Parliament can’t cure unemployment

YOUNG SOCIALIST LOBBY

Young Socialists from all parts of Britain will lobby Parliament on the issue of unemployment on February 11. Some of the Labour Party big shots are said to be worried that there may be clashes between that bulwark of democracy, London’s police force, and the Young Socialists.

With a General Election in the offering this would be an awkward time to find bricks in pockets or dead men in the Morley Atkinson Hospital (specialising in head injuries), especially if the owners of the pockets and the skulls were supporters of Harold Wilson, future tenant of 10 Downing Street.

PATERNOSTER BUILDERS
WIN ANOTHER BATTLE

Just one month after the successful strike in support of the steel fixers, the employers struck again at the Paternoster Site, St Paul’s, London. This time they fired the plumbers’ shop steward, Bro MacIntyre, who has been carrying on the struggle for equal bonus payments for plumbers’ mates.

Where bonus systems operate in the construction industry it is customary to pay the same rate to semi-skilled workers as to tradesmen. There is already more than enough differential in the basic union rates. The plumbing contractor, Ellis (Kensington), one of the biggest firms in the industry, refused to pay equal bonus rates. Then they laid off the last 16 men on the job. Bro MacIntyre was No 16 on the seniority list. For the purpose of “last on first off” they obviously went down that list just far enough to get him, plus one for luck.

The plumbers struck and put a picket on the gates. A mass meeting of the site, called by the Federation Steward, gave the management an ultimatum calling for the reinstatement of the shop steward and recognition of immunity of stewards for the duration of the job. The ultimatum expired on the morning of January 7. It was fought with some of the more determined would-be scabs. But there were some persuasive talkers on the picket line and by 10.00 a.m. the site was dead. Even the electricians and lift erectors were out.

At a mass meeting in the basement car park on January 8, the strike committee was able to recommend a return to work, on the basis of the reinstatement of Bro MacIntyre, plumbers’ shop steward, with a guarantee that he would be free to carry on his duties till the end of the job, and a shilling per hour bonus for the plumbers’ mates as an interim offer, further negotiations to take place within a month.

Once more solidarity has produced results. The kind of solidarity that cuts across the artificial division of craft unions. When are we going to have an Industrial Union for the construction industry, and make this kind of solidarity a feature of all building sites? 

We do not suggest that the police would deliberately put bricks in pockets or fracture anyone’s skull, but these things have apparently happened in police stations, and evilly-disposed persons claim that because of this the police must be responsible.

This is mere circumstantial evidence, and though circumstantial evidence may be sufficient for judges and juries to hang men by, we Syndicalists say the police are innocent until proven guilty of putting bricks in demonstrators’ pockets, or of causing such injuries to Hal Woolf as resulted in his death at the Morley Atkinson Hospital.

Nevertheless, we would be failing in our duty if we did not advise Young Socialists, coming to London to lobby Parliament, that they should have their pockets sewn up and wear a crash helmet before they set foot in Whitehall.

If the Young Socialists survive the hazards of Whitehall and reach the Parliament building with empty pockets and whole skulls, they will then meet their MPs and get down to business.

The purpose of the demonstration is to protest against the continuing high level of unemployment, especially in the North-East and in Scotland, and especially among young workers. Unemployment has dropped somewhat in the

Direct action helps Kent victims of eviction

The Court Order having been served on Mrs Hilden and her family (see Direct Action, January), the Tunbridge Wells Committee of 100 Tenants’ Association, now including John and Brenda Graville and Jennifer Lyle, decided to demonstrate directly, as far as we could.

The eviction was fixed for 12 noon, January 8, a Wednesday. On the Tuesday the Town Council again refused to consider Mrs Hilden’s case. On Tuesday evening, 500 leaflets were distributed up and down the road Mrs Hilden was living in, and the Press and Southern Television were notified.

At 11.30 on the following day Television cameras, journalists, a couple of policemen and about four Committee of 100 demonstrators holding posters stood outside 124 Upper Grosvenor Road, Mrs Hilden’s address. By 12 noon 30 demonstrators stood blocking entrance to the door and the Committee banner hung out of a first-floor window. The bailiff looked worried, the policemen stupid. At 1 o’clock, an hour after the demonstration was due to
London and South East regions. It remains high in the North and in Northern Ireland. In lobbying Parliament the Young Socialists will demonstrate their faith in that institution’s power to solve the problem.

Can Parliament solve the unemployment problem? The Young Socialists believe it can. The Labour Party claims that not only the problem of unemployment, but also the problems of housing, education, transport, hospitals, and “defence” will be swept away by a wave of a magic wand once Parliament has a Labour Majority and Wilson the keys of No. 10.

Many Tories are honest enough to admit that “unemployment is part of the balance of nature”—rather like the way foxes keep down rodents and Tory squires with their horsey females keep down foxes! Unemployment keeps down workers.

