

WHEN PARLIAMENT returns to overt business in October it will discuss the Government's new Criminal Justice Bill. The forces of authoritarianism, aided by the reawakened popular hysteria for repressive measures, have already started a voluble campaign to control the civil liberties of the subject. Their first attempt was to compulsorily fingerprint the whole population, this fortunately proved a science-fiction non-starter as the administrative difficulties cannot yet be solved by cybernetics.

The attack on the jury system seems, however, to be succeeding. Lords Parker, Goddard and Shawcross have started a pressure group that juries in future should bring in verdicts on a majority vote of 9 to 3. This is essential in their opinion because too many 'guilty men' get acquitted by the eccentricity or corruption of one man on the jury. They claim that jurors are intimidated by organised gangs and Shawcross (we are the masters now) said that 'I think the figure of four out of ten acquittals is disturbing.' Then he added: 'We know beyond any question of doubt at all that over 80 per cent. of those who are prosecuted are in fact guilty.' Leaving aside the obvious query as to why the other 20 per cent. are prosecuted at all one must ask the question why does the State bother, for other than theatrical reasons, to go through the whole rigmarole of prosecution if these people are known from the outset to be guilty. The reason is that the State has to provide a semblance of justice, what they want to do now is to streamline the system.

This attack on the jury system is not new. Judge Jeffreys when dissatisfied with a jury's verdict used to send them back and keep them without food until they brought in the required decision.

Now a very eloquent persuader, Louis Blom-Cooper, in the *Observer* has even asked for the total abolishment of the jury system on the grounds that it is inefficient and costly. He maintains that 'for 95 per cent. of crimes the stipendiary and lay magistrates have administered criminal justice to the comparative satisfaction of the public'. And that in the remaining cases 'the criminal law is humanely administered by the judges, and if not by them by the Home Office'.

He would propose to have a tribunal of three judges, who would give reasons for their decisions which could be scrutinised by an appeal court with full review powers.

Another group of reformers, nearer to us in spirit, are also finding faults with the jury system.

JACK ROBINSON.

MY DEAR PAPA

HENRY CLAY FRICK, whom anarchists may remember as the bungling, incompetent target of Alexander Berkman's otherwise eminently successful attentat, has recently been reaching back from the grave to plague mankind even further. On January 19, 1965, his daughter, Helen Clay Frick, instituted a suit in the Court of Common Pleas of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, to prevent the distribution of a book entitled, *Pennsylvania—Birthplace of a Nation*, by Sylvester K. Stevens.

According to the *New York Times*, July 27, 1966, Stevens was handed a rather adverse ruling by Judge Clinton R. Weidner when that worthy decided two weeks ago that Dr. Stevens would not be allowed to offer in defence of his book any secondary material, e.g. citations from other histories, encyclopaedias, or other reference works. Consequently Stevens appealed on July 26 to the United States District Court in New York to take the unusual step of intervening in the state case to stop Miss Frick's legal action. Stevens contends that the right of an author to publish a book is a constitutional right guaranteed by the First Amendment. Supporting him is a committee of fourteen reputable historians—a paradoxical phrase which, if nothing else, excludes Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. The committee calls itself the Joint Committee for the Defense of the Rights of Historians Under the First Amendment, making its title exactly as long as its membership list.

Dr. Stevens can hardly be deemed an iconoclast. He received a Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1945; served as State Historian of Pennsylvania from 1937 to 1956, and has been executive director of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission since 1956.

Miss Frick's suit complains that the Stevens book contains the following false[sic] statements about her father:

'That Henry Clay Frick acquired his wealth contrary to Christian principles and practices. . . .

'That Henry Clay Frick reduced wages to an unreasonably low figure, that he forced men to work unreasonably long hours, that he was not interested in the welfare nor safety of his employees, that he exploited labour and that he charged coal miners unreasonably high rents for their houses.'

'That Henry Clay Frick was responsible for the bloodshed in the Homestead strike of 1892, and that he caused blood to be shed in an effort to oppose a labour union.'

With all that Frick was guilty of, this is the best that Stevens could come up with—but, as we said, he is hardly an iconoclast. Yet even these mild recriminations are too disturbing for the insouciant Miss Frick. She prefers to scamper barefoot through her vaults wholly untroubled by qualms of conscience. Perhaps what is needed is a latter-day Berkman to take a pot shot at her.

