PUBLIC SERVICE WORKERS'

NETWORK

No.5 OCT-NOV 1994 FREE

INSIDE:
P2 Repression and victimisation in Hackney
P3 Letter
P4 Commercialising the Voluntary Sector
P6 Why we need new unions

CONTRACT KILLING

Although called various things - Compulsory Competitive Tendering (CCT) in Local Government, the Internal Market in the NHS, and Market Testing in the Civil Service, all services currently face the same threat. The basic principle is the division of management structures into Purchaser or Clientside, and Provider or Contractside, and then services are "bought" from various departments or Direct Service Organisations by other departments, or by a new tier of management.

A general review of Local Government services, which has been going on since the 1988 Act, and is now entering its final phase, determining which white collar services councils should provide direct, and putting the rest out to tender in making CCT universal. Some local authorities have volunteered to test the process for a specified area. For example, in London, Brent council is carrying out the pilot scheme for Libraries, Newham council is doing the same for Housing. The government clearly wants it implemented before the next general election.

For most services provided by manual workers - street cleansing, refuse collection, building repairs, cleaning, catering, running parks and playing fields - this is now a way of life, and some services have faced two or three tendering processes. What happens is workers in what were council services, and are now Direct Service Organisations (DSO's), get subjected to cuts in staffing levels, "flexible" working practices, etc. in order to cut costs and keep the price of the tender for the contract drawn up by Clientside as low as possible.

Anything which might give a DSO an advantage can be challenged by a private contractor as "anti-competitive" behaviour in an appeal to the Secretary of State. The private sector is not restricted by any such sanctions, and a large firm bidding for contracts with different authorities can benefit from economies of scale which a DSO is denied. The bottom line was illustrated in Haringey, north London, this year where the DSO lost the refuse collection contract because the council did not accept the lowest bid. The fear is of privatisation and redundancy, but the dangers are wider and more insidious than that, and fear is used to get workers to agree to worse working conditions to win a contract, and keep their jobs.

The unions' response to this brave new world of "improved" services has been twofold. First of all, NUPE and NALGO merged (with COHSE in the NHS) out of fear of the GMB, which had an advantage because it organised both white collar and manual workers, and was more likely to appeal to contractors in "tendering" for union recognition (the labour relations management contract) as a single union for all employees. Such are the noble origins of UNISON.

Secondly, having secured membership subscriptions, and therefore corporate survival, there is TUPE {Transfer of Undertakings Protection of Employment}. This is a European law which is supposed to guarantee your pay and conditions if a new boss takes over the service. UNISON sees it as a magic weapon, protecting workers from the cowboys. However, the real damage has usually been done by the DSO's softening up process to win the contract, and above all we must not sell our conditions down the river to keep it in-house.

Union organisation must be more flexible and adapt to the new environment. The reformist unions have adapted by merging to guarantee survival as managers of conflict for the new (and old) bosses. Actual organisation needs to adapt differently, to be carried with workers from job to job, and to organise in the community as well as on the job, denying cheap labour pools to contractors. It also needs a more flexible structure so that workers in voluntary, private and direct service organisations are linked directly to co-operate to defeat attacks on pay and conditions and services, not to compete for jobs and to save unions' check off arrangements. It must be based on political understanding and commitment, not just go with the job.

This is the kind of organisation we advocate in the Public Service Workers' Network - revolutionary unionism.

CRIMINAL INJUSTICE IN HACKNEY

On 20th July 1994 a lobby of Hackney Council, held by trades union and community groups to protest at the Criminal Justice Bill and the Council's plan to use the new powers to evict tenants and squatters, was attacked by riot police of the Territorial Support Groups. Officers were seen head-butting, punching and kicking protesters, before arresting seven people, some of whom they injured badly. Those arrested now face serious charges, which could involve heavy fines or imprisonment. Those with the worst injuries have been charged with assaulting the police. All are denying the charges against them.