We Syndicalists recognise in the Young Socialists a genuine desire for a solution to the problem of unemployment. We respect them for their idealism and sincerity. These are the qualities which have brought them into conflict with their seniors of the Labour Party from time to time.

But we say that Parliament, with or without a Labour majority, will not solve anything while the capitalist system exists. And Harold Wilson & Co have no intention of dismantling capitalism. They do not wish to do so. They feel horror and revulsion at the very thought, and in the event of a revolution in this country the bureaucrats at the top of the Labour Party and the TUC would be found on the side of the boss. But if they do not wish to abolish capitalism, they cannot wish to abolish unemployment. You can’t have one without the other. The Tory is frank about this. It is his system and he gets the profits.

As long as there is capitalism, there will be a gap between the value of the worker’s wages and the value of his product. That difference is the profit which goes into the capitalist’s pocket, which supports him in idleness and pays his lackeys, policemen, jailers, hangmen, judges, army officers and clergymen, etc., to keep the people “in their place”. The worker cannot consume all the goods produced, because his wages are not big enough to pay for them. Even the parasites can’t get through it all—that’s why we hear so much about export markets. So from time to time we get “overproduction”, and then we have unemployment. The cause lies deep within the capitalist system. And the Labour Party does not intend to abolish Capitalism.

The Syndicalist Workers’ Federation advocates the formation of revolutionary industrial unions, or syndicates as they are usually called. With one syndicate for each industry, and all the syndicates linked together in a National Confederation of Labour we would have an organisation which could carry on all the necessary functions of a civilised society. The State, which is the enforcement agency of the capitalist class would be abolished along with the capitalists.

A free society, in which the workers own and control their industry through their own organisations, with all power in the hands of the rank and file, will have no need for leaders, bosses, or uniformed thugs. But in the day-to-day struggle NOW, the industrial form of union organisation will be far more effective for securing improvements in wages and conditions than the welter of archaic craft unions, or those ponderous bureaucrati-ridden monstrosities, the so-called General Unions, which now make up the British Trade Union movement. We offer a practical programme for the present and a revolutionary programme for the future.

Make no mistake about it, Syndicalists are determined to abolish Capitalism and the State, and with them unemployment and all the other consequences of the system. We invite the Young Socialists to join us in this struggle. We invite them to do so in the name of their own ideals and, with confidence in their sincerity, WE SAY JOIN US NOW.

POSTSCRIPT: We believe that conscription will be re-introduced very soon, by a Tory or Labour Government. We will fight it. Will you VOLUNTEER for the Syndicalist Workers’ Federation? Or will you be CONSCRIPTED to make the world safe for the London Stock Exchange?

SEAN GANNON

Terry Chandler out on bail

ON SUNDAY, JANUARY 20, a group of Committee of 100 supporters organised a protest march against the jailing of Terry Chandler. About 70 people marched from Speakers’ Corner, Hyde Park to Tottenham Court Road, went by tube to Clink Street and marched to Wandsworth Prison. Leading the march were headed “An Organised Vengeance Called Justice.” A marcher called out, “The Labour people won’t allow this if they get in.”

The demonstrators sang songs outside the prison and Tommy Farr spoke of the need for continued activity, asking for support for the Ruislip demonstration which the Committee of 100 is organising at Easter.

As we go to press, Terry Chandler has been given leave to appeal—with bail to allow him to consult law books and documents (he is conducting his own appeal). Peter Monle was refused leave to appeal. See PEOPLE NEWS 24.1.64.

EVICTIONS (cont. from page 1)

start, one of the policemen came up and said the eviction was postponed for that day. The Daily Express reporter confirmed that he didn’t believe the policeman. Neither did we.

At 4.15, when most of the Committee’s support was back at work, etc., eight policemen and a bailiff pushed their way past the six demonstrators left and forced open a window—the front door being barricaded. We kept up a running argument between us and the police and several local housewives came and threw abuse at the policemen’s heads. By 6 o’clock, however, the family’s possessions were loaded on their van and the eviction was finished. Most of the uniformed members of the Conservative Party who had come with the bailiff left, leaving only two behind. These last two policemen waited till the lock was changed and then left, so did we.

We had made arrangements to squat them in an empty house—one of the 30plus empty houses in Lambeth, which the Town Council would rather see idle than purchase for homeless people, not to mention the acres set aside for private development, offices, car parks, shops.

But the evicted family were so brought down that we had a collection and settled them in a hotel. Local workers on the telephone exchange sent us a delegate, Jim Spellman, on Wednesday night, asking if we wanted money, which we needed desperately: more money for the hotel and a few bob— unofficially, of course—from Labour Party members.

Now the Hildens are being re-housed—in half of Jim Spellman’s house. We have carried this issue to a tidy finish, even finding Mr Hildem a job, and showed the Town Council that what they say they can’t do for people, groups like the Committee of 100, backed by working-class people like the Telephone Exchange workers, can and will do to the eternal detriment of bureaucracy’s reputation.

