

Workers' fight

3p

No. 64 - July 27 to August 10th 1974

NO FASCISTS IN THE UNIONS!

Not the Red Flag at this workers' meeting, but the Union Jack - the 'bloody butcher's apron' and chief emblem of the fascist National Front. Egged on by the Front, they were gathered last week in Leicester to do the bosses' work - demanding the victimisation of militant black strike leaders. (Photo: Workers Press)



Clear out National Front infiltrators!

When a man knows he is going to be hanged in the morning, said old Samuel Johnson, it concentrates his mind wonderfully.

The fact that Bill Roberts, AUEW Convenor at Edbro's in Bolton, is to stand as parliamentary candidate for the National Front in the next general election should concentrate the minds of trade unionists on the rope which this fascist organisation is preparing for the labour movement, including the mass trade union organisations.

National Front infiltration of the unions will, if not checked, first cripple them through racist division of the working class, and then annihilate them by substituting "Labour Front"

organisations of the Mussolini-Hitler type on the ruins of free trade unions.

The National Front denies that. Some of its working class members may not fully know it. Nevertheless that is what the fascist programme for the trade unions always has been, and what the real NF plan for the unions is now.

Today the main 'selling point' of this organisation, led by Hitler-worshipping Nazis like John Tyndall and Martin Webster (though certainly not all its members merit such a description) is anti-black racism. That in itself is a big enough threat to the interests of all workers: racial division and the conflict of groups of 'native' and immigrant workers in a whole series of recent strikes, in which racist

white workers have scabbed on militant blacks, is a warning no sensible trade unionist can ignore.

Rallying to the message of racism, many workers go on to give the NF a hearing on other issues too. The main drift is that the NF is for the "British Nation". (The fact that the labour movement, including the Labour Left and even the 'Communist Party' with their irrelevant obsession with the Common Market, have a basically nationalist basis makes the NF line appear normal and acceptable.) It says that this Nation needs 'responsible' trade unions.

That means 'trade unions' linked in a 'responsible' partnership with the bosses in the 'National interest'. In

turn, that means a mass purge of militants, 'Communists', etc - at the very least.

All historical experience demonstrates that, once it becomes powerful enough to do it and the bosses need to have it done, every fascist movement smashes the independence of the trade unions, binding the workers hand and foot to the bosses.

SLIPPERY

Today when it is relatively small and the bosses don't yet support it, British fascism can use slippery phrases about 'responsible trade unionism' and 'putting the national interest first'. This allows it to work for the destruction of the unions from within them.

Trade unionists who work

with or for the National Front are knowingly or unknowingly working as fifth columnists and scabs.

They should be treated as such. Members of the National Front should be banned from membership of the trade union movement. It is a disgrace that some people who openly flaunt their membership of the NF, and even stand for it in elections, are allowed to remain in the trade union movement, and in some cases actually hold stewards' or convenors' positions.

The labour movement needs to organise a campaign to purge itself of fascist infiltration - and of the racism which has provided a fertile breeding ground for fascism.

GREEK DICTATORS STAND DOWN

THE FALL of the military dictators of Greece has followed almost inevitably from the failure of the coup they organised in Cyprus during the 3rd week of July. After a 7-years' reign the tyrants and torturers overreached themselves, and provoked massive international reaction and a Turkish invasion of Cyprus.

Now they have had to step down to make way for a "Government of National Unity" under arch Conservative former Prime Minister Karamanlis.

The final push appears to have come in the form of a US Government ultimatum;

which merely confirms many people in a belief that the CIA masterminded the colonels coup in 1967 and that their repressive regime couldn't have survived without the continued support of the USA.

With their fall, hard on the heels of the Portuguese dictatorship, one more stretch of the soft underbelly of the imperialist NATO alliance becomes exposed. The world almost saw all-out war

between two members of this alliance of tyrants for "freedom" and of warmongers against "aggression".

