Banks loot Greece

Cops defend Wall Street

SEIZE THE LOOT FROM THE PREDATORS!

Strike on 30 November! Fight the cuts!
Today one class, the working class, lives by selling labour movement. Taxation of the rich to fund decent public services, homes, education and jobs for all. A workers’ movement that fights all forms of oppression from the burden of housework. Free abortion on request. Full equality for lesbian, gay and bisexual people. Black and white everywhere have more in common with each other than with their capitalist or Stalinist rulers. Democracy at every level of society, from the smallest workplace or community to global social organisation. Working-class solidarity in international politics: equal rights for all nations, against imperialists and predators big and small. Open borders. Global solidarity against global capital — workers everywhere fight for a future with common ground. Freedom for BLAST, and every worker everywhere who has something in common with them. From their capitalist or Stalinist masters. Our priority is to work in the workplaces and trade unions, supporting workers’ struggles, helping organise rank-and-file groups. We are also active among students and in many campaigns and alliances.

We stand for:

• Independent working-class representation in politics.
• A workers’ government, based on and accountable to the labour movement.
• A workers’ charter of trade union rights — to organise, to strike, to picket effectively, and to take solidarity action.
• Taxation of the rich to fund decent public services, homes, education and jobs for all.
• A workers’ movement that fights all forms of oppression. Full equality for women and social provision for free women from the burden of housework. Free abortion on request. Full equality for lesbian, gay and bisexual people. Black and white everywhere have more in common with each other than with their capitalist or Stalinist rulers.
• Democracy at every level of society, from the smallest workplace or community to global social organisation.
• Working-class solidarity in international politics: equal rights for all nations, against imperialists and predators big and small.
• Open borders.
• Global solidarity against global capital — workers everywhere fight for a future with common ground.
• Freedom for BLAST, and every worker everywhere who has something in common with them. From their capitalist or Stalinist masters.

The Alliance for Workers’ Liberty aims to build solidarity through struggle so that the working class can overthrow capitalism. We want socialist revolution: collective ownership of industry and services, workers’ control and a democracy much fuller than the present system, with elected representatives recallable at any time and an end to bureaucrats’ and managers’ privileges.

We fight for the labour movement to break with “social partnership” and assert working-class interests militantly against the bosses. Our priority is to work in the workplaces and trade unions, supporting workers’ struggles, helping organise rank-and-file groups, helping organise rank-and-file groups.

The University of Birmingham has suspended my status as student, because of the Guild [Student Union]’s suspension of me as officer. I have now lost the right to be on campus, although not the right to be at the campus gates.”

What had Edd done to be suspended as Vice President Education at the Guild [Student Union]? He had spent ten days in prison without trial for his part in a banner drop at Lib Dem conference. Two other Birmingham student activists are on bail. Edd was bailed on 27 September. He has not been tried or convicted. But on returning to the Guild, he found that he had been suspended by its (un-elected) General Manager. Edd is also a member of the NCAFC national committee. If the Guild bureaucracy and the unян can get away with this, it will be an outrage against Birmingham University students’ democratic rights. It will set a precedent that any left-wing student union officer, any campaigning student union officer, anywhere is fair game for removal from above. As the fight against the Tories’ cuts heats up, this is a major threat to student activism. We need to fight for Edd’s reinstatement as part of the campaign to re-claim control of our student unions from unelected, non-student bureaucrat, and put control back in the hands of students and their elected representatives.

What you can do:

1. Sign the petition in defence of Edd: 
   https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/176254

2. Email a message of protest to the President of the Guild: president@guild.bham.ac.uk

3. Pass a motion through your student union, union branches or student society.

4. Edd’s campaign. A model motion is available soon.

5. More: call NCAFC on 07775 763 750

**Labour conference: a delegate’s diary**

By a National Campaign Against Fees and Cuts (NCAFC) supporter

Birmingham Uni student Edd Bauer reports:

The University of Birmingham has suspended my status as student, because of the Guild [Student Union]’s suspension of me as officer. I have now lost the right to be on campus, although not the right to be at the campus gates.”

What had Edd done to be suspended as Vice President Education at the Guild [Student Union]? He had spent ten days in prison without trial for his part in a banner drop at Lib Dem conference. Two other Birmingham student activists are on bail. Edd was bailed on 27 September. He has not been tried or convicted. But on returning to the Guild, he found that he had been suspended by its (un-elected) General Manager. Edd is also a member of the NCAFC national committee. If the Guild bureaucracy and the uni can get away with this, it will be an outrage against Birmingham University students’ democratic rights. It will set a precedent that any left-wing student union officer, any campaigning student union officer, anywhere, is fair game for removal from above. As the fight against the Tories’ cuts heats up, this is a major threat to student activism. We need to fight for Edd’s reinstatement as part of the campaign to re-claim control of our student unions from unelected, non-student bureaucrat, and put control back in the hands of students and their elected representatives.

What you can do:

1. Sign the petition in defence of Edd: 
   https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions/176254

2. Email a message of protest to the President of the Guild: president@ guild.bham.ac.uk

3. Pass a motion through your student union, union branches or student society.

4. More: call NCAFC on 07775 763 750

**Labour conference: a delegate’s diary**

By a Labour Party conference delegate

This year’s Labour party conference [25-29 September, in Liverpool] was, according to Campaign for Labour Party Reform, Democracy secretary Pete Willsman, “the most lively in years – more support for references back, more support for speeches against the leadership line, and some political debate.”

This is the second year we’ve had参考 投票 motions back on the agenda, after they were stored in 2011.

Dave Prentis, general secretary of the public service union, UNISON, got a plaudit from the majority when, speaking on the UNISON motion about public services and the pensions dispute, he demanded that Labour back the 30 November strike. If Labour leaders don’t support the strike, he said, then his members and his union won’t forgive them. He said that a line supporting the strike had been taken out of context, and shouldn’t have been.

Kingelsey Abrams, from the UNITE union delegation, spoke against a motion from USDAW on public service cuts which criticised those cuts only as too far and too fast. The whole UNITE delegation voted against the motion. The unions had failed to push the (limited) democratic reform proposals in their own submission to “Re-founding Labour”, but they stood firm against pressure from the leader- ship to have their 50% of the vote at conference re- duced, and reduced plans for “registered supporters” to have a say in Labour leadership elections to small proportions.

Some delegates man- aged to start some heck- ling when the headmaster of a Catholic Academy spoke about how good Academies are. People round about them started to pay attention to what was being said, rather than just clapping every speech to be polite.

A few delegates walked out for a speech from the chair of the Police Association, and their gesture sparked good discussions. A Merseyside CLP dele- gate spoke up for free edu- cation after the platform had announced a new pol- icy (devised without refer- ence to conference) that Labour would only cut university tuition fees to £6,000. Many delegates ap- plauded her, much to the amusement of the officials.

People cheered Ed Miliband’s speech when he said he wasn’t Blair and when he kept saying how he was proud of the link with the unions. They were less keen when he went on to say Labour had been wrong to oppose Thatcher’s selling-off of council houses and anti- union legislation. There was good ap- plause, and a good-look- ing show of hands, for a speech moving reference- back of the stitched-up “Re-founding Labour” rule-change package. Later in the week, a constituency delegate got up to make a speech calling for the over- throw of capitalism — an idea not heard about Labour Party conference for some decades now! — and we heard some good applause.