R.S.C.

Jury on Trial

They think that as the jurors are selected from a 'middle-class, middle-minded and middle-aged' group therefore 'liability for service (should) be extended to everyone on the electoral register . . . and the upper age limit increased to 65' (Tony Smythe in *Tribune*). Another lawyer well known for his work for libertarians in trouble with the law, told us that he found juries sometimes biased against coloured citizens.

Nevertheless, in at least one case known to us, a jurymen who stood up against the rest with exceptional humanity, courage and common sense managed to persuade his colleagues to bring in a verdict of 'Not Guilty' for a comrade to the visible chagrin of the judge.

Where do we stand? On the one hand we will oppose any encroachment on our civil liberties with whatever means we have at our disposal. If we think the jury system is some safeguard against a mad, sadistic or biased judge then we must uphold the jury system (even though the judge has power to overrule its recommendations for

leniency as in the trial of the Wethersfield Six). But will we continue to have a jury system in an anarchist society without judges where men and women of the community discuss such acts which they deem anti-social?

The jury, whatever its demerits, still has about it some of the attributes of a communal decision-making body and such is thought by some to have tribal origins. To establish the majority system is to take the spirit of consultation out of it and reduce it to a mere game like the rest of law.

Our ultimate aim must however be to empty the prisons and sack the police and the judges. This would surely generate a feeling of liberation and a sense of relief that will transform society which will value such freedom and whose members, freed from artificial guilt and the trappings of the law would live accordingly, knowing that anti-social activities may mean a return to a society where prisons are full in the name of justice and for our 'own good'.

R.

An Invitation to the Dorchester

GOVERNMENT INVITATIONS rarely (if ever) arrive at FREEDOM'S office so when last Wednesday an OHMS envelope arrived at Maxwell Road it was viewed with some measure of suspicion. It was an invitation to meet Lt. Gen. Nguyen Huu Co at the Dorchester Hotel, Park Lane, W.1, and 'give him the reception he deserves'. It was learned afterwards that Mr. Edward Heath, Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Norman St. John-Stevans, MP, had received similar invitations and had unsuspectingly gone down Park Lane.

At 7.15 FREEDOM'S Society Editor was sitting in a deckchair in Hyde Park scanning the portico of the Dorchester for signs of a welcome mat. There was no sign of the Provos, the Rev. Robert Delford Brown of the First National Church of the Exquisite Panic or of Mr. Harold Wilson. There were however signs of familiar figures from Rentacrowd so eventually he made his way over to the Dorchester, on his way up Park Lane he passed a parked limousine which contained the vice-premier of South Vietnam, who quite obviously was hesitant of entering the Dorchester, even by the side door, for, by now a small crowd of demonstrators was gathering, including two with a large scarlet flag with a yellow star in the middle. Presumably this was the flag of China adapted for Trotskyite use.

Enquiries among the demonstrators elicited the fact that the invitations were not valid for entry into the Dorchester, Mr. Edward Heath and Mr. St. John-Stevans had been turned away since they were in possession of spurious documents. Apart from this and reported abortive and successful attempts to enter the Dorchester, the whole thing seemed to be a 'non-happening'. Sundry picketeers, some with Vietcong flags (pardon—NLF) and various assorted signs, turned up so the Society Editor returned once more to his deckchair.

Whilst meditating on the possibilities had he a gun with telescopic sights and were he not a pacifist it could be seen that the police had arrived in full force and were guarding all entrances and exits to the Dorchester and were shepherding the demonstrators to an ill-defined section of the roadway in front of the Dorchester.

Returning to the Dorchester it was obvious that any attempts to enter the hotel were doomed to failure, whether it was the Committee of 100 girl in evening dress or the wild saboteur intent on cutting loudspeaker cables. The situation had settled down to the usual confrontation between bad-tempered police and surly picketeers. After a

Provo attempt on the part of the police to incite a breach of the peace by stepping on a demonstrator's sandalled foot, whilst moving him on; our Society Editor moved off, thwarted once more in his attempt to break into society. . . .

Later it was learned that one of our comrades had been arrested, charged, apparently with obstructing a stationary motor-car and/or frightening the female occupant of the chauffeur-driven car (which was occupied by a man who was leaning out to read the poster). The comrade was kept in the police cells from 10.30 p.m. till 1.30 a.m. to verify his address and when he appeared in court next morning he was, by the intervention of a chance witness, given a conditional discharge.