Supporting police violence

The response of Hackney Council to this attack has been to support the police. In an unprecedented move the Council took out injunctions against those arrested which banned them from council property and a named squat in the borough. This blanket ban would prevent the defendants from using public toilets or housing benefit offices, without written permission.

Likewise, those who work in Hackney would be unable to go to offices of their unions without written permission, or they too would be risking arrest.

The injunctions were "ex-parte" - the defendants had no right to appear at the court when they were served - but on 30th August they challenged the injunctions at the High Court and the Council backed down, allowing the injunctions to lapse.

Two of those arrested work for the council, or council-funded projects. The Council has applied political pressurise to get these workers sacked before the charges get to court. The police also gave out information to one employer- Hackney Independent Living Team (HILT) - and the media, about the arrests, breaching confidentiality. In this case, they have succeeded - a residential Support Worker, who also (conveniently for HILT) happens to be an active union convenor, has been sacked. An active campaign for his reinstatement is now underway. As we go to press, a lobby of HILT's AGM is planned, in protest at this victimisation. Telephone the number at the end of this article for an update.

Cllr Simon Mathews

The Council face opposition from all sections of the community to years of cuts in jobs and services, the victimisation and harassment of black workers and union activists, and recently of Jane Brown for being an out lesbian *and* a head teacher. They want to make decisions with disastrous consequences for people in Hackney, with their conceit that they remain "good socialists" protected by an aggressive and violent police force.

A criminal attack

It is no coincidence that the police attacked opponents of the Criminal Justice Bill, which comes into force in October. Simon Mathews, Hackney's Chair of Housing, wants to use the new powers to more easily evict homeless people from empty property, and tenants with rent arrears.

Hackney Council's use of the High Court to restrict people's freedom of movement, and the pressure applied to get two workers sacked for taking part in a legitimate protest, demonstrate their contempt for basic human rights. They have decided that the individuals are already guilty before the cases have even come to court, and their collusion with the police, in sharing confidential information, is prejudicial to the defendants' cases. This is clearly a threat to the right of public service workers to take part in political activity.

Hackney Council already has a politically repressive Code of Conduct. Now they are implementing the worst aspects of the Criminal Justice Bill before it has even become law.

This is adapted from a leaflet produced by the Hackney 7 Defence Campaign. If you can help financially - through organising a benefit, for instance - or politically, by publicising the issue, contact the Campaign at the address below. Leaflets and model motions for union branches are also available.

Hackney 7 Defence Campaign
C/O COLIN ROACH CENTRE, 10A BRADBURY ST, LONDON N16 8JN
Tel 071 249 8086

THE BUSINESS OF SURVIVAL £££

The changing nature of the voluntary sector; the effect on workers (right); and on social services (left).

COUNTING THE COST

Gone are the sweeteners for the implementation of the Community Care Act. As a Social Worker in Lancashire, my instructions six months ago were to innovatively promote a more flexible social service provision, to enable people to live in their communities wherever feasible and sensible. The cornerstone to this flexible approach was to make quality needs-led assessments rather than service-led ones. High priorities were to be given to client choice and the needs of carers. To enable this flexible service to grow, policy objectives were to actively promote a flourishing Independent Sector.

Six months into the implementation of the Act the service has been seriously curtailed. Within my Authority the District Purchasing Managers are all singing the same tune: namely nil growth in expenditure for the next six months, and a review of all up and running services to look for savings. We are now being told that the underlying principle to improve the clients' quality of life is no longer appropriate. New services should only be introduced where there is serious risk to life. Furthermore, domiciliary[1] care packages have been given strict financial constraints. These cost limits are currently set at £180 pw for elderly clients and £250pw for adults under 65 with disabilities. There are examples of patients being unable to leave long term care to return to the community as their care packages exceed the cost limits. Instead of practically supporting carers we have now been told to restrict respite[2] care to two fortnights per year. Domiciliary help should be restricted to those in the greatest need and to avoid using the Independent Sector at all costs. Any preventative measures now have to be ignored.

