

Irish trade union leaders' jamboree

THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE of the Irish Congress of Trades Unions opened in Galway on July 24, 1962. It would, indeed, have been surprising had the Conference passed resolutions dealing with the fundamental cause of the social evils which called the TU movement into existence—Capitalism. However, there were no surprises, but the Capitalist Press tripped over themselves in glee at speeches by TU leaders denouncing, with all gusto at their command, the unofficial strikes of the past 12 months.

In his opening speech, William Fitzpatrick, President of the ICTU, appealed for workers "to resist in a spirit of patriotism the temptation of unofficial strikes." Later, discussion took place on a resolution calling for the education of workers "against implication or other association with unofficial strikes." Mover P. J. O'Brien called for Conference "to consider what was to be done with people responsible for promoting unofficial strikes." He made the rather ridiculous assertion that "in his experience unofficial strikes had support from shop stewards living in another country." One wonders if he meant Russia!

That this resolution was referred to the Executive Council of the Congress, instead of being chucked in the garbage, does much to reflect the class level of the delegates present. O'Brien's speech called for investigation into the causes of unofficial strikes. Perhaps next year this fellow, who prides himself on being a worker, will call for investigation of the causes of trade unionism!

The shadow of E.S.B. workers, Cork railway workers and Dublin busmen was hot in the minds of the bureaucrats and their lackeys, there present to denounce workers who still see day-to-day life as one of a bitter struggle to make ends meet and for whom the class war is not an academic subject, but a very real thing. The bureaucrats were clearly concerned lest the very significant independent actions of the working class should in any way upset their honeymoon with the bosses on the Irish National Productivity Council and the Employer-Labour Conference.

Besides unofficial strikers, the bureaucrats found that another section of the TU movement was acting "irresponsibly". The many attacks on dissident trade unions asserting their sectional interest in the face of "community interest" seems to have been a reference to the ETU, which was recently thrown out of Congress for "poaching" members from other affiliated unions, which supported Congress stabbing the workers in the back during the E.S.B. strike last August.

It is worth recalling that the ETU had an opportunity of exposing the collaborationist tactics of Congress during that strike, if its bureaucrats put working-class solidarity before bureaucratic diplomacy. The ETU "leaders" failed to take sides decisively last August and are now reaping the harvest of rotten fruit being showered on them by the more mature TU statesmen. During the Connolly Day Commemoration speech last May, Congress President, Fitzpatrick, stressed the need for a "disciplined TU movement"—even if it meant spending much of Conference time denouncing members of the working class who are not fully convinced that in class collaboration lies their true interest.

Congress did find time to attack the Government. The recent decision of the Supreme Court to uphold an injunction against the Irish Union of Distributive Workers and Clerks, prohibiting them from placing a picket in a dispute to enforce a closed shop, came under discussion. Delegates were told Congress had appealed to the Government to amend the Constitution and have picketing rights restored. Ruaidhri Roberts, joint secretary of Congress, said the Government was considering new legislation to clarify the matter. He further informed delegates that the legislation would cover questions of strikes and picketing in disputes involving membership of a union or unions!

Brendan Corish, leader of the Labour Party, doubted the ability of private enterprise to face up to the challenge it would meet in the Common Market and called on the Government to take a hand in the promotion of industry "to ensure that Irish workers will continue in employment and be kept at home" (!). Recall that, while the Labour Party was a member of a coalition Government administering capitalism in Ireland some years ago, there were 100,000 unemployed.

The following day, joint secretary, Leo Crawford, told Congress that they were having more difficulty negotiating with public enterprise than with public enterprise. A curious statement on the heels of Corish's speech, though entirely in line with the facts of the

last 12 months. One wonders at Crawford making such a statement—was he not instrumental in stabbing E.S.B. workers in the back and selling the busmen to the mercies of a Court Tribunal?

Other points from speeches were briefly... Jim Larkin, General Secretary of the Workers' Union of Ireland, said "picketing was not always necessary for a successful strike"... John Carroll, Irish Transport and General Workers Union, moved a resolution directing attention to the urgent necessity for positive planning to prepare for conditions of free trade, stressing that it was essential to make satisfactory provision for redundant workers.

Thus the bureaucrats and their lackeys tried to evade and dodge the real issues, the fundamental crux of the problem—Capitalism. No voice of protest was reported in the Press about the ICTU's collaborationist policies in the Employer-Labour Conference and the Irish National Productivity Council. Although Ruaidhri Roberts denied that the INPC could be compared to Britain's NEDC, one wonders if he could indicate any real difference.

It can be seen that the Irish TU movement is degenerating into a direct tool of the capitalist class, the small minority who own and control the means and instruments of production. This trend has already taken place in the more highly industrialised states and is the pattern for the emergent capitalist societies of the underdeveloped countries. It coincides with the difficulties of the British capitalist economy, which calls for "wage pause", "wage restraint" and those close relations, Neddy and Nick, the brainchildren of the Etonians. The TU bureaucrats visualise themselves as acting as the balance between Capital and Labour. The unsavoury aspect of it all is that we pay them.

None of these manoeuvres and intrigues can possibly alter the facts of capitalist society. It remains the exploitation of the working class of the fruits of their labour by the minority of parasites. The class war is an integral part of capitalist society and unofficial strikes a manifestation of that fact. Whatever horse-deals are arranged in rear head offices, there is no change at the "front". We, the working class, must organise our might to replace these labour lackeys of Capitalism by our own movement, controlled from below at shop-floor level and face our enemy, the capitalist class, from a position of strength that will ensure their overthrow and the emancipation of the workers from the shackles of the wages system.

PAT KELLY.

Literature

"Direct Action" pamphlets:—

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE UNIONS?

by Tom Brown 5d.

NATIONALISATION AND THE NEW BOSS CLASS

by Tom Brown 6d.

WORKERS' CONTROL

HOW LABOUR GOVERNED, 1945-1951

THE BRITISH GENERAL STRIKE

by Tom Brown 5d.

THE LABOUR PARTY ILLUSION

by Sam Weiner 8d.

ETHICS AND AMERICAN UNIONISM

by Sam Weiner 8d.

THE SOCIAL GENERAL STRIKE

by Tom Brown 4d.

BULGARIA—A NEW SPAIN

8d.

THE LONDON YEARS (autobiography)

by Rudolf Rocker 7s. 6d.

THE IWW'S LITTLE RED SONG BOOK

1s. 9d.

STRIKE STRATEGY (National Rank & File Movement)

4d.

FRANCO'S PRISONERS SPEAK, 1s. 6d. (issued by the Spanish Ex-Servicemen's Association).

DIRECT ACTION (Fortnightly SWF paper)

5d.

INDUSTRIAL WORKER

(fortnightly organ of the IWW) 4d.

IEWS AND COMMENTS

(organ of the Libertarian League, U.S.) 8d.

All prices include postage

S.W.F., 25a Amberley Road, London, W.9

Printed and published by the S.W.F., 25a Amberley Road, London, W.9.

WORLD LABOUR NEWS

ENGLISH PAPER OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Vol. 3 No. 5 (17)

September-October, 1962

Fourpence

Nicky and Neddy—the crosstalk comedy act

WANTED—People to stand the 3-card trick.
Able to swallow anything.

QUALIFICATIONS—Keen desire to do nothing.

APPLY: Nicky or Neddy, Houses of Hot Air, Westminster.

