

Direct Action

For workers' direct control of industry

Inside—Merchant Shipping Act unmasked : Great American lockout : Irish militant is victimised

MONTHLY PAPER OF THE SYNDICALIST WORKERS' FEDERATION (IWMA)

Vol.7 No.7 (61)

July 1966

Fourpence

T.U.C. STRIKEBREAKERS

THE SEAMEN urgently need solidarity if they are not to be defeated by the shipowners and Labour Government. "Solidarity" does not only mean donations to the Strike Fund, though these are also welcome, but effective militant action on the world's waterfronts. **AND QUICKLY!**

If this is not obtainable through "official" channels—and ITWF secretary Hans Imhof's professed sympathy for the

British Government, even in the event of its using Royal Navy personnel as strikebreakers, does not suggest that it will be—then the appeal must be made directly to the rank-and-file portworkers. For the first six weeks of the strike NUS leaders kept their gloves on. To win the struggle **THEY MUST COME OFF AT ONCE.** Too much is at stake for this battle to be lost through half-heartedness.

The line-up of forces has been the clearest possible justification for Syndicalist policy. On one hand, the shipowning interests allied with the Labour Government, the Press, the Tory Party and the top brass of the TUC. On the other, the seagoing workers, whose militancy has prevented a vacillating leadership, under NUS Secretary Bill (Hot & Cold) Hogarth, from doing a compromise deal—despite almost overwhelming pressure from outside.

Predictably, Labour's "left" MPs threw their (feather)-weight into the balance on the shipowners' side. Mr. Eric Heffer (Liverpool, Walton), erstwhile member of the now-deceased Marxist group, Socialist Workers' Federation, said: "Many of us on this side feel it is regrettable that the seamen did not accept the (Pearson) report as a basis for negotiation."

OUR DEFINITION

But the most despicable role has been that played by the TUC catspaws of Harold ("Reds Under the Bed") Wilson. The dictionary defines "Woodcock" as "a wild fowl allied to snipe." Our definition, however, would more exactly fit Mr. George Woodcock, General Secretary of the TUC: "Strikebreaker".

Woodcock now stands even more completely exposed than when photographed in his swimming trunks on holiday in Fascist Spain—where TU militants rot in jail—before being summoned back to do his master's dirty work. Flying post-

cont. on page 2 col. 1



DON'T STAND BY—PULL YOUR WEIGHT!

AID? OR A SUBSIDY FOR EXPORTS?

"BY helping the developing nations with trade and aid, we are not only helping to keep the peace in the world but helping to build up the markets of the future".

Baroness Gaitskell, House of Lords, 27.4.66

A CYNIC was heard to remark the other day that the recent independence of British Guiana will benefit only the politicians, bureaucrats, and their hangers-on. He was wrong. He forgot the stamp-collectors.

T.U.C. aids bosses (cont.)

haste to London, his purpose was twofold: to prevent effective support being given the seamen by other unions in this country, notably the T & GWU, and to sabotage the NUS leadership's belated call for the blacking of British shipping by member unions of the International Transport Workers' Federation which had in large part already been pledged.

Unfortunately, he met with success and the Labour Government's aim of isolating the seamen from massive support by workers in other industries was, broadly speaking, fulfilled.

But right from the outset it has been crystal-clear—Wilson himself admitted this openly—that the seamen's claim for an immediate 40 hour week, with a consequent wage boost estimated at 17%, would smash the Government's attempted wage-freeze, otherwise known as the Prices & Incomes Policy.

All the way, therefore, the seamen have been fighting on behalf of the entire working class of this country in what Wilson, George ("no time for militancy") Brown and Grunter chose to make a test case. Defeat for the seamen meant a crushing defeat for the workers as a whole. Never has the old slogan that "an injury to one is an injury to all" been more fully borne out.

BIG BATTALIONS

Some unions—notably the Boilermakers, National Union of Port Workers, ASSET, DATA—recognised this and gave the strikers generous support. But the big battalions of organised labour were not drawn into the struggle, either on the simple issue of solidarity, or that of "after the seamen, our turn."

For this, a heavy share of responsibility must be carried by Hogarth and the NUS executive. From the start they knew that, even after a month on the stones by the coastal seamen and a small section of their more militant deep-sea members, little over one-third of the union's membership would be out, thanks to the repressive terms of the Merchant Shipping Act, which George Foulser deals with in this issue. In such a situation it was essential to spread the strike quickly and mobilise every possible support. This was not done and the ground was prepared for Woodcock and Co. to carry out their scab antics as finger-men for Wilson.

An official NUS leaflet states that the Merchant Shipping Act is not at issue in the strike. WHY NOT? This archaic legislation is the seal of serfdom for seafarers.

The interim report of the Pearson Court of Inquiry condemns the NUS Executive Council for calling the strike because, it says, "there was nothing to call for the use of this very drastic and dangerous remedy." (Dangerous for whom? The shipowners? Wilson?). But the same document records the substantial improvements gained in seamen's hours and conditions in 1960 and 1961—the years of the unofficial seamen's strikes, organised by the National Seamen's Reform Movement in opposition to the NUS leadership. Those gains, since whittled away, were the direct result of rank-and-file organisation and action. As in other industries, it is only when the shipowners face the reality of working-class militancy that substantial concessions can be won.

INTERIM REPORT

Much has been written in the Press of the "great concessions" made to the seamen in the interim report, which was predictably accepted by the shipowners and rejected by the NUS. In fact, the "concessions" were whittled away by cutting the seamen's paid annual leave and axing a 12s. 6d. monthly increase in "efficiency pay" after five years' service.