The Cyprus coup was, undoubtedly, reactionary - and not alone because it was masterminded from Athens. There is a delicate balance within the island between the Greek majority (80%) and the Turkish minority communities. The majority of Greeks, through their support

for Makarios after 1967, have shown little enthusiasm for union with Greece; and even many who favour pan-Greek nationalism must have believed that it would have been an absurdity to want to pay for such Greek unity by placing themselves under the iron heel of the Athens junta. Certainly the Greek Cypriot labour movement felt that way.

The post-1960 settlement in Cyprus was an imposed

settlement following a deal between the Turkish, British and Greek governments. We have no reason to idealise it. But it did lead to a relative independence and neutrality for Cyprus. Despite eruptions between the Greek and Turkish communities in 1963/64, it did allow some co-existence of the communities.

The Greek-Turkish conflict in Cyprus was of course encouraged and used by Britain to aid in ruling the island, leaning on the Turkish minority. But there are deep historic roots to it too - the 19th Century Greek struggle for independence against Turkey, the Greek onslaught on apparently crippled Turkey after World War 1 which led to massive pogroms in Asia Minor against the many scattered Greek communities, etc.

Continued on inside page

But its soul goes marching on...

It is something of a disgrace that the infamous Industrial Relations Act and its spawn the NIRC have lived out their days to die peacefully in bed; and something of a consolation to remember that it did, after all, die of mortal wounds inflicted by working class struggle.

The Industrial Relations Act had become, since the freeing of the Pentonville 5, "a troublesome piece of legislation" to many bosses and to trade union leaders not normally concerned to defend the working class. It disturbed the comfortable relations between bosses and trade union bureaucrats, and the fight against it gave militants a focus around which to organise against the trade union bureaucrats and the Tory government.

Crucial

For the Labour leaders, its repeal was something they could promise in response to the deeply felt antagonism against this bosses' weapon, knowing that it was something that cost capitalism nothing to concede, and more particularly when this concession was given in return for the glowing prospect of a 'social Contract'.

But though the Tories are probably relieved to see the Act go, they're nevertheless fighting tooth and nail to make sure that the Trade Union and Labour Relations Bill will be, by the time it gets onto the statute books, very recognisably the Son of Industrial Relations Act.

The minority voting position of the Labour Government is allowing a situation where this Bill (designed primarily to repeal the Industrial Relations Act) will be passed with crucial Tory and Liberal amendments (mainly passed in the House of Lords, where the Tories have an inbuilt majority) some of which are almost exact copies of sections of the Tory Act.

Goad

So far, amendments include:

- The requirement of a minimum rule book for all unions, with the State superintending certain aspects of internal union affairs.
- "Every worker has the right not to be excluded from membership of a trade union, branch or section of a union..." (This was the issue in the Goad case under the I.R. Act; it means nobody can be 'branched' or disciplined for breaking union rules, scabbing, etc.)
- Conversely, workers can leave unions if they give 'reasonable grounds' and, having done so, have legal recourse to keep jobs in a closed shop.
- That more than one union can be recognised in a closed shop. (e.g. staff association, company unions etc can be backed up by law if they try to break a closed shop.)
- "Those who encourage others to break their contract or threaten that contracts would be broken will be in the wrong." (That is, blacking, picketing, combine committee instructions, shop stewards' instructions and

Continued on back page

GREECE

Workers' action is now the key

Continued from Page 1

The socialist answer to the seething mass of Balkan national conflicts which the backwardness and then the breakup of the old pre-World War I Turkish Empire produced, has been for a Balkan Socialist Federation. Though the nationalities that make up the Yugoslav state (Croats, Serbs, Montenegrins etc) co-exist not without tensions, Yugoslavia is a miniature (though bureaucratically limited) version of what the 'Marxist solution' means in practice.

Meanwhile, independent bourgeois Cyprus seemed to offer a limited local solution. For that reason, and also because of the 'neutrality' of Cyprus, the Cypriot labour movement, dominated by the Communist Party, favoured independence.