THE Government are in a bit of a state about wages, expansion and profits. The former Chancellor of the Exchequer, Selwyn Lloyd, tried the big-stick policy, but the only workers he could beat were the nurses, who have both hands tied behind their backs anyway.

Now new boy Maudling is to have a go with the proposed National Incomes Commission (Nicky). This Commission, so far as one can gather, will assist in educating the public to the fact that their interest is involved in every wage claim. It will then be easier for the Government to blame workers for the rising cost of living—an "independent commission" couldn't be biased, especially if a couple of TU leaders could be blackmailed on to it!

What a load of old toffee! We've heard this line before—remember the wicked busmen, railwaymen and miners, whose wage demands forced up the cost of travel and coal? The tragedy is that some people believe this drivel, and the Commission's job is to get more people to swallow it.

The Commission will also investigate important claims, before they come up. The idea is to set the lower-paid worker at the throat of the higher-paid, because the former is encouraged to believe that the latter, by making a wage demand, is pinching a portion of his slice of the cake. Clever tactics—if you fall for them.

The Commission will also consider awards retrospectively, thus attempting to prevent increases by "comparison", i.e. railways and comparable jobs outside the industry. Of course the Commission will investigate profits and restrictive practices! If the employers' price fixing and restrictive practices were exposed in all their glory, it would make better reading than Lady Chatterley's Lover.

George Woodcock, Gen. Sec. TUC was right to tell the Government to stuff Nicky, but when the TUC was asked for an alternative they were knackered. As upholders of the capitalist system, they should have dreamed up some new classic.

FORD BOSSES ISSUE A CHALLENGE

The latest dispute at Fords, Dagenham, was caused by the management transferring 45 men from one department to another. The men agreed to the transfer of 27, but the management made the issue one of principle and stood firm on 45.

Fords' management claim the right to transfer men as and when required, without having to consult the shop stewards. The failure

Strikers make history in Turkey

TURKEY—What may be the first recorded strike in the history of Kemal Ataturk's "Modern" Turkey began on July 25, when over 600 Ankara dustmen defied the ban on strikes in support of demands for an increase in wages from 7 Turkish liras (about 5s 3d) a day to 10 Turkish liras and a reduction in working hours from 16 to 8 a day. Although the right to strike was granted by the new constitution, this provision has not yet been implemented, and 185 of the strikers were reported to have been sacked by the municipal authorities for breaking the law. On August 12 some 6,000 workers employed on building Turkey's new steel industry at the Black Sea port of Ereğli demonstrated against their wages and working conditions. Halil Tunc, general secretary of the federation of Turkish trade unions, declared: "We have decided to open the struggle against the small groups and opportunist firms who assure their own comfort at the cost of the poverty and misery of the Turkish worker."

of the strike action endorses and strengthens the management's claim. This was and still is an issue of prime importance. The management posed the question, "Who is in charge?" And, by the failure of the strike, were still able to answer—"We are".

Workers at Fords are to be congratulated on accepting this challenge, their weakness lay in looking round for official backing and finding "there it was, gone!" One union official quoted the earnings of workers in the "prepare for sale" department, compared it with the average in the rest of the factory, then made the constructive statement that the striking workers' attitude was "selfish".

Firs point: Fords do not pay their workers unless they earn it, unlike some unions and their full-time officials.

Second point: men in the "prepare for sale" department conceded that some workers should be shifted, but Fords had to establish the "principle", "We say 45, and 45 it will be".

Let's get straight who makes cars at Fords. The workers—without them the Ford management is nothing. Therefore, without appearing to be biased in any way, it is they, the workers, who must exercise the control. The days of "you go here, you go there", are over; we must take control when and wherever we can, no opportunity must be lost.

WIDOW'S MITE FOR BUILDING WORKERS

The big cats in control of the building jungle have been forced to concede 1d per hour to a million building trade workers. A claim for 3d an hour was made last January. The employers made no offer, promising to chat later in the year. The unions were not satisfied and the claim went to an independent arbitrator, who awarded 1d an hour post-dated August 20.

The building industry is one of the biggest rackets under the sun, one big jungle, survival of the fittest—at the workers' expense.

ETU TRAGEDY

Electrical workers have been in a bitter, long dispute with Associated Electrical Industries on the site of one of Scotland's largest power stations. In May, 40 contracting electricians went on strike for an extra 2s an hour, to bring their pay in line with some other craftsmen on the site. On July 20 they returned to work to let negotiations continue and the employers then offered 7d an hour.

From then the issue is confused. According to the union, the men refused the offer and handed in their notices, asking the ETU to declare the site "black". The ETU maintained that, as the men were not technically on strike, they had no option but to declare the site "open". The contractors promptly recruited 13 fresh electricians. Two ETU executive members told the men they had sacked themselves and were therefore to blame for the situation.

The management support the ETU against the "political extremists". If employers support the union, then brother, something is seriously wrong. Obviously the ETU executive have pulled a "stroke"; they wanted to kill the strike and rank-and-file agitation on the site, so they interpreted the "withdrawal notices" in the same way as a kid just leaving school: any fool knows that "asking for cars" is a strike tactic.

Since the war electricians have raised their status beyond all recognition, but if some direct action is not taken these gains will be in danger.

The fight between the Communist Party hacks and the reactionary hacks must be killed and the only people able to do this are the rank-and-file sparks, in a virile rank-and-file organisation. King Street, Transport House, or the Vatican are not invited. In fact they will be enemies of such an organisation.

ENGLAND EXPORTS UNEMPLOYMENT

In exchange for whisky, England's export to Scotland is unemployment. Certain Scottish pits are to be closed earlier than expected. In Fife closures are in areas which have no other industry, about 5,000 jobs are involved.

No one wants coal mining to continue longer than necessary, men are not moles. I visited a so-called model pit in Yorkshire and brother, they can keep that job for £500 a week. But in this chaotic society, where bods can earn £500 a week for plonking a

Read 'SEAMEN'S VOICE'

THE RANK AND FILE SEAMEN'S PAPER

5d postpaid from Bill Christopher, 34, Cumberland Road London, E.17.

guitar and screaming like a ruptured duck, coal is still needed and the men who mine it are still lucky to make £20 a week.

The pro-tem solution is shorter shifts with the same money. It's virtually impossible to amend the stinking system we live under, the only real solution is to destroy it.

WE STAND FOR ANYTHING

Public Transport, what a macabre joke. We have a bright £24,000-a-year bod trying to run railways at a profit, by cutting and carving right, left and centre. Railways are not run to provide a service for the people—they have been given to Beeching to cut to pieces.

Railway workshops are being closed down, no work, yet for the first time in 14 years railway workshops at Derby are to make cars for LTE underground. What a brilliant idea: nationalised workshops make cars for a nationalised industry, that's organisation, that is.

The beloved topic of all Londoners is "the bloody buses", when you can see one and, if you do, if you can get on it.

This service (?) is complete and utter chaos, with passengers and operatives the very last consideration. One ambition in my life is to see all transport workers working together as one unit; until that situation is arrived at, busmen and railwaymen will continue to be cut to ribbons. One is played against the other; in a dispute, one section is always the blackleg. Wages and working conditions cannot be improved working in isolation, any action by one section means nothing on its own.