ROBERT ESCARPIT in “Le Monde”

Juanita Ives

IT WOULD CLEARLY be in the worst possible taste to recall Suez a propos of Panama and in the US it would certainly be taken as proof of Castroism or, at the very least, anti-democratic leanings.

Moreover, the two affairs have nothing in common. At Suez it was a question of colonialism. Two old and predatory nations, weakened and poorly armed, had the audacity to oppose the expansion of young Arab nationalism, which became so much more respectable through its control of much of the world’s petrol. At Panama, on the other hand, a great liberal and democratic power, efficaciously protects a little country from temptations born of poverty. This is so obvious the case that it would be pointless not to give it even a second thought.

Poor, ignorant Panamanians, who aspire to quench their thirsts in the flow of the Canal’s brackish water. They are stirring up the mud, these innocents.

JES D GILBERT-ROLFE

Panama—and Suez
ITV SCREENS A WARNING TO TOURISTS

The truth about Franco Spain

ON Tuesday, January 7, Granada Television presented "The Truth About Spain" as part of the series "World in Action". Although it now seems fashionable for most of the British press to attempt to whitewash the Franco regime, this programme was surprisingly impartial. In attempting to show the two faces of Spain today, it convincingly earned its title "The Truth About Spain".

It was like a breath of fresh air to see a programme about Spain which actually included a mention of Franco's fascist dictatorship. This programme went even further—it showed us glimpses of "El Caudillo" chatting with his old buddies, Hitler and Mussolini; there were brief shots of the Civil War, while the commentator was reminding us of the 500 Britons and more than 1,000,000 Spaniards who lost their lives in this war. As for the price of political opposition in Spain today, the prison paintings of Augustin Ibarra (see DA, January '64) were used to startling effect.

It was a film of stark contrasts—on the one hand we saw the beautiful golden beaches on which it is estimated one in 50 British tourists will be spending their holidays this summer; we were shown the land grab and massive building boom in tourist areas (i.e. the building of hotels, luxury villas and other tourist amenities) and we were informed that 295,000,000 were invested in Spain last year. On the other hand we were shown some of the deplorable conditions in which the majority of the Spanish people exist and were informed that more than 18,000 people earn less than £1 per week. The commentator told us that some of the money might even filter down to the Spanish poor—but he didn't seem very convinced and went on to illustrate the growing chasm between rich and poor.

BRUTALITY AND TORTURE

We learned of the shortage of skilled factory workers and were shown a State-run factory near Madrid (in which Leyland Motors have a one-twelfth share). We saw a worker from this factory, who, we were told, earns £13 per week, is housed in a State flat, and whose children get the dubious benefits of a State education. We were shown his daughter, no more than 7 or 8 years old, at her lessons in the Factory school. The subject? Political History. The period? The Spanish Civil War—Franco-style of course! But in contrast to the new affluence of this skilled industrial worker, we were informed that only one-fifth of the Spanish people are employed in factories, only one in ten children receive any schooling whatsoever (and those who do have their minds filled with religious scribble and fascist propaganda) and, again, that more than 18,000 earn less than £1 per week.

During this filmed programme there were interviews with two of Franco's ministers (one of them, Fraga Iribarne, very concerned with starting a school to train people for the Tourist Industry), a wealthy authoress and two silly little minds filled with religious scribble and fascist propaganda.) The commentator told us that some of the money might even filter down to the Spanish poor—but he didn't seem very convinced and went on to illustrate the growing chasm between rich and poor.

FINANCING REPRESSION

In the 13 years since Britain re-opened diplomatic relations with Spain we seem to have heard more about the delights of the Costa Brava or the Costa del Sol than conditions of the Spanish working class. Returning tourists appear to have enjoyed the golden beaches and the low prices, without considering why everything is so cheap (cheap to the tourist that is)—thereby giving the lie to those who maintain that the more tourists there are to Spain, the more people become aware of the conditions in Franco's Police State. With the influx of thousands of tourists a number of foreign newspapers—British, German, French, etc.—have appeared on Spanish news-stands. But this programme reminded us of the heavy censorship, not only of the Spanish press, but also of the foreign papers, which are heavily scrutinised for anything which may be termed "seditious".

However, there are some who benefit from Tourism (one of Spain's most lucrative industries) ... In January Fraga Iribarne announced pay increases shortly to be awarded—the Army, Civil Guard and Police (Franco's main weapons of repression). And who will pay for these increases? Tourists to Spain?

BOLIVIAN STALEMATE

FINANCING REPRESSION

NEGOTIATIONS PROCEED between the miners and government of Bolivia after a frustrated show of force by the latter, which produced no results. The miners' situation can be solved only with the opening of new mines and the replacement of old machinery for new. The practical question is sidestepped and the miners' situation continues as before: they still hold on strongly and they do not give up their arms.