POGROMS

The National Guard coup with Eoka-man Nicos Sampson as president had the clear objective of a quick unification of Cyprus and Greece. Logically it led immediately to anti-Turkish communal pogroms (the extent of which is as yet unknown to us). It led also to mass repression of the Cypriot left by the right wing Cypriot spawn of the Greek Colonels and Generals.

Turkey's invasion followed, toppling not only the Sampson regime but, in its disgrace and humiliation, also knocking the props from under the Athens junta.

The Karamanlis regime in Greece now has the delicate job of rolling the film of the last decade of Greek history backwards to, they hope, a

stable bourgeois regime.

After eight years of power (from 1955), during which he ruled in close alliance with the army, even using military dictatorship in certain parts of the country, Karamanlis

Below, left to right: Makarios, Nicos Sampson, Ioannides (police chief behind Colonels and generals), & Karamanlis.



was defeated in 1963 by George Papandreou's Centre Union Party. This led to a situation where the traditional factions of Greek politics — all extreme right — were displaced by a party deriving its fundamental authority from popular electoral support.

EXILE

The scene was thus set for a coup, a return to the normality of government based on vicious military and police repression — the reality of the Karamanlis regime. Even limited parliamentary democracy was too much for Karamanlis: he went into exile.

The coup against Papandreou occurred 'constitutionally' through the

King in 1965, only to be superceded & strengthened by the barbarism of the Colonels in 1967, to forestall elections which could no longer be put off and longer easily rigged.

Now, while the army-appointed President Ghizikis remains in office, Karamanlis must step forward as front man, attempting to go back to the 'stability' of pre-1963. He may attempt to restore the fugitive ex-king Constantine, who fled at the end of 1967. Certainly, the inclusion in government of some Centre Union politicians does not indicate any change in what we can expect from Karamanlis. Mavros, for example, had made it known that he was eager to collaborate with the Colonels.

But, as in Portugal, the decisive thing will be the degree of mass action in

response to the end of the army terror rule. That will determine what happens. In Greece too, the policies of the workers' organisations will be decisive. Unfortunately, the policies of the Greek 'Communists', have for long been class collaboration. As in Portugal, they will help — or try to help — the bosses to re-stabilise their system.

DEMOCRACY

The struggle in Greece must, immediately, be for a democratic republic (full trade union rights, freedom of speech, assembly and the press, freedom to form parties, free elections, etc), and the immediate breaking up of the standing army. From Portugal to Greece to

different set (Labour).

At the time of the General Election, *Workers Fight* published an article calling not for organs of genuine workers' control, such as trade union committees on industrial safety, workers' factory inspectorates, etc, but for workers to fight for the Labour Party's proposed fake workers' control committees — though the writer himself admitted these committees would have reactionary aims. And in *Workers Fight* No. 58, Stephen Corbishley sets up union-management safety committees as a threat to big business; in fact capitalists with any sense want these committees, and use them to give a semblance of 'industrial democracy', while turning shop

stewards into junior management watchdogs of shop floor feelings. The best that militants can do if they join such bodies is to expose them as the farce they are.

Ed. Corbishley goes on to say that legislation to be discussed in Parliament could be useful. What is this legislation? Did he mean the proposals to set up joint union-management bodies which the Labour Party is trying to con workers into accepting?

Is the working class so weak it is forced to abandon 'normal' action in favour of haggling over petty details in a class-collaborationist talking shop? If you say that trade unions can still continue independent activity, then why should they try to use joint committees which only

IN THE opinion of the strikers at Imperial Typewriters, Leicester (and of every serious trade unionist), "It is incredible that trade union officials can actually accept the victimisation of their members."

The T&GWU convenor at Imperial Typewriters, Reg Weaver, doesn't think so. On Tuesday July 23rd, he actually led a one-day strike of 300 scabbing white workers at the factory to demand the victimisation of the Asian strike leaders.