It was also learned that a comrade (call him X) entered the Dorchester by an unorthodox route. Such was his impeccably casual dress that even though he had a bundle of Vietnam peace leaflets under his arm he was not stopped for a while. He was asked if he were a guest by a waiter. He said he was, then he was asked his name. He said 'Mr. X' which happened, by chance, to be the name of a guest.

He was thereupon ushered to the lift and his (or rather, the other Mr. X's) room floor and he then proceeded to distribute his leaflets under the doors of the hotel rooms. After a rather difficult interlude, when he wandered into a famous pop-star's private suite, he made his way out of the Dorchester unscathed. . . .

On the whole it was a very successful 'happening' at the Dorchester and received wide publicity on the radio and in the newspapers publicising this hush-hush visit of the Vice-Premier.

By the way, who *did* he dine with at the Dorchester? What *did* he get out of them?

J. RUMBOLD.

Let us have your orders NOW for the 8-page FREEDOM September 17



PROVO

Legislation for Capitalism

THE PRICES and Incomes Bill, which has now been rushed through Parliament, was given the Royal Assent at noon on Friday, August 12. The placing of this Bill on the Statute Book illustrates the determination of the Government to solve the present economic difficulties of capitalism. Due to the general tightening of world markets, legislation is needed to restrict the power of the trade unions. The Government is now in a position to issue a Statutory Order of Council on any workers who take direct action in pursuance of an increase in wages. The Order expires after 28 days unless 'before the end of that period the Order has been approved by a resolution of each House of Parliament'.

This Bill is a further encroachment on the freedoms not only of the trade unions in a collective sense, but also of each individual member. It shows how thin the veneer of our democracy really is, how the capitalist system is propped up and aided by the State. Legislation is necessary in the present crisis through which British capitalism is going in order to give the employers a weapon of control over their employees. Workers have gained considerable organisational strength because the economy has been run with full employment, but now we have not only legislation which takes away the right to strike for higher wages, but an economic policy which will bring about unemployment.

Those Trade Union leaders who support the legislation not only see society in capitalist terms, but obviously also as an authoritarian one. The Carrons and Coopers see

themselves as part of a powerful State based on coercion, while the George Woodcocks, being the liberals, think the State can rely on voluntary restraint.

ALL WAGES AFFECTED

Ever since the Incomes Bill was first put forward by the Government, many trade union leaders, shop stewards and rank-and-file members have had a 'won't affect me' attitude, but the wage freeze has shattered all this. It should also be remembered that this law-enforced wage freeze affects not only national negotiations, whether settled or not, but also those that take place at shop-floor level. This means that bonus, piece-work rates, etc., will be affected and that employers can give the shop stewards whatever rate they like. The whole basis of bargaining is going to be undermined and this will give the employers considerable control over the shop stewards and the workers they represent.

Already disputes over settlements have developed into industrial action. The recent British Oxygen Company's productivity agreement is one that is likely to go this way, for workers have already carried out their part of the bargain only to find that their wage increase is now to be stopped. Even if the union involved, the Transport and General Workers' Union, does not take action, there is a strong possibility that their members will.

This has already happened at a factory in Slough where a negotiated raise for engineers has been frozen. A spokesman for the Amalgamated Engineering Union has said: 'This sort of dispute is cropping up in many places.' Many of these disputes will be small isolated struggles, but important nevertheless to the workers involved in them. This freeze is not what it infers, i.e. a standstill, but will mean a wage cut, not only because of rising prices, rents, etc., but because of cuts employers will try to make in those rates over and above the national agreements.

Obviously there will be breaches in the freeze, not only by workers successfully threatening, or taking, action, but also by employers offering extra money to attract skilled

men who are in short supply. These will be minor breaches and as such will be tolerated. However, the Government will act in the case of any major threat.

In many ways the crisis facing capitalism in this country is a reflection of a world-wide one. The system as a whole does seem to be heading if not to a slump at least to a recession. Markets are shrinking and although the war-gear economies have helped to stave it off, the threat is still in this direction.

TOTALITARIAN MEANS

A number of so-called democracies are using totalitarian means they deplore in other States in an attempt to solve the economic problems. As in this country, so in others and it is the working people who will have to make the sacrifices. The State is increasingly assisting the capitalist system to carry on. Employers now welcome the intervention of the Government and accept State planning, subsidies, etc. Changes do take place in the system, but they are made, basically, to preserve it. Far from the State being the agent for the abolition of the profit system, it props it up with public money and legislation.