Despite demands from the Americans, the vice-president of the country is Juan Lechin, who, coming to power as the champion of the Panamanian crisis, so force will be discounted for a few months until they think it convenient to act otherwise. Kennedy had thought of making Bolivia the experimental showcase of American Aid—and if Johnson continues with that thought, money will pour in as it never poured before.

The Americans at this moment are a bit wary because of the Panamanian crisis, so force will be discounted for a few months until they think it convenient to act otherwise. Kennedy had thought of making Bolivia the experimental showcase of American Aid—and if Johnson continues with that thought, money will pour in as it never poured before.

It is not an easy lot for the Bolivian politicians. On one side, the Americans demanding "peace and no labour strife"; on the other, the miners demanding their rights. On top of that, corruption in those who have power. For the moment, a stalemate. The next few months ahead will tell us what will be the real outcome.

FOLK SONGS FOR PEACE—February 21, 8 p.m., Lewisham Town Hall (Concert Hall), Catford, S.E.6. Ewan McColl and Peggy Seeger and others. Tickets 10s., 7s. 6d. and 5s. Contact Janice Edmunds, 56 Vicars Hill, S.E.13. Proceeds London Committee of IWA.

JUAN NOVEDADES.
Irish farmers ‘offend’ against the State

W R I T I N G on the retention of the Death Penalty for political offences in Eire (Direct Action, November, 1963), I pointed out that the “Offences Against the State Act” was so framed that it need not be used merely against militant Republicans, but could be turned against any section of the community which incurred the wrath of the government. Little did I then suspect that the aptness of my prophecy would be dramatically illustrated before the month was out, when the hitherto ultra-respectable National Farmers Association were threatened by the Minister for Local Government with being declared an illegal organisation under the Act. The facts are as follows:

The Rates System has long been a source of dissatisfaction to farmers in Ireland. This year a further increase provoked farmers in Co Kilkenny to state that they would only pay this year’s demands at the old rate. The Kilkenny branch of the NFA declared their solidarity with the rank and file of the membership and advised all members to adopt the same attitude. In retaliation, the local authority made an example of one small farmer by cutting off welfare payments being made on behalf of his invalid sister and threatened to seize property from all defaulters. The NFA stood firm and stated that they would continue the invalid’s welfare payments.

At this point the hard-pressed local authority appealed to the government for help and the Minister for Local Government made a “rash statement during which he made the following remarks (Irish Times, 29.11.63):

‘Unlawful organisation’

“An organised campaign of this kind is clearly unlawful and strikes at the roots of ordered government. It could not be tolerated. The government could not stand by and allow action of this kind to go on . . . accordingly steps are being taken to ensure that the Kilkenny County Council is enabled to collect all monies outstanding, including interest that these measures will bring hardship and inconvenience to a great number of people . . . It should be pointed out further that any organisation which promotes, encourages, or advocates the non-payment of local taxation is an unlawful organisation contrary to Section 18 of the Offences Against the State Act (1939) and the penalties attaching to membership are severe.”

This was the first time ever any government had admitted the OASA could be applied indiscriminately at the whim of a minister. The NFA members were reported as being dumbfounded by the threat, but nevertheless avowed their determination to continue their campaign and also protested against the action of the State-controlled radio and TV service in suppressing statements supplied by the farmers, while giving full publicity to the Minister’s statements.

Within a few more weeks the campaign had become such a thorn in the side of the government that the Prime Minister, Lemass, included a statement on it in his Annual Christmas “Report on the State of the Nation”, which included the following (Irish Times, 13.12.63):

“Mr Lemass said that if agitation of this kind could succeed in any degree whatever, or even seem to succeed, or even to develop so as to be capable of being misrepresented as having succeeded, it would bring the whole administration of government, both local and central, into disorder. That was the road to ANARCHY and he wanted the government’s position clear beyond all possibility of misunderstanding . . . he wanted them to have no misunderstanding whatever. They could succeed in this campaign only at the cost of destroying the Irish State. The government would not let that happen easily.”

He finished up with a sinister note of blackmail by suggesting that the government’s plans for specially-close relations with the NFA would be shelved if they were going to encourage campaigns of illegality.

Since then there have been no further developments, whether because the government has resorted to the familiar tactic of muzzling of the press, or to a wait-and-see attitude on the authorities’ part is not yet clear, but it is not likely that the farmers, who have been receiving nationwide encouragement (from anarchists’ or State-destructors’) will back down easily.

Trouble was also experienced in collecting the rates on the West Coast island of Inisbarra, where the inhabitants refused to pay because they have no roads, no proper water supplies and no pier. A group of men from the island, all elderly, were sentenced to one month each, after they refused in court to abandon their protest. They were lodged in Limerick Jail, but after a storm of protests the government thought again and ordered their release next day. When questions were asked in the House about this affair, the Minister said it would be “improper to make any disclosures”; a left-wing deputy who sought information about the action of the authorities in the Kilkenny affair was told by the Minister that he was “talking drivel”. So much for the public accountability of democratic representatives!

