

The government has now listed the maximum number of labor pickets to six, while banning secondary support pickets unless the employer is an immediate supplier or customer of the employer in dispute.

The unemployed will provide the strikebreakers to destroy the unions. Unemployment is now officially 1.9 million, although trade union leaders charge that in reality it is over 2 million. Two and a half million people are expected to be out of work by the end of 1981, according to a recent survey by the Charterhouse Group.

The structure of unemployment reflects a number of new trends:

- For the first time, the wealthier southeast regions of England are showing high unemployment rates.

- Long-term unemployed (over three years) now consist of almost 25 percent of those out of work, triple the number ten years ago. Of these, about 75 percent are unskilled or semi-skilled manual workers. Some are almost illiterate, and over 60 percent are over 35.

- Youth unemployment is rising proportionately, as a third of the total unemployed are now under 25.

This huge manpower pool has generated a hideous system of exploitation known as the "Euro-lump," which has received growing attention in recent weeks. About 50,000 British workers are now estimated by the Foreign Office to be working in continental Europe, 20,000 "on the lump" (illegally, without paying taxes.) These workers are recruited by unscrupulous agents and brought to "human cattle markets" in Nijmegen, Holland, where they are signed up for construction work and other manual labor in Holland, West Germany, and even the Mideast. High wages are promised, but the agents frequently disappear before the workers are paid; 1,600 of these workers ended up penniless on the steps of the British Consulate in Düsseldorf last year. So far this year the figure is already higher, and this is just a hint of things to come. Thatcher is now calling for increased "labor mobility" to solve the unemployment problem.

The 'bonkers' Sir Keith

The influence of British Secretary of State for Industry Sir Keith Joseph on his Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, might best be compared to that of Zbigniew "Rasputin" Brzezinski on President Carter. A fanatical monetarist and member of the free-enterprise Mont Pelerin Society, Joseph is Britain's leading public advocate of the shift to a "postindustrial society." He and a few others in the inner clique of the Thatcher cabinet have effectively isolated the Prime Minister from differing counsel, including that of the "wets" (skeptics) in the Cabinet itself.

A recent profile of Sir Keith by Simon Hoggart, published in *The Guardian* July 31, included the following observations:

"'Keith Joseph?' the late Reginald Maudling used to remark. 'He's as nutty as a fruit cake.' It's a judgment that few people have felt the need to revise drastically since. It is often said that, with the significant exception of the Prime Minister, the Tory Party divides into two groups on the subject of the Industry Secretary: those who think he is mad, and those who think he is stark, staring bonkers. . . ."

"You can see how he got his reputation. When he is worried, which is usually, a vein throbs in his forehead giving an instant read-out on the state of his inner mental turmoil. A former Minister who chatted with him the other day said: 'His hand was shaking like

an alcoholic's yet I know he barely touches the stuff.'

"During election tours he appears obsessed by the need to avoid the public, terrified that he will divert them from their quotidian round. On public platforms he often sits with his head buried in his hands as if news has just been brought of some ghastly personal catastrophe. Now and again, if you listen to him on the radio, you can hear him sigh deeply. For years now, certainly since he was appointed to his present job in May last year, politicians on both sides of the House have been predicting his imminent nervous breakdown, yet, like Billy Bunter's postal order, it never comes. It seems that he is always like that. . . ."

"Some MPs . . . wonder why his considerable political skills should often be interlarded with the most amazingly back-handed behaviour. The most damaging example of this was his notorious Edgbaston speech in October 1974. In it he said that more and more children were being born to mothers in the lowest social classes, the people who were least able to bring up children because of the social deprivation they were already suffering. So, he said, 'the balance of our population, our human stock, is threatened.'

"What he meant was that a higher proportion of children are being born into poor and feckless homes and that, because of the 'cycle of deprivation'—his own phrase—they went on to produce yet more underprivileged children, in a continuous vicious circle. It's a fairly obvious point, almost a truism, yet it was phrased so badly that it sounded like a Nazi demand for genetic engineering. . . ."