Much has also been said about gains made by the seamen in 1965. But the interim report has to admit that: "The new arrangements contained a defect, entailing a psychological disadvantage and an element of inequity. The nominal

working week at sea, instead of being reduced from 44 hours to 40 hours, as might have been expected, was increased to 56 hours." It adds that the Chairman of the Seafarers' Side at that time said: "He knew that some of his members would resent the 56-hour week at sea because at first glance it would seem to be a backward step. He felt sure that when it was fully explained they would accept it."

Far from accepting, the militant NUS rank and file rose in revolt against their executive's betrayal of the 1964 AGM's demand for (1) A substantial increase in wages; (2) A 40-hour week; (3) Increased overtime rates.

The politically-inspired red herring that a secret ballot of the striking seamen would reveal an almost unanimous wish for a return to work was exposed on June 20—when the NE coast, by 609-43, voted to continue the struggle. Independent scrutineers counted the votes.

Southampton, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow and Hull voted overwhelmingly in the same way.

WHAT MATTERS IS WINNING

The structure of the NUS is still undemocratic. This strike was called by the executive council because they were under heavy fire from rank-and-file groupings, such as that around the Bristol Channel Ports and on the NE coast. Already, before the strike, the demand was gaining ground for a new and democratic union, with genuine shipboard delegates and committees ensuring rank-and-file control, and officials subject to recall by the membership. More will be heard of this in the future.

Meanwhile, what matters is winning the strike. We repeat our call of last month for effective solidarity. Oppose Wilson's efforts to divide and rule the British workers by defeating the seamen. Make their case known and get support for it wherever you can—on your job, in your union branch, among your mates. And even if you are not able to help in other ways you can get collecting sheets from the Strike Fund, National Union of Seamen, Connaught Road, London, E.16 and aid the struggle with hard cash.

'The road to anarchy'

KENT COUNTY COUNCIL'S merciless campaign against the homeless reached its lowest level yet on June 7, when Mr. "Justice" Blain committed to prison Roy Mills, father of six children, and Stan Daniels, who was ill in bed and unfit to be moved. Their "crime"? Visiting and sleeping with their wives at King Hill Hostel, West Malling, against a court order. "If orders of the court are deliberately flouted and injunctions disobeyed, and if those who are subject to such orders are allowed to be laws unto themselves, there lies the road to anarchy," commented "Justice" Blain. The Friends of King Hill are intensifying their activity in support of the Kent homeless. Details from 5 Clock House Road, Beckenham, Kent (BEC 7517).

Death from 'natural' causes

AMSTERDAM POLICE, whose notorious brutality has made them bitterly hated, claimed a new victim during three days of clashes with demonstrating building workers, who were supported by the anarchist "Provo" group. The dead building worker, Jan Weggelaar, 51, was killed on June 13; two post-mortems, conducted by the police, pronounced that death was due to "natural" causes. There were scores of injured and more than 50 arrests. The demonstrations began when building workers had a 2% cut made in their holiday bonus for "administrative costs." The money was taken from their pay packets and given to a union of which the workers disapproved.

SLAVE ACT SHACKLES SEAMEN

You may be interested in reading something about the Merchant Shipping Act as it affects seamen in general—that is, all hands, from the Old Man to first-trip deck-boy.

A merchant seaman joins a ship by signing her Articles. These are Articles of Agreement between the Master and the crew, and are governed by the Merchant Shipping Act. A copy of an "Extract from the Agreement" is put up aboard all merchant ships where it is "readily accessible to the crew". I have consulted such an Extract aboard quite a few ships, and most of the points I mention here are part of the various Extracts, Home Trade, Foreign-Going, Running Agreement, and so on.

A seaman on deep-sea (Foreign-Going) articles is not entitled to receive his wages or any part thereof from the time he joins the ship until the voyage is over and he has signed off the ship's articles. He has no legal right to shore-leave, either. Both cash and liberty abroad are subject to the Master's discretion. If the skipper wants to, he can deny any and all of his crew pay or shore-leave for the duration of an entire voyage, even if the ship stays out for a twelvemonth or more.

"CASH AND LIBERTY ABROAD TO BE AT THE MASTER'S DISCRETION"—This clause is part of the "Extract".

ILLEGAL TO STRIKE

When a skipper wants to give a seaman a bad discharge at the end of a voyage, he does so by having the words **"DECLINE TO REPORT"** stamped in the space in the discharge for Conduct. **DECLINE TO REPORT** is a bad discharge in the eyes of the skipper, the unlucky chap getting the "DR", and the Shipping Office Superintendent who authorises his getting it. Legally, however, **DECLINE TO REPORT** is not a bad discharge but merely means what it says: the Master declines to report on the seaman's conduct. Skippers with a grudge against a crew-member can therefore spoil a good record when the man has behaved excellently throughout the trip . . . I should know—I got a "DR" for nothing once, in 1944.

A seaman is not allowed to complain. If he does so, whether as an individual or speaking for his mates as well, he can be, and only too often is labelled **"AGITATOR"**!! If men go to the master in a group to voice a grievance big or small, they can be as orderly as they wish but their action can be construed as mutiny under the Act, and believe me there are skippers still extant who would use that construction to feed their ego or something. Such types are dying out but are not all dead by a long chalk.

Under the Merchant Shipping Act, a seaman on articles cannot strike. Striking while on articles in an overseas port is mutiny, and while it is not quite as wicked to withdraw one's labour in Great Britain, it still illegal, as witness the test-case of the **"CASTILIAN's"** crew in 1960. They all got a month's imprisonment for striking. It was rumoured that these men were jailed as a deterrent to would-be strikers. In actuality, the **"CASTILIAN"** case roused more seamen than anything else could have done, and it roused the Labour Movement into action on the seamen's behalf into the bargain.