[1] Domiciliary care involves home visits.

[2] Respite care gives the regular carer a break.

Most Voluntary Sector groups were formed to meet shortfalls in state provision, providing many different types of services from Community Arts to Community Support. The nature of these organisations varies from large national charities to small neighbourhood projects, all providing essential services where government has failed. During the 1980's they flourished with support from local and national government through schemes like the Urban and Community Programmes. Politically they are promoted by both Labour and Tory parties as the way community services should be delivered. The Tories go on about communities taking responsibility, targeting resources and, of course, cost effectiveness. The Labour party think they are great because they are controlled, as they see it, by the local community, they show how the government is failing to provide proper services and of course they fit in with their 'community development' policy..

Over the last few years the voluntary sector has gone through many changes with the abolition of the Community Programme and the winding down of the Urban Programme and, the implementation of Community Care.

The first direct effect of these changes has been the reduction in funding. Many organisations have had to 'rationalise' their services as their reliance on the Community Programme has left them unable to sustain the number of people they 'employed'. Many projects simply folded when the pool of cheap labour from the community programme disappeared. Many projects have struggled on turning into charities or have been absorbed into local authorities' 'community development' departments, often leading to redundancy or some sort of re-deployment for the workers. The projects that have survived this have tended to be the larger 'high profile' projects. These ones fit nicely into the 'new world' of community care. Those projects that have survived into what is now increasingly being called the 'independent sector' are having to deal with the new contract culture with its service level agreements (SLA's), compulsory competitive tendering (CCT), and good old fashioned begging.

Commercial and competitive

The situation now is that voluntary sector organisations are part of the 'market' competing with statutory services, private companies and, of course, each other. Most projects have always prided themselves on the high quality of the services they provide, usually setting the standard in their particular area. Since the market has been created around them the pressure on projects has been incredible. They are forced to pursue ever larger contracts, cutting resources and staff to breaking point. Many projects have not increased staffing levels at all, and yet have increased their workload by over 100%. The effects of this are predictable. The quality of service has been reduced, the 'user friendliness' of projects has been lost, the campaigning role that many projects had has faded away and of course the workers are demoralised and frustrated.

Many projects have no choice, if they are to survive, but to tender for contracts that were previously done by statutory bodies such as social services or the health service. Some projects have done this with glee as they have felt that users have been getting a bad deal from the service previously, usually due to under funding and bad management. This has led to projects rapidly changing what they do, leaving their original aims as secondary or often totally abandoning them. In the past success has been measured by the quality of service delivered. Now it is cost that matters above all. Decisions that used to be made on users' needs are now based on whether it is 'cost effective'. Workers who were employed to provide services now spend half their time budgeting and dealing with the ever increasing administration.

Money talks

As voluntary organisations become businesses the control by users has significantly diminished because what now controls the organisation is money. Where once users directed policy and developed new ideas for the implementation of services often now they have been reduced to fund raising committees or 'user consultation groups' . Funders, mainly local authorities, have seized upon this to impose their own rules. Service level agreements leaving no room for organisations to develop new services have been imposed, the tight financial straightjackets make so called 'independent' groups just arms of local authorities.

Abusing the workers

Workers in the voluntary sector have always been underpaid and have had to put up with atrocious working conditions. They have put up with this basically because they are committed to what they are doing, and to the organisations they work for. What has happened now is this good will has been abused. Workers are expected to take on all the extra work imposed by the 'new regime', improve 'productivity' and still get crap wages and conditions. Unfortunately the sector is virtually un-unionised, what unions exist are worthless, usually just taking subs, selling holidays and nothing else. Any attempt by workers to improve their situation is thwarted by guilt tripping, false promises such as 'it will get better if only we can get this contract' and, of course, threats of job losses. The future is not good for the voluntary sector, the onslaught seems to be only just beginning. If we are to save our jobs, sanity and services we must start to organise ourselves across all sectors. The Public Service Workers Network is a good place to start.

