NO ROOM FOR ASIANS? RUBBISH!
NO ROOM FOR RACISM

LISTEN POWELL!
The Tory Government and the bosses it serves now desperately need all the help you can give. We have - so far - thwarted its plans, and defeated it again and again. We have driven it from office before long.

WE? The working class. The men and women of all creeds and colours who do the work in Britain, who man the factories, drive the trains, clean the streets, erect the buildings, care for the sick in hospitals, build the ships and load and unload them, stoke the furnaces and dig the coal. "We", the real people of Britain, the "Lower classes", on whose backs your class stands.

Uganda Asians as another chance to whip up racist hysteria in Britain. Wrapped in the cloak of a far-seeing "patriot", a man who speaks for the "People", your service to the bosses is in fact to get the Tories off the hook by dividing worker against worker, while against black, to deflect the anger of the working class, to head off its discontent and to pit our ranks against another, to our common injury and to the benefit of your class.

Your message is the sick message of hatred and division. In the name of averting a "national catastrophe" you want to promote a working class catastrophe - that of racial conflict. You harvest race hatred and you sow it. You have become the prophet of a race war which you do your best and worst to set alight.

After your 1968 speeches, fascist organised "anti-black" demonstrations, and racist gangs look to assaulting black workers and youths - IN YOUR NAME. That, Powell, is where you link arms with the Mosleyites and the National Front, that sick and obstinate gang of naff, of Hitler-lovers who get their kicks from hatred of blacks and Jews, and who want to destroy the trade unions and labour movement.

That is why you are one of the most dangerous enemies of the British working class - black and white - right now. You are the carrier of a disease of racism that could ravage the working class and cripple its ability to go on standing up to the attacks of Heath's Government.

You are also the biggest fraud and con-man in the whole Tory Party. You are a shameless, habitual, barefaced liar. AND WE CAN PROVE IT.

YOU SAY: Immigration equals national catastrophe. Why? Now? For whom? Immigrants to any healthy society are an asset and a "bonus". They are fully grown, educated (and they are educated) and capable of working, whereas additions to the population by natural increase need years of education, care and social benefits.

You play on the fears and the insecurity of workers under capitalism. But you, Powell, are a fanatical defender of capitalism and enemy of socialism, which is the real solution to the problems of the working class.

You are a foremost exponent of the "lame duck" philosophy. You believe in the "free market" even if it means 3 million unemployed. You care nothing for the working class or for the effects of capitalism.

You are against the Trade Union, you were a minister in a Tory government whose every anti-working class act you supported.

You are no "friend of the ordinary man". No - you have nothing but a spiv's contempt for the working class.

You have one concern only - to divide our class on the basis of skin colour, to cripple us in the real fight. Keeping out immigrants will not solve unemployment or any other problem: if workers listen to you, they will be less.

CONTINUED PAGE 2

DOCKS:
30-HOUR WEEK IS THE ONLY ANSWER

In this case go not to him but to the dockers themselves. And, if the promises of Jones-Aldington are kept, this will be true.

The point however is that it is also the ordinary docker, and not Jack Jones or any other union bureaucrat, who will carry the Cross.

The settlement does little or nothing to staunch the flow of jobs away from the ports. Its intention is to quieten the ordinary dockers by a few concessions, while the bosses continue to reorganise the industry at the dockers' expense.

It is vital that portworkers understand why and how Jones and the bosses were able to head off their revolt, and outflank the militants of the National Ports Port Stewards Committee.

CONTINUED PAGE 2
To read the papers these days, you'd think this country was threatened with a plague—all because the 50,000 people who on average emigrate from the country every year will now be replaced by a like number with a different skin colour.

But the disease which really threatens is the disease of racialism.

Whenever some crisis erupts anywhere in the world, and the first dealings of British nationals arrive home, there is every outcry about the jobs that our own people will take up, or any talk of the same problems entailed in their moving. Often these people will have no more to do with their home place than they are, of course, white. And that, to the racialism-mongers, is all.

They know, and anyone knows, that people create jobs as well as doing them; that they build houses as well as living in them; that they staff schools and hospitals, as well as using them; that they pay taxes no matter where they come from.