The return of all the strikers without victimisation must indeed have been galling for Reg Weaver who, when Imperial sent all the strikers their cards, declared that as they no longer worked there he couldn't negotiate their demands.

12 Weeks

For the strikers, the return to work with no victimisation (starting Monday July 22nd) was a major victory. They had been out for 12 weeks, without strike pay, many without social security.

The strike started on May 1st, when 39 Asian workers — mainly women — walked out of one of the Imperial works in Leicester. These women, from Section 61, had discovered that for the past two years they had been paid bonus on a target of 200 machines or more, when the agreement stipulated a target

FROM BRITAIN TO IRELAND — AND BACK AGAIN

DEVELOPING THE TECHNOLOGY OF REPRESSION



CS gas was used to inflict collective punishment

THE British Army has been involved in over 30 wars of counter-insurgency since 1945. Of these the war in Ireland is probably unique in that it is taking place in an advanced country.

The significance of this is clear. Belfast or Derry today, London or Liverpool tomorrow. The theoreticians of counter-insurgency clearly envisage this. Kitson, for example, has said: "It is difficult for the British with their traditions of stability to imagine disorders beyond the powers of the police to handle but there are already indications that such a situation could arise and this at a time of relatively unvalued affluence... If a genuine and serious grievance arose, and such might arise from a significant drop in the standard of living, all those who now dissipate their protests over a wide variety of causes, might concentrate their efforts and produce a situation beyond the powers of the police to handle. Should this happen, the Army would be required to restore the position rapidly".

Choice

Already the operations at Heathrow, Hull, and Reading have aimed to accustom people to the sight of troops on the streets. During the miners' strike large scale preparations were made for

joint police-army action in strike breaking and the arrest of pickets.

The virtue of the BSSRS pamphlet on the technology of repression in Ireland is not only that it points to the links between Ireland and Britain but also that it points out that the choice of repressive techniques is a political choice for the ruling class, which largely depends on how they expect public opinion and those against whom the repression is directed will react.

"The new technology of repression offers the state a 'graduated response' to conflict situations. This may enable situations to be held in check which otherwise could not be controlled without resort to more dramatically repressive measures (such as Bloody Sunday) which will be politically counter-productive. So riot control technology is not just designed to end demonstrations or other 'riots', it is a variable in a political equation. The pamphlet shows this by examining the techniques used in Ireland between 1969 and the imposition of direct rule in 1972.

Up to August 1969 the repression the civil rights movement met from the RUC was fairly traditional and aimed simply at forcing the Catholics back to their previous position. By August 1969 new tactics were needed,

when the RUC, faced with a virtual insurrection in the Bogside, could not just go in and club people as they had done before.

They were therefore issued with CS gas, which was "a use of technology to try and render governable the ungovernable". CS had previously been used in Vietnam, where, counter to the assertions of the Ministry of Defence, deaths had resulted from its use, and also in the street fighting in Paris in May 1968. It was first used in 1969 in Derry to try and disperse the crowd who were petrol bombing the RUC.

Collective

Within days, however, the Bogside had grown accustomed to it and since then its function has been different. In the words of the pamphlet, "the way that it has been used in Derry and Belfast has not merely been for dispersing demonstrations. Again and again we have accounts of the gas being deliberately fired into crowds or through the doors and windows of houses... It serves as one means of collective punishment for all the people of an area in which political demonstrations are occurring." Those most susceptible to CS are the sick, the elderly and children.

The next escalation of technology came as a direct

result of the 1970 election. The Tories saw the problem as one of law and order, and thus tended at first to think of a military solution being all that was needed. Alongside vastly increased raids, on the Catholic areas rubber bullets were introduced. Though described by the Army as having the impact of a "hard punch with a fist" their use has resulted, among other injuries, in three fractured skulls, three cases of severe brain damage, nine cases of blindness in one or both eyes. The desired effect was not obtained because the political premises on which the increased repression was based fundamentally misunderstand the consciousness and aspirations of the Northern minority.