ORGANISE AGAINST MORAL BLACKMAIL

Life in the voluntary sector has traditionally been a strange mixture of workers isolated from other agencies, with little concept of unionisation; and a service provision that is both flexible and centred on client need, which the monoliths of Health Authority and Social Services were unable to provide. So what changes has the new climate of community care brought so far ? As far as service provision goes, there has been a radical streamlining of services and procedures in the name of 'quality assurance' (a term that represents a PR exercise proclaiming that need can be met by tick sheets and mission statements).

The emphasis has all changed . Now reviews and reports have a uniform structure, the public face (how clients and homes appear) has become more important than emotional need, and all the time the amount of client support is being reduced. The organisation presents this as an improvement.

Each week workers are expected to take on a greater work load, whilst illness (especially stress) is targeted by management. New contracts tend to be part-time and the use of lower-graded staff and bank workers has become widespread. In the past annual pay rises have followed national agreements but now this is in jeopardy and management are using the old moral blackmail of saying that increases in pay have to be met by cuts in service, blah, blah ... The silence of the unions is deafening. In my own organisation workers are discouraged from talking each other, and have been informed that discussion with workers from other agencies will be viewed as industrial espionage!

A forum where workers can organise resistance to these changes is desperately needed. It won't be easy. There is little tradition of unionisation (in the sense of broader organisation) and management will continue to play the card that whatever action we take will be against users' interests. But if we are not to be a part-time, very low paid workforce providing a third rate service (and who knows, a return to more cost efficient larger institutions), then we must seize the day and organise.

NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK

WHY WE NEED REVOLUTIONARY UNIONS

At a time when the discussion of politics in the trades unions is at an all time low, it is appropriate to state what we mean by the term "revolutionary unions", or anarcho-syndicalism.

The Public Service Workers' Network argues that we need revolutionary unions. The principle reason for the failure of the reformist unions (TUC-affiliated) has been because they have tried to concern themselves solely with "economic" matters (pay and conditions), leaving politics to the Labour Party.

We are totally opposed to this artificial division between political and economic responsibilities. Every economic dispute, no matter how small, is at its heart political. Whenever management try to uphold their "right to manage" and workers dispute it, a political struggle is going on. Thus, a seemingly petty dispute over wearing a tie, for example, is political to the extent that it is an example of management attempting to exercise control over our working lives.

Equally, when RMT leader Jimmy Knapp appeared on television to deny that the signalling grades dispute had anything to do with privatisation of the railways, insisting that it was "a straight industrial dispute", he was deliberately trying to hide the political nature of the dispute. During the 1989 dispute over railways negotiating machinery when Knapp argued that the reasons for it were purely industrial and nothing to do with British Rail's plans to soften up the industry ready for privatisation, it was part of a systematic attempt by a reformist trades union leader to deny the reality staring him in the face: that what the state was engaged in was a wider political project to destroy trades union power in order to restructure the industry.

CALLING THE TUC'S BLUFF

This is the lesson that the trades union movement failed to learn in the 1980's: that the real fight was against the British state, intent on smashing the power of organised labour. Faced with an crisis in all the Western economies and the rising power of Japan and the economies of the Pacific rim, the boss class systematically planned an assault on trades union power. They identified the problems of the British economy as high wages, low productivity, restrictive practices, and a culture of shop-floor militancy. They believed that these were all symptoms of too much trades union power, which had to be smashed if they were to reverse the trend of industrial decline. The aim was to introduce a low-paid, flexible, casualised, non-union workforce which would attract inward investment.

Hence the challenge which faced workers in 1979: an assault on workers' rights, living standards and working conditions which required a class-wide response if it was to be defeated. Such a response would have demanded a class-conscious trades union movement consistently arguing over the years that workers not only had to pursue their interests in the short term on day-to-day issues, but that this had to be linked to the longer term political aim of replacing capitalism with a social system run by and for the working class.