The point which emerges from all this is that the potentially extensive use of the Offences Against the State Act, which was hitherto merely a speculative possibility, has now become a real and immediate threat, and any person, group or organisation daring to thwart or defy the government will do so at its own risk.

The practice which the Eire Government obtained by using the Act against Republicans is now bearing ugly fruit and there seems little doubt that the Irish people will yet learn to regret that they did not take action to have this pernicious legislation abolished for all time when the government first revived its use in 1957. There is an old Irish proverb which says, “The day of the big wind is not the day for thatching”, which can mean that the time to resist coercion is not when you’re looking through bars.

BILL CONNOLLY

GROUP NOTICES

S.W.F. (LONDON)

Open Meetings

Wednesdays, 8.30 p.m., at the White Swan, 28, Farrington Road, London, E.C. (near Farrington St. Station, in loop off main road on other side of railway line).

February 5 Workers’ Control or Workers’ Management … Discussion with ‘Solidarity Group’

Israel ………………………. Ralph Rosenbaum

February 19 Printworkers struggle for unity ……….. Bill Christopher

February 26 Industrial Action against the Bomb ……….. Pat Arrowsmith

BIRMINGHAM AND W. MIDLANDS. Contact Peter Neville, 12 SOUTHERN FEDERATION. Contact Alasdair Macdonald, Torphin, Torphin Road, Colinton, Edinburgh 13.

BRISTOL FEDERATION OF ANARCHISTS—For details please contact the convenor, Ian Vine, 3 Freemead Place, Hotwells, Bristol 8.

LIVERPOOL—Those interested in forming a libertarian discussion group on Merseyside, please contact Vincent Johnson, 43 Millbank, Liverpool 13.

MANCHESTER—Contact Jim Pinkerton, 12 Alt Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancs.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS ANARCHIST GROUP meets on 1st and 3rd Thursday of every month at 8 p.m. at 4, Mount Sion, Tunbridge Wells, Kent.

NOTTING HILL ANARCHIST GROUP—Please contact: The Secretary, Top Flat, 38 Oxford Gardens, London, W.10. N.B.—The monthly discussion meetings have been suspended.

HACKNEY ANARCHIST GROUP. Meets Tuesdays (in term), Q5 Queens. Details, town and gown, Adrian Cunningham, 3, North Cottages, Trumpington Road, Cambridge.
WHO ARE THE WORKERS?

AFTER THE REVOLUTION, by D. A. de Santillan, a Syndicalist book of nearly 30 years ago, expressed tersely the basis of our economics. All wealth is produced by labour applied to natural resources, there is no other wealth. There are three main ways of obtaining this wealth—by working, by begging and by stealing. Of which of these three classes do you consider yourself a member?

When the term "workers" is used, different images are conjured by different persons. To the Leftist, Worker (capital "W") is a man on a poster, half, or wholly, naked with broad shoulders and balloon biceps, carrying a flag or hammer and sickle and marching towards the dawn—or sunset. This mythical character is used by persons who like workers in the abstract, but not workers in concrete.

To others, "workers" means men who wear tweed caps, mufflers and heavy boots, have dirty fingernails and drive lorries, do mysterious things with lumps of metal or carry heavy loads on their skulls. A rather broader classification seems justified. For economics, any person engaged for reasonable periods in the production of socially useful services and goods is a worker. So designated should be doctors, actors, professors and authors, inventors, scientists and explorers, as well as "white collar" and "manual" workers.

HOW DO THEY LIVE?

Of course, we have always to bear with the objector who wants a dividing line, length without breadth, between each classification. "I know a professor who pinches books in Charing Cross Road, is he a worker or robber?" Or, "what about the labourer who has £600 in the Post Office Savings Bank and draws £15 a year interest, is he a worker or a capitalist?"

One cannot think without classifying, but there is no sharp, true line of classification in nature. We observe the colours of the rainbow, violet, blue, green, etc, but where does red end and orange begin? We cannot tell, but we do not therefore deny colour and say that the spectrum is black and white. If the professor were stealing books as a full-time occupation, instead of a hobby, he would earn a transfer to the robber class. Likewise the labourer, if he gave up labouring and tried to live on his bank deposit, he would be promoted to the capitalist class—or the morgue. The important point is, by what means do they live?

But what do we mean by the working class? In any society now there are persons, the vast majority, who own no means of production and to obtain access to that means and its fruits, must go on the labour market and sell their labour power. They are sufficiently numerous, identifiable and generic to be called a class.