With the rise of the Provisional military campaign in 1971 internment appeared an increasingly attractive 'solution' to the politicians at Stormont and Westminster. The swoop on 9th August 1971 was followed by the use of new and extremely sophisticated methods of torture. Although most of those picked up were subjected to some form of brutality, the techniques of sensory deprivation were pioneered by the British Army at this time, from methods used by the Stalinist secret police in the '30s.

Internees were hooded, forced to stand spreadeagled against a wall for long periods, subjected to noise and deprived of adequate food and sleep. These techniques lead to long term psychological damage. Physical torture is not used so extensively because it leaves more obvious marks, is less useful in extracting information, and is more likely to lead to a political reaction as it is less easy to

joint committees?

divert workers' attention into useless alleyways? Given the fact that workers have been rediscovering tactics like the sit-in strike, and that there have been calls for bosses to "open the books", the situation is perfect for socialists to agitate for workers' inquiries into industry, for workers' factory inspectorates, trade union safety committees, and more direct union control over such things as manning levels and production rates — without management poking its nose in on behalf of the bosses.

Until management is made directly responsible to the shop floor, they must be excluded from any "industrial democracy" or "workers' control" bodies — workers must form their own

independent bodies, with strike action and occupations to back up their demands.

Alan Theasby, Middlesbrough.

Stephen Corbishley replies

ALAN Theasby points to two alternatives.

One is where workers are permanently mobilised, permanently militant, permanently vigilant, and thus exercise control over work conditions.

The other is where bosses entice

trade unionists into joint committees which function just as talking shops to divert workers from direct action.

But the real world is more complicated. The class struggle develops unevenly, with fits and starts, with the battle-line staked out with all sorts of temporary agreements and compromises between bosses and workers. (The trade union movement itself embodies a standing compromise between workers and the capitalist state)

Take an example: the National Dock Labour Board. Local boards, with 50% management and 50% union representation, control hiring and firing on the docks.

Is this a case of fully-fledged workers' control? Far from it! At most it is a limited check on one aspect of the bosses' operations.

Yet it is the bosses who want to abolish the NDLB and the

dockworkers who want to defend it. Why? Because he NDLB makes it very difficult for the bosses to sack dockers.

Of course the NDLB only acts as it does because direct action is ultimately there to back up dockers' demands. But if dockers had to rely on immediate direct action every time they wanted to stop the bosses sacking someone, then what would happen about sackings just before Christmas? or when money is short after a long strike?

Revolutionary socialists of course would prefer direct workers' control. But we recognise we won't always get it; in fact, we will get it on a large scale only in a revolutionary situation. And for that reason we have to look closely at the various 'compromises' that come up.

In many cases — like worker-directors in the steel industry, or the Joint Consultative

Committees — these committees simply serve the interests of the capitalists, and should be flatly opposed, as Alan Theasby argues.

But take the case of the Labour Party promising 50% worker representation on boards. It is quite true that their intention is simply to try to get workers to take responsibility for running capitalism.

But the majority of big business are opposed to these Labour Party plans. Why? Because they know that the intentions of the Labour Party leaders and reality are not the same thing.

If workers force that 50% representation out of unwilling capitalists — elect rank and file recallable representatives — use that position to demand information on the running of the company — then the "50% representation" can become a bridge to real workers' control, rather than a roadblock.

Again, take safety committees. Of course any joint committee should be coupled with independent workers' safety committees, and it was an error of my original article not to mention that. But if workers, while not yet being ready to take the factory completely out of the hands of the bosses, can force management to listen regularly to workers' complaints — and that means a joint committee — isn't that preferable in that concrete situation to having to try to appeal to direct action every single time you want improvements on safety. And doesn't that explain why in fact most bosses are opposed to such committees?

One final point: the legislation referred to is the "Health and Safety at Work" Bill, which is not about joint committees, but does include some useful reforms.