During a seamen's strike, a seaman speaking at a strike-meeting ashore can be silenced and if necessary jailed under the Act, even when he is not on ship's articles. On application to the High Courts of Justice by shipowners or their representatives, an injunction informs the seaman in question that he must cease from speaking at strike-meetings and from all other activities designed to further the strike, otherwise he is liable to go to prison for contempt of court. A number of us

were unable to address our fellow seamen because of injunctions received during the July strike of 1960. These injunctions were still valid in the second seamen's strike that year, August-September, 1960.

It was a July injunction which sent the strike chairman Paddy Neary to Brixton Jail for contempt of court just after the second strike began. Those of us with injunctions against them all got ready to join Paddy. Fortunately for us the Neary jailing awoke a storm of national protest, and the authorities stopped at jailing Paddy. I should just like to make a point as a gentle reminder, that despite being merchant seamen, we are British after all—or are we?—so why should a seaman who strikes be liable to trial and imprisonment? Striking is legal here. This is a free country—for everyone bar us seamen.

"CREW TO WORK CARGO BUNKERS AND/OR BALLAST WHEN AND WHERE REQUIRED"—This clause is seen in the "Extract".

By means of this clause British seamen have been forced to act as strikebreakers for a foreign employer of labour in a foreign port. Many seamen of course have refused to do such work, and have suffered under the laws of Britain for "refusing to obey the lawful command of the Master". While this clause is not used these days to my knowledge, *nevertheless it is still in the articles.*

A seaman who misses his ship abroad is not only liable to forfeiture of wages for the entire time he served aboard the ship, he can get jailed into the bargain. Some Merchant Navy Pool Offices have the walls decorated with posters giving such news items as: **"AT SOANDSO POLICE COURT RECENTLY A SEAMAN WHO HAD DESERTED HIS SHIP IN AUSTRALIA WAS IMPRISONED FOR THREE MONTHS: HE FORFEITED HIS WAGES FROM THE SHIP HE LEFT ALSO FROM THE SHIP IN WHICH HE RETURNED TO THE UNITED KINGDOM"** . . . **AMEN!!** . . . Serve the rotten swine right for committing sacrilege against the Holy Shipowner . . .

Of course, the above-mentioned seaman does not get away with it as lightly as that—oh no! He usually suffers the loss of his livelihood by removal, either temporary or permanent, from the Register of Seamen of the Merchant Navy Pool. This is an unofficial organisation but controls 99% of British shipping nevertheless.

"DISCIPLINE"

One corner of the "Extract from the Agreement" is devoted to **"PROVISIONS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF DISCIPLINE"**. Beneath the heading are listed various offences and misdemeanours for which seamen can incur fines of varying amounts plus the loss of from a half-day's pay upwards. Repetitions of an offence are punished on the doubling-up principle regarding fines, etc. The fining system contains the qualifying clause **"IF NOT OTHERWISE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW"**. That allows the skipper to have the offender dealt with by a court of law . . . Better for the seaman, surely, you may think. A British court and British justice after all—yes, but for seamen it is justice subject to the Merchant Shipping Act, that is to say, once a man is convicted in a court of law of a shipboard offence committed while on articles, a prison-sentence *is mandatory*: the Court is not allowed to let first-offenders off or fine them; they must be sent to prison.

Here are some of the offences covered by the **"PROVISIONS"**, etc.:

cont. on page 6, col. 1

Direct Action

PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE SYNDICALIST WORKERS' FEDERATION, BRITISH SECTION OF INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION

Why not jam today?

LOWER-PAID workers are certainly getting a hard time under the wage-freeze, whether the latter is operated by the Prices and Incomes Board or by the TU bosses. Any doubts about this should have vanished swiftly after this year's Annual Delegate Meeting of the Union of Shop, Distributive and Allied Workers (USDAW) threw out a motion calling for an immediate increase of £2 per week. Instead, the executive recommended and had approved only an immediate "substantial" but unnamed pay rise, "working towards" a £15 minimum. One delegate exposed the multitude of USDAW wage agreements for less than £9 p.w. for men and less than £7 p.w. for women, but his words went unheeded by the majority, who continued to play follow-my-leader.

If this conference was any indication of the strength and determination of rank-and-file shopworkers, they are clearly in for harder times yet, for added to their worries of making ends meet on starvation wages is the possibility of victimisation in the mass-sackings now being planned in non-exporting industries following the introduction of the Selective Employment Tax.

The USDAW leaders will clearly follow the Co-op MPs who failed to vote against the new tax. For, just as the MPs wish to remain loyal to those who bestow Parliamentary offices, so the USDAW officials wish to retain the many satisfied customers to whom they peddle wage-slaves at such bargain rates. Indeed, many of the leaders of USDAW, full-time officials or not, already have their eyes set on Westminster, where they can serve the needs of the employers in a far less humble and far better rewarded manner. It has been asserted that so diligent are the leaders in their pursuit of satisfied employer-customers that they have to recruit as many as 120,000 new members every year to make up the losses and lapsings of membership which result. And if we

STATEMENT

GLASGOW GROUP of the SWF have asked the National Committee to make it clear that they completely disassociate themselves from a leaflet purporting to be endorsed by members of a number of organisations, including Glasgow SWF and Glasgow Federation of Anarchists. The leaflet, headed "Tackle the United States Military Machine here in Britain Now. Support the Vietnamese People" is also repudiated by the Glasgow Anarchist Group. It was issued without the knowledge of either organisation.