Such people come in all shapes and sizes and work in many different ways, but they all have one thing in common. If one loses his job or decides to rid himself of his employer, he must at once start looking for another employer. Unlike the chattel slave, he is not the property of one master, but he, by his economic disinheritation, is subject to a class who can give or withhold the means of life.

If I say that such men are carpenters, fitters, railwaymen, miners and such, who are curiously called "manual workers", I will be understood, but their brothers and sisters may be shop assistants, clerks, teachers, chemists, travelling salesmen and such as are called "brain workers" (You will notice that there are now two distinct biological creatures—men who have hands, but no brains, and others who have brains but are without hands. See any Labour Party manifesto).

Sometimes, in the American style, they are called "blue collar" and "white collar" workers. Yet they, too, have the same problem arising from their lack of right of access to the means of production. They, too, may be sacked and they, too, must seek another employer. It must then be obvious that the "white collars" must do what the "blues" have learned to do long ago. Form unions, strike, picket lines, recognise the employing class, not as friends and benefactors, but as class enemies. Unfortunately, there are many, not all in the employing class, who seek to confuse these workers by claiming that they are a distinct social class, that they are middle class.

To talk of "blue collars" being one social class and "white collars" another is like an anthropologist classifying the races of mankind by the colour of their socks. A white collar, even an old school tie, does not protect a worker from low wages, redundancy or injustice. The only shield against these evils is the combination of methods evolved by their fellow workers in industry.

As I write this, an example has been given to me by the Daily Telegraph and other papers. A couple employed by the John Lewis Partnership at Southampton became engaged. The man, David Tomlin, was transferred to London, his fiancée became a section manager at Southampton, they were married and several executives attended the ceremony.

Mr Tomlin, however, wanted to live with his wife Roberta in Southampton. John Lewis (the Partnership stands for the identity of its firm and its workers) said this could not be done, so Mr Tomlin found himself another job in Southampton. Mrs Tomlin was then dismissed "under a company rule which forbids staff to hold positions of responsibility in the firm if they have close relations in managerial positions with rival firms." (Daily Telegraph, 14.1.64). Wage slavery enters the bedroom.

DIVIDE AND RULE

Of course the boss class welcomes all snob talk which tends to split the ranks of the workers. By calling their jobs "staff positions" and their wages "salary" and a few other items on a worthless honours list, they expect in return the same unquestioned loyalty received by a feudal lord, in particular to scab during strikes.

Again, today I read of 70 clerks, who put on overalls and went to work on dyeing machines after 250 workers struck at a Nottingham nylon dyeing works. The strikers, members of the Hosiery Finishers and Dyers Association, were deprived of wage increases already agreed. Fortunately such scabbing is less frequent now than in pre-war days, but it is still a shameful menace. The British boss class always seeks to promote division and has nothing to learn from the Roman divide et impera.

On the other hand, there are old and virile unions of teachers, railway clerks and others. Strikes have occurred among many groups, regarded as strike-proof. I have witnessed strikes by schoolteachers (lasting 6 weeks), by policemen, jailers, schoolchildren, stable boys, bank clerks, musicians and all sorts and conditions of men—and women.

In the Revolutionary Industrial Union—or Syndicate—there must be room for every person, who is not a delegate of the boss, who plays a part in the production of that industry or service, tradesman, labourer, clerk, scientist, draughtsman, tea-maker. White collar, blue collar, no collar. Black socks, red socks, no socks. One in, all in.

TOM BROWN
**BOOK REVIEW**

**THE DEATH OF JESUS**  by Joel Carmichael

(Gollancz, 1963, 25a, 275 pp.)

Mr Carmichael is an American and a Hebrew and an Islamic scholar who is conversant with classical Hebrew, Greek, Arabic and Aramaic. He also has the added advantage of never having received any formal religious instruction as a child. He is an extremely competent man regarding his particular subject and he has written a very scholarly book.

The thesis undertaken to prove that "Jesus thought of himself as no more than the herald of an imminent material transformation of the world (the Kingdom of God), that his message was addressed to the Jews of his own time and to no one else, and that upon the failure of the Kingdom of God to come, Jesus' movement was the result of an altogether different course of action which led to his violent death." Very briefly this " altogether different course of action" was one of armed insurrection.

The Gospels, which are our main source of information regarding Jesus, are such a morass of contradictions as to be almost unintelligible from the historical point of view (even from the "pie in the sky" angle they don't do much better) and Mr Carmichael picks his way very carefully through these four highly dubious Books. He also uses other New Testament Books and sources outside the Bible (e.g. the historian Josephus, Jewish "Law", derived from the TORAI, forbade Jews to submit to the domination of foreigners and as a result the Romans continually found themselves with an extremely militant and violent resistance movement on their hands. Led by men like Judas the Galilean, his father Hezekiah, his son Menahem (son's family that one!), Simon of Perea, and Athurings—the Zealots! the Sicarii, the baryonim were a constant source of trouble to the Roman authorities. Similarly, both John the Baptist, and Jesus were leaders of popular movements against Rome. Jesus wasn't any "Son of God" nor did he claim to be—he was a socio-religious revolutionary, who believed implicitly in the "Law" of the TORAI. His disciples (of whom at least four—Simon the son of Zebedee, his brother John, and Peter himself—are known to have been Zealots or baryonim) were in fact his "lieutenants". Jesus' campaign culminated in the taking of the Temple by armed force. The insurrection was not successful, however, and after it had been broken by Roman solders and the Temple police, Jesus went into hiding in Bethany. This hiding-place was betrayed to the authorities by Judas Iscariot, Jesus was arrested, tried, and then executed by the Romans.

