LONDON LABOUR 10p
BRIEFING
No 8 FEBRUARY 1981

ILEA : ONE STEP FORWARD

IN A REAL, but only partial victory, the ILEA Labour Group has faced both ways on the issue of implementing Party policy in election year. At their budget meeting on January 6 they voted to bring in cheaper school meals from April, cutting the price from 35p to 25p. They refused, however, to maintain the level of the authority's expenditure in order to improve Inner London's education service.

BRYN DAVIES
Vauxhall GLC Member

Both are pledges made in the Party's manifesto for May.

Opening the debate, Ashley Bramall proposed a budget which aimed to maintain services using resources released by government restrictions on the authority's capital programme.

This resulted in a total net expenditure of £694 million, which would require a 62p rate. After changes in the method of paying government grant this meant an increase in the ILEA's precept of 43%.

This, he claimed, could be defended on educational grounds against attacks from the government, ratepayers and London borough councils. Standards of education would be maintained and do much of what the Party wished.

PARTY POLICY

This approach was unacceptable to many members of the Group. An amendment was moved to increase the budgeted expenditure to £715 million (i.e. a 64.5p rate) in order to carry out Party policy.

This is to continue to improve and expand educational provision, and to reduce school meal prices. This would not only maintain the volume of the authority's expenditure, but also allow real developments in areas identified as priorities.

These included: softening the effect of falling rolls on individual schools; greater provision for 16-19 year olds, particularly the unemployed; expansion of adult education, especially community and outreach work; and continued expansion of nursery education.

HOW THEY VOTED:

For the amendment:
L Bondy, B Davies, G Dimson, N Fletcher, L Herbert, E Hillman, H Hinds, L Layward, K Livingstone, J Merriton,* C Rossi, S Turney

Against the amendment:
A Bramall, J Branagan, D Chalkley, M Garside, L Gilles,* R Goodwin, A Grieves, D Kelly, J Keys,* M Kingwell, C McAskill, S Mayne,* D Miles,* M Morgan, J Phillips,* W Ross, A Sofer, F Styles, T Walker, A Ward

* denotes coopted members.

These developments could all be defended on educational grounds and needed more additional resources than proposed by the Group leadership.

In the debate that followed, it was suggested that the expansion called for by the Party was neither necessary nor practical. Accusations of deliberately causing splits were also made and one member called for real cuts in services, in line with the ones being made in the borough (Islington) she represented.

For those members supporting Party policy, however, the most difficult thing to understand was the obstinacy of the leadership. The improvements they proposed were merely token and more could and should be done. Particular emphasis was laid on the health and educational benefits of making school meals cheaper.

SCHOOL MEALS

In the vote the amendment to carry out Party policy was defeated by 12 votes to 20. A further amendment was then moved just to reduce school meal prices. With a few people from the middle ground switching sides this was passed 16 to 13.

Londoners face, next year, a massive rate rise brought about almost entirely by government policy. For many ratepayers, also suffering from government imposed wage cuts and rent increases, the increases will be too much to bear. On the other hand Labour controlled authorities have made real advances in public services which need to be defended.

If rates are to be increased, then at the very least Party policy should be followed. Some would prefer a rejection by Labour authorities of any involvement in carrying out Tory imposed cuts, whether in reduced services or in incomes through higher rates.

There seems no justification, however, for imposing a massive rate increase and still failing to develop services in the way the Party had agreed was necessary in a vote only three months before.

COUNCIL JOBS:

G.L.C. Sackings: No Pledge From McIntosh

KEVIN MOORE
Lambeth Councillor

IN THE immediate pre-Christmas period Horace Cutler gave GLC staff a special present of the first compulsory redundancy notices in the history of the GLC.

Several scaffolders in the Direct Labour organisation were thrown on the dole by the GLC and a last minute plea to the ILEA leadership to employ the men was rejected.

Several dozen other GLC staff face compulsory redundancy and this prompted the GLC NAGLO branch to ask Andrew McIntosh for a commitment that any staff made redundant will be rehired by a Labour GLC.

COMMITMENT AVOIDED

McIntosh prepared a draft reply which he presented to the Party Policy Committee, which avoided giving a firm commitment:

Thank you for your letter of 27 November, and for the copy of your earlier letter. I am sorry that through an administrative mistake your first letter did not reach me personally, and I was not aware either of your very welcome words of support or your requests for commitments: this explains my remarks at your AGM, which must have puzzled your members. . . .

In both your letters you ask for an assurance "should staff be made redundant compulsorily by the Tories that Labour would offer such staff reinstatement at no detriment after election."

. . . . **But your members will be only too well aware that we will be working on a Tory GLC budget for 1981/2,** *and in the context of savage attacks by a Tory government on the freedom of local authorities to carry out their mandate. It would be irresponsible, and unfair to your members, to say more now to your members than a Labour GLC will need their skills and experience (which we do) and that* **we will do our best within the law to find jobs for them,** *giving preference to any who have been made compulsorily redundant. An unconditional assurance, which we might not legally be able to meet, could adversely affect the difficult decisions which your members are facing when being offered voluntary severance. It would be very wrong of us to make promises which we could not keep, and thus give your members a false picture of our powers.*

The policy committee failed to agree and the letter was put direct to the Labour Group.

WORK FOR ALL

Ken Livingstone moved an alternative proposal that we do give such an undertaking on the grounds that if we are going to implement the manifesto there will be no problem finding work for all.

A proposal to defer a decision until consultations had been held with the unions was agreed, so there is time for CLPs to submit motions supporting the case for a reinstatement pledge to the Labour Group.

Camden Thinks Again

CAMDEN LABOUR GROUP are having to "think again" about proposals from officers and leaders advocating 600 redundancies in the borough's Direct Labour Organisation.

Camden CLO is one of the biggest and best organised in London. The proposal would have devastated the DLO, which employs about 1,000, including management.

Martin Kingham, a senior steward on Camden DLO and a member of Hackney South CLP, reports: "Due to the combined opposition of DLO workers and left councillors the proposals were rejected by about 18 votes to 15."

The large number of redundancies arose out of the crash modernisation programme embarked on in 1980, which required many new workers. But Tory grant cuts and refusal to give loan sanction blocked these plans.

"This was the first blow, but what has made the council leaders think again about drastic redundancies has been Heseltine's moratorium on new building and capital works repairs and the housing grants squeeze. This has been disastrous for all DLOs."

MASS MEETING

The DLO joint works committee in collaboration with left councillors has been working to resist redundancy plans. A mass meeting in November gave stewards authority to call indefinite strike action the minute the council declared redundancies.