In 1979 organised workers faced an economy which was going into crisis and could no longer deliver the full employment and growing standard of living on which the post-war consensus was built. The choice before us then was either to replace capitalism with something else or to go under.

Unfortunately, in 1979 we were in no position to replace wage slavery because our organisations were deeply, ideologically committed not to class war but to class collaboration. The social democratic ideals which they promoted sought to eradicate class conflict, play down class consciousness and depoliticise the trades union movement. The social democratic dream envisaged an ever-expanding economy in which poverty and unemployment would be a relic of the 1930's, social partnership between unions and employers would ensure a rising standard of living through a gradual redistribution of wealth, social benefits and state education for all would ensure a stable society based on cohesion not conflict. The original aim of the trades union movement - that of securing for the workers by hand or by brain the fruits of their labour - was replaced by the aim of securing a larger slice of a larger capitalist cake.

THE EMPEROR'S NEW CLOTHES

The only fly in the ointment was that social democracy is based on a totally false premise: that capitalism is no longer subject to the uncontrollable cycles of boom and bust, and has stabilised itself. This premise lost its last shreds of credibility in 1979. The severe and prolonged economic crisis freed the capitalist class from their dependence on social democracy and partnership with the trades unions as a means of controlling militancy among their workforces. Instead it allowed them to return to their traditional method of labour discipline - fear of mass unemployment - to hold down wages, backed up by state repression to manage social conflict.

The tragedy for the working class was that the unions were in no position to respond to these attacks. Forty years of class collaboration (at least, it can be argued this goes back to World War I and earlier,) had de-politicised the trades unions. An entire generation of workers thought that "political unions" meant a block vote at Labour Party Conference and "beer and sandwiches" at 10 Downing St.

The origins of organised labour in this country - which were entwined with the politics of the revolutionary overthrow of wage slavery, the bosses and government - from landless agricultural workers in the last century; to the New Unionism of the 1880's; the syndicalist revolt in South Wales, Liverpool and elsewhere before 1914; and the Red Clydesiders of WWI and after; have been kept safely in the history books where they can do no harm. It was not easy to return to our traditions of class conflict which had been abandoned under conditions of full employment.

Today working people find a situation which may be different, but not new. Capitalism is in a constant state of upheaval and renewal. Although capitalists now compete at the level of international trade blocs, competition still forces them to cut costs by increasing productivity and driving down wages. This is the source of class conflict and a fact of life in all capitalist societies. Given the nature of capitalism, social democracy is doomed to failure. The only way forward for working people is to re-learn the methods of class struggle and constantly link the short term need to improve pay and conditions with the long term aim of replacing capitalism with a system that responds to need not profit.

THE FUTURE

We believe that we have to build an alternative to the present trades unions. An alternative openly committed to a revolutionary transformation of society, educating workers and raising class consciousness not only through militant industrial action to gain concrete improvements in pay and conditions, but also by constantly raising and debating the failure of the current system and organising the means to create a new society. Whilst initially some would be attracted to such unions simply on the basis of effective action, it is our aim to convince them of the urgent need and genuine possibility of building a new society.

Above all we must learn from the mistakes of the reformist unions which only organised one part of working class life - that which exists in the workplace. If we are to have class conscious organisation the union would need to be involved in all its aspects. We must look to build a union movement based both in the community and the workplace. The union office, local or centre must be not only the focus for organising workplaces in the area, but also a place where workers can turn to deal with difficulties in all aspects of their lives: housing, health, education, etc. The union must become a living expression of the class it represents and their struggles, rather than just a bunch of old men in suits.

When we talk about "revolutionary unions", we mean more than simply a revival of militant traditions for which the working class in Britain used to be well known. We are talking about a change in the culture of workers' organisation which will reflect the changes in our lives over the last 20 years.

Mass unemployment and part-time working mean the union can no longer claim to speak as the organised section of the working class if it does not organise outside the workplace as well as within it; thus rent strikes, consumer boycotts, and protests against the deterioration of public services must become the province of workers' organisation.