It calls for gang warfare against US servicemen in Scotland, proposing that American soldiers in pubs, cinemas and dance halls should be beaten up, and concludes, "Get with it, you who would call yourselves revolutionaries . . ."

Such propaganda is at best stupid, at worst it could be the work of agents-provocateurs. Syndicalism has always been anti-militarist in principle, policy and action, but our aim is to persuade workers in uniform that they are acting against their own class interests—as Tom Mann and Guy Bowman did with the famous "Don't Shoot" manifesto to soldiers who were to be used against strikers. Mann and Bowman were imprisoned for that Syndicalist manifesto, but it had a powerful effect.

Beating up servicemen is one sure way to prevent any sympathetic contact being made with these conscript workers. There is already considerable disaffection with the Vietnam war among U.S. youth, both in and out of uniform. Senseless propaganda, like this leaflet with its understones of racism, can only undermine such anti-militarist trends. Our aim should be to strengthen them.

take into consideration the fact that the Co-op, from which the larger part of USDAW members are recruited, actively encourages its employees to join unions, we are left wondering if USDAW is a union in any sense at all apart from its name.

The most resounding note of the speeches with which the incomes policy has been lauded up and down the country is that it will somehow enable the lower paid workers to "catch up" with those getting higher wages. That the USDAW leaders who support this policy should be so unwilling to pledge anything more than "jam tomorrow" shows it will not do this. The excuse for the whole idea of "catching up" is the old bosses' argument that higher wages mean higher prices, hence if better-paid workers press further ahead, the lower-paid will be not only left behind but actually suffer a lower standard of living.

ORGANISED STRENGTH

Just before the last General Election, such arguments evidently inspired a factory worker to write to the Liberal Party and *complain* that he was comparatively well-off! But what makes such workers' wages higher? It cannot be repeated too often that the living standards of all workers directly reflect their organised strength: their ability to use and control for *themselves* (regardless of the wishes of employers, politicians and TU leaders) their only weapon—the strike or threat of a strike.

The price argument is false. Without going into it in detail, it suffices to say here that the direct effect of a wage-rise is a fall in profits. Employers may (and very often do) try to compensate for this by raising prices; however, since every employer is out for the best prices possible, wage increases are really no more than a very useful excuse for further attempts in this direction.

It is typical of the employing class and its political and trade-union lieutenants that they should express most concern for those whom capitalism exploits most. Workers who want more should take note, instead, of the deeds of workers whose pay and conditions they would like themselves.

GROUP NOTICES

LONDON: Weekly meetings at Lucas Arms, 245 Grays Inn Road, WC1 (5 min. Kings Cross Station). Wednesdays at 8.0 p.m. (Note: change of day and time).

LONDON: SWF Industrial Action Sub-Committee (London). Readers wishing to help in the work of this committee are asked to contact the Secretary, c/o 34 Cumberland Rd., London E.17.

Open-air-meetings every Sunday, Hyde Park, 3 p.m.

ABERDEEN: Contact R. Comrie, 288 Hardgate, Aberdeen. Regular meetings.

BELFAST: Contact Tony Rosato, 103 Deer Park Road, Belfast 14.

BIRMINGHAM AND W. MIDLANDS: Contact Peter Neville, 12 South Grove, Erdington, Birmingham 23.

BRISTOL: Contact Mike Davis, 130 Chesterfield Road, Bristol 6.

GLASGOW: Contact R. Lynn, 2B Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, C.1.

HULL: Contact Jim & Shelagh Young, 3 Fredericks Crescent, Hawthorn Avenue, Hessle Road, Hull, Yorks.

LIVERPOOL: Contact Vincent Johnson, 43 Millbank, Liverpool 13.

MANCHESTER & DISTRICT: Contact Jim Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs.

NEWCASTLE: Meetings every Thursday, 8 p.m., at The Adelaide, Newgate St., Newcastle-on-Tyne 1. Contact M. Renwick, 122 Mowbray St., Heaton, Newcastle 6.

POTTERIES: Contact Bob Blakeman, 52 Weldon Ave., Weston Coyney, Stoke-on-Trent.

SOUTHALL: Enquiries to Roger Sandell, 58 Burns Ave., Southall, Middx.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS: Contact J. D. Gilbert Rolfe, 4 Mount Sion, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

WITNEY: Contact Laurens Otter, 5 New Yatt Road, North Leigh, Oxon. Witnev. Oxon.

DIRECT ACTION PRESS FUND—June, 1966

Glasgow, S.1, R.C. 8s 6d; Liverpool, V.J. 9s 4d; Hyde Park Sympathiser 1s 8d; Los Angeles, S.S. £1 15s; Sudbury, Ont., £1 13s 10d; SWF London Group £3 13s 3d. Total £8 1s 7d.

THE GREAT AMERICAN LOCKOUT

LOCKOUT, by Leon Wolff (Longmans, 42s.)

AN EXCELLENT BOOK, factual, informative, complete and very readable. "I can't put it down", said a friend. At 42s., above our reach? Ask for it at your public library, pester them if necessary.

The last decade of the 19th Century was a hard time for American labour. Drought and storms drove poor farmers from the west to seek work in industry, while from the east came hosts of immigrants seeking the same jobs. Mostly unorganised and not speaking English, they were cruelly exploited by a ruthless employing class, of whom the steel bosses were among the worst. Attempts to organise and strike were crushed by the Army, police, armed thugs and Pinkerton's detectives.