"Our first step is to demand jobs for DLO employees and the removal of private sub-contractors. We have already suffered serious reductions in our wages through loss of bonus schemes—this has led to strikes on several borough sites. But we're not accepting the loss of jobs as well.

"Redeployment is a bit of a joke. Last November they said they wanted more road sweepers. When we got onto the Works Department, asking exactly how many were required, they said, 'Nine'."

On Monday, 5 January, DLO workers were preapred to launch all-out strike action to stop the proposals before that day's Labour Group meeting, rumoured to include compulsory redundancies, early retirement and redeployment.

But they postponed action because the proposals were deferred until the officers had done some more sums.

However, it is feared these 'sums' might mean even more savage job-cutting plans.

Feeling is strong that a good Labour council should put the jobs of its workers and the services provided as the first priority, if it wants to stage serious united resistance to the Tories—otherwise council and workers will go down divided.

M.D.

Lambeth : Living On The Front Line

IN LAMBETH we have been facing up to the question of whether or not we want to stay in the fight against this Tory government. The decision on whether or not Lambeth should levy a supplementary rate at this point is part of that question.

TED KNIGHT
Leader of Lambeth Council

The argument in the Lambeth Labour Parties has been that it is the role of Labour councillors to protect working class families within the borough to the maximum that they can. But it is seen as absolutely essential that Labour should retain control of the council, and should use the fight to expose the government and argue for alternative policies.

There is another question also that faces left councillors at all times but becomes particularly sharp under a government such as this: why are we on the council at all, when our work is constrained not only by central government, of whatever political colour, but also by the economic nature of the society in which we live?

PLATFORM

I believe that, for socialists, local councils are a platform from which they can continue their fight for socialism.

Under a Tory government it is a platform of resistance, protecting to the limits the standards of living of the people you represent, but within a situation where you can continue that fight.

There is no point in removing yourself from that fight.

This is the situation that Lambeth is now confronted with:

As a result of government policies, we are facing a projected deficit of £11.6 million in the current year. It was the intention of the Labour Council to borrow the money needed for that deficit and to include in our next year's review of our budget any losses that had occurred in this year.

But the District Auditor visited us on 12 December, and he informed us that it was illegal to borrow money to meet that deficit, and therefore we would be unable to carry that amount of £11.6 million forward to next year, and that it was necessary for us to raise a supplementary rate to legalise the borrowing, because we were only permitted to borrow against money raised in this financial year.

BANKRUPTCY

The failure to levy a supplementary rate would mean that the council would be bankrupt somewhere in mid-January, and that would mean that there would be no money of course to pay either wages, salaries or any other debts the council owed.

The consequences of that situation would be that receivers would be appointed to take control of the council's financial affairs and they would be empowered to levy any rate or make any other financial decisions that were in their interests.

The Labour councillors would also be very quickly removed from office on the basis that they were not conducting the affairs of the council in a responsible and businesslike manner.

Such a decision would place the trade unions in an impossible situation because all of their members' jobs would be placed at risk by a decision of the Labour council, and it would be very difficult for them to have any influence on the future livelihoods of their members if they were presented with economic chaos.

The receivers would obviously cut jobs drastically and also many services, including no doubt those in the voluntary sector which are grant aided by the council. The social consequences would be that those in need of the council services would have them removed.

UNIONS IN FIRING LINE

A decision not to put on a supplementary rate would isolate the Labour councillors and Labour Party from the trade unions within the local authority trade union sector. The unions would not see it as a common fight because we would not be in the firing line—it would be only them.

I don't think it is right that we should ask 10,500 workers to decide to put their jobs at risk—because that in itself might produce the opposite effect from what we were hoping.

Rather than its being a rallying point, the right wing would argue that here you have the consequences of a no cuts policy by a Labour council—receivers moving in, 10,500 jobs at risk, social and economic chaos reigning, services not available for those who need them.

You don't fight against a Tory government by just producing 10,500 martyrs, under the misapprehension that that will be the turning point in the class struggle.

Merely putting people up for sacking is a protest movement, not a mass movement. We are not interested in simple protest politics. We are interested in continuing to fight for the working class people of this borough by retaining control of the council.

Through that control we will use all the means we can to show that the supplementary rate and other proposals that flow from government policies are the responsibility of the Tories.

LAMBETH WEEK OF ACTION

Lambeth is calling for the support of workers throughout the country for its Week of Action in the first week in February. Workers are being asked to give some form of commitment to whatever action they think it is possible to support the stand.

GO TO GLASGOW ON FEB 21

Following the massively successful demonstration against unemployment in Liverpool, the Labour Party NEC is calling another jobs protest in Glasgow on February 21.

Last time there was an impressive turn out from London, largely because the Regional Executive took the initiative and booked some trains. This time they are dragging their heels.

Glasgow may be a long way, but thousands of Scottish socialists regularly attend demonstrations in London!

Get your CLP to contact the regional officials and flood them with requests for train tickets! Ring Herbert Morrison House on 703 6511.

SUPPORT DIRECT LABOUR

OVER THE last few years there has been a steady flow of press stories of council house building deficiencies. Readers are left with the impression that council housing is of very poor quality, and that this is due to the fact that they are publicly owned and constructed.

This reinforces the general attack on all public enterprise.

Most of these deficiencies are due to the inadequate performance of the private contractors who built them, and the remainder to inadequacies of the consultants who designed them.

Direct Labour Organisations have suffered from a kind of "guilt by association' because of the vague public idea that council housing estates are built directly by councils themselves and not, as in fact most of them are, by private building contractors.

These stories all offer an excellent opportunity for propaganda from the Labour Party and the trade unions in favour of DLOs and against private enterprise in the building industry.

PUBLICITY GAP

How does London Labour plan and conduct its propaganda and publicity? Not very adequately, to judge from the continued silence on the causes of leaks, cracks, and even subsidences on GLC and borough housing estates.

It could have been demonstrated, in press releases and correspondence columns, that almost all DLOs have a fine record for efficiency and economy in construction, as well as providing many other advantages, while private contracting is almost universally enormously expensive, inefficient and conducive to corruption, and careless for the safety of workers.

Islington Borough Council has had to erect fences and canopies around their 12-14 storey blocks to protect passersby from falling lumps of concrete. It is costing £5,360 per unit to repair 112 maisonettes in seven blocks of the GLC's Alton Estate. In Hillingdon £8 million minimum is required to carry out basic remedial work. There are many more examples. A recent example appeared in the *Guardian* on December 18, when it was reported that a former GLC housing estate at Thetford had developed extensive cracks which would require expensive repairs.

POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Direct Labour Organisations are in the front line of political struggle. Ensuring better standards of new council building and repairs, better safety for workers, and other benefits, is only one aspect, what one might call the quality-of-life aspect. The political aspect is even more important. DLOs provide a service which is open to democratic controls.

As important, their growth could, and should, undermine and weaken the private building and construction industry, and strengthen the trade unions.

During the last Labour government the construction industry spent over £1 million on propaganda campaigns against all forms of public ownership in the building industry; and during the election it gave considerable impetus to the Tory bandwagon in marginal constituencies.

The value and political importance of DLOs needs to be far more widely understood, in the Labour movement as well as among people outside it.

The Direct Labour Collective, 55 Mount Pleasant, WC1, has brought out two excellent publications, "Building with Direct Labour" and "Direct Labour Under Attack", price £1.50 for the two. They are forcefully and clearly written and admirably produced, and should be bought, studied, and used by all members of GLC and borough councils' Labour Groups, and the London Regional Publicity and Public Relations Sub-Committee.

ELEANOR LEWIN
Finchley CLP

ANTI-NAZI RALLY

THE ANTI-NAZI LEAGUE organised an anti-fascist rally in December which was attended by between four and five hundred people.

The platform speakers included Giovanni Favelli of the CP controlled Bologna Council, Henri Buch, the General Secretary of the avowedly anti-racist Free French Police Union (FASP) and Leo Heinemann of the Union of Victims of Nazi Repression (VVN), who had himself been a prisoner at the infamous Buchenwald concentration camp. Sharing the platform with these international speakers were Paul Holborrow, National Secretary of the ANL and Tony Benn MP.

Giovanni Favelli accused the Italian far left of creating the conditions for the rise of the right, whilst Leo Heinemann received a standing ovation when he drew the parallel between the current disunity among workers' parties and that in Germany in the 1920s which allowed Hitler to rise to power. Tony Benn, for his part, and against a background of hecklers supporting the H-Block hunger strikers, pointed to unemployment as the main precondition for the growth of the extreme right.

Solly Kaye of the CPGB, after a powerful speech, made an even more powerful request for donations to the ANL and succeeded in dispossessing the meeting of cash, cheques and IOUs totalling something in the region of £950.

REG GREEN
Lambeth Central

ILEA Entertains Apartheid

THE INNER London Education Authority has entertained at least 10 visitors from the apartheid regime of South Africa. Nearly all the visits were arranged by the British Council or the Central Office of Information and officers working for the ILEA. Councillors were not consulted about any of the visits.

The visits, which fly in the face of the authority's declared intention "to combat racism and the discriminatory practices to which it gives rise", have come under fire from anti-apartheid campaigners. Arguing that all programmes of sporting, cultural and educational exchange are presented by the South African government as evidence of the acceptability of apartheid to the world, the campaign has called on the authority to condemn apartheid publicly and to refuse any visitors from South Africa access to any of ILEA's institutions. London Labour Party activists are expected to join this campaign shortly.

Meanwhile, the London Borough of Lambeth has withdrawn its account from Barclay's Bank in protest against the bank's involvement with the South African economy.

Since 1976, several thousand school pupils have been killed, wounded, arrested or exiled because of protests against apartheid in the education system of South Africa.

NARANDRA MAKANJI
Wood Green CLP

TORY HOUSING MISERY

DAVID NICHOLAS
Vice-Chairperson, London Labour Party

THE CUTBACKS in public sector housing finance are causing misery to millions of people. Elaine is one of them. Her case was quoted by a London Labour MP in the House of Commons last month.

A deserted single parent of a baby boy, she lives, eats and sleeps in a room 10 foot by 10 foot cramped with furniture and personal belongings; she shares the kitchen, bathroom and WC with the landlord's overcrowded family.

Elaine says: "I am having to walk the street at all hours of the day with the baby. I am constantly being hassled by the landlord each time the baby cries or walks on the floor. I am getting to the stage where I am constantly hitting him for every cry."

NO HELP

What do government housing policies offer her? Telling Elaine to buy her own home is a sick joke. Living as she does, in a Tory controlled borough, her chances of rehousing by the council are negligible. The Tory GLC certainly won't help and housing associations, their funds severely restricted by the government, can't help. If Elaine lived in a Labour controlled borough her situation would be better, but, since the latest cutbacks, not much better. The government's withdrawal of money for housing investment programmes, the moratorium on new building and rehabilitation and the forced sale of council homes means extremely long waiting periods for any sort of council accommodation.

Even the usual Tory lie that the private sector will step in and provide more homes is not believed by anyone any more. Building activity has sunk to such a low level that private building companies, traditional supporters of the Tory Party, are complaining publicly about the housing cutbacks.

In an almost unprecedented move a group of Merseyside builders bought national newspaper advertising space to publish an open letter to John Stanley, Minster for Housing and Construction. Among other things, they said: "Our group of 80-plus companies are faced with almost certain bankruptcy. . . . the effects of unemployment in the area when present cutbacks finish in February or March will be catastrophic."

RENT RISES

It is Elaine and the millions like her, the workers in the building trade and council tenants, who are to have yet another vicious increase in rent, who are bearing the brunt of the Tory cuts in housing.

The money that should have been used to provide houses and jobs is fast disappearing in tax handouts for the very rich, high interest repayments to money lenders and expensive and deadly warmongering policies.

The position in London is perhaps worse than anywhere else in the country. The cuts have been greater and yet the quality of the capital's housing stock is one of the poorest of any British city. A quarter of all homes in London are "unsatisfactory" according to the definition of the Department of the Environment. Over 100,000 new waiting list applications were received last year. Record numbers of families are becoming homeless.

The level of new building is now so low that the average dwelling in London will have to last 900 years before demolition!

FIGHT BACK

The crisis in the capital is deepening rapidly and the labour movement must use every opportunity to fight back. The GLC elections in May offer one springboard for attack. The truly desperate situation facing many families must be highlighted. The election should be used to confront the government with evidence of the hardship they are causing, and support should be mobilised for alternative policies.

In the next issue Gladys Dimson, GLC Housing Spokesperson, will look towards the future under a Labour GLC, and write about the task of re-creating a housing initiative.

HOUNSLOW UNITED

HOUNSLOW'S LABOUR Council has recently announced that it would continue to defy the Tories by striving to maintain services during 1981-2, a policy for which it has already been placed in Heseltine's 'penalty box'.