The party officials now all seemed to be Blairite ex- students. They attempted to control every aspect of the conference. They write people’s speeches and pressure delegates to vote their way. All the emergency mo- tions submitted were ruled out of order. Everyone would you think just turn for appearance’s sake they would let one or two through. The Union activists tried to move that the BAe job losses be discussed as an emergency motion, and was told that nothing was allowed as an emergency after the Friday before con- ference. The issue was then brought to conference in the “safe” form of a Na- tional Executive statement.

On one issue, the few left-wing delegates appeared to make no headway with the majority: Labour coun- cils making cuts. Even del- egates who would insist that a future Labour gov- ernment make no cuts would not support Labour councils today defying cuts. And we heard terrible politics from the platform on benefits, asylum, busi- ness rate, army, cuts.

All in, some things are moving — too few, and too little, compared to the scale of the attacks on our movement, but those in the Labour Party who want to reassert so- cialist ideas have a little to show for that.

**Dale Farm concessions**

One of two legal cases brought against Basil- ion Council to stop the eviction at Dale Farm travellers site has forced some concessions.

The Council has to leave five pitches and several structures intact. As full “clearance” can no longer go ahead, it should seriously under- mine the stated intention of council’s eviction; to “return” the site to the green belt. That is a non- sense — the site was origi- nally a scrapyard. The outcome of an- other legal case chan- elling the entire evic- tion will be available be- fore October.

dalfarm. wordpress.com
By Theodora Polenta

ADEYD, the Greek public sector union organisation, has started a wave of occupations from 3 October.

Occupations are taking place in the ministries of economics, culture, agriculture and development, justice, and labour, and in town councils.

The Greek private sector union organisation, is already calling for a general strike on 19 October. The leader of ADEYD has denounced the Pasok government as sacrificing public sector workers and services to the financial speculators. “Our response will be a waves of strikes, occupations and demonstrations”, the leader of ADEYD said.

The Greek police have responded by arresting over 2,000 workers who turned up for the general strike.

On 5 October ADEYD and EPTK (the General Confederation of Greek workers) have just called for a 24 hour strike. Transport workers, journalists, state and public hospital workers, utility workers, tax collectors and others will join this strike.

The 5 October strikes, hand in hand with workers’ and students’ occupations, should be the start of a general general strike.

The “High Instance” [a sort of government advisory council] has declared that political publicity is forbidden — with or without democracy, but we will have to wait to see how real and solid this means.

The leader of ADEYD said: “Our struggle will carry on as long as their policies that push all Greek workers towards poverty and destitution carry on. The Pasok government is not saving our country, because our country is the Greek workers who are under attack.”

68 schools and over 97 universities are occupied against the government’s attacks on education. In particular, on 3 October a massive demonstration of students at the centre of Athens blocked all roads and analysed the traffic for hours, asking for more money to meet educational needs.

On 5 October George Papandreou has announced a 30% cut in public sector wages. Workers are not to be paid for 3 days, and a further 30% for a month.

The Greek government of “good intentions”, its numbers did not add up on the weekend of 2-3 October. The Greek deficit is expected to amount to 8.5% of GDP rather than the 7.6% reported by the Troika (EU, European Central Bank, IMF)

Now 30,000 workers in Greece’s public sector are to be cut. Each department will be prepared to wangle a list of 10% of workers “surplus to requirements”. About 8,000 workers will be “placed on hold” and have their wage reduced to 60% of its already reduced level (around 700 to 800 euros per month).

These workers “have the right” to apply for new jobs. But the minister has announced that for every ten workers leaving the public sector, at most one new job will be created.

In the elections, I think the Greek people will tend to support independent trade union candidates rather than parties.

I find that having a pluralist system is only a good thing. But the leader of the UTT is known to have a very bad, pro-Ben Ali past. How can someone like that claim to be able to represent people?

DIVIDING

It risks dividing workers into several organisations, but it’s important to establish a hegemony of a single union centre.

The leaders of the official union centre also have a bad past, and we should not join regional union offices, not the union centre, which led the revolution.

In the elections, I think that the UTT will tend to support independent trade union candidates rather than parties.
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The so-called US Tea Party is indeed “chilling” (Solidarity 219) — that using patience, sympathy and reasoning is the best way to help a child develop self-control, and an end to a “moral” viewpoint — I think she misses some points and overstates her case.

1. It is my experience (which is admittedly not vast) that primary school teachers want to be rational and sympathetic with children. That is not the picture Jayne paints. But the fact that teachers cannot always be responsive to individual children’s needs must be less to do with approaches to teaching and more to do with high class sizes — up to the 30 legal limit in many primary schools.

2. I think small children need something other than general guidance and “talking through” of problems. Children’s ability to reason and to understand the consequences of their actions for good or bad develops very gradually. Of course “talking through things”, explaining and reasoning by adults plays a central part of that process. And to not have that approach, especially with older children, is wrong, politically wrong even.

But what expect children to be able to reason and to clearly empathise is quite another matter. Empathising is an incredibly difficult “skill”. False expectations in a child’s ability to do these things may cause confusion and upset. Increasingly children are expected to abide by adult standards. In the criminal justice system there is a debate about lowering the “age of reason”; this, so that children can be prosecuted and locked up, for “criminal behaviour”. The argument that children should be expected to reason is a matter of convenience for the Right because embedded is the notion that children are “naturally” immoral. The Left should not make the same mistake.

3. Rules are good. Or rather clear and rationally framed rules and the consistent implementation of rules are good. They can “stand in” for moral moral knowledge and help guide children towards greater understanding and help them develop.

Potentially schools can do this sort of thing well — precisely because it is a community — and children can construe their own behaviour with that of other children. Of course, sensible and about keeping the school community safe and happy can be undermined by too many rules and petty rules. But again, it is not my experience that state primary schools do have lots of petty rules. Maybe it is different in faith schools.

4. The biggest issue I have with Jayne’s approach is the idea that schools can “fix” children’s behaviour that schools can “fix” children that children have at home. And surely it is a child’s relationship with their family and the experiences they have at home that leads to self-destructive and aggressive behaviour. That schools can “fix you up” is an idea that both the left and right think, obviously, from radically different points of view.

The biggest problem children have “at home” is poverty and there is no quick fix for that.

It seems incredible to me that there is a link between poverty and so-called bad behaviour in children. Love does not put food on the table and a child who has to eat out of a box of crisps for breakfast is a child who will feel insecure and unhappy.

Teachers who respond to children’s educational needs cannot substitute for a parent who is too stressed and disorganised by the harsh realities of life. To respond to all of a child’s emotional needs. In fact a teacher who gives a child a lot of attention may make that parent feel more powerless and unhappy about the struggles they face.

There are monumental missteps and the simplest and most effective one of these is smaller class sizes. That and to make schools more genuinely rooted in the “community” (e.g., as centres for lots of varied adult education).

More consistent application of liberal teaching methods (which most teachers do adhere to) would surely follow.