In September the National Rank and File Movement hopes to organise a Conference of all transport workers. The NRFM does this in all humility, it is not attempting to teach "grandmother to suck eggs" but to unite all transport workers in their common struggle for better conditions and a better service for the passengers—sorry, commuters.

BILL CHRISTOPHER

Resistance grows in Castro's Cuba

Summary of a report from the Libertarian Underground Movement in Cuba.

THE Cuban Marxists fashion new laws, without making them known to the people. These are put into force gradually and when the law is in almost complete application, it is announced to the people. Some time ago the underground movement denounced a new law, whereby all rights of parents over their children were taken away, with the State to be in control of everyone, right from the cradle. There was such an outcry against this law, that Government officials had to deny its existence and finally a much modified form was put into application.

Now, the underground movement denounces another monstrosity. We quote below extracts from a new law, part of which is already being enforced and is intensifying the growing struggle for liberation of the Cuban people.

LAW OF CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM—LIQUIDATION OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

① Private property is prohibited—specifically, private ownership of the following is abolished: land, transport, cattle, farms, commercial establishments, industries, banks and trusts. The legality of collective ownership through the State is recognised.

② The State has the sole rights of directly administering the exploitation of agricultural land, cattle raising and the finances of commercial and industrial transport. The State will own all natural resources of the country and develop them for its own benefit. It has the power to concede the profits of any Municipal property and reserves for its own use all rates and taxes throughout the country. The citizen will own his clothes, shoes and objects of personal and domestic use.

③ Inside the country certificates of consumption will circulate. These will be issued by the State for distribution to citizens for services rendered as producers and will satisfy their needs. All legal currency and all foreign currency will be used exclusively for international trade, to fulfil the overseas obligations of the State. The Certificate of Consumption will represent legal currency.

④ In order to develop collectivisation of property, the State takes upon itself the power to encourage the increase of population and to settle in the country groups of inhabitants from Socialist countries. With these ends in view, motherhood is considered obligatory and legal, for the purposes of the State, in whatever form.

⑤ All citizens between the ages of 14 and 60 must take part in production, irrespective of sex or race, except those physically or mentally incapable. In order to enjoy the benefit of the collective property everyone must belong to the National Revolutionary Militia.

⑥ No one is allowed to leave the country, unless with the express permission of the Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government.

This law authorises the entrance into the country of 500,000 citizens of the Chinese People's Republic.

The authorities have not yet dared to publish this law officially. Its contents have been obtained by the underground movement's espionage service.

During the past few weeks the ordinary people in Cuba, hungry and in despair, have been demonstrating in the streets against the brutality of the Castro-Communist dictatorship. The pretext for these protests was the scarcity of the basic necessities of life, but at the heart of the matter it was not only hunger, but also the aversion of the Cuban people for all tyrannical regimes, whether run by Batista or Castro.

The two most biggest demonstrations were at Cardenas and El Cano. In Cardenas the demonstration became so violent that the Government sent tanks, planes and contingents of troops, led by President of the Republic, Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado, to quell the demonstrators. The President, protected by armoured cars and artillery, made a threatening speech to the crowd. In El Cano, a small town in Havana province, the crowd erupted so suddenly that the authorities could do nothing to stop it. Once the demonstration was over, however, the Government issued a decree expropriating everything belonging to the people of that town. This has created an precedent, previously unknown, whereby a group of people do not own even the shoes on their feet, because they have become the property of the State, as a measure of official repression.

Although strict censorship makes it impossible to have immediate or exact information, indiscretions of the official radio and newspapers show that the demonstrations are spreading rapidly. In one place, opposition elements called the people together several days running, without even trying to hide their actions from the authorities. In other places, in order to prevent demonstrations, the authorities would have had to shoot the entire local population.

As a consequence of these demonstrations, the Government has again started publicising the shooting of militants of the underground opposition. Previously they were shot secretly; now the executions are announced with a great fanfare, to terrify the people and stop protests against the brutality of the regime.

On July 11, for instance, the following notice appeared in the Cuban Press: "On July 10, 1962, the following citizens were executed by firing squad, having been accused of different insurrectionary activities: Eugenio Medina Diaz, Osmin Gorriñ Vega, Ramon Fundora Sanchez and Roberto Hernandez.

In other ways, too, the wave of oppression has been accentuated, until it has become a threat to every man, woman and child in the country. Anyone, for no specific reason, is likely to become a victim of the so-called Committees for the Defence of the Revolution.

Now, as a final blow, the Castro-Communist dictators have told their followers to go about armed with clubs, to attack anyone who dares to express publicly the least criticism of the Government or any of its measures. With this in mind, elements which support the dictatorship attend all union meetings, social gatherings, in fact anywhere that people meet for any reason, even butchers and other shops. Already there have been cases where people have been assassinated in broad daylight in this way.

translated by M.S.

Postbag

I ENCLOSE A SUB for the next year of "World Labour News"; the last issue was great, especially the article on the tottering fascist regime in Spain.

As I'm working temporarily as an assistant nurse cum psychiatric social worker at a mental hospital I found M.B.'s article "An unhealthy service" interesting. At a time when war-mongering dignitaries receive headline news with their flea bites, it is instructive to witness the physical and mental misery of those who seldom get a mention. Perhaps a man who has spent his life working on the railways, left to slowly flake his life away, or a demented working class youngster faced with a lifetime of institutionalised imprisonment for the "crime" of his mental disease.

One is torn between sympathy for patients and nurses; it is possible to see fault and even sadism among some of the nurses, yet if one were to "feel" the difficulties of every patient, life would be intolerable, thus one develops a certain hardness that can be mistaken for indifference or even callousness. Many patients are very difficult, but others could be helped outside the hospital. Yet it is very encouraging to see the amount of unofficial nursing that takes place outside the hospital—if only there was enough sympathy in the community to make mental hospitals unnecessary. Yet this is a revolutionary desire, for only where men are treated as men and not as things, will sympathy and love develop. And love is sabotage to the State.

Hull, Yorks.

J.W.

CND AT THE CROSSROADS

THE MOVEMENT against nuclear weapons has reached a major turning-point, more important even than that which preceded the formation of the Committee of 100.

The CND, according to one of its founding leaders, was inaugurated not to get Unilateral Disarmament—an "impossible demand"—but by posing this slogan to rebuild the Left of the Labour Party to a point where it would be in a good position to bargain with the Right and make a better compromise than it had done in 1957 at Brighton. From this beginning, CND was bound to reach a point where the radicals who really want Unilateral Disarmament would have to separate from those who, by their own boast, are merely "Multilateralists who mean it." Though the Committee of 100 was symptomatic of this division, it was no more than that.

Briefly, the radical wing opposes both East and West in the power struggle and advocates Unilateral Disarmament in every country. It is enamoured neither with bourgeois democracy, nor with Bolshevik tyranny, so it sees no reason to insist that the Bomb be opposed constitutionally, yet does not advocate the seizure of power by a "revolutionary elite." It wishes to see industrial action and mass civil disobedience against the Bomb in every country, though some holding these views consider the Committee of 100 premature and others, while supporting the Committee, still believe in either democracy or Communism.

Given this distinction, a parting of the ways is inevitable. But equally, given the nature of the movement's right wing, with a leadership out for a "good compromise" and a rank and file which, while lacking revolutionary ideas, is nevertheless sincere, disillusion of most of the latter with the former is bound to develop. If, by then, the radicals have managed to form a viable separate movement, many whose views now go no further than a vague New Leftism will turn to revolutionary thought. This, however, is for the future.