It is not possible, and never was, to reduce the working class experience to one single homogenous stereotype. The revolutionary union must reflect the diverse experiences of workers from many cultures and backgrounds, this means assimilating the experiences and interests of black, asian, Irish and women workers. It would be impossible to do this without organising outside the workplace to tackle problems ranging from racism and anti-social violence to childcare provision. Equally necessary is an extension of democracy, with decision-making at the base - in the workplace and locally, with recallable delegates, regular rotation of tasks and positions, etc.

As long as the present unions remain committed to the sort of class collaboration and blinkered social democratic vision described above, they will be unable to offer anything to their members except the sort of "policing the membership" role which they played when the last Labour government tried to implement its incomes policy.

The period ahead will offer little economic stability, but increasingly bitter class conflict. We need organisation that recognises this fact and does not lead its members into disputes with illusions in any fairness or British Justice. We need to start laying the foundations for a society administered on the basis of workplace and community control for need, not for the profit of a few, by building organisations of and for the working class - revolutionary unions - now.

This article was adapted from *Transport Worker No.8*, if you have any views on any of the issues raised in this article, write to PSWN. PO BOX 1681, LONDON N8 7LE. Letters will be assumed to be for publication unless otherwise specified. *Confidentiality guaranteed.*

NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK

LETTER

Dear PSWN,
Thanks a lot for sending us PSWN No.4 - a great improvement on previous issues. I particularly liked the article attacking hierarchies, one of the every day, taken-for-granted, insanities which stop public services being adaptable and creative enough to provide decent services. It's been worked out that where I work, in Lambeth, there are seven tiers of management between the lowest paid workers and the councillors. Only the bottom three do anything that you could recognise as useful. Personally I think that everyone in the department should be paid the same and the "professional" (i.e. interesting) jobs and the drudgery should be shared out. Collective decision making would make everyone committed to carrying out those decisions, instead of being pissed off by management's incompetence, as we are at the moment.
As a practical suggestion I recommend trying to set up informal networks to link workers at different work sites directly, often social events are a good place to start the ball rolling, so that at least management's latest cuckoo schemes can be met with a unified (V-sign) response and at best we can start to take over management decision making for ourselves. Only anarchist organisation can actually solve many of the problems confronting the public services.
So send us twenty or so of the next issue. A couple of us work in local councils and one in the voluntary sector - so we'll try to pass them around. We'll send any news, etc. that we have in future - it would be good to read about more (successful) disputes in the next issue - like the Manchester story - because UNISON tells us bugger all about what's going on.
All the best - keep up the good work.

Steve, Anti-Nuclear Network

EDITOR'S COMMENT

We couldn't agree more with the contents of this letter, but it should be pointed out that PSWN, along with the rest of the Solidarity Federation, think that any self-management under the present system would be either temporary or illusory (if tolerated by the authorities, the former is more likely and it would be crushed ruthlessly). Self-management can only really work as part of a wider social revolution which destroys capitalism and the state, and places real power in the hands of the working class. For this we think that a formal network (PSWN itself) committed to promoting and creating revolutionary organisations is required. We also try to spread Network and the message of revolutionary unions through it and other Network publications as widely as possible.

STAMP OUT INCOMPETENCE!