PETE ROWLANDS
Hounslow CLP

Hounslow imposed a 41% rate increase. last April and has raised rents and imposed a 10% staff vacancy rate in order to fund increases in expenditure in certain areas. While this has affected services, no substantial cuts have been made, and Hounslow Council has generally received support for the stand it has taken.

Up until recently however, there has been little by way of any public campaigning by the Labour Group to mobilise support for their stand.

NOW CAMPAIGNING

This is now changing—one of the CLPs has issued a mass leaflet supporting the council, and in November a meeting of the Group and party members in the borough agreed in principle to set up a campaigning body based on the Group, the two CLPs and the Trades Council, to seek support for the council's stand and to link with national initiatives.

This has now been agreed by the constituent bodies and the campaign should get off the ground shortly.

Such a position has been slow to develop in Hounslow, but it is based on substantial unity and has much potential behind it. Whether it and similar campaigns can mount a united and successful challenge to the Tories remains to be seen.

KILNER HOUSE EVICTION

Over 500 hundred police, armed with riot shields and sledgehammers evicted the 20 protesting squatters from the barricaded fifth floor landing on 9 January, in the final protest against the GLC's policy of selling flats in Kilner House.

Aware that the eyes of the press were upon them, police largely refrained from using strong-arm tactics and only two squatters were arrested. This ended the 98-day successful squat which has attracted good publicity against the GLC policy.

The cost of the eviction was enormous. Police vandalism, when they smashed their way into the empty flats is estimated to have cost in excess of £10,000; and the GLC will now be spending over £5,000 per month on security.

CAROL TURNER
participant



All out for May 7!

THE LEFT HAS WORKED HARD over the last two years to make sure that we had a democratically decided GLC election policy. Well, we've got it now—in a manifesto worth fighting for. The left fought too for candidates pledged to fight on and for that manifesto. We've got them too—the best and most enthusiastic list we've ever had.

Now it remains to get them elected on 7 May. There must be no letting up now, no leaving the chores to the 'old guard', no letting them take over the reins at the last moment, no softening the edges of agreed policies.

The Campaign Committee of the London Labour Party, which has been appointed by the Executive to take over all activities until the GLC election, is in the hot seat. It must see that manifesto policies are projected in a straightforward, comprehensible and honest manner in all centrally written material; the popular manifesto, the middle pages of the election address, the February Broadsheet, the special leaflets—all these must faithfully reflect the spirit of the October conference. And the same goes for what is said at press conferences and put into press handouts.

The money donated by the unions to the GLC election fund gives the Campaign Committee a lot of clout. The provisional, and admittedly hopeful, budget disclosed at the December conference of candidates and agents amounted to over £300 per constituency. Well over half of that will carry the message written centrally. The way that message is handled could make or mar the CLPs' campaign.

TONY HART
Chairperson, Press & Public Relations Sub-Committee
London Labour Party

GLC ELECTI

WITH ONLY TWO CANDIDATES still to be selected, the election line-up is now almost complete. The major gains made by the left in the summer selections have continued throughout the autumn and it is now possible to see the shape of the next Labour Group.

The major upset was the small number of candidates on the ideological right who managed to get selected to reinforce the present right wing of the Group. McIntosh Bramall, Garside, Morgan, Branagan and Sofer were all reselected but only Jenkinson, Paul Rossi, Judge, and McBrearty are certain to reinforce them after the election.

The contrast with the influx of talent on the left of the Group could not be more marked and seems certain to ensure that the long standing rift between the Regional Executive and County Hall will shortly come to an end.

KEN LIVINGSTONE, GLC Member for Hackney North

PERCENTAGE LABOUR LEAD AT 1979 GENERAL ELECTION

	Constituency	% Lead	GLC Candidate 1981
	Newham South	41.9	Tom Jenkinson
	Stepney	41.6	John Branagan†
	Bermondsey	38.7	George Nicholson*
	Newham North West	35.0	Arthur Edwards†
5	Peckham	31.7	Harvey Hinds†
	Hackney Central	31.4	John Carr*
	Brent South	28.5	Illtyd Harrington†
	Woolwich East	28.4	Mair Garside†
	Hackney South	25.9	Margaret Morgan†
10	Bethnal Green	25.2	Ashley Bramall†
	Tottenham	24.9	Andrew McIntosh†
	Newham North East	24.0	John Wilson†
	Battersea North	23.0	Gladys Dimson†
	Greenwich	22.1	Deirdre Wood
15	Deptford	21.7	Alex McKay*
	Lambeth Central	21.6	Paul Moore
	Southall	21.6	Yvonne Siev†
	Dagenham	21.5	Harry Kay†
	Barking	20.5	John Ward†
20	St Pancras North	20.3	Anne Sofer†
	Islington North	19.0	
	Vauxhall	18.8	Bryn Davies†
	Hackney North	18.3	Gerry Ross
	Islington South	18.0	Frances Morrell
25	Brent East	16.6	Norman Howard†
	Islington Central	15.9	Simon Turney†
	Tooting	14.5	Tomy Banks*
	Leyton	14.0	Denise Luinberg*
	Walthamstow	12.5	Paul Boateng
30	Hammersmith North	9.8	Dave Wetzel
	Holborn	9.5	Charlie Ross†
	Hayes and Harlington	7.8	John McDonnell*
	Wood Green	7.1	Mike Ward
	Feltham and Heston	6.9	Peter Pitt
35	Erith and Crayford	5.7	Elgar Handy*
	Norwood	5.6	Ted Knight
	Edmonton	4.5	Ken Little
	Lewisham East	3.1	Paul Rossi
	Lewisham West	2.3	Lewis Herbert†
40	Mitcham and Morden	1.3	Tony Judge†
	Battersea South	1.1	Valerie Wise
	Dulwich	0.3	Lesley Hammond
	Paddington	–0.3	Ken Livingstone*
	Hornchurch	–1.7	Alan Williams