Cathy Nagent, south London

Tea Party threat to healthcare

The so-called US Tea Party is indeed “chilling” (Solidarity 219). If the next US president is a Republican, the Tea Party will move closer to power.

Obama’s health-care reforms will be rolled back. It will literally be “business as usual” as the health care companies boost their profits. The US health-care system was always pretty costly and less efficient than his right-wing supporters claim.

There is a serious threat for the UK, I think. As Tony cuts affect the NHS; further privatisation of health care will be presented to us as inevitable and the only way to deal with long waiting times for elective health care and the private health care venues waiting to chew off profitable chunks of the NHS.

The US Tea Party movement always described itself as grassroots. In fact, it’s more accurately called “astroturf”. In short, a fake grassroots revolution. It’s funded by millionaires, like the Tony Blair-backed “AstroTurf Wars” exposed the Tea Party very effectively. And yet many UK Tories admire the Tea Party.

The USA and UK are a genuine revolt of working people to save and improve health care for all. And that doesn’t mean more private health care either.

Graeme Kemp

Serge’s differences with Trotsky

Martyn Hudson thinks that Trotsky and Trotskyism have been reduced to a “New Labour” variant. I haven’t read enough about to judge. Did Trotskyists really accuse Serge of being an accomplice to the murder of the Tsar? But how could a man objecting to the rise of the Cheka? But how could a man objecting to the rise of the Cheka? Once I have read more about Trotsky, I think, that Trotsky was a combination of the Spanish POUM (the unified Marxist Workers’ Party, an anti-Stalinist, verbally revolutionary but in fact centrist formation), defending against Trotsky’s political questions. What does Martyn think of those criticisms? Isn’t it true that, by joining the bourgeois government in Catalonia, the POUM squandered the opportunity to lead the Spanish workers to victory, and handed over the revolution to its Stalinist hangmen? Wasn’t Serge’s defence of the POUM (against Trotskyist criticism, not against bourgeois-Stalinist repression) a serious lapse in political judgement? And while Serge was right to insist that, by the late 1930s, the Russian workers had lost power to a new ruling class, was he right about the roots of Stalinism in the pre-Stalin period?

Serge objected to the rise of the Cheka? But how could a revolution, plunge into civil war and ended in a dozen imperialisms, do without special police? He accepted the repression of the Kronstadt uprising as necessary, but thought it was symptomatic for the Spanish POUM (the unified Marxist Workers’ Party, an anti-Stalinist, verbally revolutionary but in fact centrist formation), defending against Trotsky’s political questions. What does Martyn think of those criticisms? Isn’t it true that, by joining the bourgeois government in Catalonia, the POUM squandered the opportunity to lead the Spanish workers to victory, and handed over the revolution to its Stalinist hangmen? Wasn’t Serge’s defence of the POUM (against Trotskyist criticism, not against bourgeois-Stalinist repression) a serious lapse in political judgement?

And while Serge was right to insist that, by the late 1930s, the Russian workers had lost power to a new ruling class, was he right about the roots of Stalinism in the pre-Stalin period?
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Seize the loot from the predators!

"Companies are sitting on huge cash reserves", reports a writer in the Financial Times (3 October). “In the US, for example, companies had $1,200bn (€980bn) stashed away in cash and short-term liquid investments at the end of last year”.

The banks, bailed out by governments in 2008, are sitting on even huger cash piles. Central banks anxiously stuff more and more cash into the commercial banks, hoping that this will ease up credit and stop a new sharp economic downturn. And yet global capitalism is on the brink of a new crash, and set for a long period of economic depression and high unemployment even if the new crash is avoided.

On 3 October the Greek government announced it would not meet its targets for cutting its budget deficit. Euro-leaders and the IMF will now decide whether Greece gets its next chunk of “bail-out” funds.

They will push the Greek government to agree even sharper cuts as a condition. On 2 October the Government said it would slash another 30,000 public service jobs in just the next two months.

The “bail-out” funds do not go to the Greek people. They go via the Greek government to banks which have lent the Greek government money and demand it back with interest.

The aim is as much to enable those banks to get their money back — and so arrange that if or when Greece finally does say it just can’t pay its debts, the cost is carried by Euro-rapean public institutions, ultimately by taxpayers, rather than by banks.

At the same time, a movement like Spain’s “real democracy” and Greece’s “indignant citizens” has burgeoned in the USA.

Occupy Wall Street” has been demonstrating in Zuccotti Park, near the global financial epicentre of Wall Street, in New York, since 17 September.

The movement demands “democracy, not corporatocracy”, and says: “We are the 99%, that will no longer tolerate the greed and corruption of the 1%, We are using the revolutionary Arab Spring tactic to achieve our ends…”

In Britain as in Greece and in the USA, services and jobs are being cut, wages are being kept down, and speed-up is being enforced at work, in order to keep feeding banks and big business with cash while keeping governments credit-worthy on the global financial markets.

To use the word thrown out by Ed Miliband in his Labour Party conference speech (27 September), the lives of millions are being cramped and ruined to feed the greed of economic “predators”.

The labour movement should mobilise against the predators.

The first step is to join strike movements like the 30 November strike against pension cuts, and demand they be extended into campaigns of rolling and selective action with the power and urgency needed to win.

The second step is to demand taxes on the rich. While Greek workers and pensioners suffer, rich Greeks have €600 billion in Swiss banks — more than enough to settle Greece’s debt repayments without trouble.

In Britain, while benefits, services and jobs are being slashed by cuts of £18 billion from benefits and £16 billion from education and other local services, over five years, just one thousand of the wealthiest people in the country hold a total of £400 billion, according to the Sunday Times Rich List.

Taxation alone would leave the ultra-rich, the predators, with the economic power that they so abuse.

The third step is to seize the wealth from them, and redirect it, under democratic control, to goals of social provision, improving services and jobs, and bringing social equality — rather than to profit, greed and exploitation.

Expropriate the banks. Take them into public ownership, and don’t leave them to be run by the same bankers with the same profit priorities, as in 2007-8, but establish democratic and workers’ control.

Expropriate the big corporations sitting on their cash piles, and redirect production, under workers’ control, to social aims.

The labour movement, currently fed only bland slogans like “close tax loopholes” and “a Robin Hood tax”, should demand a real debate on economic policies. We should set the aim not of a Lib-Lab coalition after Cameron has done his five years, and not of a Labour government which goes on from where Cameron left off, just softening it slightly, but of a workers’ government.

In other words, a government based on the labour movement, accountable to it, and pursuing the interests of the working class as Thatcher, Blair, Brown and Cameron have pursued the interests of the predators.

Is this as good as it gets? Women’s lot under capitalism

THE CASE FOR CLASS-STRUGGLE FEMINISM

Saturday 26 November
11.30-5.30, University College London, Gower St, London WC1E 6BT

Creche available • Evening social
Tickets: £10/5/2
Details: workersliberty.org/isthisasgoodasitgets
Tel: 07883 520852

• Women against cuts
• What kind of student women’s movement?
• Migrant women’s struggles
• Marxism and feminism
• Women in North Africa and the Middle East
• Fight for reproductive justice

Why you should be a socialist feminist: a series of discussion meetings

Coming to a town near you...