No amount of reform can alter the system. It cannot be abolished by a change in Government, but only by the desire and conscious effort of the people. Workers, because they produce the real wealth, can play a very important part in this. The present policies of the Labour Government show once again what anarchists have always pointed out, that the State is not a force for freedom. It is in the opposite direction that workers should aim. They should take power into their own hands and by organisation at their place of work should gain and extend their job control. Factories, building sites, mines, etc., should not be isolated, but should be linked up with one another. In this way the worst effects of the Government's policies will be defeated. If the struggles are isolated and fragmented, then workers and their job organisations will suffer a big setback.

P.T.

POOR BECAUSE YOU'RE POOR

IT MAY COME under the heading of primeval economics to point out that the poor must, by their very position in our society, bear the brunt of any punitive tax measure, while the rich, even though from pure altruistic or patriotic motives they might wish to, cannot make any sacrifices. If one is rich then, by the very nature of that fact, one has unrestricted access to the material wealth of one's particular society and if, as a result of a lowering of one's income, you find that one cannot share to the full the pleasures and the necessities of one's particular society then, brother, you are no longer rich. For the broad mass of the working class, however, any rise in the prices of consumer goods, any extra tax or any lowering of wages by reason of unemployment, strike action, sickness or the end of idiotic overtime, within a matter of weeks means an observable cut in the daily and weekly living standard. This is not to be maudlin about the obvious but merely to point out the simple lesson of our economic life: that you're rich because you're rich and poor

because you're poor. Yet even within our national comedy of errors when sacrifices are demanded from everyone below a certain wage level injustice is still the order of the day. We expect, and accept, that the professional class will be allowed, with pained government disapproval, to rat on any national economic policy; but within the major industries that old 3½ per cent. was held before our eyes as the key to a new way of life as sacrosanct as the tablets of Moses were to the boys in the valley. But disillusion is always there and a study by the Hay-MSI group has fulfilled our happiest forebodings. The Hay-MSI organisation exists to recruit men for the top jobs in our national economy and the report from this plush Labour Exchange for July 1965 to July 1966 has shown that the weekly pay packet moved faster and higher for the executives than for the horny-handed worker. Not for the struggling executive the mystical 3½ per cent. but a rise of 7½ per cent. in that period and this was accepted as the normal increase for men of their position within the eco-

Freedom For Workers' Control

AUGUST 20 1966 Vol 27 No 26

BUILDING WORKERS FACE A HARD TIME



THE BUILDING INDUSTRY will be one of the worst affected by the present economic policies of the Government. Although certain fields of the building industry programme, such as health and education, are not scheduled for a cut-back in spending, the general tightening will affect many other schemes.

The Selective Employment Tax will also mean that building firms will look very closely at the number of people on their pay-roll and a considerable amount of pruning will take place. This tax on pay-rolls will encourage a wider use of labour-only sub-contracting, and can further weaken the position of the trade unions in the industry.

In recent years the building worker has had a considerably long run of full employment, with the exception of periods of bad weather. But already there are signs that this state of affairs will not last for very much longer. A high level of unemployment in the industry would also weaken the union organisation which many building sites now enjoy. The Government's legislated wage freeze will hit building workers especially hard because when new jobs start, or when new bonus targets are needed, employers will dictate their rates without workers being able to carry out normal negotiations.

In fact the Government's policies are a heaven-sent opportunity to assist many employers in smashing union organisation on their sites. This is what Wimpeys are in fact trying to do on their huge Brunel University job at Uxbridge. Although the job is scheduled to finish in 1984, Wimpeys say that because of re-phasing and the Government's policies, they will have to sack a gang of scaffolders and their shop steward. Wimpeys say that the money for the next phase of the job is being held up by the economic squeeze, yet the stewards' works committee has made extensive enquiries of the educational authorities, the Government, etc., and have been assured that the University is not affected.

mony. In a survey of some two thousand top jobs, plus information culled from the pay packets of over seventy thousand men in the engineering, chemical, transport, motor and food industries it was found that those men in the £1,000 to £1,500 class from July 1965 garnered a pay rise of 9½ per cent. while the boys earning over £7,000 a year had to settle for a sacrificial average of 8.3 per cent. Whatever lesson there is to be learned from these figures you can reason out yourself but one point is blindingly obvious and that is that within this corrupt society of ours it is those men and women forced to work at those £8-, £9- and £10-a-week jobs displayed outside Labour Exchanges who, by direct and indirect taxation, daily bear the brunt of our economic burden and their sacrifice is not what they give but what our society withholds from them.