What is wrong with this country is not that it needs more people of different colour and at all of what colour they are, but the people who run it for their own narrow greed. It is the system they use to squeeze their profits out of the rest of us. It is a system in which the number of jobs is not determined by social need but by the need to keep profits high. If there were a million less working people in Britain today, it would not solve the unemployment situation. Demand would still be lower, and unemployment quite probably just as high. Remember the '30s? Population a good deal less than now, hardly a face on the street. And massive unemployment.

All the 'horrors', all the false talk of 'remote politicians who don't know the real problems' is nothing but pure racialist demagogy—and what is more, sheer distraction can there be when the working classes are running the Tories' vicious policies back down their throats, one by one.

More convenient, too, that the press and the right-wing politicians can cover up their own racism with that of General Amin. They can utilise his bigotry usefully—yet they endorse his stare by speaking of the Asians as if they were non-people. Anyhow, the Sun even went to the nauseating point of showing up awardsawwoometowns of this.

But how did all those Asians come to be in Uganda in the first place?

The answer to that question is quite illuminating—particularly of Britain's part in the affair.

When British imperialist first seriously began to grab African territory, it was not with any ready foot on the part of the Empire. Large numbers of Indian labourers and technicians trained already in Britain's industrial discipline, were brought over from East Africa to build the railway—which was necessary to provide the flow of raw materials. They were encouraged to become intermediaries between the ruling British and the Africans, and results forced them into commerce where, because foreign trade was controlled by Britain, they continued to act as middlemen.

When the movement grow for independence, the Indians were still in the middle, and often the Africans' blusters at imperialism fell on them as the nearest and most vulnerable target. In 1958 they suffered from boycotts and physical attacks.

When Uganda became independent in 1962, although large numbers opted for Ugandan citizenship, many remained in the city, and known to us as 'POWELL (cont.)

able to right unemployment, instead of at least a real cause they will start attacking each other.

You are not the exponent of a cure for our lives: you are an ulcerated carrier of the disease—capitalism—which afflicts British society.

YOU SAY Britain is overcrowded. But what about the thousands who LEAVE the country every year?

YOU SAY that immigrants differ in cultural background. Yes, we do. (Do the Welsh, English, Scots and the large numbers of European workers in Britain differ here after the war.) But not nearly so much as nothing to the wealth of the society, to the wellbeing of the majority of its people.

50,000 coloured immigrants who work for just as much as one year (and they do work) will contribute much more to the common wealth than the British people than will the whole gaggle of spivs and parasites that make up the ruling class during all the natural lives of a whole useless generation of us.

Black workers have more right to live in this country than all the mixed-in-bred 'white Britons'. You and I and the like of you, Reginald Maudings, the Arnold Winters, the Black countrymen and the Enoch Powells—they have earned that right through hard work. And, may I say, no one perhaps can help us 'us' make it really Black Britain. We are one of the bands of rats like you.

In 1960 some of these workers joined with fascists in supporting us. Since then the working class has felt its own strength, it has got a clearer picture of its real enemy now for a long time past. It has the experience of a series of victories, millions of them, with tens of thousands of Black and Asian workers.

Many militants must and will rally to protect our black brothers if the fascist gang and back-binders of '68 once again try to use the "respectable" cover you provide to attack blacks and Asians.

This whole time working class militants, black and white, can create defences against this fascist onslaught. A few honest fascistniks backs into the sewers from which you encourage them to emerge.

If they don't, they are allowing us, Powell, and your class, to implant a wound on the working class which can turn septic.

With all our hearts, we, working class militants from the port and steel town and the inner-city backstreet, will fight to right it out and, wipe, out the racistolent your poison for ever.

The black workers are our brothers in the struggle of the working class and the colonial and liberation, the smart gutter rat that you are, are one of the most useful representative elements of everything we are struggling against.

Tomorow
Editor, Real Steel News
Harold Youd
Editor, The Hook
by John Cunningham

Two months ago, Ceylon declared itself a "Free Sovereign Republic" and changed its name to Sri Lanka. Despite the fine sounding title, it is doubtful whether the 16,000 political prisoners (whose trials began 12 June) consider Sri Lanka free, in any sense of the word.