Jade Baker (NUS Women’s Committee, personal capacity) and other AWL women student activists will be speaking at college meetings in London, Hull, Liverpool, Leeds, Royal Holloway, Cambridge... Details: 07883 520852.
In July the Egyptian feminist and novelist Nawal El Saadawi visited London and spoke to Solidarity.

What opportunities have opened up for women as a result of the democracy movement; what are the problems?

The problems of the revolution in Egypt and the problems of women are connected...

Women have come to my home; even young members of the Muslim Brotherhood. They tell me we might differ on some things but we agree with you on many things.

I am still censored by the media after the revolution; but rape is a product of patriarchy. It gives more time for all parties to organise — including pro-Mubarak forces.

The [Parliamentary] elections are now pushed back to November/December. Is this a good thing?

Yes, while we were in Tahrir Square, some young men said to me: ‘even veiled women come to me. We are used to the veil. But when the mind is unvelled, that makes a change.’

We are only at the beginning of the revolution. We can’t change everything at once.

Were you present during the International Women’s Day events this year?

But the NGOs [backed by the Mubarak regime] are funded by the US and the EU: five women can start a NGO. They fragmented the feminist movement. The women’s movement was suppressed by Suzanne Mubarak and the ministers around her. We couldn’t have a NGO without the permission of government. We started the EWU again from Tahrir Square.

The problems of the revolution in Egypt and the problems of women are connected. The removal of Hosni Mubarak by the Egyptian army was a real trade union movement.

The veils become a habit, like make-up. They are used to the veil. But when the mind is unvelled, that makes a change.

Can we talk more about young women... in Egypt and elsewhere...

Among young women there is a concentration on rape, but rape is a product of patriarchy. It was the first one in Egypt to condemn Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) as a doctor. I lost my job.

I was censored by the New York Times because I linked sexual rape to capitalism and colonialism. Sexual rape is not separate from war. From capitalism.

Suzanne Mubarak, etc. They encouraged NGOs to fight FGM without mentioning social /economic mutilation. So that people won’t challenge that, they just fight against cutting girls.

I was not censored by the media after the revolution; but rape is a product of patriarchy. It was the first one in Egypt to condemn Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) as a doctor. I lost my job.

Our constitution is very backward. It creates conflict between Islam and Christianity. State /money /land have no religion.

We have to more or less free elections (as far as possible under capitalist society). To work toward real democracy and freedom, against free market democracy, which is false democracy.

What's the most important thing to do in Egypt now?

The most important thing is to have a secular constitution. One that says all Egyptians, men/women, Muslim /Christian, etc. are equal.

The most important thing now is to have a secular constitution. One that says all Egyptians, men/women, Muslim/Christian, etc. are equal.

The veil becomes a habit, like make-up. They are used to the veil. But when the mind is unvelled, that makes a change.

The constitution should be secular; we also need to change the family code. The removal of Hosni Mubarak by the Egyptian army was a real trade union movement.

The problems of the revolution in Egypt and the problems of women are connected. The removal of Hosni Mubarak by the Egyptian army was a real trade union movement.

The most important thing now is to have a secular constitution. One that says all Egyptians, men/women, Muslim/Christian, etc. are equal.

What opportunities have opened up for women as a result of the democracy movement; what are the problems?

The problems of the revolution in Egypt and the problems of women are connected...
Busworkers are among many groups of workers currently taking industrial action in Egypt

Strikes grow in Egypt

Despite attempts by Egypt’s military government to impose emergency laws, and despite its moves to extend its interim rule well into 2012, strikers in Egypt are becoming more assertive.

A common theme, according to the Cairo paper Al Ahram, is the demand that “Prime Minister Essam Sharaf honour his months-old promise to raise the minimum wage for all government employees to 700 Egyptian pounds” (£76) per month.

Not only the lowest-paid, but also groups like doctors and teachers, are below that.

As of Monday 3 October, bus drivers in Cairo, who have been in dispute since 17 September, were talking of running the buses for free, without collecting fares, as a new stage in their struggle.

They have demonstrated on the streets, and some have gone on hunger strike. On 27 September their union (parently one of the new independent unions, not one of the old state-run unions) announced a deal, but the drivers continued striking.

As well as wage rises, they demand an upgrade of the bus fleet, which they say is old and dangerous.

On Monday 3 October, also, professors and students at six universities demonstrated to demand the replacement of university administrators inherited from the Mubarak regime.

At Ain Shams, Alexandria, Assiut and other universities, professors have struck.

Egypt’s 1.5 million school teachers began a strike move on 17 September, demanding wage rises, the making permanent of tens of thousands of teachers on temporary contracts, and the sacking of the minister of education.

Some of them joined Cairo transport workers in a city-centre protest. As of late September, a significant minority of school teachers were still on strike.

Doctors in public health services struck and organised rallies and marches in September. As well as wage rises, they demand an increase in the public health care budget from three per cent of government spending to 15%. (In Britain in 2009-10, the Department of Health took 17% of government spending.)

In addition, Al Ahram reports that 4,000 workers at Ain Sokhna, Egypt’s only privately-owned seaport, struck from 21 September against the owner, DP World, and after four days won “a near-complete victory”.

Workers emerge

the rebel stronghold of Benghazi in March 2011, where he would have crushed the revolution, probably via a bloody massacre. Representatives of the “rebels” government, the National Transitional Council, lobbied the west to intervene.

Successful campaigning by the Western left to prevent NATO intervention would have flown in the face of the express wishes of the revolutionary movement itself, and resulted in a massacre in Benghazi which would have been a tragedy in itself but also an enormous defeat for the “Arab Spring” as a whole.

We didn’t oppose the intervention. We stressed that NATO could be given no overall political trust, but also that general opposition to NATO could not, in this specific instance, override more immediate political concerns.

NATO intervention in Libya has been of a different character to the 2003 war in Iraq or the 2001 invasion of Afghanistan. It was unlikely to resist in the occupation of Libya. It was a relatively limited action with limited goals.

The leadership of the NTC consists mainly of men from the Qaddafi regime who “jumped ship”, and many are going on the secular left during protests against Israel’s war in the future. There is already a Democratic Workers Party, which is an excellent development.

The most far-reaching of the uprisings so far has been in Libya.

Of course it is unusual in that its ultimate success was dependent on military intervention by NATO.

NATO intervention for sure prevented Qaddafi invading Libya

Events in Libya therefore constitute a revolution — so far, a political revolution which has removed the old regime; but also a revolution in the sense of a genuine mass uprising of the oppressed, deserving the support of socialists.

For sure, the possibilities for working class and socialist organisation in Libya now, and in the immediate future, are immensely greater than they were under Qaddafi. Those on the left who suggest (implicitly or explicitly) that the revolutionary movement is “reactionary” and should not be supported are utterly wrong.

Of course Western powers now seek to influence — even shape — whatever new government arises in Tripoli. But this isn’t true only of Libya.