However, the skilled steel workers were organised in the Amalgamated Association of Steel Workers and that organisation came to conflict with the Carnegie steel empire at Homestead, Pennsylvania, in the summer of 1892, when the steel company, during wage negotiations, presented crushing demands of wage reductions to the union. Carnegie went off to his grouse moors in his native Scotland, leaving direction of the conflict to his partner and manager, Henry Frick. The workers rejected the wage attacks of Frick and Carnegie and, on June 24, were locked out.

The Homestead steel works were heavily fortified with loopholed walls, barricades and barbed wire. The scabs had to make "Fort Frick" their home—or prison. The workers gave a wonderful show of solidarity, American and immigrant, union and non-union, against which the sheriff's men and police were powerless. A strong, 24-hour picket line, with headquarters and half-hourly reports, besieged the fort, a reserve of 800 Hungarians and Slavs, with two interpreters, stood by.

PINKERTON MEN

Then came reports of an army of Pinkerton men, reinforced by recruits from Chicago and New York. Strikers placed a warning steam whistle on top of the Electric Works, every road was blocked, railway depots surrounded, a thousand men patrolled both banks of the river, while the steamboat *Edna* was chartered to patrol the water.

Pinkertons completed their spearhead of 316 heavily armed men on board two armoured barges, towed by two steam tugs. On July 6, the fleet with its armed men in military uniform, sailed up the Monongahela river to Homestead. But, before they reached Frick's Fort, the alarm of steam whistles and crackers sounded at 4 a.m. and thousands of men, some armed, women and children, poured down to the waterfront. The barges came alongside and the crowd, armed

with pistols, shot guns, stones and sticks rushed the barbed wire and gained the shore of the Fort.

As the thugs, each with a Winchester, 50 rounds and a pistol, cautiously appeared, the people opened fire, the thugs ducked and most of the bullets bounced off the armoured plate. Then the Pinkertons reappeared, firing into the crowd with magazine, quick-firing Winchesters. Thirty men fell, dead or wounded. Some thugs fell, too, but the crowd retreated to put up barricades of steel and scrap iron.

The strikers' defence had suffered from lack of organisation. Now greater care was shown, men only went to the front and a force was sent to the opposite bank. Now the barges were besieged. An old brass cannon fired on them from a hill, but its elevation was too limited. Oil was floated down river and lit, but it was poor oil. Men on both sides were being killed and wounded, when a party of strikers attacked the barges with bundles of dynamite and opened the armour.

Pinkertons wished to surrender, a meeting of strikers was first against granting them this mercy, but finally decided to allow surrender, for while the law was powerless, the Army must appear soon.

The hated Pinkertons came ashore and the stores of food and arms aboard the boats were distributed. As the enemy marched to town, men and women, many of them Slavs who did not know the terms of surrender spoken in English, and driven by grief, attacked some of the prisoners, who were later put on a train to Pittsburgh.

ATTEMPT TO KILL FRICK

Then came the Army, infantry, artillery and cavalry, 8,000 militiamen camped in the town, trained cannon on the strikers' houses and opened the mill to imported scabs. The strike was now doomed. Although money was coming in, from even faraway places, the people were suffering. Stirred by their agony, the Anarchists Emma Goldman (whom some of us remember from Spanish Civil War days) and Alexander Berkman threw up their prosperous little business in Worcester, Mass., to aid the strikers.

Their aim was to kill the tyrant Frick with a bomb, but Berkman could not make an effective grenade, so, with their last few dollars, they bought a revolver. Pushing his way into Frick's office, Berkman fired, wounding him twice. At his trial Berkman showed the highest courage and treated the court as the guilty ones. He was sent to prison for 21 years.

A great wave of public opinion, revulsion and contempt swept the USA and Europe against the steel employers, but the strikers were defeated by "law, order", quickfiring rifles and starvation. When the news of Berkman's attempt on Frick's life reached the Army camp at Homestead, Private Iams shouted, "Three cheers for the man who shot Frick." For this he was sentenced to be tortured and dismissed. Tortured he was, until his heart almost stopped beating.

For many years American workers sang the ballad, "My father was killed by the Pinkerton men." In Britain, where Keir Hardie, the revered leader of the Labour Party, had his election expenses paid by Carnegie, trade unionists demanded that the "blood money" be returned. Bowing to the storm, Hardie sent £100 of the money to the strikers.

Later, Frick and Carnegie quarrelled. After some years Carnegie sent a message, suggesting a meeting of reconciliation to Frick, who replied, "Tell your friend Carnegie that I will see him in Hell, where we are both going." Let that be their epitaph.

TOM BROWN

FRIENDS AND NEIGHBOURS

DEMAND RELEASE OF JAILED POLISH SOCIALISTS—Picket inside and outside Polish Travel Office (ORBIS), 313 Regent Street, London W.1, Saturday, July 9, 10.30 a.m. United Libertarian & Socialist Defence Committee.

OFFICIAL SECRETS from Ipswich Anarchists. Pamphlet price 9d. (incl. postage). Contact Tony Reeder, 68, Christchurch Street, Ipswich, Suffolk.

RESISTANCE—Committee of 100 Bulletin, 6d. From 32a Fellows Road, London N.W.3.

OXAN—Quarterly bulletin of Oxford Anarchists. Specimen copy 1s. from L. Otter, 5 New Yatt Rd., North Leigh, Witney, Oxon.

ALTRINCHAM LIBERTARIAN YOUTH—Contact Stephen Richards, 25 N. Vale Road, Timperley, Altrincham, Chesh.