The current position is that we have reached the watershed where co-existence between "Multilateralists who mean it" and "Unilateralists who mean it" is no longer possible. The simple reason is that CND's leadership is as determined to subvert democracy within the movement as is the leadership of the Labour Party.

Malcolm Pittock ("Peace News", 28.7.62) has described how Canon Collins prevented publication of a resolution passed at CND's 1961 Conference, stating that the Campaign was opposed to all military alliances and advocating Unilateral Disarmament by each and every country possessing nuclear weapons, and how—by Gaitskill-type manoeuvres—he managed to get it reversed this year.

Even more flagrant has been the Executive's attempts to nullify AGM decision on the formation of Industrial Sub-committees, in every possible area, to promote Industrial Action against the Bomb. At Conference they told us that, by passing this, we should alienate the trade unions and make the attainment of industrial action more difficult. We were urged to leave it to the union leaderships—a policy which, unfortunately, CND has generally been content to follow in the past, with precisely the results one might expect: none.

Now, in true social-democrat style, they repudiate not merely the motion passed against their wishes at Conference, but also their own former position. Canon Collins has written to "The Times", saying that CND does not even wish the trade unions to use industrial action to further the cause of Nuclear Disarmament. As a result, Father Michael Scott and Pat Arrowsmith have resigned from the Executive. Presumably these who are sincere in wishing to see such Industrial Sub-committees will follow the precedent of the Committee of 100 and form a distinct organisation, especially designed to promote industrial action for disarmament.

Any likelihood that the division might be patched up and another shameful compromise made has, fortunately, been torpedoed by the Committee of 100 Industrial Sub-Committee leaflet handed out in Moscow, which started the radical position with no "ifs" or "buts" (full text in "Direct Action", Vol. 2 No. 8). This has caused furor among the Russian patriots in CND and considerable tut-tutting by the Natopolitans—and will force the pace in such a way as to prevent any self-styled revolutionary finding reasons for selling out in the interests of unity.

Presumably any movement which arises to promote industrial action, whether or not its supporters believe in Civil Disobedience, will find itself bound to work with the Committee of 100, which has done more in this field than anyone else. Round this alliance other radicals will regroup.

But this is no time for congratulating the radicals on their refusal to compromise. The time for attacking Collins' refusal to publicise CND's wish to see Unilateral Disarmament in every country was when the Executive published a statement of aims last August, omitting it. But "Peace News" refused to publish a letter so doing. The very day that Mike Scott and Pat Arrowsmith resigned from the CND Executive, "Peace News" decided not to publish an editorial they had already written on this repudiation of Conference policy on Industrial Action.

The very fact that the motion was passed in the first place, advocating that CND should set up these Sub-committees to promote Industrial Action was something of a farce. The formation of such Sub-committees would convert CND into a revolutionary organisation, yet here one has a Campaign with a nominal membership of 14-million, able to get 150,000 people at a time to demonstrate, passing a motion which in effect turns it into a revolutionary movement.

Since when were revolutions born of resolutions at Conference? If there were so many supporters of revolutionary industrial organisation in this country that they can swing such a Campaign, why is the National Rank and File Movement so small? Why is it that some people who supported the motion advocating Industrial Sub-committees, opposed the formation of the NRFM and have recently left the Committee of 100 Industrial Sub-committee?

Can it be that our radicals, advocating as they do a society totally different from both East and West, and renouncing the methods of both Social Democracy and Bolshevism, are yet not radical enough? Too true! Recently some of these radicals, rightly saying that we shall never get ND from the Labour or Communist Parties, abandoned these—to do what? To form yet another parliamentary organisation, INDEC. This is not, of course, as bad as those who remain in the Labour Party, some of whose alleged radicals went so far as to welcome the attempt by leading Labour Leftists (both Unilateralist and Multilateralist) to work out a compromise based on the horror of a nuclear-armed World Government.

The radical wing of the Campaign has not, by and large, seen that a split was inevitable from the first and, generally speaking, would avoid it if possible. Syndicalists will have no such illusions; we knew from the start that the CND leadership did not mean to go to the end of the road—and could not, even if it wished. We knew the Campaign to be a temporary expedient—and even with the radical wing are those who will still need a lot of pushing!

LAURENS OTTER

Zensl Muehsam dies—a victim of three dictators

ZENSL MUEHSAM has died in the Russian Zone of Germany. Her companion, the German Anarchist Erich Muehsam, was murdered in a Nazi camp 28 years ago. The Central Committee of the Unified Socialist Party (Communist) devoted an obituary notice to his widow, without mentioning that she passed many years in Soviet concentration camps and prisons.

In 1935 Zensl was invited to Russia, on the pretext that the works of her companion would be published in Moscow. All the original manuscripts of Erich were handed over to the Russian archives, but up to now no complete edition of his works has been published. Only some selected poems, some pages of prose and his "Apolitical Memoirs", that were well known in Germany, before the Nazi seizure of power. No works of an Anarchist character, nor any posthumous unpublished matter has seen the light of day.

Zensl disappeared into the Russian camps in 1936. She was arrested when seeking the means to leave Russia. Persecution started on a denunciation made by Walter Ulbricht, the present East German dictator. In 1939, after the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, Zensl was to have been handed over to the Nazis, with Margaret Buber and other women, but the war prevented the transfer being carried out and she remained in Russian camps and prisons.

After the war she was freed; in 1956 she was sent to East Germany, but she was seriously ill and intellectually exhausted. She was forced to remain in the Eastern Zone and all contact with her old friends in West Germany and elsewhere was forbidden. Some letters written by her gave the impression that she was no longer completely balanced. Symptoms of mental illness were already noticeable when she was in Russia. Some letters, moreover, were clearly forged.

Later she was decorated with several medals; the State granted her the pension of an old anti-fascist militant, and she was forced to sign a series of hate manifestoes against Federal Germany and other Communist propaganda declarations. Libertarians in West Berlin could never establish any contact with her and she apparently took no steps to do so.

Zensl Muehsam was the victim of persecution by Hitler, Stalin and Ulbricht. After passing long years in Russian communist concentration camps and prisons, she was further humiliated, systematically exploited by the propagandists of Red Fascism right to the end of her life. The name of our comrade Erich Muehsam has been used by a system against which he always fought and his posthumous works have been stolen.

H.R.

REVIEW

DEMOCRACY AT WORK

DEMOCRACY AT WORK (Common Wealth, 6d). A very useful little pamphlet, which I highly recommend. It starts with a brief sketch of how, in the last 150 years, radical protest, largely dominated by Marxism and kindred doctrines, has been mainly directed at obtaining State Control and has ignored Syndicalist warnings on this. It argues that, partly because of this and partly due to the growth of the joint stock companies, the nature of society has changed, so making invalid the traditional slogans and analyses of the Left. It then gives a broad outline of what would constitute Industrial Democracy and how this may be attained.

The pamphlet is short and, therefore understandably, there is no detailed analysis of the growth of Managerialism. Nevertheless, the distinction between Capitalism and Managerialism is somewhat over-emphasised, the former being equated almost exclusively with that form of society which existed in the days of Karl Marx.

