). In this section the emphasis will be on seeing how far the shop stewards in the sample saw the interests of the working class as demanding that it exercise state power. This would require them seeing their interests as irreconcilable to the capitalist social system, and at the same time, having an ideal of an alternative society achievable by the actions of workers in the class struggle which goes beyond immediate demands. The first question the stewards were asked was designed to see if they believed Socialism was likely in their lifetime:-

<u>Table 15</u>	<u>Socialism in Your Lifetime</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
	Yes	22	11	11
	No	78	14	64

So only one fifth of the stewards expect to see Socialism in their lifetime (27). It can be seen that half of this group were Communist stewards. What might be considered surprising is that the majority of Communists did not expect to see Socialism when they belong to an organisation which produces programmes for the achievement of Socialism and tries to motivate its members to work for this end. In this scepticism about seeing Socialism one can see that for some Communist stewards their critiques come from their practical experiences rather than from theory. Thus, they judge on the basis of what the working class at the moment sees as its aims, rather than what its historic role compels it to do.

This belief in the likelihood of Socialism can be contrasted with their answers to the question, 'Would you support a Socialist Britain?' 79 of the stewards said they would support a Socialist Britain, and this included all the Communists. Here one can see a difference between hope and expectation, and the tempering of the former by the latter. Though what is meant by Socialism may differ among the stewards, as can be seen by their answers to the question on how they saw Socialist Society.

Table 16 The Stewards View of Socialism

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
A Labour Government in power	29	7	22
Workers' taking power	9	7	2
Spreading Nationalisation	2	1	1
More Egalitarianism	3	-	3
No answer	35	10	25

Thus, over one third of the sample did not have a view of Socialism which they felt like giving to a researcher. Even those who did answer present a problem of interpretation. For example, the characterisations given to the type of Labour Government they identified with Socialism varied. For some it involved changing Labour to the Left, and making M.Ps accountable to workers while for others it was just the presence of a Labour Government. As James Young said:-

"I think over the next 10, 20, 30 years Socialism will still be the main party of Government . . ."

In part one is seeing here a reproduction of answers given in the previous Chapter in answer to the question on whether Labour was a workers' party.

In addition, the answers here show the presence of the two notions of Socialism found in the above sections. One can see elements of the 'Statist' and 'voluntaristic' Socialism, which it can be suggested differently combine various themes found to be present in the stewards' answers, moralism, egalitarianism, and rationalism. It may be these differences in combination which lead to different meanings being given to Socialism. Thus, for the 'Statist' Socialists rationalism may be the dominating theme, while for the 'voluntarists' it is a domination by moralism. So Alan Grimmon, Communist, and 'voluntarist' feels for Socialism:-

"The question is unity. The day we get unity is the day the system can tremble. It has proved itself the few times in the past the workers had unity we have forced Governments' to change their minds. So it's a question of getting unity maintained so that workers can take over power."

Here the path to Socialism involves workers recognising their moral obligations to unite with each other for mass actions to change society.

A dominant assumption in society against Socialism is that it limits freedoms and leads to totalitarianism. To see if this assumption has any resonance among the stewards they were asked, 'Don't you think Socialism would mean an end to freedom in Britain?'

Table 17 Relationship of Socialism to Freedom

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Would End Freedoms	26	-	22
Would Not End Freedoms	68	25	43
Don't Know	10	-	10

In this sample two thirds did not think Socialism would end freedoms. In this they differed from the United States workers in Peck's study who viewed Socialism as anti-individual liberties. They were more like the French workers in Hamilton's and Lacone's studies. In Hamilton's a number of workers felt the U.S.S.R. was best for workers, because it had more freedom for workers. While in Lacone's almost 70% of the Communist and Socialist activists did not think French society was really democratic. So it might be considered that the consciousness shown by the stewards in this sample is more similar to Left activists than other groups on this issue (28).

The relationship the stewards felt existed between Socialism and freedom can be considered in more detail. In all 46 of the stewards (16 Communists) felt that Socialism would in fact extend their freedoms because they lacked freedoms just now, and in John Roger's words:-

"the person who has fought against Capitalism isn't going to settle for less."

These 46 stewards directly challenged a dominant assumption of society. Only 18 stewards, none of them Communists, agreed with the dominant assumption, and felt that if Socialism went too far it could restrict freedoms by being like Russia. This result leads one to consider what the stewards felt was standing in the way of them seeing a Socialist society in their lifetime.

Table 18 Obstacles to Socialism Being Achieved

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Lack of Interest	12	4	8
Human Nature	11	-	11
Living Standards	9	2	7
Cleverness of Rulers	8	4	4
Action of Labour Government	30	8	22
Don't Know/No Answer	28	7	18

It can be seen that a slightly higher percentage of Communist stewards gave no answer to this question than did Non-Communists. It would seem that to them socialism is rationally, morally and in egalitarian terms so desirable that they cannot think of reasons why other workers oppose it. It may be that it is from this type of attitude that demoralisation and depression develop among Communists.

From the Table one can see confirmation of attitudes towards the Labour Party in the last Chapter and earlier in this section, when 30 of the stewards feel it is the Labour Governments actions which block the path to Socialism. Though it should be noted that 7 of the Non-Communists feel the difficulties are caused by external factors constraining their Government. In this one can hear echoes of the 'Rightist' statements in the A.U.E.W. Election Addresses apologising for the failures of Labour Governments. For the 12 the problem lay in workers not being interested in Socialism. In this one can detect a certain patronising element e.g. Peter Lyden, Communist says:-

"There's no doubt about it the average worker is politically ignorant and is brainwashed by the press and the media into thinking things are all right when they're not all right."

This element can be traced back to the rational theme in these stewards thinking, and could lead to a contempt for other workers without the presence of the moral and egalitarian themes. Similar to this view, but from the other side of the equation, are those who place the emphasis on the ability of the British ruling class to maintain itself. As Archie Cherrie sees it:-

"The employing class in Britain is the oldest and most cunning and they have plenty of practice in resisting progress."

The other groups may be considered to be adopting variants of dominant assumptions in their answers. For 11 Socialism is Utopian because:-

"We're all quite greedy . . . We don't want to share and share alike, which is what Socialism is about."

While for 9 the British have "had it that wee bit easier . . . In Russia and China they'd been hammered into the ground." In these answers one can see assumptions that capitalism is best tailored for human nature, and that Socialism is something they have in distant lands which are 'backward' and poor. The continuing influence of these assumptions shows that Capitalism still has ideological and psychological resources available to influence workers' consciousness.

These assumptions may be thought of as compensating for the workers being powerless by explaining it in ways which give feelings of uniqueness and superiority. They are rooted in elements of prior experience of the stewards and the ideological influences of mass cultural institutions of society. However, just as time forces changes in culture so it brings changes in existing assumptions, though not in a direct or immediate way. One factor in bringing about such changes is the existence of alternative ideological systems more congruent with the workers' objective interests. Hence, the stewards were asked, 'How do you think Socialism might be achieved in Britain?' This would allow one to see if strategic perspectives existed based on ideological alternatives. Only 22 had such perspectives, 15 Communists and 7 Non-Communists, and this was not necessarily the 22 who thought they would see Socialism in their lifetime. The difference is that there are 4 more Communists, and so 4 less Non-Communists. This suggests the importance of ideology in allowing some stewards to overcome the pessimism of their expectations.

From the answers of those who had developed strategic perspectives one can outline the means of change visualised:-

Table 19 Means for Achieving Socialism

	<u>All</u>	<u>C.P.</u>	<u>Non-C.P.</u>
Socialist Labour Government			
and Mass Action	16	13	3
'Classical Revolution'	4	2	2
General Strike	2	-	2

Once again, one can see the difference between 'Statist' Socialists and 'voluntaristic' ones.

Though, in this case, it is not as distinct owing to the peculiar situation of those adopting a 'Classical Revolutionary' perspective. Thus, Tommy Graham, Communist, believes:-

"You'll only get Socialism in the factories by a dictatorship, the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat led by the Party. Without that you're going to be running all sorts of roads. We will all be arguing about where to go from here and things will just fall apart."

This group can be considered to support voluntaristic action by the working class, but only within definite parameters and circumstances. A more clearly voluntarist means of achieving Socialism can be found in those who feel a General Strike is necessary. As Jimmy Lee puts it:-

"The last General Strike in '26 would have done it if the T.U.C. hadn't sold them out . . ."

However, for the majority of those with strategic perspectives the means was a Labour Government changed in content and with a new programme which would encourage mass support and action.

As Charlie MacNamara, Communist, puts it:-

"I believe the present Labour Government could do it if it was Socialist and would say this is the line we are going to take. Then the workers could be mobilised to push for that line in the factories so that the Labour Government couldn't back down. We could get to a situation like Popular Unity in Chile though this time the workers would be prepared."

Thus, the 'Statist' notion is seen as requiring mass action to ensure that the new type of Labour Government does not back down in the face of employer resistance, which could be taken to extremes. Unfortunately, it was not found out from the stewards whether they believed that the achievement of a Socialistic Government was an irreversible change or whether at elections if defeated it would allow itself to be replaced by a pro-Capitalist Government which would act against the 'march of history', and dismantle the Socialist elements of change in society. From Lacone's work on French Communist activists one might suggest that for the majority of Communist stewards it was an irreversible change. In addition, one can see that it is the Communist stewards who stress the importance of Parliamentary methods, though their scepticism in legislative solutions is shown by their emphasis on mass action.

From the results it would seem that a majority of the stewards did take Socialism as an 'ought to be' and so supported it, even though they did not think it likely in their lifetime. However, it does not seem that the stewards saw Socialism as a prescription of historical laws. This leads to difficulties in understanding what the stewards meant by Socialism, since there seems to be an overlap between political power and State power. Thus, the factor blocking Socialism for 30 stewards was the action of the Labour Governments.

It can be seen that the majority of stewards are at some level dissatisfied with capitalist Britain, even if fatalism stops them developing substantive critiques from their assumptions which are incompatible with capitalism.

Once again one can see the existence of different types of radicalisms, and that only a minority can be described as having a radicalism characterised by strategic prerogatives. Nevertheless, the willingness of 79 stewards to support Socialism shows a high development of solidarity for a society more in line with their interests. Only 22 can be said to have a Socialist form of consciousness in the deepest sense, in that they had a strategy for winning Socialism. It can be seen that the definition they gave to this goal played an important part in predetermining the means they adopted. Hence, one can differentiate then on the basis of whether they were 'Statist' Socialist or 'voluntarists'. Involved in these differences was the combination of the themes of rationalism, moralism and egalitarianism. The consequence of these differences can be seen in the relationships perceived between workers and their organisations, and the principles, strategy and tactics to be adopted. Again Communist stewards make up the majority of those with the Socialistic form of consciousness. Here one can see the importance of belonging to an oppositional group which tries to develop a counter ideology to that dominant in society, and suggest means of altering society. (How far a counter-ideology is needed for someone to actually become a member of an oppositional group, and then how far the group further develops counter-ideology will be discussed in the conclusion to this Chapter, and the next Chapter.) However, again one has to face the problem of explaining why 10 Communist stewards did not articulate these alternatives. 9 of these stewards had appeared previously as having not developed alternatives in previous sections. This would suggest that similar reasons as outlined previously were at work.

For some being members of the Communist Party displays their implacable opposition to capitalism, but not necessarily an ideology developed in the deepest political sense. For this group, the ideological constructs of the Communist Party had failed to demonstrate its strength and relevance for the achievement of Socialism. Yet, as Richter points out, it is the Communists in the A.U.E.W. who play a big role in raising the perspective of Parliamentary advance (29).

Conclusion

It can be suggested on the basis of the results in this Chapter, that elements of Socialist class consciousness do exist among the stewards. These express themselves in a rejection of some dominant assumptions of society. So

- (i) 75% did not accept that wages cause inflation;
- (ii) 63% did not think Britain fair and just;
- (iii) 67% did not believe Socialism would end freedoms;
- (iv) 90% wanted a redistribution of wealth and power;
- (v) 66% felt workers could run industry;
- (vi) 79% would support a Socialist Britain;

This compares with other studies of workers' attitudes. Thus, Hamilton found that in the 1950s most French working people felt injustice, and half the unskilled and two fifths of the skilled expected change by revolution. While Moorhouse and Chamberlain found oppositional attitudes by the majority of their respondents to market forces, and a desire for distribution according to needs (30).

The stewards support for constructive changes shows that their attitudes had their origins in material interests, which gave them form and organisation. Their lack of adaption to existing conditions seem to be based on conceptions of what they would like to see. This shows an identity of interests with other workers and an opposition to employers. However, the fact of the limited developments of some of the identity and opposition within forms of Trade Union consciousness means that the criticisms of society does not necessarily penetrate to causes. Thus:-

- (i) 47 blamed employers for the crisis - 53 did not do so explicitly;
- (ii) 26 gave 'Leftist' solutions to the crisis which would benefit workers - 74 did not;
- (iii) 66 had initially accepted a positive purpose for the Social Contract;
- (iv) 27 supported workers' participation with employers;
- (v) 78 did not expect to see a Socialist Britain;

The key factor in assessing how far Trade Union forms of consciousness have been replaced by elements of Socialist forms of consciousness is how far the stewards have developed rational strategic perspectives for change. The elements of Socialist class consciousness leads to the stewards recognising all social relations as determined by class relations. It enables the stewards not just to reject the present society negatively, but to positively present alternatives (31). In this study positive aspects of Socialist class consciousness were found. Thus:-

- (i) 38 had ideas on how to redistribute wealth and power;
- (ii) 23 had ideas on achieving workers' control;
- (iii) 22 had ideas on how to achieve a Socialist Britain.

It is among these stewards that one begins to see the development of coherent substantive radicalism (32). However, the level of coherence and consistency of these radicalisms can be shown to vary. This is because some stewards have given only one strategic overview (27), while others gave two (9), and others three (12). So that in all, 48 stewards were able to give at least one strategic perspective for change. One can suggest that the 'failure' of the stewards to give three strategic perspectives may show some limitations in Socialist consciousness development. For these stewards Socialistic ideology is not so developed that they can see some aspects of change as feasible. The importance of ideology can be seen from the fact that twenty two of the Communist stewards were able to give at least one strategic perspective. Of the 12 stewards who gave three, 9 were Communists. From this it can be suggested that Communist stewards were more likely to give alternative perspectives. This may be linked to the fact that membership of the Communist Party develops an unavoidably ideological overview. At its crudest, this may result in, as Wessen points out, that "anyone who has learned a few stereotypes and the requisite jargon" can believe "he has mastered big secrets" (33). So membership of the Communist Party does not automatically mean a developed Socialist form of class consciousness. What it does do is signify a possibility of these developments, since it shows a class theme and a revolutionary impulse (34).

The difficulty is to explain why some Communist stewards fail to give any strategy, while others show a lack of consistency. It can be seen that the Communist Party gathers together impulses and currents of opposition to society in its recruitment. The problem is why do some stewards remain members, when they have become fatalistic and demoralised by the scope of the class struggle, and the awareness of the goal not being reached, and the long hard road ahead (35). In part the answer to this problem must lie in the relevance given to life, and the escape it gives from insecurity. For some membership may be continued out of duty, habit, friendship etc. While for others joining may be a last act, rather than a process of ideological development. So one need not necessarily identify length of membership with ideological sophistication.

Overall then, one can see that a highly coherent form of Socialist class consciousness exists among 12 stewards. In addition, another 36 stewards have some conception of an alternative society. This would imply that the thesis of the decay of political consciousness cannot be verified, since there exists among some of the workers' conceptions of capitalism, crisis and alternatives. On the other hand, it was also suggested that system of exclusions, rejections and divisions existed which showed themselves in the use of stereotypes and cliches. Some stewards choose examples of other groups and things, to define themselves against. These examples e.g. highly paid car workers, are designed to camouflage the sectional interests of groups of workers. These cliches and stereotypes help support the dominant assumptions of society.

These assumptions can assimilate aspects of the ideologies being used by workers in an isolated way to help maintain the existing society behind a Left phraseology. This phraseology works by obscuring the elements of unity, and struggle of the working class. Thus, workers' control is replaced by participation, and so collaboration with employers. Those who did not have a coherent form of Socialist consciousness were in various ways 'contaminated' by these assumptions. Given that 48 of the stewards did show elements of Socialist consciousness, it still means that 52 stewards had forms of Trade Union consciousness, with various levels of criticism of aspects of Society.

In the next Chapter an attempt will be made to explain how class consciousness develops. It will do this by considering some possible causal connections and relationships which might be at the roots of the stances of various stewards.

NOTES

1. For a discussion of this see R. Miliband, 'Marxism and Politics', MacMillan, London, 1977, p 33.
2. N. Bukharin, 'Historical Materialism', Allen and Unwin, London, 1926, pp 285-7.
3. See, for example, M. Brinton, 'The Irrational In Politics', Solidarity, London, 1975.
4. For a discussion of this point, see, J. Kekes, 'Rationality and Problem Solving', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Vol. 7, 1972.
5. Ibid, p 362.
6. S.J. Cogner, 'Class Consciousness and Consumption', Journal of Social History, Vol. 10, 1977, p 311 discusses this method.
7. E.B. Bax, 'The Ethics of Socialism', Swan Sonnenschein, London, 1902, pp 103-5 discusses the limitations of 'Class instinct'. See, too, P. Anderson, 'Origins of the Present Crisis' in 'Towards Socialism' Cornell, 1966, pp 33-4.
8. See H.F. Moorhouse, 'Attitudes to Class and Class Relationships in Britain', Sociology, Vol. 10, 1976, pp 492 - 3.
9. R. Luxemburg, 'Leninism or Marxism', Square One, London, 1978, pp 4 - 6.
10. For example, S. Herkommer, 'Working Class Political Consciousness', International Socialist Journal, Vol. 2, 1965, p 65;
A. Gorz, 'Strategy for Labour', Beacon Press, Boston, 1967, p 3.