Mr Carmichael traces the probable development of Jesus' and his movement from its origins to the death of Jesus, though not in that order) and the reasons why the Gospels present such a different picture. Finally, he examines the transformation of Jesus into a religious cult and the early development of that cult.

Mr Carmichael's thesis is very well argued, and from the point of view of presentation, is excellent.

When Philip Toynbee recently reviewed "The Death of Jesus" in the Observer he stated that Joel Carmichael's theory would be "all the more plausible if we, as a people which is interested in history, in the study of history, in the study of history...". Although Toynbee probably thought he was being funny he is probably correct—put Spanish comrades would certainly choose a logically-argued theory in preference to an irrational belief in the supernatural. What is more, he believe that the same is true of Englishmen (the American, French, Italian, Mexican, etc.) comrades—In any event the Death of Jesus is an important book that deserves considerably more attention than it has, as yet, received, and one that I would like to recommend to all comrades.

BRIAN HART

**FASCISTS STIR UP RACIAL STRIFE IN SOUTHLAND**

A SPEAKER'S STAND has been set up. Next to it a Union Jack is flying. Around the platform stands a goon squad of neanderthal-looking youths and middle-aged men. The place is Southall, Middlesex. The British National Party is meeting.

A speaker mounts the platform. They all follow the same line. After the war we promised homes for heroes. What have we got? The black invasion is bringing vice, unemployment and unmentionable diseases. Here and there references are made to the slums.

In Southall, with an Indo-Pakistani community of 6,000, these meetings have become a common sight in the last two years. Few people, however, took them seriously until last May, when two BNP members contested the council elections.

The results were striking. In one ward the Fascists polled 257 votes (13 per cent of the poll). In the other they polled 479 votes (27 per cent of the poll) and beat the Conservatives by 61 votes.

However, the most surprising aspect of the elections was the attitude of Mr A. J. Steele, a local Labour candidate. He was far from condemning the Fascists. Cllr Steele merely observed that people voted for the BNP to protest against their ward being turned into a slum.

EXPLOITING GRIEVANCES

But the elections were to prove only the beginning. In August several hundred signatures were collected for a petition urging the council to buy vacant houses to prevent them being purchased by Indians. The council discussed the petition there was uproar in the public gallery as Fascist slogans were shouted.

In October, Sir Edward Boyle, Minister of Education, came to Southall to speak to parents who objected to their children being educated with Indians. Outside the meeting police stood by as the BNP demonstrated.

Shortly afterwards the local education authorities held another
THE national press are having the time of their lives with the steel dispute at Port Talbot. The maiden aunts of the press were held up by their inns but the latter, in its editorial of 16.1.64, asks why the modernisation of the structure of the TUC is lagging. Obviously they have the Swedish set-up in mind where a centralised authority is all-powerful.

Morgan is a tragedy for working-class organisation, inasmuch as thirteen unions are involved and the AEU and BISAKTA are at cross purposes. The situation is complex, involving two disputes; on the one hand the AEU (craft union) wants parity with the top process workers, on the other, all craft unions claim for extra holidays.

The steel employers are in an excellent tactical position, supporting the AEU against the BISAKTA, thus antagonising the AEU and driving the traditional wedge. Also in the background is the threat of the Steel Co of Wales' customers porting, to all intents and purposes, BISAKTA against the AEU, on one hand the AELJ (craft union) wants parity with the top process workers, otherwise the damage done will be irreparable.

EMPLOYERS' SECOND THOUGHTS

IT is reported that at Neddys pre-Christmas meeting some employers had ideas about profit controls (to what extent is not known), but the employers on the National Economic Development Council had different ideas—they realised that such crazy ideas would not be supported by employers in general. They might consider some such policy if tied up with wage restraint. If no union in its right senses would put its head in that noose.

SEAMEN READY FOR A FIGHT

MANY new members have been elected to the executive council of the National Union of Seamen, on the basis of their militant support for shop stewards representatives on board ship and claims for better pay, shorter hours and more leave.

Standard week for seamen is 44 hours and a qualified AB with six years' sea experience gets £119.15 per week basic. The nature of their job causes them to work under duress, unlike factory workers, if at sea they are tied to the job weekends, bank holidays, etc. Pay and hours should be commensurate with such conditions of work.