This, however, differed from Mercantilism, both in the Tudor and Stuart forms, and to give Marx his due, he did predict that Capitalism would become centralised, even if he did not invent the name Managerialism and even though his disciples have always aided the process. In healthy reaction against both those who hold that the remedy for the ills of Managerialism is more of the policies that created it and the parties who boast of having advocated the same policies for 50 years, while commenting on how wrong the others were (since the nature of society is changing, this implies either that their analysis was wrong, or is now out of date and that therefore their policies are suspect). Common Wealth tends to the opposite extreme and is apt to discount anyone who has not produced a totally new analysis in the last dozen years.

They therefore underestimate the Libertarian resistance to Marxian statism and also shy away from giving a full blueprint of the future, on the grounds that the attainment of Industrial Democracy is too far ahead. Finally, they react against the insurrectionary tradition to the point of arguing that the free society can evolve only gradually.

Quite apart from the fact that if it is so far ahead, we will not survive to see it, they give the Spanish Syndicalist achievements as an example of what they hope to achieve. While no Libertarian would wish to mould the working class to fit a preconceived blueprint, failure to supply any large pattern at all is tantamount to offering a pig in a poke.

L.O.

An Austrian worker writes...

Police brutality in Graz

HUMAN RIGHTS in Graz, Austria exist only in the Red Cross and in hospital, where one is not asked what party one belongs to. You get help there, but outside no such rights exist. In public office we have a band of anti-social elements who receive good pay and special powers from the State. The police represent the ultimate power. Treatment and procedure in police stations is brutal in the extreme. Here is one recent example from my own experience.

I was at work erecting a crane and had to knock off, because I was feeling ill. On reaching the bus stop I collapsed, but got to my feet and found two policemen at my side. One of them, who had been watching me at work from a distance asked me to accompany them to the police station. The door closed behind me, a third copper appeared, twisted my arm and threw me to the floor. The second one trampled on me, shouting abuse, then forced my knees apart.

They handcuffed me so that it hurt and took me in another room, where the first one pulled on the chain of the handcuffs so that my fingers went white and I lost all feeling in them. This treatment went on for a time, another copper asked for my name and address, then I was released and told: "Idealism is dead in Austria. Now it is only brute force and each for himself."

I returned to my place of work and showed my mate my swollen hands. The next day I tried to lodge a complaint and went from court to court in vain. At the chief police court they listened and made fun of me, but I couldn't get a hearing from the chief, a Herr Weingrill, because they stopped me seeing him.

The Press told me to clear off, saying I must be mentally sick to complain about the police. Another officer told me: "You are being too honest; that won't get you far in Austria."

For not complying with any party politics and for having fought against the fascism of Dollfuss and Nazi dictatorship, I am being punished very severely.

J.T.

MANCHESTER: For information about SWF activity in Lancashire, contact J. Pinkerton, 12, Alt Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs.

WORLD LABOUR NEWS

PUBLISHED BI-MONTHLY BY THE SYNDICALIST WORKERS' FEDERATION, 25A, AMBERLEY ROAD, LONDON, W.9, ENGLAND

Yearly subscription rate: 3s.0d

Peaceful co-existence

SOHO IS NOT the only place where co-existence works. We have just experienced one of those unintended social experiments, which are often more significant than the planned sort, an experience which demonstrates that when men come together as persons, not as political animals, it is possible, despite temperament, race or colour, to adapt themselves to one another's company.

About two years ago, the Express Dairy Co. of London, bought out a smaller milk bottling company, the I.M.S. This firm, while employing British and Irish labour, also, because of low wages, had many immigrant workers, all unorganised. Coming under the new firm, the I.M.S. workers soon discovered that Express paid higher wages and demanded the same rate. A strike, carried on by unusual, but effective methods followed and the I.S.M. workers obtained the same wages as the Express employees and joined their branch of the T&GWU.

The parent company then shut down the I.M.S. depot, transferring its workers to Express depots, many of them going on night work at Cricklewood in N.W. London. There the labour was almost entirely British and Irish and no one knew what would happen when the new men arrived. Already there was much racial prejudice, especially among men who lived in Notting Hill and North Paddington.

Now, on night shift especially, there was quite an international crowd—West Indians, West Africans, two Poles, two Indians, Greek Cypriots, Turks, Maltese, a few from British Honduras and one Algerian colon. The union attitude was very correct, the new workers were received as full members, paid their dues and received full wages and work rights.

It was odd to see how both old hands and newcomers were shy of each other. But the new arrivals were shown how to use the new machinery by the British and Irish workers. Gradually the thaw set in and now all work well together, without that dreadful self-consciousness.

A white and a coloured worker may be together on one job. A West Indian may be relieved for his tea break by an Irishman. In the canteen, at tables for four, may sit the representatives of four distinct races, or a coloured worker may play cards with an Englishman and a couple of Irishmen. Matinees has even reached the ultimate confidence of workmen and men of various shades and hues indulge in schoolboyish horseplay and shadow boxing.

In this case, at least, the racial problem is social and political. While the coloured population of Britain is said to be only one per cent, it is largely concentrated in a few areas, mostly the decaying, crowded areas associated with casual employment and social insecurity. Such are the places where, for 100 years in Britain and the US, immigrants have collected. There the locals have watched the new peoples grow in number and their fears of unemployment, loss of their insecure dwellings and loss of living space have, rightly or wrongly, increased.

This is a social problem, one which society can solve, but the personal, human problem of "getting to know you" easily melts into place when people make human contact on equal terms. Man is always better as a human being than as a political animal.

PRESS FUND, Ju 14—August 14, 1962

Stenbenville, Ohio, A.G., £1 6s; Edmonton, Alberta, W.G., 7s; Proceeds SWF party, £5 15s; Hove, A.R. 1s; Tucson, Ariz., J.F. 17s; Hartford, Conn., M.A. 11s 2d; London, W. T.P. 2s; London, W. B.H. 6d; London, N.W., A.V. 1s 6d; London S.W., R.H. 6s; Rochdale, J.M. & B.B. 10s; London, N.W., K.H. £1. Total £10 17s 2d. 1962 total carried forward £25 8s 11d.

THE SWF is now again publishing its original paper, **DIRECT ACTION**, which has incorporated "Workers' Voice." This appears fortnightly, edited by Bill Christopher in duplicated form, and gives first-hand information on all aspects of the workers' struggle against capitalism and State oppression. Specimen copy 3d. (plus 2d. postage) from SWF, 25A Amberley Road, London, W.9., or 5s. for 12 issues.

Fascism—a philosophy for devils

FOR THE PAST two months British Fascism has received far more attention and free publicity than at any time since the 1930's. The names of Colin Jordan and Sir Oswald Mosley have become household words and the psychopathic antics of their rodent followers a matter of serious public discussion.

By something more than coincidence, the focus on fascism was accompanied by a serious outbreak of racial rioting in the Worcestershire town of Dudley. Whether these riots were directly instigated by followers of Jordan, Mosley or one of the other crackpot fuhrers we do not know, but the fascists are everywhere doing their best to stir up racial hatred. Mosley's protests that his propaganda is no longer racist should be taken with a large pinch of salt. Two printed stickers that have recently appeared on the walls of streets in London—and probably elsewhere—where coloured workers live, give the lie to his claim. One reads: "Union Movement says House Britons FIRST", the other, "Britain for the Britons—Send the coloured migrants home."