NOTES

11. G. Lukacs, 'Lenin', New Left Books, London, 1970, p 40 makes the point about the characterisation of the crisis illustrating the divisions in the Labour Movement.
12. For U.S.A. workers views on the causes of crisis see, S.M. Peck, 'The Rank and File Leader', Cornell, 1963, pp 232-3. C. Hill, 'The World Turned Upside Down', Penguin, London, 1975, p 21, discusses the importance of who is blamed for a crisis.
13. Peck, *ibid*, p 234, found similar attitudes among U.S. workers. He points out that this does not mean they seek an end to the profit system, but only higher wages.
14. Anderson, 'Problems of a Socialist Strategy' in 'Towards Socialism', *ibid*, p 221 points to the importance of a strategic perspective.
15. M. Mann, 'The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracy', American Sociological Review, Vol. 35, 1970, p 424, discusses why inequality is accepted. For the incorporation of popular ideologies see N zongola-Ntalab 'Ideology and Class Struggle in Zaire', Berkeley Journal of Sociology, Vol. XXII, 1977-78, pp 116-121.
16. See G. Hodgson, 'Trotsky and Fatalistic Marxism', Spokesman, Nottingham, 1975, p 53.
17. E.J. Hobsbawm, 'The British Communist Party', Political Quarterly, Vol. 25, 1954, p 35, and 'Revolutionaries', Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1973, p 12 discusses the type of workers who join the C.P.G.B.

NOTES

- 17 cont., For discussions of the function of ideology among radical groups see D. Bouchier, 'Radical Ideologies and the Sociology of Knowledge', *Sociology*, Vol. 11, 1977; and H. Lefebure, 'The Sociology of Marx', Penguin, London, 1972, p 76.
18. W. Orton, 'Labour in Transition', Allen, London, 1921, pp 263-4.
19. See H. Scanlon, 'The Way Forward for Workers' Control', Institute for Workers' Control, Pamphlet One, p 3.
20. Ibid, p 6; and H. Scanlon, 'Workers' Control and the Transnational Company, IWC, Pamphlet 22, p 5.
21. See A. Crawson, 'Pluralism, Corporatism and the Role of the State', *Government and Opposition*, Vol. 13, 1978.
22. See, 'Industrial democracy response to the white paper', Engineering Employers' Federation, 1978.
23. For a discussion of different types of workers' control see A. Ferry, 'Industrial Democracy and Workers' control', 'Red Paper on Scotland', ed. G. Brown, E.U.S.P.B.
24. Scanlon, 'The Transnational Company', *ibid*, p 6, discusses this point.
25. See W.W. Fuchs, 'The Question of Marxist Ethics', *Philosophical Forum*, Vol. 7, 1975-76. For critiques of this position see D.B. Myers, 'Ethics and Political Economy in Marx', *Philosophical Forum*, Vol. 7, and A. Wood, 'The Marxian Critique of Justice', *Philosophy of Public Affairs* Vol. 1, 1971-72.

NOTES

26. Wood, *ibid*, pp 267-71.
27. This can be compared to Herkommer, *ibid*, pp 66-7 where he reports that 2% of workers in GFR sought fundamental change. For the results of a study of French political activists see D. Lacone, 'On the Fringe of the French Political System', *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 9, 1977.
28. Peck, *ibid*, Lacone, *ibid*, p 427; R.F. Hamilton, 'Affluence and the French Workers' in the IV Republic.
29. I. Richter, 'Political Purpose in the Trade Unions', Allen and Unwin, London, 1973, p 221.
30. Hamilton, *ibid*, pp 115-7; Moorhouse and Chamberlain, *ibid*, p 398.
31. See J.L. Wood, 'New Left Ideology: Its Dimensions and Developments', Sage Professional Papers, American Political Series, Vol. 2, 1975, p 6.
32. For a discussion of types of radicalism see, N. Rotenstreich, 'On Radicalism', *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, 1974. For the difficulty of determining what people believe see R.S. Gottlieb, 'A Marxist Concept of Ideology', *Philosophical Forum*, Vol. 6, 1974-75, p 387.
33. R.G. Wesson, 'Why Marxism', Temple Smith, London, 1976, p 221.
34. For discussions of Communist supporters attitudes, see T.H. Green, 'The Electorates of Non-Ruling Communist Parties', *Studies in Comparative Communism*, Vol. 4, 1971, pp 90-6.

NOTES

- 34 cont., For a discussion between political consciousness and party consciousness see D. Koenker, 'The Evolution of Party Consciousness in 1917. The Case of Moscow Workers', Soviet Studies, Vol. XXX, 1978, pp 38-9.
35. Thus, studies exist of why people join the Communist Party and leave it, but not why they remain members. See, for example, G.A. Almond, 'The Appeals of Communism', Princeton, 1954; K. Newton, 'The Sociology of British Communism', Allen Lane, London, 1969, pp 20-6.

Chapter Six: Some Causes of Class Consciousness

In the previous Chapters descriptions and interpretations have been given of the attitudes and characteristics of the shop stewards in the sample. In this Chapter an attempt will be made to examine possible explanations of these attitudes and characteristics (1). Initially, it was hoped to base the explanations on a number of hypotheses about the attitudes and behaviour of the stewards. However, the results were poor and few significant or conjunctional links were found. Where significant results were found the problem was that it was not clear that the causes examined were not themselves effects. In part this may be due to the problems of quantification in the social sciences. These arise because we are not dealing with recurrent phenomenon which are isolated and stationary. By seeking to explain we are moving into more abstract, less empirical areas, and to a different level of discourse. However, this conclusion could only be reached after seeing what a quantitative method produced in this case.

Thus, in this case, one can see limitations exist in a study which hoped to quantify, then process and explain human actions. (These issues are discussed in Appendix One) The isolating of certain factors means ignoring chains of influence from a complex interacting whole. Interconnections and reciprocal interactions are undermined (2). Another problem that was highlighted was a positivistic danger in seeking regularity in the development of something like class consciousness. This depends on conceptualising class consciousness as made up of discreet parts which can be subjected to statistical techniques.

It means accepting an essentially metaphysical postulate that ultimately everything and anything can be correlated with everything else (3).

As a method quantification was used because of the example of other social science research. Almond (1954) used it to help explain the 'appeals of communism' in terms of the 'needs' it satisfied in recruits. Hamilton (1967) examined the source of attitudes of French workers by reference to their work skill, unemployment experiences, income levels, factory life, etc. While Leggat (1973) employed the techniques to examine the 'sources and consequences of working class consciousness' among different ethnic and racial groups in an American city. That it did not give good results in this study may be because the questions used did not generate information which was suitable to quantification.

A problem which arises from these works is that there is a failure to recognise the limitations of their findings both in scope of explanation and time of relevance. They fail to see that research can only bring out a respondent's opinion, beliefs and attitudes on some topics. Related topics may heavily qualify particular opinions on the topic under investigation. While critiques of the work of Goldthorpe et al show that alternative explanations are possible from the same quantitative data, and depend on the theoretical method adopted (4).

As a reaction to the problems of using quantitative methods in social sciences, an alternative method of research has been used.

This is narrative description which appears to examine people as connected historical wholes. Of course the evidence that is amassed is always incomplete, and does not provide the possibility of full descriptions, let alone context. Researchers always have to infer from limited data on the basis of large assumptions and often using crude psychologisms. Further, it is necessary for social science to typify at some point in an explicit way.

Unfortunately, a number of studies using a narrative method typify implicitly, and so one is unclear about the relationships between the particular and general. However, as a method it has been popular in the study of class consciousness since it is felt to be valuable in describing workers and giving a 'feel' of their lives through pen portraits and 'lives in process'. These studies place emphasis on particularities and uniqueness. Lane and Roberts (1971) used it to examine the effects of a strike on a rank and file committee. Beynon (1973) wrote the biography of a car plant to describe the developments in a Shop Stewards Committee. While Nichols and Armstrong (1976) and Nichols and Beynon (1977) used pen portraits to look at individual workers "social thinking" and show "the ways people come to understand themselves and their position in society, and in history through their concrete experiences of society".

In this Chapter it had been hoped that both quantitative and narrative techniques could be used. The quantitative techniques would help indicate the reliability of tests of evidence in relation to aggregate data. While the pen portraits would be used to give a more complex portrayal and convey attitudes, feelings and beliefs, and how they might have been formed in certain stewards.

However, the quantitative method will not be used to the extent planned because of the poor results. The test on the data which was done involved examining the possibilities of relationships between variables, and the levels of confidence one could have in saying they existed. This meant examining how far a distribution of answers could be said to result from chance. It was hoped to get results which would show, at most, a 5% chance result. This would mean that one was 95% confident in asserting a relationship between variables. Unfortunately, as has been said, this result was seldom found. When it was, it was not clear that cause and effect were being differentiated. Hence, it will be pen portraits which will be used in the main to look at the mechanisms of class consciousness, in a society with little experience of mass Socialist consciousness. Any explanations which are given in this Chapter can only be partial. As was said in an earlier Chapter class consciousness is not an attribute which workers naturally possess. It is a sense and a meaning, a mode of understanding, and representing the class struggle. Hence, it is developed in a learning process which draws certain conclusions from the particular synthesis of practical social relations the worker is involved in. It is an active and selective process of reflection. At present there is no formula for the development of the individual's class consciousness because one cannot fully determine the events leading to individuals making conscious decisions. One can only examine the limited information one has about the individual's biography and see the traits and events paving the way for actions.

Though social science methods are unable to explain the development in individual class consciousness, they do attempt to deal with the development of mass class consciousness. Among Marxian social scientists one can often see metaphysical categories of 'dialectic' being used to do this. Thus, for example, Petras (1978) attacks "conventional sociology's" study of class consciousness and revolution, and says its findings are unimportant since it ignores the class struggle and the historic process (5). He then piles the suppositions of Marxism together to form a structure of definite truth. His is a theory of complete coherence, clearing up the problems of the past, simplifying the present and outlining the future. To do this, he speaks in the name of a working class which has been torn out of its context of historically conditioned interests. Petras, also, fails to see that his historical facts can only be assumed to be such by means of the very principles which are in question. This is not to say that a theory of development of Socialist class consciousness should not be attempted. Only that one should be aware that it is a matter of speculation in which the results will be predetermined by the theory adopted. Nor can one claim to have outlined the correct theory abstractly. The only proof of correctness would be the achievement of Socialism since the theory of development of class consciousness can best be described as the theory of working class emancipation.

The problem being examined here is how does the working class come to see its objective interests. That is, how does it come to understand (as far as is possible) the 'totalness' of class relations and develop strategic perspectives for an alternative society.

One is seeking the causal factors conditioning the broad masses of people to involve themselves in revolutionary struggle. This struggle is a 'period in the life of the people when the anger accumulated over centuries . . . breaks to the surface in deeds and not words, and in the deeds of the masses of the people by the millions, and not by individuals . . . ' (6). It is the unusualness of this period, and its rarity which adds to the problems of study.

From the approach adopted in this study revolution can be said to result from the sum total of unresolved contradictions - between labour and capital, an obsolete political and social structure and the social forces of production, between external and domestic policies of the ruling class and the interests of the working class. These contradictions mature through a complex and lengthy process conditioned by specific changes occurring in various spheres of life, particularly in the nature of relationships and disposition of class forces. At this point one can introduce the concept of revolutionary situation. This helps answer the question of the means through which the working class progress beyond trade union consciousness forms to a state of readiness for decisive combat. This transition in consciousness for the mass of the working class begins independently of the will and desires of class and political parties, as a consequence of objective factors. It is these objective factors which lead to the conditions for the transformation to Socialist consciousness. They involve:-

- (1) A political and economic crisis of nationwide proportions, this means the ruling class is unable to rule in the old way. There is a crisis in its policy which leads to dislocations within the ruling class and its 'destabilisation'.

- (2) This coincides with the oppression and suffering of the mass of people growing worse. For example, the exacerbation of the economic crisis gives rise to declining living standards of a drastic kind, and an intensification of the class struggle.
- (3) The lower classes do not want to live in the old way, and the effects of the crisis are leading to indignation and revolt and an immense increase in their activity.

These objective changes, and the subjective changes they help to bring about, are the initial and essential factors in maturing a revolutionary situation. However, they do not guarantee it and cannot bring it to a conclusion. Under the effects of these objective factors the lower classes move spontaneously to a state of ferment and dissatisfaction with the existing society. However, this is insufficient for fundamental change. Further development requires conscious, rational action. This new stage is marked by:-

- (1) The lower classes moving from a fierce hatred of the bourgeoisie and its agents to conscious decisions to overthrow the present society.
 - (2) The development of the appropriate organisational forms of struggle which give the required unity of will.
- Socialist consciousness requires a new set of practices which replace those which define trade union consciousness, and bring new sets of relationships and loyalties. This change in the content of activity is vital in bringing about changes in the form of consciousness.

- (3) The Marxian approach adopted here at this point lays stress on Socialists taking advantage of the crisis to rouse people and reveal to them the existence of a revolutionary situation. It also helps them develop the sense of their own value so that they can develop and retain a moral ascendancy.
- (4) For a revolution to take place a majority of "Class conscious, thinking, and politically active workers" must feel it is necessary (7).

Thus, the Marxian alchemists of revolution stress the connection between subjective and objective factors in the transformation of class consciousness. Though to non-Marxists it may seem that the revolution is Marxism's holy of holies, and the means to attain it involve a cultivation of hatred among one grouping in society towards other groups. This hatred is then given a glossy covering by calling it class consciousness and saying it is a rational awareness of objective interests (8).

The major subjective problem, from a Marxian viewpoint, is the development of Socialist consciousness. The problem is, how does one ideology replace another one, so that fundamentally new conceptions of reality which inform the nature of organisations, the problems and methods for tackling are developed? An additional factor which can be added to this problem and which may be answered by this study is, what makes a worker become revolutionary in a non-revolutionary situation?

To give some answers to these problems, the method used will be pen portraits of some stewards. This does not constitute an adequate biographical treatment since there is no probing of the stewards' family, friends and associates. Nor is there utilisation of any empirical documentation which might be available. Thus, there is no multiple, independent account of events and behaviour which might be assessed and balanced. The method of pen portraits will be used because, as Capp (1972) points out, an understanding of why individuals react differently to similar experiences can best be understood by looking at hereditary and background (9). Though there can be a tendency for the approach to fall into hagiographical descriptions, especially where evidence is poor and one is dealing with such a complex matter as intellectual development. Nevertheless, this risk can be faced since as Nichols and Armstrong point out the method can overcome "the oversimple static characterisations by looking at the structure of social thinking of individuals". In this study the focus will be on both some obstacles to class consciousness, and how some stewards overcome obstacles to the development of some forms of Socialist consciousness (10). Though there are no scales on which the stewards can be weighed and measured against one another, and though they differ in nature and in personalities, one has still to attempt to pick out 'typical' stewards for examination and comparison. This involves examining dominant traits and seeing the paths some stewards have taken to Socialist consciousness, and factors which have stopped others developing

Of course, given the Marxian perspective adopted for this study, one could claim that there has been no development of mass Socialist consciousness because the conditions for its development have not existed. The reality of society is such that it necessitates the dominance of trade union forms of consciousness amongst the working class. Thus, it is a question of the historical order of social existence. However, there is a certain blandness about this Marxian axiom. One has to recognise that despite necessities and impersonal forces governing the historical course of social existence, the individual steward has personal biases and peculiarities. These can be looked at from the stewards' responses to questions. The difficulty is that the interview method tends to petrify particular responses. This means it is more difficult to see the different weight and consistency the stewards give to various attitudes and ideas. Nevertheless, the following case studies will outline the attitudes of the stewards.

Michael McEwan

Background: Michael McEwan was 41 years old when interviewed. He was married with 3 children and lived in Port Glasgow. He had been brought up in Govan and served his apprenticeship in Fairfields Shipyard. Michael had emigrated in the early 1960s when he was unemployed to Australia because "the benefit wasn't enough for me and the wife and the oldest girl". He would have stayed there "if the wee boy hadn't got a disease of the hip and we just couldn't afford the treatment . . .". His grandfathers had been an engineer and rivetter, and his wife's father had also been a rivetter.

He "believed they would be" in their respective unions. They "were great Labour men and were involved and took a lot to do with Labour", though "they weren't Communist minded".

The family home was religious:

"We're Roman Catholics, we still are. We carry out our obligations. I mean I go to Church on a Sunday."

However, this did not lead him to be an 'Anti-Communist Right' in his attitudes. Though he felt "The Catholic Church is very much against Communism". He felt that there were a lot of Communists involved "because not enough people get involved," and Communists were "fighting and doing a lot" to try and "get a place in the Movement".

Here one can see an attitude which could lead him to support 'Anti-Communist Right' candidates at some stage in an election. Though in earlier elections he had supported Jimmy Reid, "a working mans' man" even though he was a Communist.

Union Experience: Michael had joined the Union in Fairfields "because you had to be in the Union . . . there's no choice about it". He believed the individual had the right not to join though, "he shouldn't be looking for the rights off it". Here we see the moral attitude towards unionism found throughout the study. It is a moralism based to some extent on recognition of self-interest satisfied by union membership since -

"If you go back 40-50 years, not even when they were outlawed and fighting for their rights, you were living on coppers . . . To me the trade union movement is giving the people the right to fight for money and get better things."

In this characterisation of the functions of the Union one can detect the attitudes of the 'Trade Union Right' tendency. He sees the Union as giving "the right to fight", yet feels there are too many strikes, "when you read the paper there are strikes day and daily".

In addition, his belief in solidarity with other workers "depends what kind of dispute". As for foreign workers, he thinks "right now we're fighting for our own rights in this country without going abroad". From this it can be suggested that behind the rhetoric of "fighting" there is a failure to see that workers may share problems which can be solved by international action. There is no recognition of common interests which necessitate solidarity. Nor does the idea of agreeing with the case provide sufficient motivation for helping other workers who are not British. The concentration is solely on internal problems.

Ideological Attitudes: Michael believes the Conservative get their funds "from the big firms and monied people" because "if they're going to do anything they'll do it first for the monied people . .". In this one can see a belief in politics being about the representation of interests, and parties representing opposed interests.

For Michael workers no longer face the sack from management, though he believes they should be able to "if it's a good reason". These reasons are, "if management hasn't got orders, or can't sell . .". In this one can see an acceptance of the social priorities of the capitalist firm.

Thus, the method adopted by Michael for fighting redundancies was to abandon demarcation to protect the trade.

He supposes "you should spread the wealth a little more evenly" though he does not feel "they are doing the right thing", they take over a business someone "has worked hard to build up . . ." Here one can see a bending to a plank in the dominant assumptions in society which pictures Socialism as being opposed primarily to small business, rather than monopoly capitalism.

Michael hoped the Social Contract would bring about this change, and thought it was a good thing because -

"I believe the low paid workers are going to catch up with the high fliers . . . there are too many high paid workers, like you read Chrysler and Leyland and the money they are making . . ."