These people have been imprisoned without trial for over a year for their part in the revolutionary insurrection of April 1971. It is worth taking a closer look at the "Free Sovereign Republic of Sri Lanka," for, when the facade is removed, a mass of poverty, corruption, and oppression is revealed.

For example:

During 1971/72 the armed forces were expanded from 14,000 men to approximately 45,000.

The police force was doubled.

Under the state of emergency declared on 15 March 1971 and still in force, freedom of speech, assembly, and publication have been suspended and workers are at a standstill.

Police and military have the right of arrest on suspicion.

One out of every 4.4 million an estimated 700,000 unemployed.

What caused this island to explode into revolutionary upheaval in 1971, followed by a wave of repression?

To understand, it is necessary to go back many years. Ceylon was brought under British rule at the beginning of the 10th century. British missionaries found its own answer to this problem: many thousands of Tamil "coolies" from Southern India were transported to Ceylon to provide cheap labour for the plantations.

The Introduction of huge numbers of foreign workers into the country had a two-fold purpose. It provided enormous profits for British imperialism in Ceylon, and at the same time the ruling class used the difference between Tamil and Ceylonese to "divide and rule". The large-scale introduction of tea in the 1880s, replacing coffee which had been ravaged by plant disease, led to the development of monopoly control of the plantations because only monopolies could afford the huge sums needed to start the plantations. The capital, and therefore the control, was British. To this day the two major companies in Ceylon are both British, Brooke Bond and Lipton. The control of the imperialist country does not stop there - marketing, selling, and distribution are almost completely in the hands of British capitalists.

There are only two other crops of importance in Ceylon, rubber and coconuts. Together with tea they make up 90% of Ceylon's export earnings. The important point to note is that the world demand for these three products has been declining for years. The country, dominated by foreign interests and capital, has never been allowed to encourage diversity.

Consequently Ceylon's economy has deteriorated over the years to the point where it has a massive foreign debt. As always when the economy runs down, it is the working class who suffer. Wages have been kept down, unemployment has been rising steadily for years, and share prices. To add to this corruption in Government circles is rife - even more so than in this country! Government departments concerned with public welfare have consistently underperformed while the only Government department to actually exceed its budget in 1971/2 was the ministry of defence.

This framework of corruption, unemployment and exploitation produced the insurrection of 1971. On 15 March 1971, the Ceylonese cabinet - representing a coalition of left-wing parties, including the pro-Moscow Communist Party and a party which used to be revolutionary, the LSPP - announced that a "pilot" to overthrow the Government had been discovered.

Poverty and Terror in Ceylon

Set up by Britain, armed by Russia and China

ANGELA'S PARTY

Angela Davis became for millions of Afro-Americans the symbol of black resistance. Her association with embattled militant groups like George Jackson and Rachel Magee, struggling in the toils of a savage, murderous, and relentless legal system, seemed to point to a real substance behind the mass media figure.

But there was always something odd. What was she doing in the U.S. Communist Party? That party is one of the most corrupt and unrepentant Stalinist parties in existence. Automatic sympathy and support for the members of this party victimised by McCarthyism cannot erase from our memories its gruesome history. And Angela Davis cannot realistically be accused of having acquainted herself with that history. Her seeming endorsement of the trials and persecution of dissident C'Tech commentators show that she was not only aware of it, but accepted it.

It is the history of a party which in the 1930s attained mass influence in the newly organised unions and could have taken the whole American labour movement at least to the point of a mass workers' party based on the unions with socialist Communist influence. Instead it supported the Democratic Party, the party of the racist Dixicrats. Instead of building and educating a rank and file militant movement in the unions it allied with bureaucrats and even trade union gangsters until its very substantial influence in the CIO was merely another faction of the increasingly corrupt trade union establishment.

In the Second World War the CP supported the government fanatically: it supported the bombing of "unfriendly" countries and demanded the "liquidation" of all "Socialist" (but anti-imperialist) Communist groups. Today it has seen serious revival, and is a hard-line Moscow-oriented party of the counter-revolution of Czechoslovakia. Running a token Presidential candidate, in practice it supports the "liberal" (but anti-communist) McGovern.