ON LINE-UP

45	Ealing North	–2.4	Gareth Daniel*
	Fulham	–3.5	Barry Stead
	Ilford South	–4.1	Ed Gouge
	Putney	–5.3	Andy Harris
	Woolwich West	–5.8	Neil Davies
50	Enfield North	–6.7	Tony McBrearty
	Hampstead	–8.5	Anna Bowman
	Brentford	–9.0	Roy Gregory
	Croydon North West	–9.3	Mary Walker
	Hornsey	–9.9	Kate Hoey
55	Harrow Central	–13.2	Alf Elderton
	Ilford North	–14.0	Mike Killingworth
	Acton	–14.2	Jenny Fletcher
	Streatham	–14.4	Mike Drake
	Croydon Central	–15.8	John Evers
60	Hendon North	–16.0	Frank Cooper†
	Croydon North East	–16.0	Peter Spalding
	Kensington	–16.2	Steve Hoier
	Uxbridge	–16.8	Jake Magee
	Upminster	–17.1	Graham Allen
65	Finchley	–19.8	Tom McKendry
	Brent North	–19.8	Lawrie Nerva
	Carshalton	–20.1	John Weir*
	Harrow East	–20.5	John Bartlett
	Romford	–20.9	Jack Hoepelman
70	Bexleyheath	–21.0	Jim Dawson
	Chislehurst	–22.9	Ken Mansfield†
	Hendon South	–23.1	Monty Miller
	Wimbledon	–26.6	Rock Tansey
	Chingford	–28.2	Ben Birnbaum
75	Surbiton	–30.5	Andrew Mackinlay
	Kingston	–31.5	Stuart Hercock
	Beckenham	–31.8	Paul Brown
	Chipping Barnet	–31.8	Steven Powell
	Marylebone	–33.4	Jean Merriton
80	Sidcup	–34.0	Audrey Martin
	Harrow West	–34.0	Kerry Underwood
	Westminster	–35.3	Reg Fryer
	Richmond	–35.4	Elizabeth Nash
	Twickenham	–35.5	Brian Kemp
85	Southgate	–39.0	Molly Standbridge
	Ruislip–Northwood	–39.6	Keith Goldsworthy
	Wanstead	–42.1	Paul Fiander
	Ravensbourne	–42.4	John Holbrook
	Sutton	–43.7	Phil Bassett
90	Orpington	–46.1	Keith Morton
	Chelsea	–47.6	Stephen Benn
	Croydon South	–51.8	

+ = previous member reselected / * = defeated

STOP PRESS

ISLINGTON NORTH

Left wing activist in Islington North STEVE BUNDRED has been selected to fight the Islington North GLC seat. His selection was by the Regional Executive after his GMC had failed to make a selection. Steve described the result as a step forward for the left actvists in Islington.

Asset-stripping, etc. ~ how we're failing

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT in London is probably amongst the most vital in the country–but we let ourselves down in the effectiveness of our London-wide campaigning interventions.

Take for instance the Tory GLC's current drive to sell off land and property assets. The success of their push could drastically affect a Labour GLC's ability to fully implement its housing, industrial and planning manifesto.

A circular to CLPs was sent out in the autumn alerting them to the need to devise ways of delaying and campaigning on sales. This was a good start, but without coordination and expert help, CLPs don't stand a chance of devising and carrying through delaying tactics.

FULL-TIME WORKERS

There is a desperate need for full-time workers, devoted to the phone, leg and nitty-gritty research and chase-up work that short term campaigns of this kind demand.

The Regional Officers are bogged down and overstretched with day to day organisational tick-over, selection processes, and dispute intervention. The Labour GLC secretariat are equally submerged in support work for their members. But unless we grapple with this problem we'll be dogged with a never-ending series of half-cock campaigns, ill-coordinated and ill-informed.

I believe the Regional EC and new Labour Group must seriously examine their effectiveness in servicing short term campaigns.

TIME IS SHORT

It is now January, the GLC sales were announced in September and the question has been referred by the Regional EC to one of the panels of GLC candidates–all worthy, hard-working individuals, many with marginals to fight. What time can they really be expected to devote to this issue? Yet many of them may find themselves on May 8 with vastly reduced possibilities because Horace Cutler has removed literally the soil from under their feet.

ANDY HARRIS
London Labour Party EC

Leadership in London ~ the story so far ....

IN MARCH 1980 the Greater London Labour Party Annual Meeting voted by more than two to one to change the method of election of the leader of the GLC Labour Group so that in future the leader would be elected by the annual meeting as a whole and not just by the handful of Labour GLC councillors.

The immediate response within the Labour Group at County Hall was the unexpected retirement of Sir Reg Goodwin from the leadership. The right wing felt that the best chance of retaining control of the leadership was to get a new younger face into the post before any change in the system of election.

Although Sir Reg alerted Andrew McIntosh to his coming resignation, the right came within one vote of losing control, as many in the centre of the Group felt that someone as far to the right as McIntosh would split the London Labour Party.

In the event, the National Executive Committee failed to agree the rule change and the matter was referred to the review of the relationship between Labour Groups and CLPs which will report to the 1981 October conference.

NO GROUP DISCUSSION

Throughout the debate on the method of leadership election at the 1979 and 1980 annual meetings no member of the Labour Group spoke against the proposed change and at no point did the GLC Labour Group discuss it and make a recommendation to either the London Labour Party Executive or the NEC.

At the meeting of the GLC Labour Group on 24 November a motion was proposed by Ken Livingstone calling on the NEC to agree the proposed rule change immediately so that it could come into effect for the March 1981 annual meeting.

In moving the motion he spoke of the need to resolve the issue before the May elections so that the leader would have a wide basis of support within the Party as a whole, and emphasised the importance of the leader being answerable to the annual meeting which drew up the manifesto.

Although the motion was supported by the other defeated leadership contender, Illtyd Harrington, and Gladys Dimson, who argued that all positions should be elected by the annual meeting including committee chairs and vice-chairs, it was defeated by 14 votes to eight.

All those members present who had voted for McIntosh as leader opposed the motion. The ILEA leadership (Bramall, Morgan) argued that only councillors know the strengths of the individual contenders, that the conference might elect someone who was popular but lazy and "would not do the work".

EMOTIONAL

Finally Andrew McIntosh spoke. In an uncharacteristically emotional contribution he attacked Ken Livingstone for "wasting the time of the Group with a trivial motion" and alleged that the motion was a "serious attempt to destabilise the party". He finally fell back on the old right wing ploy that we should be "attacking the Tories and not wasting our time with this trivia".

That someone who is so far to the right should complain that the left are not attacking the Tories is a bit much.

LEADERSHIP VOTE CONSULTATION

Perhaps what moved McIntosh so greatly is the knowledge that during the leadership election seven GLC members asked their parties who they should support in the leadership vote—six voted for Livingstone and one made no recommendation. When the votes of the GMCs were added together the result was Livingstone 89%, Harrington 8% and McIntosh 3%.

The vote in the Labour Group was:

	1st Ballot	Run-Off	Final Ballot
McIntosh:	9	17	14
Harrington:	9	11	—
Livingstone:	10	—	13
Abstentions:	1	1	2

KEVIN MOORE
Lambeth Councillor

CLPD ~ Future Plans

RENEWED ENERGY to tackle the existing barriers to full accountability and fairness in the Party was the hallmark of the recent AGM of the Campaign for Labour Party Democracy.