Again, one can see a support for an ideological theme of the dominant assumptions. One group of workers' relatively high wages are blamed for others having low wages. No blame is placed with the employers of low paid workers. It is the type of attitude which supports sectionalism among workers. A continual source of information for Michael McEwan is what he reads in the papers, and the only papers he reads are capitalist owned. No alternative source of information enters his horizon which could challenge these dominant assumptions. Nevertheless, these assumptions do come into collision with his experiences on the shopfloor, which lead him to support certain ideals. Thus, he supports the concepts of a Socialist Britain, which he thinks a Labour Government should bring about, though not being "politically minded" he does not know how.

Like other 'Trade Union Rightists', he supports the link between Labour and the unions and thinks "if they are going to operate as a Labour Party without unions, then why should we support their Social Contract". Support for the Social Contract is then tied in with Labour recognising that it has a special relationship with the unions, and presumably the obligations this brings.

Michael McEwan is a 'Trade Union Rightist' in his form of consciousness. He has "always been Labour minded - my family has always been Labour minded, and I don't think I'll ever change". He opposes militants because he believes "they are out to overthrow a Government at any cost". Though he feels moderates are "Conservatives", and describes himself as "to the Left".

His rhetoric contains ideas of "fighting" but his practice shows this to be highly conditional, with excuses being found to avoid it. He believes that cuts in expenditure should be opposed, but when asked if he was involved in actions against them says, "but let's face it no matter where they cut to save money they are going to hurt somebody. So what do you do . . ." In addition, his attitudes displayed a fragmentation of the working class on sectional lines, based on wage levels. In part this may be due to a main source of his information coming from the capitalist press. Nor has he had much contact with workers who possess oppositional ideologies.

He had "only really been involved with two Communists in my whole time", and this was only superficial contact. Another factor in his attitudes may have been his Roman Catholicism. This was an important theme in his ideological orientation though he had never been involved in a Catholic workers' organisation. He had been approached to take part "but personally I only take part in the Union, and I don't need to join anything. I've got two hands and I can work for everything". This non-joining is one of the factors which distinguishes him from the 'Anti-Communist Right'.

His attitude towards Communists is not wholly negative though, he does believe some of them are Machiavellian and use others. However, he does not feel there is a conspiracy by them to undermine the Union and Britain. He is not self-consciously Anti-Communist, although he is not immune from its pull in certain circumstances.

George Rennie

Background: George Rennie was 56 when interviewed. He was married with a daughter, who was herself married. He, and his wife, had been brought up in Partick. They now lived in Drumchapel. George served his time in David Rowan's of Finnieston, who "are extinct now". He was involved in the 1941 Apprentices' strike, and served on the committee. It did not, he feels, have a great effect on his thinking. His father had been a mechanical engineer and a member of the A.E.U. His grandfathers had been a boilermaker and a blacksmith, "One was in Ingle's yard which is away and the other in John Brown's".

His wife's father had been a storeman. Politics and Unions were not much discussed in his family home. Though a brother is also involved in the Union, George felt he differed from his father in outlook -

"I don't know why. I'd say I'm, ' wouldn't like to say militant, but I'm more determined than my father seemed to be. Although he had to apply himself at his work to be a thorough tradesman."

He felt he had been something of a rebel in his youth, It's just my character. I hate to see, feel suppressed or injustice". The concept of a "tradesman" who acts in certain ways and has certain rights was a strong one in George Rennie's thinking. As was the ideal of opposing "injustice" which motivated him into becoming a steward.

Union Experience: George had joined the A.E.U. as an apprentice because "I felt there was injustice being done to us . . ." He opposed the individual's right not to belong, and justified this by saying "you've never experienced it here."

His attitude towards solidarity can be shown to be influenced by sectionalism. He started off by saying other workers should be helped "on all occasions". Then he goes on to criticise other Unions for believing "they'll always get the same as the tradesman". George feels the tradesman should get more because "they can get increases through productivity which we can't get, yet if we stopped servicing them, if you took that attitude, there'd be no work in the place". It is this sort of attitude which led to a series of toolroom strikes which at one point seemed about to split the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section).

However, the answer which helps one become more specific about George's form of consciousness came in response to whether foreign workers should be helped.

"If it becomes political too much, people resent the fact you're putting some compulsion on them. They get an inherent resistance to political interpretations."

This would seem to indicate that George belongs to the 'Anti-Politics Populist' tendency. He believes strongly in the need for a union "due to management . . . I think they still reserve a lot of the old attitudes towards trade unions, and they are still going to transgress into our positions, and they are out to retain their authority." He does not like the Union "to involve too much political jargon or political attitudes . . . I like it to be really democratic". His view is that the politically involved union members are affecting the effectiveness of the union adversely.

Ideological Attitudes: George believed the Conservatives got their funds "from the monied classes seeking to preserve their wealth." Once again, one can see a view of politics as being to represent interests, at least as far as the Conservatives and the "monied classes" are concerned.

He believes there are few strikes because "the majority of people involved in trade unions have a Labour background and have supported Labour", whereas when the Conservatives were "in before with its Bill, and there was a lot of fervour worked up by Labour people . . ."

For George it is now "questionable" whether the unions should continue to support Labour's policies. Political support for Labour is, George feels, disadvantaging the unions, and within his union the tradesmen.

Given his apolitical stand it may not be surprising that he does not have strategic perspectives for change, especially since he does not seem to develop many syndicalist themes. What does come through in his answers is an egalitarian theme. He believes a redistribution of wealth and power could be brought about by -

"making genuine inroads into the people who have the wealth of the country . . . there should be a limitation on the wealth the people could have."

Not surprisingly, given his attitude to tradesmens' wages, he opposes the Social Contract. George feels there should be "some relaxation, and I don't mean to low paid workers, I mean all workers . . ." In this sort of statement one can see the combination of criticism of the Government from a Leftist position, combined with Rightist defences of sectionalism which characterise 'Anti-Politics Populists'.

From his statement one can also see the limitations to a concept of "fairness" as a tool for criticising society if it is not backed up by a class analysis. Thus, he believes total workers' control would not be fair since "if workers had control they would take over the profits . . . It would be more money towards floor level than there would be to shareholders . . ." The whole point of workers' control in taking profits out of private hands is missed. In part this failure may be due to George's tendency to judge things in terms of money. Thus, he believes people should oppose legislation "when it gets to a pitch when people have suffered, especially financially". This may be because he lack the political perspective which could give other goals or motivations.

George Rennie is an 'Anti-Politics Populist' who opposes political involvements for the Union. This does not mean he does not define himself politically as an individual. George thinks of himself as a "Socialist" but it is not the main motivating theme in his actions. It can be seen that moralism is a strong component in his thought, and that egalitarianism also exists. However, this egalitarianism co-exists with a belief in sectional advantage for tradesmen. Their co-existence is to some extent explained by the different 'domains' in which they are thought about. Egalitarianism is directed at those who have more money than him, while sectionalism is expressed against those with less. Additionally, it can be suggested that his egalitarianism is not particularly rigorous since he still believes in being 'fair' to shareholders.

George believes that politics is leading to the Union being ineffective. He has a general antipathy to politics. Thus, he does not buy Left Wing papers because he thinks:-

"They try to propound too much politics, say $\frac{7}{8}$ of it, they propound their politics very heavily."

He is not receiving any oppositional propaganda which might lead him to redefine what politics are about. Hence, his hatred of injustice is not being given a more solid grounding in an explanation of how it exists. Nor has he ever been influenced by anyone who might have encouraged these sort of ideas. This does not mean that he is not militant in his functioning as a Convenor. He has only become one after they had -

"tried out various members for the Convenorship, but they've never been forceful enough for the membership, and the members have held a meeting and decided to terminate the individual's service as Convenor."

James Cassells

Background: James Cassells was 34 when interviewed, and was married with three children. Both he and his wife had been brought up in Govan, and now lived in Nitshill. He served an apprenticeship in engineering at George Christie's in Govan, "then it closed down, then to P. & W. McLellan in Kinning Park". James was involved in the 1960 apprentices' strike.

"it was a slightly strange situation, 5,000 came up and took us out, Fairfields and Stephens and what have you."

The strike had little effect on him, "it was a big game at that time, I was only 16 or 17." His father worked in the Shipyards as a painter, and his father's father had also done this. His other grandfather was a policeman. His wife's father is a merchant seaman.

His family home was "Orange and Green. My father was a non-Catholic and my mother was a Catholic". He is a Catholic in a nominal sense now, but says he does not have the faith, "it has never held a great fascination for me."

He works in Rolls Royce. This is his second spell in the factory, having left to work for King's Aircraft until it closed down. Rolls Royce wanted him to start in the Training Department during a strike and assured him it would be all right, "but having been in there before I didn't think it was right."

Union Experience: James joined the Union when he was 18, "they come round and give you your form and say, "It's now time for you to participate, and that's why I got into it." He believed the individual had the right not to join, but then qualified it in moral terms -

"If he is any kind of person at all, and he sees the advantage the Unions have brought and he's enjoying them he should be a member."

He believed in giving solidarity to other workers in Britain, and believed "there is room for an international set up where workers are fighting". It was comments like this which stressed the value of Unionism that made it possible to categorise James Cassells as a 'Trade Union Leftist'. Thus, he felt -

"the Trade Unions are the country. They are the people of the country, they are the majority, they should have strength and the will to speak."

One can see here a challenge to an ideological theme of the dominant assumptions in society. From this statement one can see a feature which distinguishes the 'Trade Union Leftist' from the 'Rightist'. The 'Left' face up to the ideological attacks on the Unions by the dominant groups of society, and refuse to accept their definitions. A factor distinguishing them from the 'Anti-Politics Populists' can also be found. When asked if he thought Trade Unions should concentrate on industrial matters and leave politics to the Labour Party, James replied:-

"There are times when I couldn't agree more, but there are times if we are sponsoring M.Ps. we should have a voice through them to some degree."

His support for political involvement is half-hearted and limited in its scope, but it does exist in a way it does not for the 'Anti-Politics' tendency.

James's attitudes have been changed by his being a shop steward. He no longer takes attacks by managers or foremen as "personal", rather he believes it is an attack on the Union as represented by him. Similarly, he has come to be able to see through the rhetoric of the dominant assumptions.

"if you are giving the bosses a hard time then you become a militant. If you're agreeing with them you're a very good moderate."

Despite this he is reluctant to call himself a militant, but prefers to think of himself as a "happy medium", between the two. In this one can see that the ideological offensive against the Union based partly on the labelling of workers 'militant' and then linking this with negative consequences for the country has had an effect.

Ideological Attitudes: James agreed Labour was a workers' party only because "it's the best of a bad lot". It is only negatively that Labour is seen as in any way adequate, and not for what it does. Thus, he opposes the Social Contract which he felt "was meant to turn us into another India . . ." This may be linked to his strong support for the actions of Trade Unions ensuring the well being of Britain. Anything which hinders this action will thus hit at the well being. This can be seen in his reasons why there have been so few strikes,

". . . because of the economic stranglehold. Workers can't afford to lose one or two weeks with what they've got on their shoulders, whether it's debt or otherwise."

By accepting wage freezes, the Union has undermined its ability to act through its "main weapon". It is allowing itself to be disarmed. For someone like James, who is a 'Trade Union Leftist' this is deeply felt for concepts of "fighting" and "struggle" are important in their attitudes. For example, he feels management should not be able to sack workers and says "We've disallowed it, we just won't have it". They are able to do this because the "Union has fought against it in the past".

What James lacks is the strategic perspective of how to bring about an alternative society, which he says he would support. Despite the lack of this perspective, he has confidence in the capacity of working people to run an alternative society. When asked if industry is not too complicated for workers to run, he replied, "That's a load of rubbish . . ." This faith in the capacity of workers extends to his view that the prospects for Socialism are good, if only workers "could be brought to realise that if it's the number game which is important in politics, and we've got the numbers". In this faith one can see a reiteration of his view that the Unions are the country. This view can be considered to explicitly redefine the concept of the 'National Interest' to what is best for the working class. It is the Unions which have "got the voice of the people".

James Cassells is a 'Trade Union Leftist', and has great faith in the value of a combative Union. In his attitudes and opinions he is to a great extent free of the ideological catchwords of the dominant assumptions.

For him the Unions are the best expression of the 'National Interest', and this helps him to justify militant actions. He is deeply opposed to the employers. Part of the reason for this may be his strong egalitarianism, "I think we should all be equal . . . I know if a man's got a better education, or a better job, he should get more pay, but I think an ordinary working man should get a fair go". This is an egalitarianism less affected by fragmentary forces than that shown by George Rennie. However, despite being unable to think of any drawbacks to a Socialist society, and feeling the prospects for it are good, James has no strategic perspectives for achieving it. This failure is not due to him not being in contact with oppositional ideas and groups. He buys the 'Morning Star' at work and thinks it is advantageous to read it for "the plain speaking, the other side of the coin . . .". James also feels he was influenced,

" . . . there were one or two Socialists in beside me.

Working class, real working class Socialists. They were very honest people."

He was involved in discussions with them about Unions and politics. This may have partially made up for the "very little" discussions of these matters in his family home. It was these workers who got him reading the 'Daily Worker - Morning Star' "in my first trip into the Rolls Royce when I was 23."

James is a worker dissatisfied with British society. But for the "lack of gumption" he would have emigrated to Canada to get a "better chance". He does not think it is a fair and just society because the bosses are able to carry out an "investment strike" and invest abroad, so hitting the "life blood" of Britain.

In this type of statement, one can see the profound concern workers like James have for the future of Britain. It gives the lie to the assertion that those on the 'Left' are wreckers out to destroy Britain.

Jimmy Caldwell

Background: Jimmy was 62 when interviewed and living in Paisley. He had been brought up in Ayrshire, and moved to Glasgow when he finished his apprenticeship with Marrow-Fitzpatrick of Ayr. His grandfathers had been a shepherd and a master cobbler. His father was a master painter, a strong Trade Unionist, a supporter of the Independent Labour Party, and an atheist. Jimmy had been brought up in these traditions.

He had been married but was divorced. One of the contributing factors to this had been his "one hundred per cent activism". He had served on the District Committee of the A.E.U. and the Glasgow Committee of the Communist Party. Jimmy gave a list of the factories he had been employed in: Albion, Yarrows, Beardmores, Weirs, Harlands, Barclay Curles, Gleniffer Engineering, Steel Pressings, Massey Fergusons, Stephens, Remington Rand, and so on.

He believed "The real reason for me having so many jobs was my victimisation", because of his political beliefs and actions.

Union Experiences: Jimmy joined the A.E.U. in 1935 "the minute I became adult I joined the Union". Shortly after this he moved to Glasgow and started in Beardmore's toolroom where there was "a very strong Trade Union set up . . ." He became involved in the Union in an active way in this factory.

He had been involved "in quite a few strikes" over his working life, "mostly over the dismissal of shop stewards and dismissal, or rather the excessive harsh treatment of someone for some minor misdemeanour". From this one can see he is deeply concerned in defending the rights of workers from employers attacks. This leads him to support solidarity actions since he believes "it's in the interests of the people themselves, that they should give this co-operation". This theme of helping ourselves by helping others is strong in Jimmy's answers, and shows a recognition of a common class identity and opposition from his own shopfloor up to the international arena. It is one class struggle -

"to stop any inroads into their own conditions they have to be actively engaged in international solidarity with these international workers."

Ideological Attitudes: For Jimmy politics was about "class issues". Thus, the Conservatives got money from big business because "it's a class party, and they contribute to the party they think will preserve their conditions".

He is profoundly opposed to the employers and mistrustful of them. He believes they would still sack workers, but for the stewards being "so strong that management has to consult them". In addition, he has a low opinion of the capacities of many employers, "they couldn't read a dog card at Shawfield". For Jimmy, if a policy does not favour the working class it helps their enemies. Hence, he judges the Social Contract as a "negative thing" which "primarily enhances employers' profits".

It is views like this which allow one to categorise Jimmy as a 'Broad Leftist'. He believes the Unions form part of a class movement which he seeks to develop. He supports Amalgamation because it increased the capacity of his class, since it "strengthens the hands of the workers . . ." This view leads him to be irreconcilably opposed to capitalism and believe in the necessity of an alternative society. Personally, he does not expect to see it because -

"there is a tremendous amount to be broken down within the Labour Movement to win them to the conception of workers' revolution".

This belief may help account for his failure to give a strategy for achieving Socialism, though he gave strategies for bringing about a fundamental change in the balance of wealth and power, and workers' control. The strategies he proposed were 'Statist' Socialist in their contents, with a strong element of a 'Classical Revolutionary' approach, which stressed the importance of giving workers' leadership. It is in the depth of his political approach that Jimmy differentiates himself from the 'Trade Union Leftist'. He is constantly seeking means to develop the political consciousness of the workers in the direction which he thinks is correct. Following the stereotypifications of the Communist Party, he feels the main weakness of the Unions is the "economic factor, it hasn't taken on the political slant it should have . . ." Thus, workers are not acting as they should, they are not being fully rational. The questions that one can try to approach answering here is, 'how did Jimmy develop this Socialist consciousness?'

Why did he come to identify so deeply with his class? What one is really asking here is, why do revolutionaries exist? This means examining what factors are relevant to revolutionaries, and why; and how are these tested and confirmed so that a new ideology takes root in the individual.

From Jimmy's interviews one can indicate the presence of some relevant factors, and their testing by his life experiences. Firstly, his family background appears to have been Leftist, and his father sought to encourage Socialistic attitudes. Thus, Jimmy went to the local Socialist Sunday School where -

"there was a whole lot of factions involved but all anti-system and pointing out its faults".

Here he was learning oppositional ideas, and being involved in an alternative culture. He feels this experience "led me to always look for anti-system ideas". For him political ideas and debates were not something uninteresting, nor seldom held. Rather he was brought up in an atmosphere where Socialist politics were common discourse.

Secondly, these ideas of an anti-system nature were tested and confirmed to some extent in the 1930s by the hardship his family, and other families suffered, due to unemployment. He talks of the "real poverty of the miners and other workers' children". The sights he saw, he feels, had a big effect on him. The relative deprivation of the working class was brought home to him. He did not feel the Labour Party would end this.