On black struggles, the CPUSA had a magnificent record in the 1950s. Its support for the popular revolt of the Russian Revolution, it raised fearfully, for the first time, the right and duty of socialists to cry continued on p.7
Joe Wright examines the past and present of the whiteman in Africa

As can be seen from the following text, the author discusses the history and current state of European influence in Africa, particularly focusing on Britain's role in the transatlantic slave trade and its impact on African societies. The text also touches on the colonization of West Africa by Britain and the continuation of European influences in contemporary Africa.

TOBESOLD&LET BY PUBLIC AUCTION.
ON MONDAY the 18th of M.i., 1899.

BY KNOX.
THE THREE FOLLOWING SLAVES.

For Sale, at Auction, at the Bank of England, NS.


BETWEEN A slave auction.

The slaves were purchased from African men in the Sahara - the merchant and kings of the African king - here. They were loaded on the slave ships, packed in spaces of foot long boxes, bayonet, chained together. About 201 of the slaves died on the passage.
In similar fashion to nationalist myths are created around all the various peoples that were at pains to glorify the glories of their tribalities. In a similar way, the soldiers of the British army, when they harass the colonial peoples, are seen as the heroic protectors of the last remaining hope for the future of the colony. This is a common theme in the history of colonialism, where the actions of the colonizers are often seen as necessary and heroic, even when they are actually oppressive and violent.

This is a reminder of how dangerous it is to romanticize the past and how important it is to critically examine historical narratives. The complexity of the past cannot be reduced to simple narratives of good and evil, and it is important to remember that the actions of the past can have long-lasting consequences for the present.

**Joshua Francis**

Two years ago Joshua Francis, a human rights activist, was shot dead by a group of unknown assailants in the streets of London. His work on behalf of the Black Panthers in the United States had earned him a reputation as a determined and fearless activist. His death was a blow to the movement, and it shocked the world.

The funeral was held in London, and the streets were lined with mourners. The day was marked by a rally in Trafalgar Square, where thousands of people came together to honor Joshua's memory and to protest against the violence that had claimed his life.

The murder has sparked a wave of activism, with many calling for justice and for an end to the violence that continues to claim lives in the United States. Joshua's legacy lives on, as his work continues to inspire those who fight for justice and equality.

It may or may not be true that "The Ragged Traversed Philanthropists" was, an Alan Stillcase says in an introduction to the paperback edition, "the book that won the '45 election for Labour". It is certain that the book is no more than that.

It is a novel that argues against capitalism and for socialism - not for capitalism plus a few reforms of the Labour Party. The author - Robert Tressell, a housepainter who died, aged 40, in 1911 - writes about the sort of life by knew, among the working class in the early days of this century.

For picture of that life, it is vivid, critical but not contemptuous, brilliant in much passages as the account of "The Beano meeting". It is not simply an exposé, it also contains an explanation of why the hardship and lack of dignity in that life were necessary, and why.

In one chapter, for example, Owen, the socialist central character, explains to three of his working class friends why he works for Capitalism - exploits the working class. It is worth re-reading with an understanding of his argument, still fresh and relevant today.

EXPLOITATION

"These pieces of bread represent the raw materials which exist naturally in and on the earth in such unproductive use. I say, "I represent the landlord and capitalist class. That is to say, all these raw materials belong to me. I do not matter their character or quantity. They are mine and mine to dispose of by my will at my pleasure." Now you represent the Working Class: you have nothing."

But before we go any further, it is important to point out that the number that are not supposed to be merely 'a capitalist', I represent the whole Capitalist Class. You are not supposed to be just three workers - you represent the whole Working Class."

Owen proceeded to cut up one of the pieces of bread into a number of little square blocks. "These represent the things which are produced by labour, aided by machinery, from the raw materials. We will suppose that these pieces of these blocks represent - a week's work. We will suppose that a week's work is worth - one product, and we will suppose each of these halfpennies is one pound."

Owen now addressed himself to the working classes as represented by Philpot, Harlow and Easterby. "I am going to invest all my money in various industries, so as to give you Plenty of Work. You will each be paid of your daily money's worth per week, and a week's work is - you must each produce these three square blocks. For doing this work you will each be paid of your wages; the money will be your own, to do as you like with, and the things you produce will of course be mine, to do as I like with."