Mandatory reselection is safe and securing dividends already—Healey is not leader because more MPs are now willing to take account of CLP opinion. Also a reasonable leadership franchise seems likely from January 24.

We are determined to continue our record of solid progress. 1981 will see further attempts to secure manifesto control for the NEC, democratise the operations of the PLP, promote positive discrimination for women, secure short-listing invitations to black candidates and try to expose the danger of reintroducing the three-year rule.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEMOCRACY

CLPD will be making a much more vocal intervention into local government democracy—a sub-committee will invite inputs and produce resolutions for conference 1981.

CLPD has in part succeeded and the first chapter can be written. We now need to make the gains effective by holding full and extensive reselection processes in the CLPs and by encouraging candidates to stand in the 1982 local elections who are committed to accountability. Many London Labour Groups need a clean sweep. Organise *now* to achieve this.

ANDY HARRIS
Vice Chairperson CLPD

TARGET 1982

THE STRUGGLE for control of Labour councils in the 1982 London borough elections has begun. Representatives from 11 London boroughs attended a BRIEFING meeting at County Hall on 8 December, at which Ken Livingstone spelled out the tasks ahead.

Ken said that **London Labour Briefing** has been remarkably successful in organising for the selection of GLC candidates, and we must now do the same at borough level.

"But we cannot take over by manoeuvres. We must challenge the ideas of the right wing and prepare the party for when we take control."

It would be necessary to turn the council machinery outwards to obtain the support of the public. The council workforce and the community must also be involved in the council's struggle.

ARM OF THE STATE

It would therefore not be enough just to elect Labour councils which were good spenders. The council was an arm of the state and was not an inherently socialist body.

He listed objectives:

* A crucial question was the democratisation of Labour Groups. Recorded votes at Labour Groups must be pressed for.

* GMCs should take local government seriously. They should demand written reports from the councillors.

* Benn's local government proposals should be raised again--it was vital that the Party elected the leadership and determined the policies of Labour Groups.

"Above all, in this period, it must be understood that the programme of a Labour authority is not just a list of good things a social democratic authority will do. The crucial question now is the challenge to central government. We must use the council machinery as part of a permanent political campaign both against the government and in defence of socialist policies."

There must be a proper relationship with the trade unions. In Lambeth there was a joint committee between the council and the trade unions, and this should be developed much further.

In the clash with central government, the major force we had to rely on was the local government staff. If we could not mobilise them, we would not be able to reach out to the community.

We must press for trade union representatives with full speaking rights at Labour Group meetings.

SWEPT AWAY

From that meeting we should organise a series of others to discuss council policies and structures. Out of 14 Labour boroughs, the leaderships in 13 had to be swept away.

Ken's lead-off was followed by reports from the various boroughs represented. It was understood that the left wing breakthrough at GLC level would be weakened if it were not followed up at borough level, and that a key area of struggle against the Tory government was through the fight to remove right wing Labour councillors.

A first step towards "Target 1982" was confirmed only days after the 8 December meeting, when **BRIEFING** supporters were selected for the Stonebridge by-election in Brent.

Our next "Target 1982" meeting will be on Monday 9 February at 7.30pm in Room 166, County Hall.

G.L.B.

IN HARINGEY

Haringey supporters of **LONDON LABOUR BRIEFING** are taking the political lead of the paper one stage further.

They are calling a general meeting of **BRIEFING** supporters to discuss "The GLC Election Campaign and the Implementation of the Manifesto".

Regional EC member **Ken Livingstone** will lead the discussion, the aim of which is to involve Party members in discussions around the campaign needed to carry out the manifesto.

HARINGEY BRIEFING

Open Meeting

Friday 30 January, at 8pm at Trades Hall, Bruce Grove, N17

Speaker: KEN LIVINGSTONE

"The GLC Election Campaign and the Implementation of the Manifesto"

This meeting will, it is hoped, be the forerunner of other meetings to develop support in Haringey and to build the closest possible alliance between Party activists, trade union activists, anti-cuts campaigners and councillors.

Anyone interested in supporting **BRIEFING** in Haringey should contact me at 28 Lausanne Road, N8.

JEREMY CORBYN
Hornsey CLP and
Haringey Councillor

LONDON LABOUR BRIEFING
exists as an organ of communication for the left of the Labour Party in London. Through such communication we hope to be better able to coordinate and organise our activities.

Contributions are invited from all on the Labour left. As will be seen from this issue, there is no restriction to a particular political position other than adherence to a socialist viewpoint.

RALLY:
Mobilise for Labour Democracy

An Eve-of-Special-Conference Rally
at: 7.30pm
on: Friday 23 January
at: Central Hall, Westminster

Speakers:
Tony Benn MP, Arthur Scargill NUM, Eric Heffer MP, Ian Mikardo MP, Reg Race MP, Ken Cameron General Secretary (designate) FBU.

Chair:
Joan Maynard MP

Organised jointly by the Rank and File Mobilising Committee for Labour Party Democracy and the Tribune Group of MPs.

Entrance 50p. Tickets available in advance from Jon Lansman, 10 Park Drive, NW11 (458 1501).

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF HACKNEY

Havering

WOMEN'S FIGHTBACK CONFERENCE

ALMOST 200 women attended the Women's Fightback Conference in Islington recently. The conference was organised for women involved with the Labour Party and speakers included Jo Richardson MP and Mandy Moore from LARC and CLPD.

Jo spoke about the NEC's Women's Rights Study Group which will be producing around 20 papers for discussion in CLPs. Mandy outlined the proposal that the CLPD Women's Action Committee have formulated to campaign for positive discrimination in favour of women within the Labour Party.

These proposals—reported on in the December **BRIEFING**—include the demand for a reformed parliamentary day with normal working hours and appropriate facilities for those with children; that there should be a campaign for a National Women's Department at the Labour Party Headquarters and that the NEC's women's section be elected by the women's conference.

The purpose of the conference was to discuss the role of women within the Party and to formulate proposals in such areas as housing, education, and sexual politics in order to stimulate those being adopted as policy by the Party.

PARTICIPATION

The aim of Women's Fightback and the Women's Action Committee is to support and encourage women's participation at all levels of the Party. Mandy Moore reported that this year, for the first time, Labour Party Conference had seen feminists successfully organising fringe meetings, campaigning in the Party for positive discrimination and examining the sexist attitudes of male members of the Party. Next year, she said, we needed that same level of organisation and much more equal participation on the conference floor.