WANDSWORTH LIBERTARIAN YOUTH—Contact Adrian Morris, 26 Openview, Earlsfield, S.W.18.

WEST HAM ANARCHISTS—Contact Karl Taylor, 98 Clova Road, E.17 (MAR 0316).

NEXT MONTH. Contents will include: Spain 30 years after the revolution; Canadian Union bosses under fire.

Book review

Incomes Policy exposed

INCOMES POLICY, LEGISLATION AND SHOP STEWARDS, by T. Cliff and C. Barker.

2s. 6d. from Chris Davison, 83 Greyhound Road, N.17.

I FOUND this book interesting and easy to read. It is written in "Joe Soap" language and when dealing with economics this is not easy. After all, economics and law are not for the layman, but the method of professional con-men, who run present-day society.

The first four chapters expose the Prices & Incomes Policy to its naked bones. On the all-important question of profit control, the point is well illustrated by a quote from *DATA Journal* (June, 1965): "Wages and salaries are determined by

negotiation and bargaining. Any changes in their magnitude are subject to discussion in advance of the changes being made. Profits, in contrast, are not subject to negotiation. An employer does not have to negotiate with his workers to secure an increase in profits."

Price Control, as the book explains, is impossible. It takes the question of the bakers' dispute in November, 1965, when the Federation of Wholesale and Multiple Bakers were holding down the prices of bread for three months by agreement with the PIB, but prices of rolls, cobs and confectionery were up by as much as 50% in some places, without reference to the PIB.

The counter to "wages up—prices up" is beautifully explained by diagrams and worthy of the widest publicity. After all, this is the social democrats' basic premise.

Chapter Four explains George Brown's aid to capitalism through his Incomes Policy and states that the only way to achieve an incomes policy in 1966 is going to be by outflanking the trade unions on some big national wage struggle. The Government have taken the point from the book and set the seamen up as the "patsy".

Chapters 6-8 are on the trade unions, shop stewards and anti-union legislation. The final chapter winds up with "do it yourself reforms." The third from last paragraph states: "It is the general nature of the threat facing stewards that allows the opportunity for developing them into a widely-based movement. And the very fact that the attack is being launched against them by a Labour Government indicates the need for a *political* (my italics), as well as an industrial response from the rank and file movement in the factories, the docks and elsewhere."

I have quoted this paragraph in full, because this is the weakness of the book. It appears that the authors are either on the look-out for a new "revolutionary" political party, or hope to reform the Labour Party. If, after all the excellent work they put in producing this book, this is their conclusion, all that can be said is that they have learned nothing. Nevertheless this is a good 2s. 6d. worth and well worth reading.

BILL CHRISTOPHER

SEAMEN'S SLAVERY (cont.)

1. Refusing to obey a lawful command
2. Using insubordinate, etc. language to an officer
3. Striking or threatening an officer
4. Bringing alcohol on board
5. Using bad language
6. Drunkenness

Obviously there is some sense attached to most of these "offences" being designated as such. Merchant seamen are responsible people, if they were not they wouldn't be doing the job they do. A ship at sea can have only one boss, not a dozen, and to that end the first-named three offences are more or less in order. The last three are not. A seaman in port with a day off who brings back a sample of the local tippie to share with mates or even to take home can lose a couple of pounds of hard-earned wages for bringing alcohol on board. Protesting to the wrong type of master can bring a few more offences—say, drunkenness (if the Old Man says you were drunk you were drunk), using bad language, using insubordinate language and so on. Sots are very much in the minority at sea today, just as they are ashore, let me add.

The main fault with all those offences is that their phrasing enables them to be used for "framing" purposes, and they have been so used times without number. GPO cable-ship crews do not come under the Merchant Shipping Act and do not sign articles. The cable-ship skippers and crews do a very good job without one single offence or disciplinary measure being in use. They don't need the Merchant Shipping Act aboard their ships and we don't need it aboard ours, either.

The points I have mentioned here are just a fraction of the grim paraphernalia of clauses which hold seamen in bondage to the master and through him to the shipowners. The Merchant Shipping Act came into being 72 years ago; Queen Victoria was on the throne and my old man was 14 years of age. Even in 1894, merchant seamen were much worse off than anyone else, due to the Merchant Shipping Act. So don't get the idea that we are being a bit hasty when we demand the abolition of the Merchant Shipping Act (1894) *in toto*.

GEORGE FOULSER, A.B. Dis A No. R 176084
N.U.S. Book No. 835406

N.B. The one humorous note about the Merchant Shipping Act is the seamen's comment on the power conferred on the Master by the Act: "The only thing a skipper can't do to a bloke is put him in the family-way . . . and he'd do that if he could!"

This article is available in leaflet form, price 2s. per 100 copies from SWF, 34 Cumberland Rd., London E.17.

Letter

DEAR COMRADES,

How does comrade V.J. (DA, June), propose to get rid of capitalism in Ireland? Just saying "get rid of Capitalism" needs only pen and paper, the actual business of doing it needs much more than SPGB-type rhetoric.

The other points made by V.J., in particular the irrelevance of whether your boss is Catholic, Quaker, or Jew, etc., are very much to the point and I agree.

I did *not* suggest that the Catholic Church was the main enemy and I did *not* suggest Noel Browne was a hero of revolutionary syndicalism. Space does not permit me to elaborate on this point, however; to return to the first question! I did say, in form of a question: "How much longer are we to listen to the pontificating bull of priests, bishops, politicians, and clerical-educated Trade Union Leaders, who truncate working-class thinking before it even begins", by providing the one and only effective educational college in the Republic.