"As soon as the Working Class had done a week's work, Owen paid their wages."

These blocks represent the necessities of life. You are to live without these things, but as they belong to me, you will have to buy them from me; my price for these blocks is paid for them."

As the working classes were in need of the necessities of life, and as they could not eat, drink or wear the useless money, they were forced to sell their labour to the capitalist's terms. They each bought back and at once consumed one third of the produce of their work.

The process was repeated several times: for each week's work the producers were paid their wages. They kept on working and spending their earnings. The kindhearted capitalist consumed twice as much as any of them and his pile of wealth continually increased. In a light at the end the book is about 1000 pound, and the working classes were still in the same condition as when they began. In the '45 election he was returned, and increased his farm workers as his life as if their lives depended on it.

Then the capitalist, just after having sold a poor class to its next of their workers, suddenly took their tools - the Machinery of Production - away from them, and informed them that he, as owing to Production, all his stonewashed would not be able to keep with the necessities of life, he decided to close down the works.

The unemployed began to abuse the kind-hearted capitalist, demanding that he should give them some of the necessities of life that he had called in his warehouses, and even threatened to take something by force if he did not comply with their demands. But the kind-hearted Capitalist told them not to be insolent, added to them about honesty, and said that if they were not careful he would have their faces battered in for them by the police.

SOCIALISM

The basic element in the abolition of this exploiting class revolutionary party, which would bring the means of production - is clearly indicated.

But: "If you wish to see these things done away, you must take part in the vote for Labour and Liberal and Tory sweaters, shareholders of companies, lawyers, aristocrats, manufacturers, capitalists, and the House of Commons with Revolutionary Socialists."

The flaw in this conception - and the flaw in the whole conception - is that the achievement of socialism is seen almost entirely in terms of votes and Parliament. "The Ragged Traversed Philanthropists" frequently shows the socialist Owen in situations where he feels like losing hope. And it wouldn't be an accurate account of the life of a socialist if it didn't include these situations.

But what way to renew hope? The light snow that often falls over the trees, and the cover of one of his workmates, who has been keeping quiet up to then, is in fact very likely to be a socialist. "In the Spring I intend to fit out a Socialist Van, and then I shall come back here. We'll have some of the best specks of the movement, won't hold meetings every night..."

The book lacks the conception of that organized working class revolutionary party, which could link the efforts of isolated socialists like Owen with a coherent strategy for the exploitation of industry on all aspects of society. Lacking this concept, it does have a tinge of despair.
ENGINEERS' PAY

After the lost chances of Manchester

by JACK PRICE

This week negotiations were resumed between the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions and the Employers' Federation. And one thing is for sure never have the engineers been committed to national negotiations from such a position of weakness.

Not long ago there were 32 sit-ins in the factories of the Manchester area for at least £4 an hour, basic, more for women as a step towards equal pay, an extra week's holiday and a paid holiday — a 35 hour week.

The national union leadership made no serious effort to spread this sit-in movement or even get nationwide support for it. Now the men who failed to lead nationally and left it to local claims are to sit round the table, and are already showing themselves willing to ditch everything but the demand for a minimum of £20 a week for unskilled men.

CROSS-PURPOSE

The union leaders, particularly the Scalon left, have played the communist of copout tricks. They claimed that the union was unprepared for the struggle. Scalon said he couldn't take the chance of a ballot for national action in case people voted against. This, he claimed, would leave them in a very weak situation (as if that's not where the engineers are now).

Why didn't Scalon begin an massive campaign to strengthen the union at the base by fighting for the full programme of demands and the action needed to get the programme through? That means fighting in the localities for an understanding of why the government's attack on the working class must be defeated, why the ban on blacking and sympathy action under the industrial relations Act would just have to be trampled on and why the struggle would be a long and hard one.

But leaders like Scalon 'rule by cross purposes'. The rank and file demands he should take initiatives and he replies that they shouldn't attack him because they are not showing any initiative. If 'leadership' means anything, it means taking an initiative, going one step ahead.