His father was to the Left of the Labour Party and criticised it, "I would listen to my old man and other people talking about the roles of the Ramsay MacDonalds". He was "motivated against" the Labour Party, and it did not meet his test of the type of organisation required to bring about change. For Jimmy it was the Communist Party which met his test and seemed the organisation to "stop the rot that was taking place and alleviate a lot of the social conditions . . .". This belief was intensified in his contact with Communists when he moved to Glasgow. He -

"met some really intelligent men. They did not have a collar and tie but were well read for they had been unemployed till the re-armament programme and spent their time reading. These were men really worth knowing, great intellects. The ability of these men were fantastic".

Jimmy lived and worked beside these men and seems to have involved himself in intensive dialogue with them. During this dialogue "the question was posed" of joining them, which he did.

It would seem that some of the relevant factors in Jimmy's development of Socialist consciousness was his presence in a milieu where Socialist affiliation was acceptable. The conditioning of his family background was linked to the 'glittering influence' of his Communist acquaintances to overcome any problems, in the development of his consciousness.

Charlie MacNamara

Background: Unlike Jimmy, Charlie did not have his political commitments so clearly determined by his family's traditions.

His great grandfather came from Ireland, while his grandfathers were a sea going engineer and a holeborer. His father was a shipwright, a Roman Catholic, and a Socialist of some kind. His mother worked in a textile mill, was a Protestant, and a Conservative voter. Charlie was named after an uncle, who like his father, was a Socialist "by conviction". His wife comes from an Irish, Roman Catholic family. They have three children. She believes she had a "good man till he joined the Communist Party". She complains that she has lost her friends through Charlie arguing with them about politics.

Charlie served his apprenticeship in Cockburns, Cardonald, where he was involved in the 1960 stoppage. When his time was out he moved to Babcocks as a toolroom turner.

Union Experiences: Despite the factory being 100% unionised there is a lack of unity among workers. The J.S.S.C. having fragmented during a strike by the Engineers for parity with Boilermakers. Charlie feels this fragmentation reflected long standing tensions between the workers in the factory, which even stewards were involved in.

This fragmentation along with, what Charlie feels is, a lack of fight, has led to the workforce accepting three redundancies in the last twelve years which have reduced the labour force from 10,000 to 4,000. Charlie has developed a certain cynicism because of events like this, and feels that many of the workers are "reactionary". In this judgement one can see an impatience based on a belief that workers are not acting rationally, i.e. like Charlie.

Ideological Attitudes: Charlie, like Jimmy, has a sense of identity with his fellow workers, which is not restricted by national boundaries. He is opposed to employers and feels they still sack workers, despite the presence of Unions, by being more cunning than in the past. Like the other stewards, he links the employers' support of the Conservatives to their interests being served.

"it is a better party than the Labour Party to serve their interests".

Implicit in this is a somewhat negative assessment of the Labour Party, since the Conservatives are only "better" at serving big business interests than it. It would seem that he believes that Labour also represents business interests to some extent. Charlie's politics can be judged from his statement that he is "totally and irreversibly working class".

Like Jimmy, his belief that Unions are class organisations leads him to support Amalgamation "because you are talking about common problems and a common gaffer . . ." Once again, one can see the attitudes of the 'Broad Left' tendency being expressed, and as a consequence a belief in the need for an alternative society. So he sees a role for the Union in fighting for "conditions and the establishment of Socialism", by playing a part "in the class struggle". He opposes anything which stands in the way of this role, such as "social democratic attitudes steering workers off the course of advance". He also opposes policies which he believes are against a move toward Socialism.

For example, he opposes the Social Contract because it will bring about a

"totally irreversible shift back the way. The capitalist system is shored up by the Social Contract. It gives back to capitalism the central bank of wealth needed by capitalism".

Again, one can see a similarity with Jimmy's view that if a policy does not help the working class it must help their enemies.

Unlike Jimmy, though also feeling a revolution is not "imminent", Charlie gives strategic alternatives for all three questions. His view of how these changes should be brought about is in the 'Statist' Socialist tradition. He feels that these changes will be difficult because Britain "is so steeped in history and propaganda".

Charlie, thus, has a Socialist consciousness which expresses itself in one way by his membership of the Communist Party. He believes joining the Communist Party was "a logical process of moving Left, with no thunderbolts". It can be seen that this explanation of his moving Left as a rational process may help explain his harsh judgements of his fellow workers as "reactionary". He goes on to give a brief background to his change in political attitudes. From his Union involvement he came to believe --

"that to progress any views on Trade Unionism you couldn't go to the Right, you must go to the Left, for the Right reject the concepts held in Rule One (of the Union Rules).

However, to adopt this attitude requires a prior conditioning which led him to judge things this way.

Since it is not clear that it is necessary to go Left to get progress or defend Rule One. As has been shown every tendency in the Union would claim that its policies are the ones to defend the Union and get the best possible progress. Some of the conditioning factors which were relevant in his move Left can be found in Charlie's interview.

Firstly, Charlie was accustomed to hearing political debates in his family home. This would mean that discussion in this area was considered fairly normal -

"My father was a Labour voter, my mother was a Conservative voter. There was constant talk about politics in the home because of the conflict between them."

Charlie seems to have been more influenced by his father, a convinced Socialist, who would condemn anti-working class actions by politicians.

Secondly, one can see his testing of certain features of the dominant assumptions, and finding them lacking.

"When you get married you find you have commitments. To meet these commitments you have to give a wee bit more and for this you expect better returns. The capitalist system is saying to you that you can progress and I accepted that position up till I got married. I said "I'll work harder and I'll get more", but it didn't happen".

This testing led to a disillusionment with aspects of society. This did not lead to apathy but anger as he realised the relative deprivation of workers.

As his ideals about society were lost he seems to have begun to look for other ones. Initially, this led him to fully back the Labour Government of 1964. In this one can see the testing of another area of beliefs -

"Harold Wilson made me think Labour was inadequate.

In '64 I was with Harold Wilson all along the line because it was a Socialist Government - 'Here we go, now for Socialism'. Then, suddenly, he stands up and says 'We've got problems lads'. It twigged on me that I had heard this before from Home".

This led him to start making a re-evaluation of his ideas and objectives. This was not a particular rapid progress. Though hostile to the Labour Government from the mid-1960s he did not join the Communist Party till 1973. During this period he was -

"breaking down propaganda which has debarred me from thinking in Socialist and Communist lines".

However, he does not go into any details of this process in which he must have tested and confirmed oppositional ideas until he got to a point where

"I said to myself I can't go on like this. If I'm going to do something in the Trade Union movement I'll need to get involved".

Charlie wanted a more just society and felt that it was important that he involved himself in bringing it about. Nevertheless, despite the implied anguish that is in his statement, which makes it likely that he had to search his conscience before joining the Communist Party, Charlie describes it as a logical and simple decision.

Thus, when asked about the opposition of some types of religion to Communism he says:-

"I was brought up a Roman Catholic. Catholicism is international. As soon as you start to think of a united people you think in Catholic terms. That's your upbringing, so you go from there onwards . . . The working class was world wide and that directed me towards Communism".

This is not the usual sequence of logical connections made by Roman Catholics. For Charlie to draw this type of conception from Catholicism would depend on the interaction of a multitude of factors and communications. It did not prove possible to discover them in the interviews with him. It would seem that incommunicable elements exist in every experience which cannot be described, and which are not fully understood by the person.

Conclusion

It can be seen from the above studies that while one can see some factors which have been relevant in explaining why some have developed Socialist forms of consciousness and others have not, one cannot see the sufficient factors. The five stewards examined have similar events occurring in their biographies. Yet from these events they have drawn different conclusions and engaged in different actions. For example, both Michael McEwan and Charlie MacNamara had Roman Catholic backgrounds, and fathers who were Leftist in inclination. However, from this hereditary and background Michael's answers reveal a limited solidarity and an acceptance of employers' logic on issues.

While Charlie attacks the assumptions of capitalism and raises issues of class unity and solidarity (11).

From the 'pen portraits' one can see confirmation of the fact that class consciousness is a mode of understanding and representation which is learned. In this learning process, motivations are needed for it to develop so that certain senses and meanings are taken from experiences rather than others. From the stewards' interviews, one can outline some of the factors which block their development towards Socialist consciousness. For Michael it is the limited scope of his solidarity and his acceptance of 'capitalist ideas'. For George it is a sectionalism which fragments class unity on skill lines and a fairness which is not based on a class definition of 'what is fair'. In James's case one can see that dominant assumptions have had some effect and that there is a lack of Socialistic political understanding. Thus, he sees the Unions as "the people" rather than using a more class orientated term.

In their interviews one can detect elements of Socialist consciousness, but these elements are not dominating. The themes of moralism, egalitarianism and solidarity are present also. In each of the interviews one can see a different combination of these themes so that different nuances are highlighted. From these differing combinations of themes flows different conceptions of the relationships and loyalties involved in being a Trade Unionist. From the perspective of this study, the most rational development of these themes comes from Jimmy and Charlie.

In their attitudes; despite the different routes they followed to Socialist Consciousness, one can see a concern with ideological question. They both judge issues on explicitly ideological criteria.

In their 'pen portraits' one can see similarities with other studies of the 'appeals of Communism'. As Grainger (1957) pointed out, for militants in the Trade Union the Communist Party provides a more supportive milieu than other organisations (12). While as Hobsbawm (1977) suggests, many come from backgrounds where Socialistic ideas are traditional (13). Hence, as Newton (1969) points out, many Communist recruits have well defined ideologies before joining (14). Almond, Denver and Bochel, and other researchers' statistical findings are also supported, since one can see the importance of a left background, the parents' politics, the mediation of other organisations the influence of workmates, etc. Almond's suggestion that Communists conform within a deviant community may have some basis (15).

The difficulty one has to again face is that which was shown above when Charlie and Michael were both seen to have come from Roman Catholic backgrounds. To give an example, Almond stresses the importance of the involvement in radical activity in the Communists youth for helping determine future activities. As a part measure of this, the stewards were asked if they had been rebels in their youth. In answer forty five said they had been "rebels". This answer was correlated with whether they had a strategic perspective for achieving Socialism.

The following table shows the responses:-

Table 1 Perspective for Socialism by Rebel

	<u>Not A Rebel</u>	<u>Rebel</u>
No Strategy	50	29
Have Strategy	6	16

It can be seen that being a rebel in youth does incline a steward to have some strategic perspective. However, the majority of those who had been rebels did not have such a perspective. Of course, there are different types of rebellion e.g. 'Teddy Boys', anti-religion, YCLer, and this could be an explanation. However, one can indicate from the interviews that among those with strategic perspectives were, for example, ex-'Teddy Boys', while some without a strategy were ex-YCLers.

From the 'pen portraits' of the two Communists, one can see that McInnes' reasons for developing Socialist consciousness and joining the Communist Party - political choice, existential decision, ideological connection - do not operate singly. (See Chapter One: Class Consciousness) However, they do not all seem to have an equal 'pull' or 'push' effect on the individual (16). In Jimmy's case, one can see the 'push' of a political choice and the 'pull' of ideological connection were more important than existential decisions. While for Charlie it was the 'pulls' of ideological connections and existential decision which were more important. As regards the developmental routes suggested by Barker, it would seem that the dramatic and sudden conversion may be a very isolated occurrence in non-revolutionary situations. Both Jimmy and Charlie seem to have gone through long conditioning, and Jimmy seems to have been influenced by charismatic individuals.

It can also be seen that variations exist among those with a Socialist form of consciousness. In part this may be explained by the different lengths of time they have been Communists, and so had their consciousness influenced by Party training. It may also be that Communist Party membership only leads to an approximation of ideological orientations. The individual's experiences still play an important role in the emphasis given to themes.

The concept which would seem to best explain the development of Socialist consciousness in non-revolutionary situations is 'encapsulation' (17). This explains the individual's development as the focus of complex social processes involving a constellation of circumstances, and a multitude of communication networks which were of a homogeneous ideological direction. This process was relatively free from dissonant ideological pulls and pushes. They were not born with a Socialist consciousness, but were brought up in families where elements of such a consciousness were not blocked or negatively assessed. These elements were supplemented and developed by their contact with individuals and groups who pushed oppositional ideas and attitudes, and helped direct the individual's despair and disillusionment about society, and their hopes for the future in a Socialistic way. The forms of Socialistic consciousness adopted must meet the psychological needs of the individual stewards (18). Their goals and the means adopted to try and gain them must serve their self-interest by linking it to a collective interest, and giving them a purpose in life.

It is also possible that those who have a Socialist consciousness in a non-revolutionary situation may be unique along certain personality dimensions. Christie (1956) points out that Communists differ from others in conservative-radical dimensions of thinking (19). While Almond found only 10% of ex-Communists became Right wing in their attitudes (20). It is ideology which makes them different in their behaviour. As Green (1971) points out it is subjective criteria which are the defining features of these with Socialist consciousness, rather than objectives ones (21). The adoption of a new ideology by an individual means that inherited modes of ordering experience are no longer adequate explainers since they allow too much ambiguity in interpretation. Those who adopt a Socialist ideology in a capitalist society need to have been involved in interactions with others which socially mediates the development of the new frame of reference for understanding their experiences (22). These interactions are necessary for it to seem reasonable to believe in a certain way which is not supported by dominant assumptions. They have to be embedded to some degree in an oppositional Socialist culture which has its own institutions and practices. This adds to the effects of heredity and back ground (23).

NOTES

1. For discussions on why social science should try to explain as well as describe see B. Fay and J.D. Moon, 'What An Adequate Philosophy of the Social Sciences Look Like', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Vol. 7, 1977, and M. Hammond, 'Weighting Causes in Historical Exploration', Theoria, Vol. XLIII, 1977.
2. G. Steadman-Jones, 'Engels and Hegel', New Left Review, 79, 1973, pp 32 - 3.
3. L.J. Goldstein, 'Ideals of Order: History and Sociology', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Vol. 4, 1974, p 342.
4. See J.H. Westegaard, 'The Rediscovery of the Cash News', Socialist Register, 1970; and I. Crewe, 'The Politics of "Affluent" and "Traditional" Workers in Britain', British Journal of Political Science, Vol. 3, 1973.
5. J. Petras, 'Revolutions and the Working Class', New Left Review, 111, 1978, pp 49-53.
6. See VI Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 12, p 321.
7. See VI Lenin, 'The Collapse of the Second International', Progress, Moscow, 1969, and 'Left Wing Communism', Progress, 1971, for outlines of what might be required for revolution to occur. Current Soviet writings on the theory and history of revolution believe that this scenario describes what has happened in a number of revolutions - particularly the Russian. See 'Leninist Theory of Socialist Revolution and the Contemporary World', Progress, Moscow, 1975.

NOTES

8. R.G. Wesson, 'Why Marxism', Temple Smith, London, 1976, p 197.
9. B.S. Capp, 'The Fifth Monarch Men', Faber and Faber, London, 1972, p 98.
10. T. Nichols and P. Armstrong, 'Workers Divided', Fontana, 1976.
11. For a discussion of the problems Socialists face in winning Roman Catholic support see G. Amendola, 'The Italian Road to Socialism', New Left Review, 106, pp 44-49. For a Roman Catholic discussion see Archbishop G. Benelli, 'The Church and Communism', Catholic Truth Society, London, 1977.
12. G.W. Grainger, 'The Crisis in the British Communist Party', Problems of Communism, Vol. 6, 1957.
13. E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Revolutionaries', Weidenfield and Nicholson, London, 1973.
14. K. Newton, 'The Sociology of British Communism', Allen Lane, 1969.
15. G. Almond, 'The Appeals of Communism', Princeton, 1954.
16. Silone in 'The God That Failed', 1950, points out that he remembered experiences which his contemporaries did not, and these experiences were important in his development.
17. See M. Heirich, 'Changes of Heart', American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 83, 1977, p 656.
18. See H. Lavine, 'Twenty One G.Is Who Chose Tyranny' in S. Dintz, R. Dynes, A. Clarke, 'Deviance', OUP, 1969, p 433.

NOTES

19. See R. Christie, 'Eysenck's Treatment of the Personality of Communists', Psychology Bulletin, Vol. 53, 1956, p 429.
20. Almond, *ibid.*
21. T.H. Green, 'The Electorates of Non-Ruling Communist Parties', Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. 4, 1971, p 92, points out that this is because individuals do not automatically or instinctively alter in response to social and economic stimuli and tensions.
22. See, F.C. Engelman and M.A. Schwartz, 'Subcultural Phenomenon in Austria', Political Science Association World Congress, Part 1, 5, p 3 discuss the ideological attitudes workers like their workmates to have.
23. This can be seen in the biographies of some Communist leaders. See, R. Swearingen, 'Leaders of the Communist World', MacMillan, 1971. See, too, R.N. Tannahill, 'Leadership as a Determinant of Diversity in Western European Communists', Studies in Comparative Communism, Vol. IX, 1976.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to describe and explain the forms and contents of class consciousness found among shop stewards of the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section) on Clydeside. One can now ask, how far can the study claim to have done this? The findings of this study allow one to more fully understand the strong traditions of solidarity in the British Trade Union movement. It has shown the different understandings and scope which the stewards give to solidarity. In doing this the study has given some of the contents of the various forms of consciousness, and established differences in them. The dichotomy of Trade Union/Socialist consciousness has been gone beyond and detail added to possible typologies of consciousness. This Right wing dominance has been strengthened since 1978. The Right wing organisation increased its coherence and efficiency at a time when the Broad Left broke down nationally, and at district level. The Broad left let itself become isolated and drifted towards becoming a mere electoral machine. Its shop-floor organisation declined in coherence and strength. It no longer played an agitational role among militant engineering workers. This decline coincided with the deepening of the economic crisis. Engineering workers became more likely to accept arguments about 'the national interest', while seeing the Left as adventurist endangering what they have e.g. a job. The Lefts alternative solutions to the crisis lacked credibility among large numbers of engineers who had supported them in the past. In this atmosphere the Right were able to gain important electoral victories at all levels of the Union.

Certain themes have been shown to be present among the shop stewards' attitudes and behaviour. These have been themes of rationalism, egalitarianism and moralism. They could be found in the comments by the stewards in different combinations, in which each theme had a different weight. The different combinations may be considered to define different types of Socialistic thought and inspiration.

It was shown that what differentiated Socialist class consciousness and made it quantitatively different from other forms of consciousness was its strategic perspectives. It was found that forty eight of the stewards had at least one plan for altering Society, while twelve of them could give three. In this one can see a tradition of subversive lower class thinking in opposition to the political system. How many of the other thirty six should be included with the twelve whom this study asserts have a coherent Socialist consciousness would depend on how rigorous one would wish to be. It can be suggested for the thirty six that Socialist elements are important in their consciousness, if not dominant.