LUMPENPROLETARIAT.

Workers on the site see this so-called redundancy as an attack on their job organisation, which incidentally has achieved very high wage rates and good site conditions. The action of Wimpeys is a threat to long months of determined struggle and so the men have taken strike action to defeat this attack.

On other jobs in London employers are generally on the offensive. On another Wimpey site they have sacked the Federation Steward, while on the Myton, Barbican, job, the firm unsuccessfully tried to move in labour-only sub-contractors. Workers on the Higgs & Hill site on the South Bank face the same problems.

Obviously, the employers, with legislation and the threat of unemployment, hold a very strong hand. They will now try to use this to break up the considerable union organisation that exists on a number of sites. It is at site level that the main struggle will take place and unofficial organisations, like the London Joint Sites Committee, can play an important and vital part in this.

This organisation of stewards and trade union militants will be all the more necessary in the coming months to gain support and to co-ordinate any struggle that takes place. Isolation must be avoided and every assistance must be given to those workers in dispute.

It is good that this form of organisation (JSC) is also growing in Manchester and Liverpool and that an unofficial monthly paper, *Rank & File*, is now being published. This paper can play an important part, not only as a means of expression of views, but also to give news of jobs in dispute, passing on information to other workers and imparting to others some of the experience and knowledge gained through a particular struggle. Make no mistake, things will be hard this winter, but job organisation and co-ordinated support by rank-and-file committees will ensure that building workers do not suffer the very worst from the effects of the policies of the Government.

P.T.

Press Fund

FINANCIAL STATEMENT:	
WEEK 32, AUGUST 13, 1966:	
Expenses: 32 weeks at £80:	£2560
Income: Sales and Subs.:	£1840
DEFICIT: £720	

Whitehall: H.W. 4/-; London, W.C.1: S.W. 4/-; Sussex: O.M. & D.M. 3/-; London, S.W.14: J.W. £1/1/-; Manchester: R.C. £1/1/-; London, N.W.2: M.S. £1/16/9; Oxford: Anon* 5/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; Cambourne: D.T. 4/6; Sydney: Sydney Anarchist Group £2/5/-; London, N.W.3: K.L. 4/6.

TOTAL:	£7 12 9
Previously Acknowledged:	£697 14 11
1966 Total to Date:	£705 7 8

*Denotes Regular Contributor.

Contact Column

This column exists for mutual aid. Donations towards cost of typesetting will be welcome.

Mental Illness. Will anybody who is interested in mental illness please get in touch with me. Box No. 38.

Libertarian Teachers' Association. Copies of second bulletin now available. Sixpence each (2/- for five). P. Ford, 102 Stotfold Road, Arlesey, Beds.

Stickers. Vietnam, Save the People, Stop the War, etc. 3/- per 100. 27/- per 1,000. Housmans, 5 Caledonian Road, N.1.

Tourist Accommodation Wanted. American woman, travelling in Europe, needs CHEAP accommodation in London for approximately three weeks in September. Prefer relatively central location. Would like companion for European travels. Garcia Davidson, 63 Winfield, San Francisco, USA.

Megaton. Aberdeen CND magazine. No. 2 just out with article on CND break. Order from R. Comrie, 288 Hardgate, Aberdeen (10d. including postage) or from Freedom Bookshop.

Abolishment. Campaign for the Abolishment of International Royalty being formed in all areas. Would those interested please write Robert Stuart, c/o 11 Goldstone Villas, Hove, Sussex, enclosing stamped addressed envelope.

War Office? Would anybody who owns or has access to a military-looking vehicle please contact Box 37.

Accommodation Wanted in country near London for active man with invalid wife. Small income. Also any job considered. Open to genuine suggestions. Must move to help wife's health. Box No. 35.

Accommodation Wanted. Urgently. Poet seeks poet-cheap room in West London. Otherwise responsible person. Box 33.

Event. Would all those interested in participating in a lunatic event please contact Box 007.

If you wish to make contact let us know.