It is not to be wondered at that the cases of Jordan and Mosley should have thrown the ranks of "liberal" democracy into disarray, for the concept of freedom on which representative democracy is supposedly founded is more talked about and less understood than any other idea forming part of the mental currency of our society.

Colin Jordan, according to his account, has been leading two disconnected lives. During his working day he taught English, mathematics and civics at the Stoke Secondary Modern Boys, School in Coventry in, or so he implies, much the same way as any other teacher. Outside the classroom, however, he laced up his jackboots and assumed the role of embryo-Fuhrer as leader of the National Socialist Movement, one of several fascist groups of which Britain can now boast. This charming double life was suddenly burst asunder as a result of publicity arising from the fascist meeting in Trafalgar Square on July 1. Jordan was suspended from teaching.

In essence the question disturbing the consciences of the democrats is: Should individuals or groups be allowed by a democracy to propagate anti-democratic doctrines? Those who answer clearly yes declare that free expression of opinion is the birthright of every Englishman, etc., and that without this right a society is no longer a democracy. Their opponents tend to talk about the abuse of free speech, and about the limitations on this and all other freedoms when social harmony or the State are endangered.

There is nothing new in this clash of attitudes (we have seen it before over Communists and fellow-travellers) and it is generally easy to know on which body of opinion to tie the label "authoritarian." But there is one big difference in this case: the utter abhorrence which most people in Britain genuinely feel towards fascism. They may not be free from colour prejudice, anti-semitism, and delusions of national grandeur; they may not be quite so devoted to freedom or so repelled by undemocratic actions as they make out; but hate fascism they do. And I for one am not going to tell them they are wrong to distinguish between fascism and other authoritarian creeds.

It may be true that if you scratch a Tory there is at least a good chance of finding a fascist underneath—and one might well feel that in many respects with a Communist the chances are even greater. But in neither case do they openly preach doctrines to which no human being could possibly subscribe. If you are sufficiently stupid, it is possible to be a Communist or a Tory and still be a fairly decent bloke. Fascism is a philosophy for devils.

For anyone with minority opinions about society that are radical and not merely potty, it might seem expedient to defend free speech at all costs. If the free expression of one doctrine is prevented for any reason whatsoever, it might be anyone's turn next for suppression. But for Anarchists and Syndicalists, whose aim is to abolish the State and build a truly free society, the problem of Jordan and his kind is both simple and complex. In the first place, they genuinely believe in free speech, and not in a pathetic substitute that makes it possible, for example, for Lord Boothby to be sued for libel because he said something rude (though not rude enough) about Lord Beaverbrook's papers, or, for that matter, for prominent CND supporters to sue their opponents for calling them names.

To take a more serious example, what sort of doctrine of free speech is it that allows a man to confess that he does not relish the thought of strutting his harp on a radioactive cloud, but renders him liable to incarceration for inciting people to do something about it. This indeed points to the second and most fundamental difference between libertarians and democrats. For libertarians free speech is not something separate from free living, but part of it. Without either, one cannot have the other.

No libertarian will demand legislation to curb the verbal propagation of fascism, racialism or any other obnoxious creed, not even to prevent fascists from teaching children, because he does not believe in relying on the State, but on the people. If those subjected to such propaganda, however, show their disgust in no uncertain terms he will rejoice, for such a reaction is an expression of freedom

far deeper than the right of fascists to free speech.

Free speech, yes. But is there not also the right of refusal—freedom not to have any part in the handling of fascist filth, and not to associate in any way with its pedlars?

Jordan has claimed a martyr's mantle because, he says, he has never allowed his views to influence his teaching. As far as maths go, and perhaps even English within the limits of a secondary modern education, one can credit this. But civic affairs! It is just not possible to believe that such a subject can be taught without the teacher's own political bias coming out in some shape or form. A libertarian teacher might dislike the idea of children being indoctrinated by any views, even his own, but inevitably his love of freedom will make itself felt in his teaching. The same is true of his relations with his own children. It is better to recognise this and avoid both deliberate and unconscious indoctrination of specific opinions.

What is disturbing about the case of Colin Jordan is that, despite his openly proclaimed views and associations, it has taken a national scandal, provoked by himself, to stir those most closely affected into doing something about him. How one would have cheered had one read in one's daily paper, before the scandal, a small item about a strike of schoolboys in a certain school in Coventry, or the refusal of the other teachers there to work with Jordan, or the withdrawal by parents of their children.

Jordan courted publicity. How many secret "Jordans" are there battenning on the unformed minds of our children, sowing seeds of racial hatred, nationalism, militarism, imperialism, religious bigotry, intolerance, or just plain authoritarianism? Is this what we mean by free speech? Nobody who cares about freedom would want to see a McCarthy-style witch hunt in England's green and pleasant land. But would you let your children be taught by Colin Jordan?

DOV

Round the world

SPAIN—Surface workers in the pyrite mines of Huelva and Seville have won an increase of 30 pesetas (about 3s 9d) a day, and underground workers one of 45 pesetas, it was reported on August 12.

NORTHERN RHODESIA—Following the postponement of a threatened strike, it was announced on August 2 that African copper miners are to get a rise of 1s 6d a shift, with increases in overtime and bonus payments and an extra two days' paid leave a year.

ITALY—A 24-hour strike of printers (part of a campaign of lightning strikes) left Italy without any daily newspapers on August 5. A one-day strike of 900,000 metal workers in private industries took place on July 30, following a two-day strike of 40,000 bakers.

ADEN—In a complaint to the International Labour Organisation on August 2, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions indicted the British Government for Aden's anti-strike laws and the imprisonment of trade unionists.

YUGOSLAVIA—In July, 184 people crossed the border into Austria and asked for political asylum.

U.S.A.—A 24-hour strike on August 1, won leave and pension concessions for 16,000 aluminium workers, as well as greater job security at a time when automation techniques are being widely adopted in the industry. In the past three years 5,000 members of the Aluminium Workers union have lost their jobs through automation.

SAN FRANCISCO—Three pacifists—Harold Stallings (30), Evan Yoes (30) and Edward Lazar (27)—were jailed for 30 days for contempt of court on June 9, when they refused to give an undertaking not to sail to the scene of American nuclear tests in the Pacific.

AUSTRALIA—Describing two 4-hour strikes on July 25 and 31 as flagrant contempt of court, Mr. Justice Spicer, Chief Judge of the Commonwealth Industrial Court, fined the Waterside Workers' Federation £A1,000 (£800) in Melbourne on August 6. At the same time 4,000 dockers walked off 34 ships in Sydney harbour in a dispute over the size of wharf teams to handle wool loading. For this strike and an earlier Sydney stoppage on July 26, the Waterside Workers' Federation was fined £A800 (£640) on August 14.

CHAOS IN TRANSPORT
TRANSPORT WORKERS' CONFERENCE

(Sponsored by the National Rank and File Movement)

WHITE SWAN, FARRINGDON RD, LONDON EC

Sunday, October 21, 10-5 p.m.

Details from: Sec'y, NRFM, 34 Cumberland Rd, London E17

Saskatchewan doctors 'strike' is a flop

ON July 23, an agreement was signed between the government of Saskatchewan and the College of Physicians and Surgeons, which represents the doctors. This ended what has been called the Saskatchewan doctors' strike, which began on July 1 when the Medical Care Act became law and about 600 of the 700 or so doctors in the province refused to practice under its terms.