The study also showed the influence the Communist Party has among sections of the industrial working class on Clydeside. Though here one has to take into account the deliberate bias in the sample. The introduction of 'extra' Communist stewards influenced the number with some strategic consciousness. (Twenty two Communists gave at least one plan for changing society.) Among some of those with a Socialist consciousness one could detect certain elitist themes in relation to other workers.

However, these were controlled by their egalitarianism and their aim of a new society gained by mass struggle.

The use of the six forms of consciousness allowed one to see the possible directions in which consciousness might move if circumstances alter. It showed that in respect to ideology and political goals, workers can be divided into various forms which can lead to contradictions and competitive struggles within the class. One was able to see the basis of the appeals of the different forms in the repetition of certain ideas. The use of these forms helps explain the behaviour of Engineering stewards on Clydeside. Thus, one could see the strength of fragmenting influences, e.g. skill. Or, one could see the faith of some in a Labour Government, or a non-interest in politics, which allowed the Social Contract to last for so long. Despite the Left bias in the sample one was able to see some of the factors which allow the Right to dominate within the Union. Thus, six forms of consciousness and their contents were detailed and shown to exist by empirical study. The six forms were:-

1) 'Anti-Communist Right ', which would characterise itself as a Broad Right and see itself as the moderate soul of the Union. From the election addresses, and the statements of stewards one can see that its contents involve a consistent anti-Communism, a support for the Labour Party which is unconditional when it is in power and a rhetorical support for social change.

2) 'Trade Union Right' - this tendency can be characterised by its calls for an improvement in wages and conditions without being explicitly anti-management. They support the Labour Party but see politics as secondary to trade unionism and so will criticise Labour.

3) 'Anti-Politics Populists' oppose political involvement by the Union. Their main concern is with the wage fight by the A.U.E.W. It is divided between syndicalistic stewards who see politics as stopping direct action, and others who see politics as leading to militancy.

4) 'Trade Union Left' - this tendency supports militant action by the Union and is explicitly anti-management. It is willing to criticise the Labour Party and to put pressure on it by means of unofficial organisations.

5) 'Broad Left', which others would consider the 'Pro-Communist Left'. It calls for the political involvement of the Union in the struggle for socialism. They are strong supporters of wages struggles as a means of mobilising support for other struggles, and of the development of unity among workers by amalgamation.

6) 'Far Left' - this tendency is composed of self-defined revolutionary socialists. For them the Union is a recruiting ground for members for their organisations.

A main weakness of the study has been around its second aim of explaining how forms of consciousness develop. Here one could only guess at mental developments among the stewards. The theoretical assumptions of this study stated that the form and content of ideas held by the stewards would be drawn from their social experiences. However, the 'pen portraits' showed that stewards had gone through similar experiences but drawn different conclusions. The main insight gained was the importance of the 'encapsulation' of the individual in an oppositional environment in which certain psychological tensions were maintained (1).

The question arises of how relevant the findings are in relation to the A.U.E.W. (E.S.) nationally. In the Introduction it was stressed that the stewards who made up the sample came from Clydeside. Clydeside has been developed by a combination of forces and circumstances, and these have affected the ideas, attitudes and behaviour of the stewards. It is a matter for investigation what is unique, and what is shared in their consciousness. Other studies have pointed to differences in attitudes and behaviour which exist between different Districts of the A.U.E.W. However, an important feature of this study has been its focus on forms of class consciousness. The material on which the initial classification into forms was made came from national, as well as local election addresses. This would imply that the forms and contents of class consciousness found are common throughout Britain in their broad definition. What differs is the specific strength of forms in different areas. Thus, the dominance of Leftist tendencies in Glasgow may be matched by the dominance of Rightist ones elsewhere, and anti-politics ones somewhere else. In addition, the particular rhetoric around which the forms coalesce may have District specifics relating them to certain experiences and traditions. Despite the use of these forms the study did not fully show class consciousness as a process. The way the results were presented made consciousness seem a fixed entity. The 'pen portraits' of Charlie and Jimmy did show that stewards' consciousness can change over time. Yet the method of this study has tended to freeze attitudes and behaviour at the time at which interviews took place.

This problem was caused by the limitations that it was necessary to set on research designed to gain a higher degree. It meant that the time available to carry out research was limited. Thus, the initial ambitious aims on the area to be covered had to be whittled away to a project which one person could carry out in three years. This meant a relatively large sample of stewards were interviewed on a limited range of issues. The large sample was chosen to help make the results more valid. However, it meant that one could not return to the stewards on a number of occasions and re-interview them on issues to see how their attitudes had altered and try to see the reasons for the change.

Despite this negative factor necessitated by the nature of the research one can still say that the forms and contents of class consciousness have been described and, to an extent, explained. The study has shown the nature of the men and women who form the active core of the working class movement, who constitute its strength and carry out its day to day functioning. It has shown the motivations, hopes and worries of the shop steward on a number of issues. By doing this it helps break down the popular stereotypes of stewards, and shows their basic concern for their fellow Union Members.

NOTES

1. The difficulty of overcoming this weakness can be seen not only from social science studies, but also from works of fiction. In the latter the tendency has been to present the development of Socialist consciousness as 'evangelical conversion'. See, for example, U. Sinclair, 'The Jungle', Penguin, London, 1965, pp 356 - 67; or M. Lesier, 'Salute to Spring', Seven Seas, Berlin, 1977, pp 124 - 27.

APPENDIX ONE

The Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from shop stewards of the A.U.E.W. (Engineering Section). One hundred shop stewards were interviewed during the period between September, 1976, and August, 1977. This was approximately 5% of the A.U.E.W. stewards in the Paisley and Glasgow Districts. Before the stewards could be contacted it was necessary to gain the approval of the District Secretaries in Paisley and Glasgow. This meant explaining to them the aims of the study and how it would be carried out. This permission was given and with their approval and help the convenors of engineering stewards in the two areas were contacted by letter. They were asked to participate in the study, and to pass the letter on to other stewards who might be interested. The letters sent out had a tear off slip in which those interested were asked to put their names and addresses. A stamped and addressed envelope was also included so they could send the tear off back.

The A.U.E.W. has negotiation rights in approximately one hundred and three plants in the Paisley District and forty five in Glasgow. Shop stewards in forty six plants in Paisley and twenty three in Glasgow were interviewed (1). Amongst these firms are some of the most famous and renowned firms in the Country: John Brown Engineering, Govan Shipbuilders, Rolls Royce, Babcock and Wilcox, Weirs, Tollcross Foundry and Anderson Strathclyde.

Others were employed by non-engineering firms as maintenance engineers e.g. distillers such as Chivas and Grants; food processors like Spillers and C.P.C; textile manufacturers such as Coats Patons; and chemical firms like Ceiba-Geigy. Of the sixty nine firms which the shops stewards worked for eight were owned by non-British Capital - none of them was in heavy engineering. The areas in which the stewards were employed were as follows:-

		<u>Foreign Owned</u>
Heavy Engineering	24	
Shipbuilding	5	
Light Engineering	10	4
Car Manufacture	5	
Thread and Rope	2	
Transport	5	
Rubber	2	1
Food and Drink	6	3
R.O.F.	2	
Chemicals	1	1

The forms of the interviews with the shops stewards involved asking fifty questions which were divided into eight groups dealing with how they became shop stewards; the conflicts they face within the factories; their attitude to management; their attitudes to the Union and its actions; their attitude and actions toward other workers; their attitude to what the researcher considered to be key ideological issues; the ideological attitudes and actions of the shop stewards; and some biographical data.

The time taken for each interview varied from half an hour to three hours, with the average length being approximately fifty minutes. This time could vary with situations outside my control, such as the length of the shop stewards dinner hour. Hence, in some cases all the questions could not be asked, and I had to pick out what I considered to be the most important questions and ask them. The method of gaining information through the method of an interview means that one faces the standard set of problems of this method. First, the questions asked may structure the forms of thinking of the shop steward, and so the nature of the answers they give. The fact of the interview means the individual shop steward's answers were about matters which may or may not have been real topics of interest for him or her. Whether these answers given by the stewards reflected their real opinions or not is open for debate, as is the relevance of these opinions are to the shop stewards.

Secondly, the time one can expect someone to give to an interview is limited. Decision have to be made about what questions should be included. The decisions made depend on the theoretical over-view adopted, and the problems this theory leads one to tackle. In this study the concern was finding the degrees of solidarity shown by the Shop Stewards. The questions which were included aimed at investigating a set of attitudes and actions which the theory suggested should exist. So it is open to the criticisms that it did not adequately investigate attitudes which were, for example, more subtly pro-capitalist.

Further, it can be criticised by those who adopt an alternative theoretical approach and so can develop alternative explanations from the analysis of shops stewards' answers.

Thirdly, the nature and limits on research were such that only one interview was possible with all but a few stewards. Thus, the attitudes of the shop stewards were drawn from one particular point of time and this differed for each steward. Another problem has to be considered since the nature of an interview may have led to attitudes being taken out of context. The area of questioning and the movement from one area to another is decided by the researcher. This defines to an important degree the context of attitudes expressed. This could mean a false perspective was gained. The researcher may not get the full outline of attitudes and so fail to understand that a particular set of attitudes is heavily qualified by other attitudes which were not investigated.

Fourthly, when dealing with any aspect of social relationships and processes one is dealing with a highly complex set of problems. Prior simplifications of some magnitude have to be made (2). These are based on the theoretical approach of the researcher, and must be kept in mind when interpreting the data. Thus, when one divides variables into dependent and independent variables one is simplifying since they exist in interdependence.

Fifthly, problems outlined are intensified when one begins to quantify the shop stewards attitudes. It is not really possible to quantify peoples' feelings, emotions or intuitions in a satisfactory way.

Quantifications is essentially static and inflexible and so difficult to use when one is dealing with something as flexible and fluid as attitudes which shop stewards express at any one time while subject to the unusual situation of an interview. Also, quantifying forces an equivalence of measurement across the individuals whose attitudes are measured. Thus, if two stewards use the same words to answer a question one has to quantify them equal. Though the shop stewards may subjectively weigh the words differently and not really show any equivalence of meaning. In fact giving any measure to things like attitudes is presumptuous and assumes an agreed set of axioms, inferences and transformation rules. Different measures can always be derived from the same data, and no measure is inherently less accurate until one defines 'accuracy'. While attempts to slot feelings, beliefs and opinions into pre-selected measurement scales can strip them of their subtlety and qualifications which exist in the stewards' language (3).

From this viewpoint one can criticise the different types of measurement used in social science studies, and which presented themselves as alternatives in this study.

- (1) Rank ordering means holding attitudes constant so they cannot vary. While deciding on the rank ordering is a subjective act of interpretation by the researcher on the qualitative data.
- (2) Using an ordinal scale means having a measure which acknowledges things are different and in a sequence, but does not indicate the units of difference.

It assumes things which are different are also mutually exclusive. This is not an adequate assumption to make concerning attitudes and beliefs.

- (3) The use of interval scales means that emphasis is placed on differences and sees them as giving sense. It assumes that the interval between the two adjacent classes are equal. This is a rather large assumption to make in dealing with attitudes (4).

So these three measurement techniques all carry presumptions about the spread of attitudes. While many of the statistical techniques for the analysis of data assume a normal distribution of attitudes. This comes from an analysis of aggregate data rather than on actual human beings (5).

Thus quantification has to start from a position which recognises the limited scope in social science for the use of quantification. The more one quantifies human actions and attitudes the more distortions are being built into the research. In this study the use of statistics will be confined to the simplest uses.

'Dummy variables' will be used to quantify the data in this study. This allows certain statistical techniques to be used e.g. correlations. Thus, if the shop steward has the attitude he or she will be given the value 1, if he does not he will be given the value 0 (6). This means one is assuming the data is of the least informative type for quantification. Though one faces a problem with this measurement that the stewards are categorised as 'either . . . or'. The question arises of when one becomes 0 or 1 exactly.

This problem arises because the stewards experiences are continuous while our assertions are characterised by discreteness. It is to try and overcome this problem that the comments of the stewards will be used to elaborate on the quantification.

NOTES

1. From information given by the two District Secretaries.
2. E. Ions, 'Against Behaviouralism', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1977, pp 61 - 2.
3. Ibid, pp 24 - 5.
4. For a discussion of the use of the various measures see R. Floud, 'An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians', Methuen, London, 1973, Chapter 1.
5. Ions, ibid, pp 23 - 4.
6. For a discussion of the use of 'dummy variables' see H.M. Blalock, editor, 'Causal Models in the Social Sciences', MacMillan, London, 1972, pp 411 - 12.

APPENDIX TWO

Questionnaire

1. What age are you?
2. Are you married? If yes - do you have any family? How many?
3. Did you serve an apprenticeship in engineering? Who did you serve your time with? If over 35 - Did you take part in any of the apprentices strikes? If yes - Did they teach you anything? Were you pleased to get an apprenticeship? If no apprenticeship - Why didn't you get an apprenticeship? To all - Do you think skilled workers have an attitude of superiority to unskilled workers? If yes - How is this shown? Why do they have it? If no - What is the attitude of skilled to unskilled workers?
4. What is your job in this factory exactly?
5. How long have you worked in this factory? Could you tell me what jobs you have had previously?
6. At some time in their lives some workers have been unemployed. Does this apply to you? If yes - How often have you been unemployed?
7. How many people work in the factory you work in? How many in your shop?
8. How long have you been a Shop Steward? How did you become a Shop Steward? Why did you take the job as Steward? Have you ever been opposed in a Shop Steward's election? Why do you think this is? Why do you think you won? What happened to the person who lost?

Questionnaire

9. Do you enjoy being a Shop Steward? Why - How many are you Steward for?
10. Do you think Shop Stewards are troublemakers? Why do you say that?
11. How much power has a Shop Steward? Where does his power come from?
12. Have your ideas changed since you became a Shop Steward?
If yes - In what ways? If no - Has it confirmed your ideas? How?
13. Is this factory 100% organised? Why?
14. Do you hold any position in your Branch?

Conflict Within The Factory

15. Have you been involved in any strikes and stoppages?
Have you been involved in any other forms of action? e.g.
go slows, overtime bans, work to rules etc. What were
the issues which caused the problems? Were you ever faced
with 'blacklegging' during them? Why? What was your
attitude to them?

Why do workers go on strike?
Why are there so few strikes?
16. I have been told that some Shop Stewards are victimised,
or were in the past, for their Union activities. Have you
ever been victimised? Has anyone in the factory? If yes -
Why did this happen? Was any action taken to help them?
If no - Why is there no victimisation now?
17. As you know on Clydeside at the moment some people are
being made redundant because the factories are closing, or
because orders are low. Has this happened in this factory?
Has it happened anywhere you have worked? If yes - What
was your reaction to it? Why? If no - Do you think it
is likely to happen to you?
18. Within this factory has there been any demarcation disputes
between the A.U.E.W. and any other Unions? If yes - What
Unions? Why did they take place? If no - Do you have some
procedures to stop them? What? If no - How have they
been avoided?
19. Does the A.U.E.W. have any contact with white collar workers
in this factory? What are relations like with white collar
workers here? If yes - What type of contact do you have?
If no - Why is there none?

Conflict Within The Factory

20. Do you think one Union should help another when the other Union is in dispute with management, or should it keep out of other Union's affairs? Why do you think that? Have you ever given help in this factory? What was it? Do you have a J.S.S.C. in this factory? Why? If yes - What are its funds used for?

Attitude Towards the Employer

21. Do you think that management can sack or take on whom they please, when they please and if they please? If yes - Have they done it here? If no - Was there ever a time when they could? When? Should management have this type of right?
22. Where does the Conservative Party get its funds from? If they say business: Why do you think business gives its money to the Conservatives? If they don't know - Do you think it matters where they get their funds from?
23. Do you ever meet the top management of this firm? Who runs the firm? Have you met them? What was the management/owners attitude to you? Why do you think they acted in this way?
24. If a worker works hard and sticks in at his work do you think he can get promotion? If yes - To what level? If no - Why is that? All - Would you want promotion? Why do you say that?

Attitude To the Union

25. Could you tell me what Unions make up the Amalgamation at the moment? Do you think Amalgamation is a good idea? Why do you say that?
- If yes - What other Unions could be brought into the Amalgamation?
- If no - What should happen to the present Amalgamation?
- All - Should there be one Union for the Engineering Industry? Why do you say that?
26. What are the roles of a Trades Union in this society? Why does it have these roles? Do you think a T.U. has a political role of any kind? Why do you say that?
27. Should all workers belong to a T.U? Why do you say that?
- Why do some workers not belong to any Union?
- Don't you think the individual has the right to choose to belong or not belong? Why did you join a T.U.?
28. Can you tell me any of the posts which have been up for election in the Union recently? Did you read about the elections in the press, or see anything about them on T.V.?
- If yes - Why did the press take this interest in these elections? If no - How did you get information about the elections? Do the men ever ask your advice on the elections?

Attitude to Other Workers

29. Are there any circumstances, do you think, when workers in this Country should give some sort of help to workers in other Countries? Why do you think that? If yes - What forms should this action take?
- All - Has this factory taken any action of support for other workers?
- If yes - How did you explain the action to the men you are Steward for? Was it difficult to get their support? Why do you think that was?
- If no - Have you ever been asked to give this support?
30. Were you involved in the half day stoppage called by the C.S.E.U. on May 26, 1976? Why?
- Did your factory send a delegate to the Assembly on Unemployment in London on March 27, 1976?
- Do you think workers should take action against reductions in real spending on public expenditure? Why do you say that?
31. Has this factory ever given support to other factories, when the other factory has been on strike?
- If yes - What type of action did you take? Why did you give this support? How long did your support last? Was it difficult to get support? Who was on strike?
- If no - Have you ever been asked to give support?
- Don't you think that actions like this interfere with the rights of management?

Attitude to Society and Change

32. In the last General Election the Labour Manifesto called for a fundamental and irreversible shift in the balance of wealth and power in Britain in favour of working people. Do you support this call? If yes - How can it be brought about? .
- If no - Why not?
- Do you think the Social Contract will bring it about?
- What was the Social Contract meant to do? Has it been successful? Do you think the Social Contract is a good thing? Why do you say that? Who made the Social Contract? Should it be continued after July, 1977? Why do you think that?

Could you tell me what has happened to business profits during it?

-
33. What do you understand by the term workers' control?

Do you think that workers could run industry through some types of workers' control?