Perhaps comrade V.J. has the answer. If not, he ought to find it before starting such an attack.

PAT KELLY

This correspondence is now closed—EDS.

Subscribe to DIRECT ACTION

Yearly subscription rate 6s 6d (USA & Canada \$1—dollar bills preferred to cheques owing to loss in negotiating latter) from 34 Cumberland Road, London E.17. Cheques and p.o.'s payable to Syndicalist Workers' Federation.

NORTH-EAST NOTES

RANK AND FILE CONTROL NEEDED

SOME recent incidents illustrate the absolute necessity of establishing rank-and-file control over hire and fire, and breaking management's prerogative in this field.

Joss Walker was sacked from Paton and Baldwin's on Tees-side within six months of retirement for getting a mate to clock him off falsely an hour early. The mate was also sacked. It was one of Joss Walker's mates who shopped him and no action has been taken since on his behalf. The very same week, a confidential clerk (described by Joss Walker as a crawler) got 15 months for fiddling the books to the tune of £5,000; in his case a director went to court and promised to have him back on finishing his sentence.

George Rogers, a Newcastle Corporation busman was sacked because he took a few minutes off to telephone a hospital about a passenger who had fallen off his bus. He finished the journey and then asked the depot clerk to telephone. The depot clerk told him to do it in his "own" time. So he went to ask the traffic superintendent who told him he was sacked automatically for walking off duty. The union (T & GWU) refused to come in because he was not paid up. The "Service" does not care two fingers for its passengers; the "Union" looks on its members as subs-machines.

Two men were sacked at North Shields for union activity at General Foam Products. The local union (NUG & MW) secretary did at least get strike pay for the 80 strikers, though they are not fully paid up. However he got the strikers to recall their steward (one of the sacked men) as a bargaining counter with the management. What a nerve! This strike continues despite scabbing by some clerical workers. General Foam supplies cushions to the Rootes Group. It has been blacked nationally.

Less foam and more action for control of hire and fire.

GOING TO THE DOGS?

IN July Durham County Council start work on their new £2 million Police HQ at Aykley Head. A special feature is the deep Wartime Control Basement, with air-lock compartments, to combat unlucky survivors from a nuclear attack.

JACKBOOT LAW (cont.)

to the National Busmen's Union, outside of Congress (3,000 strong), to denounce the Bill as "Jackboot" and "Brownshirt" legislation.

At time of writing (June 14), protest parades are planned by ESB workers against the Bill in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, and Athlone on June 18.

It is heartening to see the TU movement is not confining its protest to strongly-worded statements and Dail speeches by Labour TDs. Rank-and-file unionists must ensure this Bill is repealed immediately, by campaigning in their own Trade Union branches and Trades Councils where possible, and **outside** of these, through their own organisations, where necessary. It must be brought home to the Fianna Fail Government that the Trade Union movement will not stand for legalised William Martin Murphyism in its most vicious fascist form. There are implications in this Bill which will be dealt with in a subsequent article.

PAT KELLY

"I do swear by Almighty God that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, her heirs and successors according to law."

Mr. Gerry Fitt, Republican Labour M.P. for Belfast West

You will be pleased to know that the design has been approved by the Royal Fine Arts Commission. The scheme is of course fully integrated with the other neighbouring local bureaucrats' buildings.

Across the Tyne, Northumberland County Council have just voted to build new kennels for their twelve police alsatians. These will have central heating and other refinements. Cost—£13,000 (thirteen thousand pounds)!

SOLIDARITY FOR SEAMEN

BASIC feelings of sympathy have been raised in the public throughout the region and cash to aid the seamen and their families has been coming in from all over—the kind of sympathy that led an Italian ice-cream man to attend specially at one mass meeting on the Mill Dam, South Shields, to give free ices to the children of strikers and supporters.

DIRECT ACTION REPORTER

The sun never sets . . .

THE British Empire still exists, though in fragmentary form.

There are small but strategic places scattered about the globe which cannot be included in the euphemism "Commonwealth", but are owned and controlled by the British Raj. Such is the Seychelles Archipelago in the Indian Ocean, four degrees south of the equator, about half coral and uninhabited, about half mountainous, with a population of 45,000, 10,000 of them in the capital Victoria.

The islands were possessed by the French in 1742, but seized by the British in 1794. Seychelles became notorious during the Indian struggle for independence after World War I, when British governments of all kinds used them as prison camps for Indian Nationalists and trade unionists—and Arabs, too.

No form of democracy is allowed in the government of the islands. The Governor is appointed from London and has almost absolute power. He is "assisted" by an Executive Council of three *ex-officio* members and any others he may appoint and a Legislative Council of 12 members, six of them officials and only four elected and that on a restricted electoral roll.

Men find work, by indenture, for periods on the uninhabited corals, which are militarily important in global warfare, and in the production of copra, coconuts, vanilla, tortoise shell, cinnamon, guano and essential oils. Wages are low and paid monthly. Attempts to form unions and better conditions have met the opposition of every British government including Labour.

In June 1966, a strike of monthly-paid workers began. Wilson's government at once sent a warship, the destroyer *Carysfort*, to the capital, although no violence had been shown.

When workers gathered in peaceful assembly, British sailors were landed and went to the central police station to join prepared action against the strikers, who dispersed. The frigate HMS *Mohawk* was also sent, to relieve or reinforce *Carysfort*.

That is how Labour governs in the Seychelles.