Briefly, the Act provides compulsory medical insurance for all residents of the province of Saskatchewan and is to be financed by (a) an annual premium of \$12 for a single person and \$24 for a family, (b) a provincial sales tax and increased income tax. The part of the Act which annoyed the doctors dealt with methods of payment. Doctors were prohibited from having a private practice and had to send all their bills to a Medical Care Commission set up by the Act and receive payments from this Commission.

Claiming that this made them all civil servants and took away their freedom, doctors closed their offices on July 1 and put into practice an emergency medical care plan, under which doctors centred in district hospitals provided emergency services free to anyone who managed to get to the hospital. This plan, together with the 100 or so doctors who decided to practice under the terms of the Act and those doctors, mainly in the smaller towns, who closed their offices but when on treating patients on the side, without accepting payment, seemed to provide a fairly adequate medical coverage for the people of Saskatchewan, though no doubt causing them a certain amount of anxiety and inconvenience.

Apart from the doctors, there was a very vocal group opposed to the Act. This group was instrumental in, among other things, circulating petitions calling on the government to repeal the Act, buying time on radio and TV to voice their opposition, organising demonstrations outside the legislative buildings and trying to get a court order suspending the Act. Significantly it was composed of well-to-do professional and business people and opposition politicians, none of whom every had to worry about finding the money to pay a doctor's bill.

For all their noise and spending, they never aroused any popular support, for the simple reason that the farmers and workers who make up the bulk of the population of the province want to be freed from financial worry when they need to call a doctor. The doctors must have realised they were losing too much of the good will of their patients, for they signed an agreement which, though in theory it gives them the right to practice outside the Act, in practice ensures that most of them are paid by the Medical Care Commission, which was the original intention of the government.

The net result is still compulsory medical insurance for the people of Saskatchewan. This, despite the objections of the doctors, is better than facing financial ruin in the event of a serious illness.

If the doctors really cared about freedom from government control, they should long ago have instituted a scheme of their own to ensure everyone had adequate medical care without the possibility of financial ruin. This they failed to do, preferring to squeeze every penny they could out of their patients. (Average net income of Saskatchewan doctors in 1958 was \$17,494. Average gross wage of unskilled workers in Saskatchewan, assuming that they manage to work a full year, was about \$3,200.)

The most significant part of this whole affair was not the noise and bluster of the wealthy few who opposed the Act, but the apathy and indifference of the great majority who did not oppose it and who stood to benefit from it. True, they stayed away in droves from demonstrations organised by the opponents of the Act, but there were no enthusiastic displays in its favour. It was as though the ordinary people realised the Act made no significant change to their way of life and that all they were doing was choosing the lesser of two evils.

Small, but encouraging, signs that people in Saskatchewan are not content with State-controlled medicine, any more than its practice for private profit, are the formation of Community Health Service Co-operatives in five centres, including the cities of Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert. Ten other centres are reported to be making final arrangements to set up clinics and interest in the idea is spreading. An estimated 3,000 Saskatchewan families have already taken out membership in these non-profit medical clinics, which will be operated by the members.

An example is the clinic set up at Biggar, a small town of 2,800 inhabitants. A meeting was called just four days after the dispute started, a Wednesday evening, and attended by 65 people. It was decided to set up a medical co-op and a target of \$40,000 was set for funds. Only two and a half days later, Saturday noon, \$35,000 had been raised. The following Monday, 250 members of the Citizens Medical Health Association met and decided to "take all

necessary steps to restore normal services to the district in both clinic and hospital." This clinic, grown from nothing in less than a week, was the result of "talk at street corners, in railway yards and on the farms in the district" according to its chairman. If it, and the others like it throughout the province, grows and prospers it will be due to the good sense of the working people, who have hit upon the best kind of health service—one run by the workers themselves.

In Sudbury, Ontario, 14,333 employees of the International Nickel Company of Canada are still waiting for the Government to tell them which union they may belong to. United Steelworkers of America challenged the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelterworkers, to which the miners had previously belonged.

Following an election campaign, in which both unions spent huge sums of money buying advertising space in local newspapers and on radio and TV, the miners voted in a government-run election to decide which union should become certified bargaining agent for all the miners.

According to Ontario law, bargaining rights cannot be taken from a union unless the union challenging it receives votes totalling 50 per cent plus one of the total eligible to vote. In this case Steel needed 7,167 votes to oust Mine, Mill and both sides knew the result would be close. Following the voting, but before the votes could be counted, Mine, Mill started a series of legal manoeuvres to try and have the vote annulled. After several months these manoeuvres were rejected and the resultant count gave Steel 7,182, Mine, Mill 6,951, with 200 abstentions. This meant that Steel had ousted Mine, Mill by a mere 15 votes but Mine, Mill, fighting for its life, immediately challenged the vote on the grounds that 32 of the ballot slips did not have the official stamp of the Ontario Labour Relations Board.

Until this final challenge has been dealt with, Steel is not officially the new bargaining agent, but whatever the outcome, only half the miners will be represented by the union of their choice. The bitterness and disunity generated by this jurisdictional battle will weaken the strength of the miners and benefit only the International Nickel Co. of Canada.

When are the workers of this country going to dig in their feet and fight the government and the union bosses for the right to join and have represent them the union of their choice?

An ironical footnote to this sorry affair is that the defeated Tory candidate for the Sudbury constituency in the recent federal election was one Don Gillis, who also happened to be the leader of the Steelworker supporters in control of the Mine, Mill local before the certification vote.

BILL GREENWOOD

IWMA WORLD CALL

THE TENTH CONGRESS of the International Working Men's Association (Toulouse, September, 1958) agreed to support the formation of "Groups of Friends of the IWMA" in all countries where sections have not yet been set up, with the aim of gaining sympathy for our International and of spreading its principles and propaganda as widely as possible.

We address ourselves especially to comrades and sympathisers in Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas, Uruguay and Argentina excepted.

It is desirable that "Groups of Friends of the IWMA" should keep close contact between themselves in each country and they will receive our Press, propaganda and news of other countries through the international secretariat.

A group can be formed by five, ten or more members. It will give you the chance to maintain regular contact with the IWMA and of being in touch with the affairs of the international movement.

All interested in this proposal should write to the IWMA Secretariat (AIT-CNT), 4 rue Belfort, Toulouse (H.G.), France.

BULGARIA—Evidence of open opposition to the Communist dictatorship, countered by mass deportations and forced labour, has been confirmed by the regime itself. Early in August Sofia Radio reported the passing of death sentences on a number of Bulgarians who injured militiamen while resisting arrest.

ARGENTINA—Mass clashes outside meat packing plants between workers and police were reported on August 13. Frontier guards took over all plants to keep out over 10,000 locked-out workers. The lockout began on August 11 as the employers, reply to demands, which had been backed by daily strikes of several hours' duration, for higher wages to meet the soaring cost of living. The General Confederation of Labour called a 48-hour general strike from August 1-2.

PAGES OF LABOUR HISTORY

Trafalgar Square—and the free speech fight

"BUT you have free speech in England. Look how the Government allows you to use Trafalgar Square and Hyde Park for meetings." How often we hear such statements, usually accompanied by a rebukeful suggestion that we ought to be grateful. The truth is we were never granted such rights. The means of holding meetings in the streets and public places of Britain was fought for and torn from the ruling class. Let us take first the popular and ever-topical case of Trafalgar Square.