If yes - How can workers' control be brought about?

If no - Why don't you support it?

All - Don't you think industry is too complicated for workers to run? Do you think there is workers' control anywhere in the world?

If yes - Where?

If no - What about the Socialist Countries?

Attitude to Society and Change

34. What do you think are the prospects of a workers' Socialist Revolution in Britain in your lifetime? Why do you think that? Would you support this type of change? Why? If yes - How do you think this change might be brought about? If no - Why not? Don't you think that a revolution would mean an end to many of the freedoms we have in Britain? Do you think that Britain is a fair and just society? Why do you say that?

Ideological Attitudes

35. There has been a lot of controversy recently about the causes of Britain's problems. What do you think are the causes of the present crisis in Britain?
Do you think that T.U. wage claims have been the cause of inflation? Why do you say that? Whose fault is the crisis? How do you think the crisis can be overcome? What exactly is a crisis?
36. Some people believe that Unions should concern themselves with industrial matters alone, and leave politics to the Labour Party. Would you agree with this? Why do you say that? Is Labour the working mans' party?
37. What papers do you read? What do you think of them?
Do you ever read left-wing papers? If yes - Why? If no - What are the politics of the papers you read?
38. Do you march on May Day?
Did you march on Ban the Bomb Marches?
Did you take part in the U.C.S. Campaign?
Did you take part in the Chrysler Campaign?
39. Do you think that T.U. have any right to challenge Government legislation? Why do you say that? Were you involved in any actions against the last Labour Governments 'In Place of Strife' legislation? The Conservative Industrial Relations Act.

Class Situation and Biographical Data

40. What was your father's occupation? Was he a Union Member? Do you know what grandfathers did for a living? Union men? What was your wife's father's job?
41. What do you hope your children will do for a living?
42. What age were you when you left school? Did you want to leave then? Why? Have you regretted leaving then? Why? Have you ever done any types of Further Education?
43. What area were you brought up in? Do you still live there? Where do you live now? Where did your wife come from?
44. Have you ever thought of emigrating? If yes - Where to? Why?
45. Was politics ever discussed in your home when you were young? Were any of your family involved in politics - parents, aunts, uncles, cousins, brothers, sisters?
46. When you were young was your home religious?
47. Do your ideas differ from your parents towards politics or unions? Why?
48. When you were young would you say you were a bit of a rebel? If yes - Why?
49. When you were young/apprentice were there any men where you worked who had an influence on you? Do you ever discuss politics in the factory with your workmates? Do you like being involved in debates and arguments?

APPENDIX THREE

The Shop Stewards

1. C. MacNamara, 36, C.P. Boilermakers, turner.
2. D. Wilson, 58, C.P. Foundry, turner.
3. A. Cherrie, 53, C.P. Shipyards, turner.
4. J. Sweeney, 34, C.P. Steelworks, semi-skilled.
5. J. Caldwell, 62, C.P. Shipyards, fitter.
6. B. McGerty, 41, C.P. Aero-Engine Makers, semi-skilled,
machinist.
7. M. Docherty, 23, C.P. Jobbing Shop, semi-skilled.
8. J. Quinn, 64, C.P. Transport, semi-skilled.
9. D. Graham, 55, C.P. Boilermakers, turner.
10. T. Graham, 63, C.P. Shipyards, fitter.
11. J. Ainsbury, 52, C.P. Shipyards, fitter.
12. E. Gray, 54, C.P. Aero-Engine Makers, fitter.
13. J. Lyons, 29, C.P. Transport, maintenance engineer.
14. G. MacMillan, 31, C.P. Transport, mechanic.
15. J. McLean, 45, C.P. Car Factory, semi-skilled.
16. P. Johnstone, 39, C.P. Machine Makers, turner.
17. B. Quillan, 64, C.P. Machine Makers, fitter.
18. A. Grimmond, 25, C.P. Yacht Maker, semi-skilled.
19. D. Duncan, 47, C.P. Gear Makers, turner.
20. W. Ramage, 57, C.P. Foundry, turner.
21. P. Lyden, 54, C.P. Food Processing, semi-skilled.
22. C. Dobbie, 33, C.P. Telecommunications, semi-skilled.
23. T. Halfpenny, 24, C.P. Boilermakers, turner.
24. A. Smith, 55, C.P. Refrigerator Manufacturer, fitter.
25. N. McIntosh, 34, C.P. Engine Maker, fitter.

26. R. McLoy, 43, L.P. Aero Engine Makers, semi-skilled.
27. J. Pearson, 56, Shipyards, fitter.
28. J. Reilley, 63, L.P. Mine Safety Equipment, fitter.
29. W. Watt, 37, Heat Engine Makers, turner.
30. J. Robin, 36, Chemical Works, toolmaker.
31. G. Syme, 54, Aero Engine Makers, turner.
32. P. McGowan, 24, Rubber Work, fitter.
33. W. Gordon, 57, Railways, fitter.
34. G. Higgins, 57, L.P. Aero Engine Makers, turner.
35. J. Cunningham, 32, Airport, fitter.
36. A. McParland, 48, Car Repair, semi-skilled.
37. A. MacDonald, 32, Jobbing Shop, turner.
38. T. Forrest, 36, Distillery, maintenance.
39. I. MacWhinnie, 27, Airport, aircraft technician.
40. R. Martin, 37, Compressor Manufacturer, fitter.
41. B. McLean, 47, Compressor Manufacturer, fitter.
42. C. MacDonald, 49, Light Maker, semi-skilled.
43. D. Mort, 45, Jobbing Shop, toolmaker.
44. H. Michie, 38, Foundry, semi-skilled.
45. R. Stewart, 54, Steel Makers, fitter.
46. D. Smith, 30, Loom Maker, fitter.
47. T. Potts, 60, Loom Maker, turner.
48. J. Reynolds, 37, Gear Makers, fitter.
49. F. Divers, 55, Pump Makers, inspector.
50. W. Jordan, 45, L.P. Thread Mill, fitter.

51. D. Thompson, 28, Chain Makers, semi-skilled.
52. J. Lee, 29, Chain Makers, fitter.
53. B. Cassidy, 28, Chain Makers, fitter.
54. J. Black, 32, Chain Makers, semi-skilled.
55. D. O'Neal, 33, Chain Makers, fitter.
56. F. Purdie, 53, Gear Maker, fitter.
57. J. Dixon, 41, Transport, mechanic.
58. F. Ellis, 61, Light Maker, semi-skilled.
59. A. Deakin, 36, Nuts and Bolts, turner.
60. M. McLeod, 53, Nuts and Bolts, turner.
61. A. Fairlie, 29, Paper Maker, maintenance.
62. E. Gallacher, 29, Transport, mechanic.
63. H. Murphy, 53, Compressor Manufacturer, fitter.
64. R. Porterfield, 46, Pottery, toolmaker.
65. P. Dolan, 47, Refrigerator Maker, fitter.
66. C. Macpherson, 36, Refrigerator Maker, toolmaker.
67. M. McEwan, 41 LaundryMachine Maker, fitter.
68. J. McGarrigle, 53, Jobbing shop, fitter.
69. W. Humphries, 55, L.P. Thread Mill, maintenance.
70. R. Brown, 47, Rope Works, fitter.
71. J. Gilmour, 37, Gas Fitters, fitter.
72. D. Gibb, 58, Chemicals, maintenance.
73. L. MacDonald, 21, Sugar Processing Machinery, fitter.
74. C. Adam, 23, Jobbing shop, toolmaker.
75. G. Rennie, 56, Tyre Maker, fitter.
76. S. Sommerville, 48, Machine Makers, turner
77. J. Cassells, 34, Aero Engine Maker, fitter.

78. M. McGoldrick, 26, L.P. Aero Engine Maker, inspector.
79. J. Faulds, 39, Aero Engine Maker, turner.
80. E. Curran, 51, Engine Maker, fitter.
81. I. Donnelly, 54, Engine Maker, fitter.
82. D. Hughes, 31, Engine Maker, fitter.
83. J. Wright, 34, Engine Maker, machinist.
84. J. Malley, 26, Transport semi-skilled.
85. J. Rogers, 55, Chemical Work, fitter.
86. J. McGovern, 47, Shipyards, turner.
87. J. Arbuckle, 47, Food Processing, fitter.
88. J. Young, 34, Food Processing, machine toolist.
89. R. Downie, 28, Railways, fitter.
90. H. Allen, 35, Glass Maker, fitter.
91. I. Bonnar, 26, Glass Maker, toolmaker.
92. J. McFadyen, 37, Jobbing shop, fitter.
93. T. Keenan, 39, Distillery, maintenance.
94. W. Rafferty, 42, Boilermakers, fitter.
95. K. Stoddart, 56, Crane Makers, fitter.
96. B. Fairns, 54, Crane Makers, turner.
97. R. Baird, 53, Crane Makers, semi-skilled.
98. J. Lawrence, 28, Machine Makers, fitter.
99. D. Molloy, 27, Transport, fitter.
100. B. Cairns, 29, Shipyards, fitter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A.E.U. Journal, Volume 33, Number 7, 1966.
- A.U.E.W. Journal, February, 1976, 'Amalgamation'.
- A.U.E.W. Journal, October, 1975, 'The 1897 Lockout'.
- G.A. Aldred, 'Communism', Strickland, Glasgow, 1943.
- G.A. Almond, 'The Appeals of Communism', Princeton New Jersey, 1954.
- K.J.W. Alexander and C.L. Jenkins, 'Fairfields', Allen Lane, 1970.
- V.L. Allen, 'Trade Unions and the Government', Longmans, 1960.
- V.L. Allen, 'Militant Trade Unionism', Merlin, 1966.
- V.L. Allen, book review in Sociology, Volume 4, 1970.
- V.L. Allen, 'The Sociology of Industrial Relations, Longmans, 1971.
- V.L. Allen, 'Contemporary Capitalism and Revolutionary Change'
Marxism To-day, Volume 16, 1972.
- V.L. Allen, 'Social Analysis', Longmans, 1975.
- L. Althusser, 'Lenin and Philosophy' New Left Books, 1971.
- L. Althusser, 'Politics and History' New Left Books, 1972.
- J. Amsden, 'Collective Bargaining and Class Conflict in Spain'
Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.
- P. Anderson, 'The Limits and Possibilities of Trade Union Action'
in 'The Incompatibles', Penguin.
- P. Anderson, 'Origins of the Present Crisis', in 'Towards Socialism'
Cornell, 1966, and 'Problems of Socialist Strategy'.
- F. Andreacci and M. Sylvers, 'The Italian Communists Write Their
History' Science and Society, Volume XL, 1976.
- L. Antsyferaa, 'The Historical Development of Mental Processes',
Social Sciences, U.S.S.R., Volume V11, 1976.
- J. Arnison, 'Trade Union Infiltrators' Labour Monthly, Volume 58,
1976.
- S. Aronowitz, 'FalsePromises', McGraw Hill, U.S.A. 1973.

- C.M. Bain, 'Kirkcaldy: The Industrialisation of a Small Scottish Town', University of Guelph, Scottish Colloquium Proceedings, Volume 8, 9, 1974.
- I.D. Balbus, 'The Concept of Interest in Marxist and Pluralist Analysis' Politics and Society, Volume 1, 1971.
- W. Baldemus, 'Efficiency and Effort', Tavistock, 1961.
- J.A. Banks, 'Marxist Sociology in Action', Faber and Faber, 1970.
- D.N. Barker, 'Two Paths To Socialism: M. Deat and M. Pivet' Journal of Contemporary History, 11, 1976.
- S. Barkin, 'Workers Militancy and its Consequences', 1965 - 75, Praegar, New York, 1975.
- P. Bassin, V. Rozhnov, M. Rozhnova, 'Freudianism: A Psuedoscientific Interpretation of Mental Phenomenon' Social Sciences, U.S.S.R. Volume 2, 1972.
- S.L. Bartky, 'Towards a Phenomenology of Feminist Consciousness' Social Theory and Social Practice, Volume 3, 1975.
- F.H. Batlett, 'Marxism and the Psychoanalytic Theory of the Unconscious' Science and Society, 16, 1951 - 52.
- F.H. Batlett, 'Pavlov and Freud' Science and Society, 25, 1961.
- J.A. Beckford, 'Accounting for Conversion', British Journal of Sociology, Volume 29, 1978.
- S. Beackon, 'Labour Politics and the Working Class' British Journal of Political Science, Volume 6, 1976.
- P. Beharrell and G. Philo, 'Trade Unions and the Media', MacMillan, 1973.
- Z. Behr, 'Consciousness and Practice in Rational Psychotherapy', Science and Society, 17, 1953.
- G. Best, 'The Scottish Victorian City' Victorian Studies, Volume 11.
- H. Beynon, 'Working for Ford', Penguin, 1973.
- H. Beynon and R.M. Blackburn, 'Perceptions of Work: Variations Within a Factory', C.U.P. 1972.

- D. Binns, 'Beyond the Sociology of Conflict' MacMillan, 1977.
- R. Blackburn, 'Union Character and Social Class', Batsford, 1967.
- R. Blackburn, 'The Unequal Society' in 'The Incompatibles',
Penguin, 1967.
- H.M. Blalock, ed. 'Causal Models in the Social Sciences',
MacMillan, 1972.
- I. Boraston, H. Clegg and M. Rimmer, 'Workplace and Union',
Heinemann, 1975.
- T. Bottomore, 'Socialism and the Working Class' in 'The Socialist
Ideal' ed. L. Kolokowski and S. Hampshire, Weidenfeld
and Nicolson, 1974.
- D. Bouchier, 'Radical Ideologies and the Sociology of Knowledge:
A Model for Comparative Analysis', Sociology, Volume 11,
1977.
- C.F. Brand, 'British Labour and the International During the Great
War' Journal of Modern History, Volume 8, 1936.
- N. Branson and M. Heinemann, 'Britain in the Nineteen Thirties',
Panther, 1973.
- Asa Briggs, 'The Language of 'Class' in Early Nineteenth Century'.
- E. Browder, 'Socialism in America' St. Anthony's Papers IX, Chalton
and Windus, 1960.
- A.J. Brown, 'Some English Thoughts on the Scottish Economy',
Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 13, 1969.
- K.D. Brown, 'Non-Conformity and the British Labour Movement',
Journal of Social History, 1975.
- R.K. Brown, P. Branneh, J. Cousins, M. Sampheir, 'The Countours
of Solidarity: Social Stratification and Industrial
Relations in Shipbuilding', British Journal of Industrial
Relations, Volume 10, 1972.
- G. Bruun, 'The Evolution of a Terrorist: Georges Auguste Couthon',
Journal of Modern History, Volume 2, 1930.
- K.D. Buckley, 'The Amalgamated Engineers in Australia, 1852-1920'
Australian National University', Canberra, 1970.

- I. Budge and D.W. Urwin, 'Scottish Political Behaviour',
Longmans, 1966.
- N. Bukharin, 'Historical Materialism', Allen and Urwin, 1926.
- N. Bukharin and E. Preobrazhensky, 'The A.B.C. of Communism',
Penguin, 1969.
- K. Burgess, 'The Origins of British Industrial Relations',
Croom Helm, 1975.
- J. Burnett, ed. 'Useful Toil', Allen Lane, 1976.
- D. Butt, 'Men and Motors', New Left Review, 3, 1960.
- N.K. Buxton, 'The Scottish Shipbuilding Industry Between the Wars:
A Comparative Study', Business History, X, 1968.
- T.J. Byres, 'Entrepreneurship in the Scottish Heavy Industries,
1870 - 1900' in P.L. Payne ed. 'Studies in Scottish
Business History', Frank Cass, London, 1967.
- G. Cameron, 'Economic Analysis for a Declining Urban Economy',
Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 18, 1971.
- B.S. Capp, 'The Fifth Monarchy Men', Faber and Faber, 1972.
- W. Carron, 'Trade Unions In Industry', Dublin Review, Volume 237,
1963 - 64.
- C. Caudwell, 'Romance and Realism', Princeton, 1970.
- C. Chamberlain, 'The Growth of Support for the Labour Party in
Great Britain', British Journal of Sociology, Volume
24, 1973.
- C.W. Chamberlain and H.F. Moorhouse, 'Lower Class Attitudes Towards
the British Political System', Sociological Review,
Volume 22, 1974.
- W.M. Chandler, 'Canadian Socialism and Policy Impact: Contagion
from the Left', Canadian Journal of Political Science,
Volume X, 1977.
- R. Cherry, 'Class Struggle and the Nature of the Working Class',
Review of Radical Political Economics, Volume V.

- R. Christie, 'Eysenck's Treatment of the Personality of Communists' Psychology Bulletin, Volume 53, 1956.
- Lord Citrine, 'Men and Work', Hutchinson, 1964.
- R.A. Clegg, 'General Union', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1954.
- S.J. Cogner, 'Class Consciousness and Consumption: The New Middle Class During the Weimar Republic', Journal of Social History, Volume 10, 1977.
- S. Cohen, R. Johnston, R. Nest, 'Marxist Psychology in America: A Critique', Science and Society, 21, 1957.
- G.D.H. Cole, 'Trade Unionism and Munitions', Clarendon, Oxford, 1923.
- G.D.H. Cole, 'What is Wrong with the Trade Unions', Fabian Tract 301.
- H. Collins, 'Karl Marx, The International and the British Trade Union Movement', Science and Society, Volume 26, 1962.
- W.E. Connolly, 'On "Interest" in Politics', Politics and Society, Volume II, 1972.
- S. Cotgrove and C. Vamplew, 'Technology, Class and Politics: The Case of the Process Worker', Sociology, Volume 6, 1972
- M.A. Coulson and D. Riddell, Approaching Sociology: A Critical Introduction', Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- B. Cowe, 'The Making of a Clydeside Communist', Marxism To-day, Volume 17, 1973.
- I. Crewe, 'The Politics of "Affluent" and "Traditional" Workers in Britain', British Journal of Political Science, Volume 3, 1973.
- B. Croce, 'My Philosophy' Allen and Unwin, 1951.
- D.C. Cummings, 'A Historical Survey of the Boiler Makers and Iron and Steel Ship Builders Society', Robinson, Newcastle, 1905.
- F. Dallmayr, 'Phenomenology and Marxism' in G. Psathas, ed.