What the Scalonians do is passively reflect the strengths and weaknesses of the localities. If a factory is strong the negotiator does well. If the factory is weak he does badly. But in either case he simply rests on what already exists, not trying to improve, to build and to strengthen.

'REALISTIC'

'They aim for what they see as 'realistic' — that is, they drop the hours demand and keep the wages demand. But the hours demand is a necessary response to unemployment because measures have to exert it, let them get off our backs.'

What is 'realistic' or 'unrealistic' is a question of the relationship of forces, which can be decided only by the struggle. And the positive action of the leadership enters into that relationship of forces as an important factor.

By means of the struggle, no matter what its immediate practical success may be, the workers will begin to understand the necessity to create a system that will be controlled by themselves and not by the profit drive.

The highest the present leaders of Britain's unions rise to is being good negotiators and effective public speakers. They fall lower, of course — to the Coopers, the Carron, the Chappell, who constantly rule by crushing every spark of militancy they find. One way would be of this type, if only he could get away with it.

RIGHT-WING TACTICS

The Scalon-type left-wingers are obviously to be supported against the right-wing Cosway. But, even though the 'lefts' start out as genuine militants on the shop floor, they can end up using the same tactics as the right.

In Manchester the union officials Tocher and Regan stopped calling the mass meetings of stewards. Agreed with the employers to keep all the agreements secret, and thus ensured that although there was a district claim each firm was well and truly on its own. And this at a time when the Employers' Federation now had a strike fund for its members of over a million pounds.

When some stewards who were members of the International Socialists called a meeting to get a levy going and try to put some pressure for a return to mass stewards' meetings, the Communist Party — of which both Tocher and Regan are members — 'blacked the meeting'.

Meanwhile, in the neighbouring Bolton, when a Workers' Fight steward called a meeting to pressure for a district claim, the union leadership locally also 'blacked the meeting', and barred them from calling the meeting from the AEUE halls.

GETTING RESULTS

Look at the way the Manchester struggle ended as far as the majority of the sit-ins were concerned. The point the employers would not swallow in the men's demands was the one about shorter hours.

In the first place, it was a counter-attack against unemployment. In the second place, 8 hours gained now is still 5 hours next year — 45 gained now has been eaten away by rising prices within a year.

At this point Scalon wanted a quick finish with 'result'. The local leadership went along with his 'realistic' approach.

Now, after previously threatening to discipline stewards for accepting money-only offers, they proposed scrapping the hours demand.

To do this, however, they could not rely on the enthusiasm of the mass of stewards. They knew there were hundreds who would not accept a split deal. But the right wing was there to help out. The GEC, AEUE stewards, led by the notorious Bowerman, 8.1. E., packed the meeting to vote in a solid phalanx for the split deal. Their employers even put on coaches for them.

Don't let the defenders of the Union officialism tell you that it has to be accepted because 'it is all for democracy'. Those stewards had not turned up at any of the previous meetings which determined the strategy. If Tocher, for example, had got up and denounced these scales for what they were, the right would have been defeated. But as it was, it was Tocher's recommendation that their solid phalanx of scabby hands voted for it.

Now the engineers face a real danger. The abstention of leadership by the executive of the AEUE may mean a shift to the right at least at the local level in this round of election. In desperation the workers whose standards of living have declined over the past couple of years of 'left' leadership, may shift to the right.

Militants must oppose this with all their power. But so long as all they have to offer is the old leaders and the old methods, they will get nowhere.
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Angela's Party

raise an immediate-issue movement of the oppressed black minority. Later this record was translated into votes.

The black movement, under CP influence, were harnessed to the Roosevelt bandwagon. At the beginning of the war the CP did its piece to snuff off the important movement of the blacks round the march on Washington in 1941.

This history — well known in American radical circles — should sadden interest Davis. It seems not.

The conduct of her trial is itself a case study in the CPUSA in action. Clearly she was victimised for her colour and her party membership. Yet the defence was conducted entirely on legalistic terms. Granted, for whatever reasons, a world-wide audience, the CPUSA and Angela Davis totally ignored the revolutionary tradition of using the bogy of the bourgeoisie to platform to inflict the system. In her case such indictment could have had an unprecedented audience and millions could have heard about Communism. The CPUSA could have extended this propaganda to the world, and with regard to Angela Davis as its presidnet candidate this year, in place of the Diefenbaker follow-the-ball.