Indeed, the general pattern is that the previous, pro-western regimes remain in power, and even after elections, the new governments are likely to be pro-western (which would be no less true of a Muslim Brotherhood government in Egypt). The outcome of events in Syria remains uncertain, and western governments are moving further in the direction of punitive — though not military — action against the extremely violent regime. But nowhere has there been a movement which has represented a serious challenge to Western hegemony.

That is not the significance of the “Arab Spring”: their significance is the emergence of new movements, and in particular the workers’ movement in Egypt.

An alternative to a pro-western economic policy is only beginning to emerge. In the past, the alternative — which was adopted by the regimes in Egypt and Syria (and in slightly different forms in Libya, Algeria, the former South Yemen, and Iraq) — was the model of the USSR (albeit in a rather diluted form). A thoroughly alternative to the neo-liberal policies which have shaped the region in recent decades — with wholesale privatisation, etc. — requires more than just opposition to “the west”, or western capital.

But challenges to neo-liberalism are already taking shape. In Egypt, at least one company that had been sold off to profiteers has been renationalised thanks to demands from below.

No doubt at present the sentiment behind such demands remains in a vaguely nationalist or Statalnoid framework; but it represents, also, a vital break with the recent past, and a foundation upon which a socialist economic policy can be forged — and with it a genuine, democratic, mass socialist movement.

Workers emerge
Predators? Demand and Unions Fight Them

By Martin Thomas

Myself, when I first read Ed Miliband’s Labour Party conference speech (27 September), I dismissed his attack on “predators” as an unmemorable empty throwaway remark.

I was wrong. If it was throwaway, then it was thrown away onto a terrain where it has been a stifling consensus in mainstream politics for decades to be “intensely relaxed about people getting filthy rich” (Peter Mandelson, 1998), and yet where now, with the crisis, millions can see that the drive for filthy riches has made society ever more cruel to the majority and economic life ever more destructive.

The “predator” line has reverberated in the media, and provides leverage for the theme which Solidarity and Workers’ Liberty have hammered at for the last year and a half: Make Labour fight! and unions fight them!

Predators? Demand Labour drive for filthy riches has made society ever more cruel to the majority and economic life ever more destructive. He retrospectively endorsed some of Thatcher’s measures in the 1980s.

However, the “ungenerous press” for Miliband’s speech has, in its own way, contributed to shifting the terms of mainstream political debate, bigging up Miliband’s anti-predator theme as more than he’d bargained for. Dugby Jones, former CBI chief and a government minister under Gordon Brown, described Miliband’s speech as a “kick in the teeth for the only sector that generates wealth, that pays the tax and creates the jobs this country needs.”

The Sun reported the speech this way: “Red Ed Miliband will vow today to take on big business as he declares the modern capitalist system’s failture”. It responded to Ed Miliband’s much-applauded line, “I’m not Tony Blair”, with the pithy sneer: “Ed Miliband on the modern capitalist system ‘a failure’.”

Benedict Brogan, in the Telegraph: Miliband’s “is a model for crushing enterprise in favour of expanding the state.”

Miliband counterposed capitalist “producers” (good) in modern capitalism the production is almost a sideline to the predation. Over a hundred years ago Frederick Engels wrote: “The capitalist has no further social function than that of pocketing dividends, tearing off coupons, and gambling on the Stock Exchange, where the different capitalists deposit one another of their capital.”

Top managers are part of the capitalist class, but production managers are the least well-paid and lowest-ranking sub-group of managers.

Right-wing writers like Simon Hetter in the Daily Mail cited the truth that in capitalism it is impossible to draw a neat line between production and predation. They used it to criticise the producing capitalists as “wealth-creators” (in fact, the workers they employ create the wealth) and to excise predation as a necessary minor sideline: “Miliband connected wealth-creators with Preston voters, adding the unfortunate truth that some people are both, and that the former depends on the latter.”

Alastair Darling, the last Labour Chancellor, was quoted in the Daily Mail and the Sun as backing the outcry: “If I build in a city centre am I good for investing or bad for speculating? Businesses are there to make money.”

On the other side of it, writers like Seanus Milne in the Guardian were enthusiastic about what they called the “most radical speech by a Labour leader for a generation.”

Whether or not the Labour movement in politics, should seek only damage-limitation under the rule of the market and profit-making, or whether it should move against at least some strands of prevailing ideology, is now an issue in mainstream politics. Socialists should apply leverage to that crack in the consensus. It may close again, but, with our efforts as the workplace, we can make a difference, we should strive to open it wider.

At one time it was fairly routine for leaders of Labour and similar parties vaguely to condemn profiteers. “Gnomes of Zurich”. Harold Wilson, 1956. “Squeeze rich under the props squarely” Denis Healey, 1978. At another time, during and for a while after the early 20th century era of repeated spasmic crisis, when even conservatives often said that capitalism might well not survive long, Labour leaders would sometimes make vague speeches about replacing capitalism, with some hope.

Since the 1990s attitudes like Darling’s or Mandelson’s have dominated. The bit in Miliband’s speech was a shift, not a revolution. It did not even mention the word socialism.

The last 30 years of capitalist organisations and then triumphant that has created a great cultural deadweight in politics. Even young, militant, street-activist movements tend to present themselves as only “indignant citizens”, or advocates of “real democracy”, or “democracy not corporatocracy”, or “another world” (underdefined). To both, we socialists must both advocate our ideas boldly, without being flattened by the deadweight, and seek leverage for those ideas in the cracks of a culture which has been flattened by the deadweight.

In history there are periods when decades of ideological evolution are condensed into months or weeks. Most of the time, though, decades take decades. Even the periods of rapid turmoil are based on previous slow evolutions.

Activists who came into political life in the early 1980s — as many of today’s labour-movement stalwarts did — will have a bias towards dismissing developments as not to be compared with that time. Their vision will still never be repeated. New events are what they are, not failed attempts to replicate past eras.

From the past, one of the most relevant experiences to learn from now is the advice that Engels gave to socialists in the USA in the 1880s. They were a small band, mostly German migrants who had been educated in socialist theory back in Germany, operating in a USA where even the most militant workers usually accepted free market economics.

Agitation developed around the idea of a two-state solution. Henry George, who argued that all social ills could be cured by taxation land.

Marc considered George “utterly backward” He understands nothing about the nature of surplus value”. In theoretical terms, his ideas were “a last attempt — to save the capitalist regime”.

Yet George’s book and the “sensation” it had stirred up were “significant because [they were] a first, if unsuccessful, attempt at emancipation from the orthodox political economy”. Engels argued that the socialists should explain George’s inadequacies, but not use that as an excuse to stand aside. They must use the “sensation” to gain maximum leverage for agitation and for pushing along the movement.

Physical threats and slanders: how the SWP treats other socialists

Young AWL members experienced first-hand some of the worst of the SWP’s political culture on the TUC demonstration in Manchester on 2 October.

An SWPer threatened to attack two AWLers (one male and one female) for being “Zionist racist.”

The SWP comrades, herself a young woman, had taken umbrage at the presence on an AWL stall of our pamphlet Two Nations, Two States: Socialists and Israel/Palestine and made several visits to the stall, each time with more fellow SWPers to back her up.