- J. Darragh, 'The Catholic Population of Scotland Since the Year, 1680', Innes Review, Volume 4, 1953.
- J. Dash, 'Good Morning, Brothers', Mayflower, 1970.
- A. Dawley and P. Faler, 'Working Class Culture and Politics in the Industrial Revolution. Sources of Loyalism and Rebellion'. Journal of Social History, Volume 9, 1976.
- D.T. Denver and J.M. Bochel, 'The Political Socialisation of Activists in the British Communist Party'. British Journal of Political Science, Volume 3, 1972.
- S. Dinitz, R. Dynes, A. Clarke, 'Deviance' O.U.P., New York, 1969.
- F.K. Donnelly and J.L. Baxter, 'Sheffield and the English Revolutionary Tradition 1791 - 1820', International Review of Social History, Volume 20, 1975.
- F.K. Donnelly, 'Ideology and Early English Working Class History', Social History, 2, 1976.
- O.G. Drobnitski, 'The Problem of Conscience in Moral Philosophy', Boston College Studies in Philosophy, Volume 4, 1974.
- T. Eagleton, 'Marxism and Literary Criticism', Methuen, 1976.
- M. Ebon, 'World Communism To-day', McGraw Hill, New York, 1948.
- L.J. Edinger, 'Kurt Schumacher', Stanford University Press, 1965.
- J.E.T. Eldridge, 'Industrial Disputes', R.K.P., 1968.
- J.E.T. Eldridge, 'Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality' Michael Joseph, 1971.
- R. Endleman, 'Oedipal Elements in Student Rebellions', Psychoanalytic Review, Volume 57, 1970-71.
- F.C. Engelmann and M.A. Schwartz, 'Subcultural Phenomenon in Austria', Political Science World Congress, Part 15.
- L.D. Epstein, 'British Class Consciousness and the Labour Party', Journal of British Studies, Volume 1-2, 1962-63.
- E.H. Erikson, 'Identity and the Life Cycle', Psychological Issues, Volume 1, 1959.

- E.H. Erikson, 'Identity: Youth and Crisis', Faber and Faber, 1968.
- B. Fay and J.D. Moon, 'What Would An Adequate Philosophy of the Social Sciences Look Like', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Volume 7, 1977.
- V.C. Ferkiss, 'Political and Intellectual Origins of American Radicalism, Right and Left', Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1962.
- P. Ferns, 'The New Militants' Crisis in the Trade Unions', Penguin, 1972.
- A. Ferry, 'Industrial Democracy and Workers' Control' in 'The Red Paper'.
- J. Fitzsimmons, 'Forms of the Apostolate', Dublin Review, Volume 231, 1957.
- R. Floud, 'An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians' Methuen, 1973.
- R. Floud, 'The British Machine Tool Industry, 1850-1914', C.U.P. 1974.
- W.H. Form, 'The Politics of Distrust', Studies in Comparative International Development, Volume 1X, 1974 .
- J. Foster, 'How Oldham's Working Class Leaders Managed to Avoid Reformism, 1812-47', Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, 16, 1968.
- J. Foster, 'Revolutionaries in Oldham', Marxism To-day, Volume 12, 1968.
- J. Foster, 'Class Struggle in the Industrial Revolution', Methuen, 1974.
- J. Foster, 'British Imperialism and the Labour Aristocracy' in J. Skelley, ed. 'The General Strike 1926' Lawrence and Wishart, 1976.
- A. Fox, 'Managerial Ideology and Labour Relations', British Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 1V, 1966
- R. Fox, 'The Class Struggle in Britain', Volume One, Martin Lawrence, N.D.

- R. Fox, 'The Novel and the People', Cobbett, 1944.
- S. Freud, 'An Outline of Psycho-Analysis', Hogarth, 1949.
- S. Freud, 'The Future of an Illusion', Hogarth, 1949.
- S. Freud, 'On the History of the Psycho-Analytic Movement',
Volume XIV, The Complete Psychological Works, Hogarth.
- S. Freud, 'An Autobiographical Study', Hogarth Press, 1960.
- S. Freud, 'New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis', Penguin,
1973.
- E. Fromm, 'The Crisis of Psychoanalysis', Penguin, 1973.
- E. Frow, 'The Engineers Strike of 1852', Marxism Today, Volume 7,
1963.
- R. & E. Frow, 'London Millwrights and the Combination Acts'
Marxism Today, Volume 16, 1972.
- W.W. Fuchs, 'The Question of Marxist Ethics', Philosophical Forum,
Volume 7, 1975 - 76.
- J.B. Furst, 'The Relation of Form to Content in Psychiatric
Thought', Science and Society, 32, 1968.
- H.J. Fyrth, 'Men of Iron', Bulletin of the Society for the Study
of Labour History, 32.
- W. Gallacher, 'Revolt on the Clyde', Lawrence and Wishart, 1966.
- W. Gallacher, 'Last Memoirs', Lawrence and Wishart, 1966.
- A. Gedicks, 'The Social Origins of Radicalism Among Finnish
Immigrants in Midwest Mining Communities', Radical
Review of Political Economics, Volume 8, 1976.
- A. Gedicks, 'Ethnicity, Class Solidarity and Labour Radicalism
among Finnish Immigrants in Michigan Copper County',
Politics and Society, Volume 7, 1977.
- N. Geras, 'The Legacy of Rosa Luxemburg', New Left Books, 1976.
- P. Gibbon, 'The Origins of Ulster Unionism', Manchester University
Press, 1975.
- H. Gibbs, 'The Spectre of Communism', Selwyn and Blount, 1936.

- K. Gill, 'Marxism and the Trade Union', Marxism Today, Volume 18, 1974.
- O. Glantz, 'Class Consciousness and Political Solidarity', American Sociological Review, Volume 23, 1958.
- G.E. Glezerman, 'Interrelationship Between Objective and Subjective Factors in October Revolution', Societ Studies in Philosophy, Volume VI, 1968.
- L.J. Goldstein, 'Ideas of Order: History and Sociology', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Volume 4, 1974.
- J.D. Goldthorpe, 'The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour', C.U.P. 1968.
- J.H. Goldthorpe et al, 'The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour', C.U.P. 1968.
- J. Goldthorpe et al, 'The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure', C.U.P. 1969.
- L. Goldman, 'Towards a Sociology of the Novel', Tavistock, 1975.
- J.F.B. Goodman and T.G. Whittingham, 'Shop Stewards in British Industry', McGraw Hill, 1969.
- A. Gorx, 'Strategy for Labour', Beacon, Boston, 1967.
- R.S. Gottlieb, 'A Marxist Concept of Ideology', Philosophical Forum, Volume VI, 1974 - 75.
- G.W. Grainger, 'The Crisis in the British Communist Party', Problems of Communism, Volume 6, 1957.
- A. Gramsci, 'Soviets in Italy', Spokeman Pamphlet, 1974.
- R.Q. Gray, 'Critical Note on the Political Incorporation', Sociology Volume 9, 1975.
- R.Q. Gray, 'The Labour Aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh', Oxford 1976.
- R.L. Greenall, 'Popular Conservatism in Salford 1968 - 86', Northern History Volume IX, 1974.
- T.H. Green, 'The Electorates of Non-Ruling Communist Parties', Studies in Comparative Communism, Volume 4, 1971.

- F.L. Grubbs, 'The Struggle for Labour Loyalty', Duke University Press, Durham, 1968.
- Ian Gough, 'Marx's Theory of Productive and Unproductive Labour' New Left Review, 76, 1972.
- M. Gunther and K. Reshaur, 'Science and Values in Political Science', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Volume 1, 1971.
- T.R. Gurr, 'Why Men Rebel', Princeton, New Jersey, 1970.
- J. Gyford and S. Haseler, 'Social Democracy: Beyond Revisionism' Fabian Research, 292.
- M. Halbwachs, 'The Psychology of Social Class', Heinemann, 1958.
- S. Hall, 'The "Political" and "Economic" in Marx's Theory' in A. Hunt, ed.
- J.L. Halstead, 'Measuring the Class Struggle', Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History, 30, 1975.
- H. Hamilton, 'The Industrial Revolution in Scotland', Clarendon, Oxford, 1932.
- M. Hamilton, 'An Analysis and Typology of Social Power', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 7, 1977.
- R.F. Hamilton, 'Affluence and the French Worker in the IV Republic', Princeton, New Jersey, 1967.
- M. Hammond, 'Weighting Causes in Historical Explanation', Theoria, Volume, XLIII, 1977.
- J.E. Handley, 'The Position of Catholics in Social and Economic History', Innes Review, Volume 2, 1951.
- W. Hannington, 'Never on Our Knees', Lawrence and Wishart, 1967.
- N. Harns, 'Beliefs in Society', Penguin, 1971.
- S. Harrison, 'Alex Gossip', Lawrence and Wishart, 1902.
- A.P. Have, E.F. Borgatta and R.F. Bales, 'Small Groups', Alfred Kneff, New York, 1962.

- M. Herrick, 'Change of Heart: A Test of some Widely Held Theories about Religious Conversion', American Journal of Sociology, Volume 83, 1977.
- S. Herkommer, 'Working Class Political Consciousness', International Socialist Journal, Volume 2, 1965.
- S. Herkommer, 'The Concept of Stratum in the Class Analysis of Advanced Capitalist Societies', Marxism Today, Volume 20, 1976.
- G. Hicks, 'The Great Tradition', International Publishers, New York, 1935.
- C. Hill, 'The World Turned Upside Down', Penguin, 1975.
- S. Hill, 'The Dockers', Heinemann, 1976.
- P. Hiller, 'Social Reality and Social Stratification', Sociological Review, Volume 21, 1973.
- B. Hindess, 'The Decline of Working Class Politics', Paladin, 1971.
- J. Hinton, 'The Clyde Workers' Committee and the Dilution Struggle' Essays in Labour History 1886 - 1923, MacMillan Press, 1971.
- J. Hinton, 'The First Shop Stewards Movement', Allen and Unwin, 1973.
- P.Q. Hirst, 'Social Evolution and Sociological Categories', Allen and Unwin, 1976.
- P.Q. Hirst, 'Economic Classes and Politics', in A. Hunt, ed.
- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'The British Communist Party', Political Quarterly, Volume 25, 1954.
- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'The Labour Aristocracy in Nineteenth Century Britain'
- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement', Marxism Today, Volume 12, 1968.
- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Lenin and the "Aristocracy of Labour"', Monthly Review, Volume 2, 1969 - 70.
- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Labour's Turning Point, 1880 - 1900', Harvester, Brighton, 1974.

- E.J. Hobsbawm, 'Revolutionaries', Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.
- G. Hodgson, 'Trotsky and Fatalistic Marxism', Spokesman,
Nottingham, 1975.
- W. Hoffer, 'Psychoanalysis: Practical and Research Aspects',
Williams and Wilkins, Baltimore, 1955.
- N. Holmstion, 'Free Will and a Marxist Concept of Natural Wants',
Philosophical Forum, VI, 1974 - 75.
- G.C. Homans, 'The Human Group', R.K.P., 1962.
- P. Honingsheim, 'On Max Weber', MacMillan, Free Press, New York,
1968.
- J.L. Horn and P.D. Knott, 'Activist Youth of the 1960s: Summary
and Diagnosis', Science, New Series 171, 1971.
- J. Horton and W. Thompson, 'Powerlessness and Political Negativism:
A Study of Defeated Local Referendums', American Journal
of Sociology, Volume LXVII, 1962.
- J. Horton, 'The Dehumanisation of Anomie and Alienation: A
Problem in the Ideology of Sociology', British Journal
of Sociology, Volume 15, 1964.
- J. Hughes, 'Should Party Systems Be Encouraged in Trade Unions?
The Case of the British Communist Party', in W.E.J.
McCarthy, 'Unions', Penguin, 1974.
- A. Hunt, ed. 'Class and Class Structure', Lawrence and Wishart,
1978.
- E. Husserl, 'The Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness',
Indiana University Press, 1964.
- E. Husserl, 'The Crisis in European Sciences and Transcendental
Phenomenology', Northwest University Press, 1970.
- A. Hutt, 'British Trade Unionism', Lawrence and Wishart, 1962.
- D. Hyde, 'Dedication and Leadership', Sands, Glasgow, 1966.
- R. Hyman, 'The Workers Union', Clarendon, Oxford, 1971.
- R. Hyman, 'Strikes', Fontana, Glasgow, 1972.

- R. Hyman, 'Marxism and the Sociology of Trade Unionsim', Pluto, 1973.
- R. Hyman and I. Brough, 'Social Values and Industrial Relations', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1975.
- G.K. Ingham, 'Size of Industrial Organisation and Worker Behaviour', C.U.P. 1970.
- G.F.K. Ingham, 'Social Stratification: Industrial Attributes and Social Relationships', Sociology, Volume 4, 1970.
- E. Ions, 'Against Behaviouralism', Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1977.
- E. Jacques, 'The Changing Culture of a Factory', Tavistock, 1952.
- M. Jahoda, 'Freud and the Dilemmas of Psychology', Hogarth, 1977.
- J.B. Jefferys, 'The Story of the Engineers', Lawrence and Wishart, 1945.
- R. Jehenson, 'A Phenomenological Approach to the Study of Formal Organisation' in C. Psathas ed.
- B. Jessop, 'Traditionalism, Conservatism and British Political Culture', Allen and Unwin, 1974.
- T. Judt, 'The Origins of Rural Socialism in Europe: Economic Change and the Provencal Peasantry, 1870 - 1914', Social History, Volume 1, 1976.
- B. Jones, 'Max Weber and the Concept of Social Class', Sociological Review, Volume 23, 1975.
- T. Johnstone, 'The History of the Working Class in Scotland', Edward, Glasgow, 1929.
- E. Kamenlea, 'Marxism and Ethics', MacMillan, 1969.
- J. Kekes, 'Rationality and Problem Solving', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Volume 7, 1977.
- P.J. Kemeny, 'The Affluent Worker Project: Some Criticisms and a Derivative Study', Sociological Review, Volume 20, 1972.
- W. Kendal, 'The Revolutionary Movement in Britain, 1900 - 1921', Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969.

- W. Kendal, 'The C.P.G.B.' Survey, Volume 20, 1974.
- J.G. Kellas and P. Fotheringham, 'The Political Behaviour of the Working Class', in A.A. McLaren, editor, 'Social Class in Scotland', John Donald, Edinburgh, 1976.
- C. Kerr and A. Siegal, 'The Interindustry Propensity to Strike', McGraw Hill, 1954.
- D. Kirkwood, 'My Life of Revolt', George Harrup, 1935.
- J.R. Kirwan, 'Industrial Relations and the Law', The Month, December, 1977.
- D. Koenker, 'The Evolution of Party Consciousness in 1917: The Case of the Moscow Workers', Soviet Studies, Volume XXX, 1978.
- T. Kupers, 'Historical Materialism and Psychology', Science and Society, 37, 1973 - 74.
- D. Lacorne, 'On the Fringe of the French Political System', Comparative Politics, Volume 9, 1977.
- W.M. Lafferty, 'The Emergence of Radical Socialism: Structural versus Cultural Explanations', International Political Science Association, 9 World Congress, 1973, Part 1.5.
- T. Lane, 'The Union Makes Us Strong', Arrow, 1974.
- T. Lane and K. Roberts, 'Strike at Pilkingtons', Fontana, 1971.
- M. Lane, 'The Conscious and the Unconscious in Human Behaviour', Science and Society, Volume 15, 1951.
- J.M. Laslett, 'Labour and the Left', Basic Books, New York, 1970.
- P. Lassman, 'Phenomenological Perspectives in Sociology', in J. Rex ed.
- J.G. Legget, 'Class, Race and Labour', O.U.P. 1973.
- H. Lefebure, 'The Sociology of Marx', Penguin, 1972.
- V.I. Lenin, 'Left Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder', Progress, Moscow, 1968.
- V.I. Lenin, 'What Is To Be Done', Progress, Moscow, 1973.

- S.W. Lerner, 'Breakaway Unions and the Small Trade Union',
Allen and Unwin, 1961.
- S.W. Lerner and J. Bescoby, 'Shop Steward Combine Committees
in the British Engineering Industry', British
Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 1V, 1966.
- D.M. Levin, 'Reason and Evidence in Husserl's Phenomenology',
Northwestern University Press, Evanston, 1970.
- N.G. Levintov, 'Some Aspects of the Leninist Theory of
Revolution', Societ Studies in Philosophy, Volume V,
1966.
- R.A. Levitas, 'The Social Location of Ideas', Sociological
Review, Volume 24, 1976.
- J. Lewis, 'Max Weber and Value Free Sociology', Lawrence and
Wishart, 1975.
- L.S. Lewis, 'Class Consciousness and the Salience of Class',
Sociology and Social Researcher, Volume 49, 1964-65.
- J. Lindsay, 'After The Thirties', Lawrence and Wishart, 1956.
- J. Lindsay, 'Hitler: An Attempt at Psychological Explanation',
Fact 16, 1938.
- L. Lipsitz, 'Work, Life and Political Attitudes: A Study of
Manual Workers', American Political Science Review,
Volume 58, 1964.
- D. Lockwood, 'The Blackcoated Worker', Unwin, 1966.
- A. Lozovsky, 'Marx and the Trade Unions', Martin Lawrence, 1935.
- G. Lukacs, 'History and Class Consciousness', Merlin, 1974.
- G. Lukacs, 'Lenin: A Study on the Unity of His Thought', New
Left Books, 1970.
- A. Lunackarsky, 'On Literature and Art', Progress, Moscow, 1973.
- R. Lund, 'Some Aspects of the Danish Shop Steward System', British
Journal of Industrial Relations, Volume 1, 1963.
- T. Lupton, 'On the Shopfloor', Pergammon, Oxford, 1963.