ESSENTIAL READING—IN ANY YEAR

HOW LABOUR GOVERNED, 1945-51

A RECORD TO REMEMBER

9d (postpaid)

UNION BACKS DUBLIN EMPLOYERS

ELECTRICIANS of Ireland, wake up! Too long have you been the pawns of the so-called TU leaders, who are endlessly and remorselessly selling you out. Twenty years ago the Dublin electricians enjoyed the highest rate of pay in these islands. Today you rate 6s. 5½d. per hour—by far the lowest—and your unions intend to keep you that way. Those of you who fight for proper wages and conditions at site level are again being threatened with expulsion. The two main unions are working hand-in-glove with the employers to defeat the militants. The “Des Toolin” case is just winding up with a win for this unholy alliance.

Last January, Toolin, senior steward, Goulding construction site, Dublin, was sacked and at a meeting of the electricians this action on the part of the employer, W. & H. Smith, Manchester, was considered blatant victimisation. They voted unanimously to strike after 8 hours. This time lag was to give the union concerned, IEI and ETU, an

opportunity of dealing with the employer. This union used (or misused) the 8 hours, and four months as well, dallying, dithering and false promising and finally came up with an undertaking from the employers that, when next they increased staff, Toolin would be favourably considered. Well, that day arrived, too, and Des applied with five others for six advertised vacancies. While the other men were engaged, he was not. The reason given—they were not employing IEI & ETU labour.

Smith's dropped a clanger here, as this union is a member of the Irish Trades Union Congress and, as it happened, the union they favour is not. One would expect results now. But hold it! Union secretary Capt. Tuke and his fellow-comedian officials, plus the ICTU, bury their empty heads in the sand. Why? Who and what is Toolin and what was his crime?

UNION DID NOT FIGHT

He organised Gouldings Site. Where there were five shops on different rates of pay and general conditions, he organised them into one shop, irrespective of whatever union they belonged to and, through him and the other stewards, they obtained the highest rate ever paid in Ireland. Furthermore, he was active in uniting all the construction workers, from labourers up, on site. It is easy to see why the employers didn't want him, but why did not the union fight his dismissal?

Toolin, with two ETU stewards, was the one who negotiated at site level the terms and conditions at Tynagh Silver Mines, where the workers had to fight the employers, the unions and the Irish Tory Government—and won. He was the steward when British Relays had to concede proper wages, etc., on the building of the giant Intercontinental Hotel at Ballsbridge—again at site level. He was the steward who gave famous American tycoon “Shovel” millionaire McDonagh a roast at Dromoland Castle. The record of Toolin is endless. He must be the greatest rank and filer this island has known. He belongs to no party, religion or association (apart from his union).

Why did the IEI & ETU avoid their responsibilities? Is it that they are unaware of them—they did not learn anything about this aspect in the Catholic Workers College? When pressed by five stewards, the site agent, Mr. Wheeler, admitted that Capt. Tuke told him Toolin was not to be employed. Is not this the same Tuke who scabbed it in Heitons in 1925 and what of his henchman, Kevin O'Connell? His claim to fame was to do 3 months' jail in Belfast for being in possession of an illegal fascist newspaper.

In this anniversary year of the execution of that great Irish labour leader, James Connolly, we shall have to ask the question: What did he die for?

J. COLMAN

Small farmers fined

Further to the article last month on the dispute between the Irish Creamery Milk Suppliers Assn. and the Government, 452 small farmers were fined £5 each in the District Court on June 2, charged under the Offences Against the State Act, with obstructing the gates of Dail Eireann. The farmers were given an extra 2d. per gallon on their milk, far from what they were claiming. The previous day De Valera had been returned “to the Park” with a greatly reduced majority of 10,000!

Jackboot law

THE legislation enacted by Dail Eireann on June 8, giving the Government the authority to make an order making strikes illegal in the Electricity Supply Board, is the first step towards Jackboot Trade Unionism. The Electricity (Special Provisions) Bill, 1966 enables the Government to make an order prohibiting the withdrawal of labour from the E.S.B. Failure to comply will lead to an immediate fine of £5,000 on the Trade Union and £100 for each extra day out, and for an individual a fine of £25, plus £5 for each extra day.

This legislation arises out of the dispute by 100 mechanical fitters for wage parity with the clerical officers in the ESB. This has already been conceded in Aer Lingus and Telefis Eireann (TV). The workers involved had not placed pickets on all 27 generating stations in the Republic, but were using this “as the ultimate” in their dispute. For their part, the ESB had announced a close-down of electric power in this event, bringing industry in the country to a standstill. Talks resumed and broke down, offers were balloted on and rejected. The stage was set and with the Presidential Election over and De Valera back safely “in the Park”, Fianna Fail planned their next coup against the people.

The Fianna Fail Government was supported by the Fine Gael Party, thus bringing Ireland's two Tory parties together on a vital issue affecting trade unionists. The Labour Party contested the Bill strongly in the Dail. Sean Casey said “it would not be beyond comprehension that next week there would be one (Bill) covering CIE (Transport), Bord na Mona (peat), Comhlucht siucire Eireann (Irish Sugar Co.) and Irish Shipping Ltd.—all State-sponsored Companies! Labour leader Brendan Corish said he “did not know how long this legislation had been contemplated by the Fianna Fail Government, but he was sure it was not thought up last Sunday morning or evening, or the previous morning. It must have been in their minds for quite a long time . . . it was the thin end of the wedge”.

Jim Tully said: “This is a dry run for further repressive measures.” Sean Dunne called it “Jackboot legislation.” It is on this note that the Bill should be treated by Trade Unionists—but will they?

The Congress of Trade Unions denounced the Bill, as “forced labour” and contrary to International Labour conventions. They said it could not be enforced. It was left

cont. on page 7, col. 1