One “exchange” ended with her being dragged off by her friends after she had grabbed an AWLer by the shirt and screamed “I am going to punch you in the face, you racist idiot!”

It is perverse that the SWP, who like to see themselves as the left’s foremost champions of Palestinian rights, take such a hysterical attitude to the idea of a two-states settlement, when opinions are consistently shown that a majority of Palestinians themselves favour such a move.

Recent articles in Socialist Worker have sneered at the present settlement as “significant because [they were] a first, if unmemorable throwaway remark.”

“Business people have dominated. The bit in Miliband’s speech was a shift, not a revolution. It did not even mention the word socialism.”

But at the same time, decades take decades. Even the periods of rapid turmoil are based on previous slow evolutions.

Activists who came into political life in the early 1980s — as many of today’s labour-movement stalwarts did — will have a bias towards dismissing developments as not to be compared with that time. Their vision will still never be repeated. New events are what they are, not failed attempts to replicate past eras.

From the past, one of the most relevant experiences to learn from now is the advice that Engels gave to socialists in the USA in the 1880s. They were a small band, mostly German migrants who had been educated in socialist theory back in Germany, operating in a USA where even the most militant workers usually accepted free market economics.

Agitation developed around the idea of a two-state solution. Henry George, who argued that all social ills could be cured by taxation land.

Marc considered George “utterly backward” He understands nothing about the nature of surplus value”. In theoretical terms, his ideas were “a last attempt — to save the capitalist regime”.

Yet George’s book and the “sensation” it had stirred up were “significant because [they were] a first, if unsuccessful, attempt at emancipation from the orthodox political economy”. Engels argued that the socialists should explain George’s inadequacies, but not use that as an excuse to stand aside. They must use the “sensation” to gain maximum leverage for agitation and for pushing along the movement.
The markets strang e Greece

By Colin Foster

In capitalist booms, credit is easy. No-one wants to hold onto cash. The wealthy plough their cash into business, or lend it out on easy terms.

In slump or depression, the opposite happens. Everyone is nervous about lending or agreeing to deferred payments. Business financing hard to find.

This cycle is working itself through in a new capitalist world where there is no hard cash, only different forms of ticket to portions of future produce.

The pound coin is a ticket or token for an aliquot part of the future labour-time of capitalist production in Britain. A dollar or euro is a ticket or token for an aliquot part of the future labour-time of capitalist production in the USA.

These are “surer” tickets, directly and immediately exchangeable for actual goods and services unless the issuing government is in collapse, but tokens for commodities rather than commodities themselves.

The “entire history of modern industry shows that metal [i.e. precious metal, gold and silver coins, etc.] would be required only to settle international trade... it performed at home were organised...[In fact] even now no metal money is needed at home.”

For decades, the US dollar, not gold, has been the world money. The labour-time of capitalist production in the USA is sufficiently reliable, and sufficiently rich and varied in its produce, that tokens for it are accepted as the world standard for labour-time as represented by goods and services.

The dollar bill is a ticket or token for an aliquot part of the future labour-time of capitalist production in Britain. A dollar bill is a ticket or token for an aliquot part of the future labour-time of capitalist production in the USA.

US DOLLAR
These are “surer” tickets, directly and immediately exchangeable for actual goods and services unless the issuing government is in collapse, but tokens for commodities rather than commodities themselves.
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Greece's public protest (the banner reads “strike till victory!”)

They have got to keep playing and trying to beat the market, because there is nowhere safe to hide...

Th[e]s[e] ongoing massive growth of more and more sorts of financial products, more and more ways of holding wealth in a liquid (tradable) form. If financial market trading is everything, more and more diversity of things to trade will become the order of the day...

The fluidity of the markets brings more rigidity from the governments. Governments, more and more, aim economically at establishing their countries as good sites for quick-moving global capital, not as relatively-autonomous, relatively-integrated economic complexes. Keeping their currency as a valid, tradable token in global markets, and retaining their own creditworthiness as borrowers on those markets, are their first principles.

Thus the strange rush by governments, only a brief time after the big “keynesian moment” of 2008, to write balanced-budget laws into their constitutions. Thus the fact that Hungary and Latvia, which have suffered the worst slumps in Europe — worse than Greece — did not use their financial autonomy to let their currencies slip in value against the euro, but made their populations absorb all the pressure.

The financial world where there is no hard cash, only different forms of ticket to portions of future produce...

The world has become like a giant complex of PFI schemes. The future income from everything has already been sold to some financier, avid for a good profit.

He may already have sold the “ticket” to that future income on to someone else. It is now part of a dizzying multiple-refraction of financial operations.

Capital pressures to secure the future income, by as much pressure as it takes on forcing down wages, speeding up work, and cutting social overheads, to keep the whirligig going round.

Despite the huge discrediting of neo-liberalism in the 2008 crash, governments have become more, not less, aggressively neo-liberal in the years since then. Greece’s budget problems are tiny relative to the Eurozone Union economy, in real terms.

A modest transfer from richer EU countries, or an agreement by central EU institutions (not just an ad hoc European Financial Stability Fund) to open lines of credit for Greece, would remove the pressure for the destructive cuts.

So, of course, would a seizure of the 600 billion euros held in Swiss banks by wealthy Greeks.

But the neo-liberal political pressure, and nationalist kickbacks in many EU countries, are making both options unworkable. So Greece staggers from crisis to crisis, the only certainty being that the working people of Greece pay the cost.
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Greek police disperse protest (the banner reads “strike till victory!”)
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“Permanent revolution” was one of Leon Trotsky's outstanding contributions to Marxism. In many respects, to be a Trotskyist is to accept the basics tenets of permanent revolution.

In Russia in 1905 and again in 1917, Trotsky found the empirical grounds for uneven and combined development, which enabled him to grasp the dynamics of the Russian revolution and therefore to draw out the full political conclusions from the analysis. Trotsky's key arguments were that the Russian proletariat would be compelled to break the capitalist relations of production and make a socialist revolution from 1905. The translations in this book indicate that Trotsky’s synthesis forged in the heat of a revolution and add to our appreciation of his Marxism.

In 1905

The first article, “Up to the Ninth of January,” written before the massacre, concluded that terrorism would be overcome by “a mass of political strikes” and that the workers’ government would be compelled to implement working class demands, such as unemployment insurance and the like. The workers’ government would be compelled to take socialist means and make a workers’ democracy. In ‘‘After the Petersburg Uprising: What Next?’’ (20 January 1905), Trotsky reiterated his argument that the principal actor was the proletariat. In his ‘‘Introduction to Ferdinand Lassalle’s Speech to the Jury’’ (July 1905), Trotsky argued for a workers’ government that would be compelled to take socialist means and make a socialist revolution. In ‘‘Social Democracy and Revolution’’ (28 November 1905), Trotsky uses the term “permanent revolution” and the brilliant of Trotsky’s synthesis underpins the concept of that time: Marxist workers’ government and set about implementing a democratic programme, such as land reform, national self-determination and institute a republic. However, this socialist workers’ government would also have to implement working class demands, such as unemployment insurance and the eight-hour day, etc., because of its social base. As such the workers’ government would be compelled by the logic of the class struggle to go further and alter the social relations — effectively the working class would begin to break the capitalist relations of production and make a socialist revolution. This revolution would destroy European workers’ struggles, which would prevent the Russian workers state from being strangled.