STEPHEN CORBISHLEY

MAXINE LANDIS examines the lessons of the strike

What's been won at Imperial Typewriters

of 168. This meant that they had been cheated out of as much as £4 per week.

In the following weeks several hundred more Asian workers joined them from other sections of Imperial Typewriters. Soon there were about 500 workers on strike, all of them Asian (the few whites who came out after an initial leafletting drifted away to find other jobs when they realised it might be a long strike).

This explosion, like any other, did not come without a long build-up. The two principal strike leaders, Hasmukh Khetani and N.C. Patel, had for some time been active inside the factory as "unofficial" shop stewards, badgering the official factory leaders to improve conditions, organising, arguing and generally building up pressure against management and for a democratic and militant shop stewards committee.

The fact that the official factory leadership was useless to the workers resulted in a mass of unresolved complaints by the workers — particularly the Asians, but not only them. These grievances related to promotion, line and quota balance, payments systems, tea breaks,

washing time and toilet breaks, waiting time payments, output targets, behaviour of supervisors and the hundreds of daily small indignities which gather in time into the "black man's burden" — racism.

This statement by one of the women strikers highlights the situation: "Ever since I've been there I've seen that the whites give their women just one machine to work on while they gave us 10 or 11 different machines in a day. You see their job is better. They have just one machine but we have to move around like gypsies.

Waiting

The West Indian women are treated just like us. Another thing is that the setters (we have all white setters) set the white women's machines first and take more trouble over them. Ours they do last and they don't even do them properly. So we have to work slower and then, with piece work, we earn less money. Before our machines are set we have to wait. So we asked for waiting time but they wouldn't give us that. White women also get jobs of their choice — they can choose their jobs. But we have to do what the setter gives us to do."

And another woman: "The other day I went to the toilet. Someone was already inside so I had to wait. I must have been there not more than ten minutes when the Foreman started banging on the door. He had come to find me in the toilet to tell me to go back to work. I was very angry and shouted some rude things at him. Wouldn't you? There's a limit to everything. When I came out he asked me what I had been doing there. I told him to go home and ask his wife what she did in the toilet."

Stewards

The demand to elect their own stewards was the demand that would deal with all these 'petty' matters. And the essence of this demand for free elections was really that they wanted to clear the decks of the management's collaborators in the union and create a really well organised factory. And this is in fact what they have won.

On the face of it, all that's been conceded is the return of all the strikers at the same grade and without any victimisation. No word has been pronounced promising election of shop stewards. But the consciousness and solidarity gained in the strike means that these workers now have the strength that usually comes from really good union organisation that's been built up over years. It means that no-one can be pushed around, followed to the toilet, cheated of bonus or put down in other ways without an immediate reaction from at least all those who were on the picket line —



Above: the strikers in a confident mood. (photo: Sid West). Below: Reg Weaver (top) and George Bromley. (photos Workers Press)

whether or not they have their own stewards.

For the first time, Asian workers are going back absolutely unbeaten by the combined forces of management, union and the National Front. The strikers were buoyed up and reinforced by support in their community and by national and international picketing actions organised by the magazine *Race Today*, and by two national support demonstrations. They mounted a mass picket every day, and frequent meetings of all the strikers discussed long-felt grievances and formulated them into demands.

From this point of view, the strike has a great deal to teach white militants. For instance, every proposal was brought back to the strikers and discussed to see if it met their needs.

Above all, the strike has managed to highlight more clearly than ever the fact that a major union like the T&GWU not only does nothing to help immigrant workers to fight for better conditions, but actually harbours and nurtures virulent racists in important positions as both lay officials and paid organisers. District official George Bromley, talking of the strikers, had said, as if they were small children "It's difficult to know what they want".

What they want had been made abundantly clear: backdating of the cheated bonus payments to January 1973; equality of promotion; special attention to the exploitation of women workers; and no victimisation.