The year of 1886 was one of depression and on February 8, Black Monday, a great crowd of unemployed met to hold a meeting in Trafalgar Square. The police dispersed them and the men reformed to march to Hyde Park to hold their meeting. At their head walked John Burns, later a Socialist MP and Liberal Cabinet minister, until he resigned in protest against the 1914 war. Burns carried a red flag.

The orderly, quiet procession marched along Pall Mall, but on passing the Tory Carlton Club they saw the windows crowded with well-fed, well-dressed, wealthy Tories, who not content with laughing at the unfortunate unemployed, shouted sneers and insults at their ragged clothes, their broken boots and hungry looks.

The road was being repaired and the crowd seized the opportunity, pelting the club's windows with large stones. The Tories' laughter vanished with their courage. Yelling for police protection they retreated to the back of the premises. As police reinforcements dashed to the spot, and a general struggle began, shop windows in nearby St. James' Street and Piccadilly were broken.

Burns and three others arrested were charged with seditious conspiracy, but the jury refused to convict. The Lord Mayor's Fund for the relief of the unemployed, which had slowly crept up to £3,000 and looked like stopping there, suddenly leapt to £70,000.

The following year, 1887, brought Bloody Sunday on November 13, when another demonstration was planned in Trafalgar Square. Using the powers given them by the Trafalgar Square Act of 1844, the Government prohibited the meeting and processions. As in the earlier revolutionary struggles of Paris and later St. Petersburg, the State garrisoned the river bridges with police and infantry, preventing by merciless use of batons the South London workers from reaching the Square, many being injured.

North of the river the processions were to be halted in streets leading to the Square, but some groups got through and one contingent, the North London, reached the Square in procession and were met by police and cavalry, the Life Guards. Among the wounded were John Burns and Cunningham Graham, a Radical MP. Both were arrested and suffered six weeks' imprisonment.

G. B. Shaw opposed this fight for free speech, but Annie Besant entered the struggle wholeheartedly. Three months later a free speech demonstration was banned by the police and a young worker, Alfred Linnell, beaten to death. A great procession followed Linnell's coffin to the grave, where William Morris gave the funeral oration. Then the vast crowd stood bareheaded while the Death Chant, written by Morris, was sung:

"They will not learn; they have no ears to harken,
They turn their faces from the eye of fate,
Their gay-lit halls shut out the skies that darken,
But lo! this dead man knocking at the gate."

And the refrain, often repeated in the years that followed:

"Not one, not one, nor thousands must they slay,
But one and all if they would dusk the day."

The fight went on, the Square was won for free speech, but in more recent times permission has had to be obtained from the Ministry of Works and only one meeting at a time is allowed.

HYDE PARK

The Reform League, a continuation of Chartism demanding democratic reform of the electoral laws, had planned a mass procession and demonstration in Hyde Park for the evening July 23, 1866. On the afternoon of that day Sir Richard Mayne had notices posted throughout London, declaring the Park closed from 5 p.m. The organisers decided to go on to the Park and attempt a meeting there. When the great procession, with many bands, banners and wagons arrived at Marble Arch, the three principal speakers, Edmund Beales, Colonel Dickinson and George Brooke, descended from their wagon and asked permission to enter the Park, the gates of which were guarded by a large force of police. After a little polite conversation and an adamant refusal, the leaders turned away and called on the demonstrators to follow them to Trafalgar Square. The procession—well, some of it—went along Oxford Street and on to the Square where, after a few brief speeches and thanks to Mr. Gladstone and others, the meeting ended.

But at the Park—oh boy! this was a Bank Holiday to remember.

In a movement which includes a large middle class, as well as a large working-class following, critical events usually find the middle class turning to constitutional compromise after many brave words, while there has most often been a large section of the working class which has wanted to use Direct Action. So it was on that glorious Monday.

As the procession wended its musical way along Oxford Street, the tens of thousands who had remained, struck at the garrisoned Park in two places. In Bayswater Road a throng hurled themselves at the massive iron rails, which were thrown down; at the same time workers in Park Lane tore down the park railings and the two sections joined forces in a fight with the police.

The fight died down as the Foot Guards marched in. The workers, seeking to fraternise, checked the troops, who halted near the gates. Then the Horse Guards cantered in—and again the crowd cheered. Soon the cavalry trotted off to another part of the Park and the police were again attacked.

Now more Foot Guards marched in under orders to shoot "if necessary". Then more cavalry, the Life Guards. Many were wounded that day, but the workers triumphed. Let us turn to a newspaper, at that time Radical and Republican, for an on-the-spot account.

"The people have triumphed, in so far as they have vindicated their right to speak, resolve and exhort in Hyde-park. True, the gates were closed against them, and lo! in twenty minutes after the Park all around was one vast, wide, gaping gate. The ordinary gates were the only closed part of the fencing.

"A long pull, a strong pull and a push all together, down went the iron railings and the stones on which they were fixed in hundreds of yards, so that in less time than it takes to tell the story, the iron barriers which excluded the people from Hyde-park were levelled to the ground, or inclined against the trees, for miles.

"Then the people poured in hundreds of thousands into the park and then, under the nose of Sir Richard Mayne, and before the masses of the bludgeon-brigade and through the scarlet lines of Foot Guards and Life Guards, with bayonets fixed and sabres drawn, were flanking police, and ready to charge, a meeting was held, a chairman appointed, speeches made and resolutions proposed, seconded and carried." Reynolds, July 29, 1866.

THE STREETS

Even more important than these two famous London spots were the market places and street corners of Britain, where a struggle for free speech went on for more than 100 years, until about the mid-1920's. Every city had its meeting place, which was also a big open-air club—the Mound, Edinburgh; the Bigg Market, Newcastle; the City Hall Square, Leeds, and a hundred others.

Not content with such places, the radical movement and also some religious movements such as the Salvation Army and the Methodists struggled for the right to hold public meetings at any street corner they thought suitable. At the end of last century and the beginning of this, the free speech fights seemed to come in waves and seasons, or at times, city by city. Sometimes a lone agitator or preacher would champion the cause, often successfully.

When the authorities made a general attack on public meetings, an impromptu united front would often form and Socialists, Anarchists, Syndicalists and Radicals would queue up to be hauled off by the police. I recall one such incident, told me by our late comrade, George Cores. Brighton was having a free speech fight and, running out of speakers, sent a call to London. George went down to Brighton, began a street meeting and was in a police cell before he had time to sniff the ozone. With him was a Salvation Army captain, also arrested for speaking in the streets. After a few hours both were called to the station desk and told they must appear in court on the following Monday, it then being Saturday. The Salvationist would be let out on bail, but George held in custody.

Then came a surprise. "This is unjust," cried the Salvationist, "if I go this man should go, too." "It's none of your business," said the inspector, "Get out." "Not until you let this man go," was the gallant reply, "If he stays, so do I." As accused persons were not provided with chairs, the captain sat on the floor—surely the grandfather of the Committee of 100. Dragged to the door he returned. Pleading, threats were useless and after an hour of rather bewildered and highly emotional contest, the preacher and the revolutionary left arm in arm—free, until Monday morning.

Free speech came the hard way. It could go the easy way.

TOM BROWN

GLASGOW: Readers in the Clydeside area interested in SWF activity are asked to contact R. Lynn, 22, Ross Street, Glasgow, S.E.