The publication of Richard Day and Daniel Gaido’s book Trotsky and permanent revolution allows the English readers to read some of Trotsky’s first formulations of permanent revolution from 1905. The translations in this book indicate the brilliance of Trotsky’s synthesis forged in the heat of a revolution and add to our appreciation of his Marxism.

1905

Bloody Sunday, 1905 Russian revolution

In ‘‘Forword to Karl Marx on the Paris Commune’’ (December 1905), Trotsky spoke of “a revolution in permanence” and defined a workers’ government, government would be compelled to take socialist means and make a socialist revolution. In ‘‘Social Democracy and Revolution’’ (28 November 1905), Trotsky uses the term “permanent revolution”, or at least its semantic equivalent “uninterrupted revolution” for the first time.

In his ‘‘Introduction to Ferdinand Lassalle’s Speech to the Jury’’ (July 1905), Trotsky argued for a workers’ government that would be compelled to take socialist means and make a socialist revolution. In ‘‘Social Democracy and Revolution’’ (28 November 1905), Trotsky uses the term “permanent revolution”, or at least its semantic equivalent “uninterrupted revolution” for the first time.

In his ‘‘Introduction to Ferdinand Lassalle’s Speech to the Jury’’ (July 1905), Trotsky argued for a workers’ government that would be compelled to take socialist means and make a socialist revolution. In ‘‘Social Democracy and Revolution’’ (28 November 1905), Trotsky uses the term “permanent revolution” and at least its semantic equivalent “uninterrupted revolution” for the first time.

In his ‘‘Introduction to Ferdinand Lassalle’s Speech to the Jury’’ (July 1905), Trotsky argued for a workers’ government that would be compelled to take socialist means and make a socialist revolution. In ‘‘Social Democracy and Revolution’’ (28 November 1905), Trotsky uses the term “permanent revolution” and at least its semantic equivalent “uninterrupted revolution” for the first time.
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Organising for 30 November

By Liam McNulty, Cambridge AWL

Trade unionists in Cambridge have taken the first steps in coordinating the strike action they will be taking place on 30 November by establishing a county-wide cross-union strike committee.

The committee involves activists from unions taking action in both the Cambridge and District and Huntingdon Traders Councils.

The initiative came from a joint motion from Unison Cambridge County Branch, the county’s largest trade union, and the PCS Customs and Revenue Branch, which was debated at a recent Trades Council meeting.

Steve Sweeney of Hunt- ingdon and St. Neots Trades Union spoke to Solidarity in a personal capacity. He said: “The committee was an important step in the fight against the Con-Dem coalition and will arm the movement in the struggles to be won or lost in one day. We will not wake up on 1 November with the Tories conceding defeat. It is essential that the strike is democratically controlled by the rank-and-file and that is the essence of the strike committee. We need to raise the political level and understand the nature of the pensions assault in the context of the crisis of capitalism. The action can be a galvanising point for major workplaces and new direct issues into the Trades Council. The strike committee can help the Trades Council and labour movement become the central point in the anti-cuts struggle, arming blocks with the ideas to advance the struggle.”

“Building blocks are in place and the idea is for the strike committee to extend beyond November. The first meeting was a positive step with many new faces from different unions. We discussed the day itself and agreed that there should be a march and rally in Cambridge with feeder marches from major workplaces such as Addenbrooke’s Hospital and Shore Hall. While these are important as a show of strength and solidarity, the goal was to organise a meeting on the day of the strike. The purpose of this was for a rank-and-file meeting discussing the polices of the strike and the way forward, accepting motions rather than a top down style meeting with the usual faces repeating mantra phrases.”

“The strike committee will see increased solidarity from other unions and will be a forum for debate and sharing of ideas. Branch union committees will feed into the cross-union strike committee, which will meet fortnightly, and vice-versa. There is a long time between now and 30 November, but Cambridge trade unionist have started organising for the future struggle.”

The Cambridgeshire plans are a positive model for the labour movement to follow. They establish a structure through which rank-and-file trade unionists can provide a counter-weight to the union bureaucracy, and a forum in which ideas about how to fight to win beyond 30 November can be discussed. This model has the potential to transcend the disconnected, “next-big-day” approach (26 March, then 30 June, then 2 October, then 30 November…), and create strategies to win this battle.

The labour movement in other parts of the country should take note.

Tube pay vote

By a Tubeworker supporter

All four trade unions on London Underground – ASLEF, RMT, TSSA and Unite – are recommend- ing their members accept the company’s latest offer: 5% (i.e. RPI minus 0.5%) this year, followed by RPI+0.5% (minimum 2%) for the next three years.

A meeting on 4 October of workplace representa- tives of the largest union, RMT, voted that the union should hold a referendum recommending acceptance.

Workers’ Liberty mem- bers in the meeting argued and voted against recom- mending acceptance, point- ing out that signing up to a four-year deal meant the owners of the company would have extra time to outsource and privatise workplaces.

Members of the Socialist Party voted to accept the deal, arguing that not fighting over pay would better enable the union to fight more vigorously on the next battle. This is typical of the SP’s “marcha socialismo”; the big fight is always the next one.

While it is disingenuous that reps did not feel that members had sufficient confidence to take on management over pay at this time, the fact that the RMT went through a democratic process is encouraging.

If such channels of rank-and-file democracy can be built on and expanded, it will help de- velop members’ confidence for future bat- tles, those coming up on jobs and conditions.

Lecturers begin action

By Padraig O’Brien

Members of the lecturers’ union UCU in pre-1992 insti- tutions will begin their industrial campaign against proposed changes to their pensions scheme, the Universities Superannuation Scheme ( USS), on Monday 10 Oc- tober.

The campaign involves an escalating series of ac- tions, beginning with a work-to-rule and moving to a work-to-rule and moving to a rolling strike action. The action is dis- allowed by an assessment by the Education and Employers inspectorate of UCU members taking part in the action, intended to apply maximum pressure to the union, rather than calling a single day, or isolated sing- le days, of protest strikes is positive. But the unions need to use that pro- gramme of action to fight for better, concrete de- mands rather than the vague call on members to enter into further negotia- tions on USS reform.

UCU branches must also urgently reach out to Unison, Unite and GMB (which organise “lower- paid academics and university” workers) to make sure members of those unions are not left behind or lured into action by UCU members taking part in the action.

At least 30,000 people, and probably more than that, demonstrated against the Tory party conference in Manchester in the labour movement’s staging-post mobilisation before the 30 November strikes.

Unite and GMB, unions which did not participate in the 30 June strikes, had particular significant mobilisations. Like the 26 March “March for the Alternative”, the Manchester demonstration had the feel of having mobilised people beyond the usual left-activist layers.

Young people, families, and local anti-cuts campaigns were well represented on the demonstration.

Southampton out again

By Darren Bedford

Southampton local gov- ernment workers will be back on strike from Thursday 6 October, marking the three-month point in their battle with council bosses over pay cuts.