The CPUSA doesn't operate like that. Nevertheless, it seems, does Angela Davis.
STANTON:
STEELWORKERS SAY
NO TO SHUTDOWN

by Tony Duffy

At Stanton, Derbyshire, the British Steel Corporation are planning to close the works down, and put 1500 out of a job.

On Saturday 4 August, over 1000 Stanton workers, with their families and numerous sympathisers, demonstrated their opposition.

After the march the meeting was addressed by most of the local MPs, six Labour and one Tory. Denis Skinner MP seemed to be the only one who managed to mention the need for the workers to fight the closures and organise a sit-in to do this.

Apart from this the contributions were the usual "If Labour had been in it wouldn't happen" or "Don't worry, we will ask questions in the house about it".

One of the two steel workers who had travelled down to give support, a member of WORKERS' FIGHT, also spoke.

It was obvious that the government needed changing, he said, but the immediate problem facing the Stanton workers was the forthcoming redundancies, and for this they could not rely on Labour MPs.

The fight was in their hands, and only by using lessons taught by UCS and Pleasleys could there be results.

He also gave a message of support from Lackenby steel workers.

OCCUPATION

After the meeting members of the Stanton Action Committee stated that the next move would be an occupation.

Ray Fletcher MP said that he thought that occupation of the works was the only realistic measure and that if it took place he would be at the works.

There has been much talk about a "work-in".

In fact, a work-in would play right into the bosses' hands — they would get production for nothing and the end would only be delayed.

The better tactic would be an occupation with NO PRODUCTION.

The BBC will then be faced with having expensive plant and machinery tied up and idle. Faced with this, their position will be much weaker.

It was suggested at Stanton by members of the Action Committee that it would be wise to keep the furnaces and coke ovens warm, so avoiding a collapse which would save the bosses the trouble of closing them down.

This is a valid point, but such action would still not be a work-in as such, since there would be no responsibility. * "It's not competitive* is no excuse for a closure.

But if we put control in the hands of the State, we gain nothing by nationalisation. Control over hours of work — over conditions — over wages — over jobs — should

production.

The threatened closure is not just the concern of Stanton workers and their families. Every time the steel industry is nationalised, it is because the bosses have not got the money to pay their workers.

BSC manage to push through redundancies, they are stronger and we are weaker for the next struggle. But a victory at Stanton could provide a springboard for workers' victories elsewhere.

The workers at Stanton need support from other workers. As a very first step, the Action Committee should send out a letter asking for support, and blacking in the event of an occupation.

Other works threatened with redundancies should also occupy.

CONTROL

BSC lost £68 million last year. So, they say, they have to "economise".

In the first place, the figure would not be £68 million if it weren't for massive compensation paid to former owners. And why should the bosses be compensated for the loss of their foot? The fact that steel prices are kept low to private industry also pushes up wages.

In the second place, so what if they're making a loss? If the bosses insist on running the economy on the basis of production for profit, not for need, then they shouldn't expect the workers to bear the burden.

The steel industry is nationalised. Fine. That means that the State should bear the financial costs for workers. If the demand for steel is reduced, then simply reduce the hours of work with no loss of pay. No Jobs lost!

NATIONAL

We can't rely on the Labour Party, who nationalised the steel industry in order to "rationalise" it.

But if MPs support the occupation, that's fine. We should demand that they use their position to help fight the redundancies.

They should use their influence to rally support in other workplaces for the occupation, organise effective blacking, and collect funds to help the strikers.

They should campaign in the Labour Party for MPs elsewhere to do the same.

No secret negotiations.

All negotiations to be under the control of mass meetings in the occupation, to which MPs should be answerable.

Local Labour councils should act as an arm of the Labour movement. They should waive rents for Stanton workers when they occupy, and should provide money from the rates for hardship cases.

There is a need for a National Action Committee against redundancies in the steel industry. The rank and file must press for this, but MPs like Denis Skinner would be in a position to get this Committee really going.