The morning session divided into workshops to discuss how to build Labour Party women's sections and the various obstacles we had to overcome such as General Committees (more often than not in 'left' Parties) vetoing women's right to organise separately within the Party. However, delegates reported that once these problems had been overcome, successful recruitment campaigns on housing estates and shopping centres aimed specifically at women had been possible. Leaflets were produced not only on current national issues such as the Employment Act and the Social Security (No 2) Act but on local issues such as refuges, abortion daycare centres, street lighting etc. Many experiences were shared and discussed by women who have been in the Labour Party for many years and women who had joined recently or were considering joining because of the victories won at Blackpool at annual conference and the emergence of feminist women's sections.

The workshops in the afternoon formulated draft policy resolutions on: childcare; health, abortion and maternity; housing; immigration and racism; social security benefits and taxation; violence, rape and sexual politics; work; education and the media; and Labour Party Young Socialists.

Full report-backs took place in the plenary session and many issues were raised. These included demands for state provision of nurseries free of charge, abortion daycare facilities, free membership of the Labour Party and trades unions for the unemployed and an end to discrimination in housing against single parents and battered wives.

VIOLENCE

We attended the workshop on violence, rape and sexual politics. This workshop was by far the most popular of the conference and had in fact to be split into two groups. It is also an area previously untouched by the Labour Party.

Some of the issues raised were that rape within marriage should be recognised as a criminal offence; that all legal restrictions on lesbianism should be abolished; that children should be taught self-defence; that some form of Domestic Purpose Benefit (as introduced by the Labour Party in New Zealand) which provides finance and housing for battered wives—or battered husbands—should be introduced.

It was pointed out that the present government in New Zealand was making it virtually impossible to claim this benefit because it was 'anti-family'! However it was felt that some similar type of benefit should be introduced in this country.

A detailed discussion of male accountability to women in the Party took place. It was agreed that we should campaign for resignation from office of any male member of the Party who is physically violent towards women.

The conference welcomed a speaker from the Garner's Strike Committee who outlined the work of the women's support committee, and a collection was held.

A message of support was sent to the women in Armagh gaol fighting for political status.

It was also agreed to contact the committee fighting for the release of Annette and Charlene Maw and offer support.

All the draft policy resolutions will be discussed by a working group from the conference and the Women's Fightback Steering Committee have undertaken to publish and distribute a booklet containing these resolutions throughout the Labour Party in order to prompt a campaign for these proposals so that they may appear on next year's Annual Labour Party and Women's Conference agendas.

SUE LONGLEY, Brent East CLP
JANET PICKERING, Croydon NW CLP
ANGELA SHARIFF, Brent East CLP

Abortion Rights Attacked Again

NOT CONTENT with the third successive defeat last year, when thousands of women (and men) demonstrated against the Corrie anti-abortion bill, Parliament looks likely to begin a fourth attempt to take away the limited facilities provided by the 1967 Abortion Act.

The threat this time comes from MP for Hove, Timothy Sainsbury who has drawn first place in this year's private members bill ballot. Should he decide to avoid this controversial subject, Donald Stewart, drawn second in the ballot, is also ready to take it up. It is widely rumoured that the bill will be a simply amendment to reduce the time limit on abortions.

It is vital that party members write to the two MPs (and send a copy to their own MP/candidate) protesting this retrograde step and pointing out the strength of public opinion in favour of a woman's choice—witnessed last year by the Corrie campaign, and confirmed by the recent survey by ALRA (Abortion Law Reform Association) which showed three out of four people in favour of a woman's choice.

Other action you can take is to put a motion through your women's section and constituency party calling on the NEC to plan a demonstration, rally or public meeting in the event of this bill being introduced. It's important to do this now, and not wait until the bill is introduced—that way we'll demonstrate to Sainsbury and his kind that the pro-choice organisations are well prepared

Continued next page

Ireland: Labour's Shame

COLIN ADAMS
Brent East CLP

THE ABSOLUTE IMPORTANCE OF THE IRISH QUESTION has been underlined by recent events which dominated the media on both sides of the Irish Sea. The Blackpool Conference of October last was a gain over the previous year as far as the debate on Ireland was concerned.

The public stance of most of our leaders, however, has not changed in the least over the past few years. The bi-partisan policy continues, to the shame of our movement. It is Tories and Loyalists who determine Labour's policy on Northern Ireland.

The most important event of late was the now-concluded hunger strike in the H-blocks and Armagh. It must be seen as a setback for the Republican movement in Ireland, who had staked so much on it. Even now, a month after its conclusion, its outcome is disputed. It is impossible to know what happened on the evening of December 18 in the H-blocks, but whatever was said to persuade the hunger strikers to give in, nothing tangible has resulted, and the blanket protest continues.

DUPED?

Whether the hunger strikers were duped or not, the government and its media were quick to claim a victory.

A hunger strike is not entered into lightly and it is important to remember that prisoners on H-block and Armagh have been suffering the most appalling conditions for up to four years. Let us not forget that it was a Labour administration which introduced the policy of 'criminalisation' and removed the special category status. It is vital to support the granting of political status to these prisoners, for they have all been convicted in special no-jury (Diplock) courts, many solely on confessions. The government calls them 'terrorists' but ignores its own definition of 'terrorist', which is someone committing a crime for **political** purposes. The fight for special category, political or prisoner-of-war status will and must continue. If anyone is in any doubt that a war is taking place, ask the British army.

The most important element during the period of the hunger strike was the huge demonstrations which took place in Ireland. They were the biggest seen since the civil rights marches of the late sixties, and gave the lie to media reports of waning support for nationalism in the north. Unfortunately, the response on this side of the Irish Sea was not so impressive. There were a couple of demonstrations plus localised events, but nothing of sufficient size to sway the Labour leaders, let alone the government. British socialists, arguing over the outcome of the hunger strike, must examine seriously the situation here just as much as in Ireland.

SETTLEMENT UNLIKELY

The other major recent event was Thatcher's secret meeting with Haughey in Dublin. Thatcher's reaction was that the talks were routine and that further consultations would take place. Haughey said that the talks were more significant and Paisley's reaction was to threaten both governments with armed Loyalist insurrection.

Speculation has been mounting about a Zimbabwe-type constitutional settlement being considered by the Tories. However, this seems most unlikely. The Loyalists in Ulster cannot be compared to the white settlers in Rhodesia. The Loyalists are still dominant, exercising a veto over affairs in the North and, more significantly, supported by the British Army on the ground.