Over 1,000 workers – members of Unison and Unite – will walk out, de- manding the reversal of contractual changes made in July which have seen some workers suffer pay cuts of up to 15%.

The strikers include Unison members working in social care, and Unite members across a range of council occupations.

The strike day will in- clude a march and rally, as well as a mass meeting for workers to discuss and plan further action.

Unison branch secretary Mike Tucker said: “After three months of enforced pay cuts, Unison members remain determined to con- tinue the fight for the re- ductions to be reversed.”

“We want to know how much their pay has been reduced while Council members have not pro- ject proposals to reduce their own allowances.”

Poverty pay in Cameron’s Britain

Nearly 10% of care work- ers earn illegally low wages, new research by academics at King’s Col- lege London has revealed.

Researchers estimate that up to 200,000 workers in that sector alone are paid below the minimum wage in a figure five times higher than official government estimates which claimed that less than 30,000 workers were paid below the statutory minimum.

Even the top minimum wage of £6.08 is not enough to live on. A report yesterday, studying alongside news from food charity FareShare that its demand was increased by over 5,000 a day since 2010.

The picture is a tragic but crystal clear one: the Coalition government’s policies are worsening poverty and food shortages for thousands of working- class families.
A New York public sector worker and member of the US socialist group Solidarity reports on the round-the-clock protests at New York's financial centre.

For the past week most of my coworkers and activist networks have been talking about “Occupy Wall Street” (OWS) constantly. There’s definitely a buzz, and it extends beyond the “usual suspects” of New York’s progressive left scene.

I went down to OWS on Thursday [29 September] (while the “grievances” were being debated) and again on Saturday [1 October], towards the end of the attempt to march across the Brooklyn Bridge.

With the arrests of more than 700, according to the New York Times, it seems like the City is taking a gamble that this will be enough to drive away the protest. With the way this has been growing in the past week, it seems like this may actually back-fire.

Ten days ago it was still relatively small, and even more white and young and male than it is now. My impression was that the Ad Busters folks that were so central to initiating OWS hadn’t done much outreach to the NY activist community, and very little — if any — to organisations of people of colour here in the City, whose communities have of course been hardest hit by the recession, compound- ing already dire situations.

On Saturday 24 September, the NYPD arrested — and pepper sprayed — about 85 people, and OWS grew significantly since.

The rally on Friday 30 September was perhaps bigger than some of the larger rallies organised against budget cuts back in June — at least several thousand. And those June rallies were organised by the major unions, having been planned months ahead of time.

**GROWING**

In addition to growing in numbers and racial diversity, it became clear the protest is developing some more political clarity in both what it identifies as problems and the objectives it hopes to achieve.

However, it also appears that these efforts to solidify some common “grievances”, demands or strategies are very inconsistent.

For example, the initial proposed “grievances” being debated on Thursday evening began with, “As one people, formerly divided by race, gender, sexuality...” The intent was to envision ourselves in a post-social (and perhaps post-revolutionary) society, but this wasn’t well received.

A small group of women of colour objected to that language “As one people, despite divisions of race, gender sexuality...” and then the phrase was dropped altogether, re-placed with, “As one people, united, we acknowledge the reality that the future of the human race requires the cooperation of its members.”

There have also been some concerns raised about the lack of acknowledg- ment that the slogan “take back America” igno- res the fact that it was stolen from indigenous people here who begin with. One anecdotal report I heard was that when an older Black activist tried to approach some of the lead- ers about developing more specific demands, the re- sponse was somewhat dis- missive, re-focusing on the “crimes of the banks” and away from the day-to-day needs of those struggling to survive the effects of those “crimes” (or for more accurately, the larger crisis of capitalism).

It seems that if OWS is to continue to grow and engage the working class of New York, it will need to develop some more con- structive ways to engage with the organisations of people of colour in the City — and there’s some reason for being hopeful.

A loose coalition of the city’s public sector unions, and the larger of the com- munity groups, has cre- ated a “Strong For All Coalition” in support. They are planning a rally in solidarity.

John Samuelson, Presi- dent of TWU Local 100 (representing most of the mass transit workers), appeared on [television] on Thursday night in support of OWS.

In addition to the unions, some of the most militant, base-building and direct-action focused com- munity groups area are also participating.

Lifting the ante in this struggle and achieving measurable gains will re- quire more than crowds... it will require the focused activity of significant layers of the organised work- ing classes, that have the roots and the experience to help leverage the power that is being built against the establishment here and nationally.

Even if we don’t get concrete wins, this will have been a huge im- portant protest for New York and the country, but there is a potential for it to be concretely effec- tive as well, and I hope we can help it get there.

Reprinted from solidarity-us.org

---

**Fight for useful work at BAE!**

By Stephen Wood, Hull AWL

A retained fire service station in Brough, East Yorkshire, which is re- sponsible for the fire safety of 26,000 people, could close as part of the consequences of huge job losses at the local BAE Systems aero- space plant.

The station is staffed by BAE workers trained as retained fire fighters. The Fire Brigades Union is de- manding talks with BAE management about the station’s future.

BAE, which was at one point Brough’s largest em- ployer, is axing 75% of its workforce as part of the nation-wide job losses of 3,000. The Brough site manufactures the Hawk Jet, which is largely used as a training aircraft by militaries worldwide.

BAE is currently bidding for a £5 billion contract to build 500 new jets for the US military, it appears these many now be manu- factured in North Amer- ica.

BAE’s plan for Brough would leave just 400 workers research and development at the site. Of the 900, which in- cludes people with 30 years of history in aircraft engineering as well as appren- tices who had worked at the plant for just three weeks, can look forward to the dole queue.

The job losses demon- strate capitalism’s con- tempt for workers’ lives.

A loose coalition of the public sector unions, and the larger of the com- munity groups, has cre- ated a “Strong For All Coalition” in support. They are planning a rally in solidarity.

John Samuelson, Presi- dent of TWU Local 100 (representing most of the mass transit workers), appeared on [television] on Thursday night in support of OWS.

In addition to the unions, some of the most militant, base-building and direct-action focused com- munity groups area are also participating.

Lifting the ante in this struggle and achieving measurable gains will re- quire more than crowds... it will require the focused activity of significant layers of the organised work- ing classes, that have the roots and the experience to help leverage the power that is being built against the establishment here and nationally.

Even if we don’t get concrete wins, this will have been a huge im- portant protest for New York and the country, but there is a potential for it to be concretely effec- tive as well, and I hope we can help it get there.

Reprinted from solidarity-us.org

---

**Block the Bridge**

**Block the Bill**

Westminster Bridge, Sun 9th October

The Coalition government’s Health and Social Care Bill, which drastically pushes forward privatisation and marketisation in health care, has its second reading in the House of Lords on 11 October.

Some Lib Dem peers are likely to move more amendments. UK Uncut has called a demonstration on Sunday 9 October, planning to block Westminster Bridge, between St Thomas’s Hospital and Parliament, in protest against the Bill.

On 4 October nearly four hundred doctors and public health experts published a letter in the Daily Telegraph opposing the Bill and declaring that it “will do irreparable harm to the NHS, to individual patients and to society as a whole”.

More: bit.ly/occt-bridge