- I. MacBeath, 'Putting Over the Paradox of Shop Stewardship',
Personnel Management, Volume 8, 1976.
- J.F. McCaffrey, 'The Origins of Liberal Unionism in the West
of Scotland', Scottish Historical Review, Volume 50,
1971.
- W. McCarthy, 'The Future of the Unions', Fabian Tract, 339.
- W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Parker, 'Shop Stewards and Workshop
Relations', Research Papers 10, H.M.S.O. 1968.
- W.E.J. McCarthy and S.R. Collier, 'Coming to Terms with Trade
Unions', Institute of Personnel Management, 1973.
- L.J. MacFarlane, 'The British Communist Party', MacGibbon and
Kee, 1966.
- N. McInnes, 'The Communist Parties of Western Europe', O.U.P.
1975.
- G. MacKenzie, 'The Aristocracy of Labour', C.U.P. 1973.
- G. MacKenzie, 'Class and Class Consciousness: Marx Re-examined',
Marxism Today, Volume 20, 1976.
- E. Mandel, 'The Leninist Theory of Organisation', I.M.G. Publications,
1975.
- M. Mann, 'The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracy', American
Sociological Review, Volume 35, 1970.
- M. Mann, 'Consciousness and Action Among the Western Working
Class', MacMillan, 1973.
- O. Mannoni, 'Prospero and Caliban', Methuen, 1956.
- H. Marcus, 'Negations', Allen Lane, 1968.
- H. Marcuse, 'Liberation from the Affluent Society' in D. Cooper
ed. 'The Dialectics of Liberations', Penguin, 1971.
- H. Marcuse, 'One Dimensional Man', Abacus, 1972.
- H. Marcuse, 'An Essay on Liberation', Penguin, 1972.
- H. Marcuse, 'Counterrevolution and Revolt', Allen Lane, 1972.
- S. Mardock, 'Californian Communists - Their Years of Power',
Science and Society, Volume 34, 1970.

- H.M. Marks, 'The Sources of Reformism in the Social Democratic Party of Germany, 1890-1914' *Journal of Modern History* Volume 11, 1939.
- L. Marks, 'Antonio Gramsci', *Marxist Quarterly*, Volume 8, 1956.
- A.I. Marsh and E.E. Coker, 'Shop Steward Organisation in the Engineering Industry', *B.J.I.R.* Volume 1963.
- A.I. Marsh, E.O. Evans, P. Garcia, 'Workplace Industrial Relations in Engineering', Kogan Page, 1971.
- R. Martin, 'Communism and the British Trade Unions, 1924-1933', Clarendon, Oxford, 1969.
- R. Martin, 'Union Democracy: An Explanatory Framework', in McCarthy, 'Unions'.
- W.H. Marwick, 'A Short History of Labour in Scotland', Chamlen, Edinburgh, 1967.
- P. Massey, 'Portrait of a Mining Town', *Fact*, Number 8, 1937.
- N.V. Matkovsky, 'A True Son of the British Working Class', Progress, Moscow, 1972.
- J. Matles and J. Higgins, 'Them and Us: Struggles of a Rank and File Union', Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1954.
- A. Merson, 'The Struggle for Socialist Consciousness in Nazi Germany', *Marxism Today*, Volume 17, 1973.
- I. Meszavos, ed. 'Aspects of History and Class Consciousness', R.K.P. 1971.
- I. Meszaros, 'Marx's Theory of Alienation.', Merlin, London, 1972.
- I. Meszaros, 'The Necessity of Social Control', Merlin, 1972.
- R. Miliband, 'Parliamentary Socialism', Allen and Unwin, 1961.
- R. Miliband, 'Marxism and Politics', O.U.P. 1977.
- R.N. Miller, 'The Consistency of Historical Materialism', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 4, 1974-75.
- S. Milligan, 'The New Barons', Maurice Temple Smith, 1976.

- J. Mitchell, 'The Ragged Trousered Philanthropist', Marxism Today, Volume 5, 1961.
- J. Monds, 'Workers Control and the Historian: A New Economism' New Left Review, 1976.
- D. Montgomery, 'The "New Unionism" and the Transformation of Workers' Consciousness in America, 1909 - 1922', Journal of Social History, Volume 7, 1974.
- D. Montgomery, 'Workers' Control of Machine Production in the Nineteenth Century', Labour History, Volume 17, 1976.
- P.T. Moon, 'The Labour Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France', MacMillan, New York, 1921.
- H.F. Moorhouse, 'The Political Incorporation of the British Working Class: An Interpretation', Sociology, Volume 7, 1973.
- H.F. Moorhouse and C.W. Chamberlain, 'Lower Class Attitudes to Property: Aspects of the Counter Ideology', Sociology, Volume 8, 1974.
- R.T. Morris and R.J. Murphy, 'A Paradigm for the Study of Class Consciousness', Sociology and Social Researcher, Volume 50, 1965-66.
- J.E. Mortimer, 'Trade Unions and Technological Change, O.U.P. 1971
- J.E. Mortimer, 'History of the Boilermakers Society, 1834-1906', Allen and Unwin, 1973.
- B.H. Moss, 'Producer's Associations and the Origins of French Socialism', Journal of Modern History, Volume 48, 1976.
- J.T. Murphy, 'New Horizons', Bodley Head, 1941.
- J.T. Murphy, 'Preparing for Power', Pluto, 1972.
- D.B. Myers, 'Ethics and Political Economy in Marx', Philosophical Forum, Volume 7, 1975 - 76.
- T. Nairn, 'The Nature of the Labour Party' in 'Towards Socialism'.
- K. Newton, 'The Sociology of British Communism', Allen Lane, 1969.

- T. Nichols, 'Labourism and Class Consciousness: The "Class Ideology" of some Northern Foremen', *Sociological Review*, Volume 22, 1974.
- T. Nichols and P. Armstrong, 'Workers Divided', Fontana, 1976.
- T. Nichols and H. Beynon, 'Living with Capitalism', R.K.P. 1977.
- N. Nicholson, 'The Role of the Shop Steward', *Industrial Relations*, Volume 7, 1976.
- M. Nicolaus, 'The Theory of the Labour Aristocracy', *Monthly Review*, Volume 21, 1969 - 70.
- C.A. Oakley, 'The Second City', Blackie, Glasgow, 1947.
- I. Ollendorff Reich, 'Wilhelm Reich', Elek, 1969.
- B. Ollman, 'Alienation: Marx's Concept of Man in Capitalist Society', C.U.P. 1971.
- B. Ollman, 'Towards Class Consciousness: Marx and the Working Class', *Politics and Society*, Volume 2, 1972.
- Talcot Parsons, 'Essays in Sociological Thought', MacMillan Free Press, New York, 1964.
- T.T. Paterson, 'Glasgow Limited', C.U.P. 1960.
- T. Patterson, 'Notes on the Historical Application of Marxist Cultural Theory', *Science and Society*, 39, 1975-76.
- P.L. Payne, 'Rationality and Personality: A Study of Mergers In the Scottish Iron and Steel Industry, 1916-1936', *Business History*, XIX, 1977.
- S.M. Peck, 'The Rank and File Leader', College and University Press, New Haven, 1963.
- H. Pelling, 'Popular Politics and Society in Late Victorian England', MacMillan, 1968.
- M. Perlman, 'The Machinists', Harvard, Massachusetes, 1961.
- A. Piepe, R. Prior, A. Box, 'The Location of the Proletarian and Deferential Worker: *Sociology*, Volume 3, 1969.

- S. Pierson, 'Marxism and the Origins of British Socialism',
Cornell, Ithica, 1973.
- D. Plotke, 'Marxism, Sociology and Crisis: Lukacs' Critique
of Weber', Berkeley Journal of Sociology, Volume XX,
1975 - 76.
- S. Pollard, 'Factory Discipline in the Industrial Revolution',
Economic History Review, Volume XVI.
- H. Pollitt, 'Serving My Time', Lawrence and Wishart, 1950.
- M.J.F. Poole, 'Towards a Sociology of Shop Stewards', Sociological
Review, Volume 22, 1974.
- K.R. Popper, 'The Logic of Scientific Discovery', Hutchison, 1968.
- K.R. Popper, 'Conjectures and Refutations', 1969.
- G. Psathas, ed. 'Phenomenological Sociology: Issues and
Applications', John Wiley, New York, 1973.
- N. Poulantzas, 'On Social Class', New Left Review 78, 1973.
- N. Poulantzas, 'Classes in Contemporary Capitalism', New Left
Books, 1975.
- B. Pribicevic, 'The Shop Stewards Movement and Workers Control',
Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1959.
- J.R. Prickett, 'Communism and Factionalism in the United
Automobile Workers, 1939 - 1947', Science and Society,
Volume 32, 1968.
- J.R. Prickett, 'Some Aspects of the Communist Controversy in
the C.I.O.', Science and Society, Volume 33, 1969.
- W. Reich, 'What Is Class Consciousness', Socialist Reproductions,
1971.
- W. Reich, 'The Mass Psychology of Fascism', Souvenir and Academic,
1972.
- J. Rex, ed. 'Approaches to Sociology', R.K.P. 1974.
- I. Richter, 'Political Purpose in Trade Unions', Allen and
Unwin, 1973.

- J. Ringelheim, 'Historical Reconstruction and Psychoanalysis: Some Methodological Issues', Philosophical Forum, Volume VI, 1974 - 75.
- E. Roberts, 'Workers Control', Allen and Unwin, 1973.
- A.J. Robertson, 'The Decline of the Scottish Cotton Industry', Business History, XII, 1970.
- D.J. Robertson, 'Labour Turnover in Shipbuilding', Scottish Journal of Political Economy, 1, 1954.
- P.L. Robertson, 'Demarcation Disputes in British Shipbuilding Before 1914', International Review of Social History, Volume 20, 1975.
- M. Rodinson, 'Islam and Capitalism', Penguin, 1974.
- H. and R.A.H. Rosen, 'The Union Member Speaks', Prentice Hall, New York, 1955.
- N. Rotenstreich, 'On Radicalism', Philosophy of the Social Sciences, Volume 4, 1974.
- T. Rothstein, 'From Chartism to Labourism', International Publishers, New York, 1929.
- I. Rutledge, 'Changes in the Mode of Production and the Growth of "Mass Militancy" in the British Mining Industry, 1954 to 74', Science and Society, Volume XLI, 1977-78.
- H.I. Safa, 'Class Consciousness Among Working Class Women in Latin America: A Case Study in Puerto Rica', Politics and Society, Volume 5, 1975.
- V. Salov, 'Psychoanalysis and History', Social Sciences, U.S.S.R. Volume 1, 1974.
- T. Dos Santos, 'The Concept of Social Class', Science and Society, Volume XXXIV, 1970.
- D.J. Saposs, 'Communism in American Unions', McGraw Hill, New York, 1959.
- J.P. Sartre, 'Search for a Method', Vintage, New York, 1968.
- J.P. Sartre, 'Between Existentialism and Marxism', New Left Books, 1974.

- L.J. Saunders, 'Scottish Democracy, 1815-1840', Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1950.
- H. Scanlon, 'The Role of Militancy', New Left Review, 46, 1967.
- A. Scargill, 'The New Unionism', New Left Review, 92, 1975.
- R. Schafer, 'The Psycho-Analytic Life History', London, 1975.
- A. Schaff, 'The Consciousness of Class and Class Consciousness', Philosophical Forum, Volume 3, 1971 - 72.
- D. Schneider, 'The Workers' (Communist) Party and American Trade Unions', John Hopkins, Boston, 1928.
- Scottish Council, 'A Future for Scotland', Edinburgh, 1973.
- B. Selkirk, 'The Life of a Worker', Dundee Printers, 1967.
- L. Seve, 'Marxism and the Theory of Human Personality', Lawrence and Wishart, 1975.
- R.E. Shaffer, 'Communism in California 1919-1924: Orders From Moscow or Independent Western Radicalism', Science and Society, Volume 34, 1970.
- D.A. Shannon, 'The Decline of American Communism', Atlantic, 1959.
- G.B. Sharp, 'Mills and Weber: Formalism and the Analysis of Social Structure', Science and Society, 24, 1960
- T. Sheridan, 'Mindful Militants,' C.U.P. 1975.
- R. Shipley, 'Revolutionaries in Modern Britain', Bodley Head, 1976.
- E. Shorter and C. Tilly, 'Strikes in France, 1830-1968', C.U.P. 1974.
- A. Slaven, 'The Development of the West of Scotland, 1750-1960', R.K.P. 1975.
- A. Slaven, 'A Shipyard in Depression: John Brown's of Clydebank', Business History, XIX, 1977.
- R. Smilie, 'My Life for Labour', Mills and Boon, 1924.
- A. Starr, 'Psychoanalysis and the Fiction of the Unconscious', Science and Society, Volume 15, 1951.
- A. Starr, 'The Nature of Scientific Proof', Science and Society, 19, 1955.

- B.M. Stave, ed. 'Socialism and the Cities', Kennikat, New York, 1975.
- P. Stead, 'Working Class Leadership in South Wales, 1900-1920', Welsh History Review, Volume 6, 1972.
- P.N. Steams, 'Lives of Labour', Groom Helm, 1975.
- G. Stedman Jones, 'Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution', New Left Review, 90, 1975.
- A. Stewart and R.M. Blackburn, 'The Stability of Structural Inequality', Sociological Review, Volume 23, 1975.
- R. Stewart, 'Breaking the Fetters', Lawrence and Wishart, 1967.
- P. Stigant, 'Wesleyan Methodism and Working Class Radicalism in the North, 1792 - 1821', Northern History, Volume 6, 1971.
- K. Stone, 'The Origins of Job Structures in the Steel Industry', Review of Radical Political Economies, Volume 6, 1974.
- L. Stone, 'The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529-1642', R.K.P. 1972.
- J. Spargo, 'The Psychology of Bolshevism', Harper and Brothers, New York, 1919.
- R. Swearingen, 'Leader of the Communist World', Free Press, New York, 1971.
- A. Swingewood, 'Marx and Modern Social Theory', MacMillan, 1975.
- A.J.M. Sykes, 'The Cohesion of a Trade Union Workshop Organisation', Sociology, Volume 1, 1967.
- E. Taylor, 'A Craft Society in the Age of General Unions', West Midland Studies, Volume 5, 1972.
- R. Terchek, 'The Psychoanalytic Basis of Ghandi's Politics', Psychoanalytic Review, Volume 62, 1975-76.
- M.I. Thomis, 'The Town Labourer and the Industrial Revolution', Batsford, 1974.
- E.P. Thompson, 'The Making of the English Working Class', Penguin, 1967.

- E.P. Thompson, 'The Labour Movement Before 1790', Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History.
- W. Todd, 'Trade Unions and the Engineering Industry Dispute at Barrow in Furness, 1897-98', International Review of Social History, Volume 20, 1975.
- T. Topham, 'Shop Stewards and Workers Control', New Left Review, 25, 1964.
- A. Tuckett, 'The Scottish Carter', Allen and Unwin, 1967.
- A. Tuckett, 'The Blacksmiths' History', Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.
- A. Tyrrell, 'Class Consciousness in Early Victorian Britain: Samuel Smiles, Leeds Politics and the Self-Help Creed', Journal of British Studies, Volume 9-10, 1969-71.
- J. Urry, 'Reference Groups and the Theory of Revolution', R.K.P. 1973.
- J. Vincent, 'The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-68', Constable, 1966.
- E. Voegelin, 'The New Science of Politics' University of Chicago Press, Illinois, 1952.
- V.N. Volosinov, 'Freudianism: A Marxist Analysis', Academic Press, New York, 1976.
- K. Waddington, 'Revolutionary Consciousness', Marxism Today, Volume 17, 1973.
- H.R. Wagner, 'The Scope of Phenomenological Sociology', in G. Psathas ed.
- B.A. Waites, 'The Effect of the First World War on Class and Status in England, 1910-1920', Journal of Contemporary History, Volume 11, 1976.
- W.M. Walker, 'Irish Immigrants in Scotland: Their Priests, Politics and Parochial Life', Historical Journal, XV, 1972.
- W.M. Walker, 'The Scottish Prohibition Party and the Millenium', International Review of Social History, Volume 18, 1973.

- G. Wall, 'The Concept of Interest in Politics', Politics and Society, Volume V, 1975.
- S. and B. Webb, 'The History of Trade Unionism', Longmans, Green, 1911.
- M. Weber, 'Basic Concepts in Sociology', Peter Owen, London, 1962.
- M. Weber, 'General Economic History', Collier Books, New York, 1966.
- M. Weber, 'From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology', R.K.P. 1967.
- H.K. Wells, 'Sigmund Freud: A Pavlovian Critique', Lawrence and Wishart, 1960.
- R.G. Wesson, 'Why Marxism', Temple Smith, 1976.
- A. West, 'Crisis and Criticism', Lawrence and Wishart, 1975.
- J.H. Westegaard 'The Rediscovery of the Cash Nexus', Socialist Register, 1970.
- J.H. Westergaard, 'Sociology: The Myth of Classlessness', in 'Ideology in Social Science', Fontana, 1973.
- R.F. Wheeler, 'German Labour and the Comintern: A Problem of Generations', Journal of Social History, Volume 7, 1974.
- J.J. Wiatr, 'Herbert Marcuse: Philosopher of a Lost Radicalism', Science and Society, Volume 34, 1970.
- E. Wigham, 'The Power to Manage', MacMillan, 1973.
- M.G. Wilders and S.R. Parker, 'Changes in Workplace Industrial Relations, 1966 - 1972', B.J.I.R. Volume XIII, 1975.
- L.J. Williams, 'The Coalowners of North Wales, 1873-80: Problems of Unity', Welsh Historical Review, Volume 8.
- G. Williams, 'Political Consciousness among the Ibdan Poor' in 'Sociology and Development' ed. E. de Kandt and G. Williams, Tavistock, 1974.
- M. Winter, 'Class Consciousness and the British Working Class', Marxism Today, Volume 18, 1974.
- E.V. Wolfenstein, 'The Revolutionary Personality', Princeton, University Press, New Jersey, 1967.

- H. Wolpe, 'Some Problems Concerning Revolutionary Consciousness',
Socialist Register, 1970.
- A. Wood, 'The Marxian Critique of Justice', Philosophy and
Public Affairs, 1, 1971 - 2.
- J.L. Wood, 'New Left Ideology: Its Dimensions and Development',
Sage Professional Papers, American Political Series,
Volume 2, 1975.
- N. Wood, 'The Empirical Proletariat: A Note on British Communism'
Political Science Quarterly, Volume 74, 1959.
- L.C. Wright, 'Scottish Chartism', Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1953.
- H. Wyper, 'Shop Stewards - Past, Present and Future', Marxism
Today, Volume 8, 1964.
- J.D. Young, 'Totalitarianism, Democracy and the British Labour
Movement', Survey, Volume 20, 1974.
- P. Zwerg, 'The Worker in an Affluent Society', Heinemann, 1961.
- A Revised Index of Industrial Production in Scotland, 1948 - 1975,
Scottish Economic Bulletin, 12, 1977.
- 'Politics and the Shop Floor', New Left Review, 80 1973.
- 'The God That Failed', Hamish Hamilton, 1950.
- 'The General Strike', Industrial Workers of the World, Illinois, 1946.
- 'The Story of the Engineers', Centenary Souvenir, 1851.