Library workers in Hackney struck for 24 hours on 19th July against staffing cuts. Twelve Library Attendants were supposed to have gone on April 1st (four vacancies have already been axed); four posts are to go with the South Area.
This is the result of management's incompetence and inability to defend the service from Hackney's budget consultants, Price Waterhouse. The first cut, which has been made with the deletion of Library Attendant vacancies, is the direct result of a mistake by an Assistant Director to which he refused to own up and lose face, resulting in the loss of £100,000 from the department's budget. Price Waterhouse touted for business with Labour councils by employing ex-Islington council leader, now MP, Margaret Hodge. However, some of us remember them as the bastards who sequestrated the National Union of Mineworkers during the 1984-85 strike. They decided cuts had to be made.
On top of that, as a result of being moved into Education, £40,000 now has to pay for an Assistant Director to manage Libraries and Arts, which used to be in Leisure. This is on top of an area structure which actually runs the service, three posts which are supposed to manage the department. The management claim that they have no say in budgets - meaning they hope we believe they are not to blame for cuts - they're redundant!
None of these measures has been stopped, although the Library Attendants have only just received voluntary severance/early retirement forms, meaning at least ten would now have to go to make up the money. However, the solid strike has restored a bit of backbone to a union that has been spineless for years. As well as a fair bit of harassment of the handful of scabs, Clapton and Parkside Libraries were actually closed on health & safety grounds - against management opposition - on 23rd August, as a result of it getting filthy because of Library Attendant vacancies. With almost all the fourteen libraries being health hazards of varying degrees of seriousness, this development is welcome.
The government's plans to put all services out to tender (see main feature) make managerial incompetence a threat to the survival of services - imagine your management drawing up a workable tender? With a Head of Department openly playing political games with a council who won't adequately fund fourteen libraries, by trying to reduce the service to between five and nine "centres of excellence" - net result no new books were bought for five months while management manoeuvred over distribution of funds - we're really in it. All UNISON can come up with is writing to the Chief Executive asking to put the Head of Department through the Capability Procedure, despite the fact that she owes her job to making cuts.
The real problem is the existence of managements, and the hierarchical society which imposes them. No short term solution is workable, but it is only through resistance now that we can develop the kind of experience and organisation needed to overthrow the parasites.

PUBLIC SERVICE WORKERS'

NETWORK

INFORMATION NEEDED

As we all know, there are some 'workers' in public services who are not workers at all. We are referring to those whose role is not to provide services, benefits, etc. but to deny them to people.

Claimants, tenants and squatters all get harassed by people supposedly investigating and clearing up 'fraud', false benefit claims, rent arrears, 'unauthorised occupancy', and the like.

While we'd all like to see big time swindlers put away - the Tories would make a good start - these people nearly always pick easy targets, as this is where the results come from.

They also often have a brief to harass workers, and to sack a few to balance the budget, preferably the black workers, and those pesky expensive women with child care responsibilities.

Information is needed to combat their abuses, and to provide evidence to help people get their rights, and to shut them down. This information will be of use to your local claimants' groups, housing action groups, etc., even to unions.

For the benefits police, information can be sent to:
National Claimants' Federation
PO BOX 21
PLYMOUTH
PL1 1QS

All information will be treated in confidence.

WHO WE ARE

Network is published by a group of militant public service workers to promote the idea of workers self-management, and of revolutionary change in society. It is also an open forum for all public service workers to share, discuss and analyse our experiences, and to develop solutions to the problems we face. We welcome your letters, comments, articles, photos and graphics, although we can not guarantee to publish them.

We are also seeking to network as widely as possible with like-minded workers.

We see no point in wasting our time and energy in trying to reform the existing unions, or in trying to elect more left wing leaders. We want to see workers' organisation which is not divided by union affiliations, bureacracy or political parties, and which embraces all public service workers, whether they are employed by local government, health institutions, voluntary organisations, or private contractors, on the basis of practical solidarity.

CONTACTS

PSWN SOUTH:
PO BOX 1681
LONDON
N8 7LE

PSWN EAST:
PO BOX 73
NORWICH
NR1 2EB

PSWN NORTH:
PO BOX 29
MANCHESTER
M15 5HW

TRANSPORT WORKERS' NETWORK: **PO BOX 73**
NORWICH
NR1 2EB

EDUCATION WORKERS' NETWORK: **PO BOX 29**
MANCHESTER
M15 5HW

SOLIDARITY FEDERATION:
PO BOX 384
PRESTON
LANCS PR1 6PQ

I would like to keep in touch with the Public Service Workers' Network

Name.....

Address.....

.....

.....

I can distribute ☐ **copies of Network**

I would like more information on the Solidarity Federation ☐

NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK NETWORK