As long as the present situation prevails, any talks in the coming months will fail. The only solution to the stalemate in the North is for us to move the Labour Party to a position of removing the Unionist veto over the affairs of the North and removing its physical support, the British army.

It is vitally important, therefore, that the issue of Ireland is again on the agenda at this year's Party conference. Even more CLPs must push resolutions and put pressure on Labour MPs, such as Tony Benn, to move towards a truly socialist position on Ireland.

The next Labour government must begin the process of British withdrawal so that Irish people need never again go on hunger strike because of British oppression.

POLAND

THIS IS A RESOLUTION which Hither Green Branch passed, to be discussed at the January GMC of Lewisham East CLP. Perhaps readers of **BRIEFING** would like to raise a similar resolution in their Labour Parties:

"This GMC condemns in the strongest terms the military threats being made by the government of the Soviet Union towards the people of Poland and declares its full support for the autonomous Polish trade union movement in its struggle to establish the right to strike as a pre-condition for other basic rights in a socialist society. It calls on the National Executive Committee of the Labour Party:

(a) to dissociate completely from the hypocritical protestations of 'support' for trade unions in Poland which have come from such reactionary sources as the Tory Party, the EEC and the mass media

(b) to organise in the near future and as a matter of urgency a demonstration in London in support of the independent organisations of the Polish working class

(c) to link this demonstration with the struggle to defend trade unionists in this country, bring down the Tory government and replace it with a Labour government pledged to implement Clause IV of the Labour Party constitution."

CHRIS KNIGHT
Lewisham East CLP

(Continued from previous page)

and well organised for any onslaught he may make on the 1967 Act.

With the main burden of the Tory anti-working class onslaught being borne by women—forced out of employment and into the home to compensate for lack of health and social services and of local nursery facilities—we must take the offensive to **improve** the limited facilities of the 1967 Act.

With this aim in mind NAC and LARC have jointly called a Labour Movement Conference (details below) and you should support this by raising it in your wards, constituencies, women's section and trade union branches—asking them to sponsor the conference and to send delegates.

We must squash the anti-abortion movement once and for all—the time for action is NOW!

CAROL TURNER
Peckham CLP and
Southwark Abortion Campaign

LABOUR MOVEMENT CONFERENCE ON ABORTION AND POSITIVE ACTION

Saturday 14th March, 1981 in London

Jointly organised by NAC and LARC for an offensive to improve the present facilities

Delegates applications and further information from:
NAC, 374 Grays Inn Rd, WC1 (01-278 0153)

VITAL BY-ELECTION

TWO BLACK COMRADES, both contributors to LONDON LABOUR BRIEFING, have been chosen to fight a double by-election at Stonebridge (Brent South) on January 29.

The selections mark a considerable departure in Brent Labour Party policy. They are also a major victory for the left.

Positive discrimination in favour of ethnic minority, women and manual working class candidates has not only been adopted by the Local Government Committee but, this time, rigorously pursued at every level of the Party. This is already being reflected strongly in nominations to the 1982 panel of candidates.

NEW MEMBERS

But the really exciting development has been the large influx of new members into the Party since the Foot leadership election. That event, combined with the enthusiasm with which Tony Benn's call for black organisations to affiliate has been accepted locally, has already had a big impact.



Manibhai Patel

Recruitment is heavy across the ethnic minority spectrum and is being spearheaded by Asian community leaders. Of these, **Manibhai Patel**, as Chairperson of the Brent Indian Association, is best known. His assessment:

"Councillors must make the stand–that comes first! But here, as everywhere else except Lambeth, they complain of lack of support, Well, here we're going to give them a lot of support. Whether or not any of them then start to develop new complaints, it will be interesting to see."

At 23, **Merle Amory** stands to become Brent's youngest councillor. West Indians make up the largest single group in a multi-ethnic ward and she is hoping that the example set by the Stonebridge Party will be followed elsewhere, particularly in the other Harlesden wards.



Merle Amory

Her view is that developments in Brent could well reinforce the trend set throughout London by the GLC selection campaign, but she has a warning:

POWER, NOT OFFICE

"Gaining office is of value to Labour in as much as it enables leaders better to lead–nothing more. Power can only come from the strength and the solidarity of the working people themselves–at work and in the home. Office has been open to Labour for the best past of this century–power is what we need. Those in office who have failed to take that power must give way to those who will–it's as simple as that."

The campaign is already well under way Polling day is January 29. Why not come over and lend a hand? This is an important one.

Committee rooms: 15 Longlents House, Shrewsbury Crescent, NW10 (nearest station: Harlesden– buses: 18, 18A, 260, 266). Agent: Ron Anderson, phone 450 4509.

NEXT MEETING of Briefing Editorial Collective: 6pm sharp on January 23 in Ken Livingstone's room at County Hall. Last date for receipt of copy for next issue: 7 February.

LETTER

DEAR BRIEFING,

I am not surprised to see that the December issue of **London Labour Briefing** is continuing its tradition of giving pride of place to battles within the Labour Party, instead of to fighting the Tories–or that the sniping is now turning on me.

Ken Livingstone seems to think there is something sinister in my statement that "you could call [the GLC manifesto] tough, you could call it radical, but you couldn't call it left wing". Has he forgotten that he himself (*Hampstead and Highgate Express,* 24 October 1980) denied that the manifesto was the result of a left wing takeover? "It's a reformist document," said Ken, "containing things which people have been talking about for London for years." Clearly the left will have to watch Ken Livingstone very carefully.

Then on squatters, an unnamed (I wonder why?) contributor reports "a split in the Labour ranks" about security arrangements. I would be more impressed with the purity of Ken Livingstone and Anna Grieves in voting against securing properties–which we all agree will *not* be sold off after we take power in May–if either of them had bothered to turn up to the Group meeting and put their views to other colleagues. In their absence we concurred with the views of Labour members of the Housing Policy Committee, including your contributor, Bryn Davies. So is the split between Davies and Livingstone?

Yours fraternally,

ANDREW McINTOSH
Tottenham GLC Member
and Leader of the Opposition, GLC

TARGET 1982

Now is the time for the left in London to start mobilising for control of London borough councils in the 1982 elections.

Come to the second meeting in this series:
on: Monday 9 February
at: 7.30pm
in: Room 166,
at: County Hall

Published by London Labour Briefing, 158 Thorold Rd., Ilford, Essex. Typeset by Rye Express (TU), 8 Hatcham Pk. Rd., SE14.
Printed by Wernham Printers Ltd. (T.U.) Forster Road N17