Yet Bromley could say "They have no legitimate

grievances. ... In a civilised society, the majority view will prevail. Some people must learn how things are done." Weaver debarred Asian shop stewards on the basis of an obsolete rule (whose existence was in fact queried by Jack Jones) giving an absurd qualification period of two years in the factory.

The strikers know, as do most workers, that the only qualification for a shop steward is how well he represents and fights for the interests of the workers. They know that to break the encrusted bureaucratic layer of Weaver's control in the factory will benefit every worker, black or white.

Scabs

But Bromley and Weaver, fighting hard for their base, have confused the white workers with a mass of lies about intimidation by the strikers, and have encouraged the National Front element in the factory, to the point of finally calling out the white workers to demand the victimisation of the strike leaders.

This action, if not all the rest, should produce a national outcry in the union for the removal of these men for this transgression against the basic principles of trade unionism, undertaken in the cause of unshamed racism and egged on by a near-fascist organisation, the National Front.

Bromley should be sacked from his union job. Withdraw the credentials of Weaver and any stewards who supported his racist strike!

The strikers feel very strong. They have a lot still to win (£500 each in lost bonus is



no small matter). But as they say in their bulletin, "The 600 strikers have been awakened. They can't be taken for a ride any more". The women, who spearheaded the strike and were the mainstay of the picketing, have formed a permanent group to fight for women's rights in the factory.

They have managed to put the Union on the spot, forcing an inquiry which many believe will be an indictment of the local officials. Weaver and Bromley, now openly fighting to destroy the settlement negotiated by regional secretary Brian Mather, are

themselves forcing a confrontation within the union.

This strike has produced a significant breakthrough in the fight against racism in the unions and on the shop floor. It will give great encouragement and confidence to other immigrant workers, who so far have only seen defeat for their efforts.

Educate

But what is also needed is a co-ordinated campaign throughout the labour movement to alert and educate trade unionists on the dangers of racism and give those willing to fight a clear programme of demands to fight on, and a clear guide to the sort of things that constitute racism. For there are no doubt many quite well-meaning trade unionists who would dismiss many instances of racism (such as those described by the strikers quoted above) as too petty and trivial to bother about. Yet where these things can exist, often for long unnoticed by whites and taken for granted by blacks as an unpleasant fact of life for an immigrant, we see officials of our largest union demanding the sacking of 25 strike leaders from a list "supplied by foremen on information from our members."

We must fight to wipe out all racism — from its most shocking to its most 'trivial' aspects.

The following demands and conditions would contribute to such a fight:

No discrimination at work or within the unions (including social clubs).

Campaigns to recruit immigrant workers to trade unions, using leaflets in immigrants' own languages.

Full equality in pay conditions, status, grading, training and other education, access to skilled jobs and promotion opportunities.

Caucuses

Support for any demands which black or immigrant workers make for educational and special religious rights (holy day paid leave, religious dress, the wearing of turbans, etc). We expect it for ourselves — real equality means respect for every person's religious and cultural rights.

Support for black caucuses within unions and factories.

Against all immigration laws and controls or discriminatory legislation. Being anti-immigration means to be anti-immigrants.

Opposition to the offshoots of such laws — the contract labour system, voucher system and deportation.

For the physical defence of black workers under attack.

For automatic endorsement of industrial action by black and immigrant workers whether they are in the majority or not.

For the expulsion from the labour movement of members of explicitly racist organisations such as the National Front.

Ghetto

Since then there have been political attempts to split the Catholics accompanied by measures to make life as uncomfortable as possible for the ghetto population as a whole, in the hope that they will not think it worth their while to continue to support the IRA. At the same time the Army has increasingly used non-technological methods, such as the "Four Square Laundry", the use of provocateurs, and assassination squads.

Unless we expose and oppose this repression now, it will be all the more difficult later.

BRUCE ROBINSON

"The New Technology of Repression: Lessons from Ireland". Produced by the British Society for Social Responsibility in Science. 30p from *Rising Free*, 197 Kings Cross Rd, London WC1.