Evidently the shipowners do not agree, they rejected a pay claim last August and at talks on Wednesday 15.1.64, wages and conditions demands were turned down again. Rank and file seamen have fought before and fought well, if they can keep the political parasites off their backs and gain support from the dockers they must win their just demands.

MESSRS ARROGANCE & CONCEIT (UNLIMITED)

FOR sheer, unadulterated arrogance and conceit, the action of the LTB in deducting 6s and 4s respectively from BASIC WAGES of drivers and conductors at Shepherds Hill, Crawley and Hurlstone garages, beats anything ever before tried on—even by the mandarins of 55 Broadway.

Staff at these garages did not lift the overtime ban quickly enough to suit their Royal Highnesses. This is a challenge to the T&GWU that it DARE NOT DUCK. This is a calculated attempt to make overtime compulsory. This says—they claim—that if they face up to two disputes, they are a certain basic wage, but you will only get it if you work overtime.

If we accept this—then any garage—anywhere—at any time—on any issue—that the bosses dare to put a ban on overtime will find its BASIC pay reduced. If we are to receive our basic pay only if we agree to work overtime—then clearly that overtime ceases to be a VOLUNTARY ACT and becomes a compulsory requirement.

If we accept this, then whether you normally work overtime or not, whether you voted for or against a ban, your basic pay will be reduced. There will be no difference between the " Yes" and the "No"—no difference between guilt and innocence, between "innocent" and "guilty".

As we go to press (January 7) our National Secretary (Sam Henderson) has met the LTB and requested that money deducted on this account be returned. The newcomer to the LTB (Mr Ottoway) has given a brusque and blunt refusal. Very well. The challenge must be taken up. If the LTB is spoiling for a fight—let them have one. Let our CBC and Delegate Conference give a sound backing.

WHY COLLAR WORKERS DEMAND RECOGNITION

The National Union of Bank Employees have submitted its first 'national' pay claim. Normally pay claims are negotiated with individual managements. In the past all banks have paid the same percentage increase at approximately the same time, proving that they acted as a body.

Banks differ in their attitude to the NUBE. Some act as if it doesn't exist, some partially recognise. The Committee of London Clearing Bankers has never officially recognised the NUBE, although unofficial contact is immigration.

This is a farcical position, the sooner the banks are pulled into line the better. Because one wears a collar and tie at work, it doesn't mean the employee should be pushed around by the bosses, unfortunately this is a common occurrence in offices, staying late for nothing and that old toffice. One goes to work to earn, to live, not because the boss loves you.

ROAD HAULAGE 4%-PROPOSED INCREASE

WAGE Council conditions and haulage workers have proposed an increase of 4% on the basic wage. There must be a four-month delay, due to wages council procedure, before the increase takes effect. The proposal has to be circulated throughout the industry, then go to the Minister of Labour for confirmation. By which time, cost of increase could be wiped out by increased cost of living, increased fares, etc. Such is the chaotic system we live under.

B.C.

Fascism (from page 6)

UNIONS NOT RECOGNISED

Behind the slogans shouting and rumour mongering that we in Southall have grown so used to, what are the facts? Well, the Rachman disclosures have shown us how race hate is caused by greedy landlords, who exploit all races. Although evidence on Southall has no militant inter-racial associations to provide us with more evidence on these facts.

Fiction is also increased by the exploitation of black and white workers by employers. For example, Woolfis, a local rubber factory employing many Indians, does not recognise unions.

The Occupation of Southall has no militant inter-racial associations to provide us with more evidence on these facts.

What can we expect of the future? Despite the action of the local trades council in setting up an inter-racial friendship committee, the situation is only likely to worsen in the foreseeable future. This is not Fascists trying to act as a body; the LTB has agreed to receive a deputation and expressed a desire to keep in touch with this Association. One Labour Councillor said he would be glad to hear of any ways of keeping coloured people out of the town.

In January, George Partridge, Southall's Labour MP, agreed to answer questions on immigration at a public meeting. There was constant heckling. A man who described himself as BNP parliamentary candidate was cheered by many of the audience.

As Syndicalists, what is our answer to the situation? Certainly not pious exhortations to love each other. No, the only answer to racism is to place the blame for slums, unemployment, etc, where it belongs—with the system and bring home to the workers that only by standing together, regardless of race, will they ever overthrow the exploiters and State bureaucrats.

ROGER SANDELL
Post Office exploits the casual workers

IT IS VERY enlightening for a student who has some previous experience of industry to spend a few days on the Christmas Post. The GPO are no fools; they know that they can pull almost any trick on students and hard-up housewives, who for the most part have nowhere else to go. The problem here is how to organise for solidarity. Furthermore, they can feel sure that most casual workers will not cause trouble over injustices, which might cause a walk-out in a union shop, for a multitude of reasons, one of which is the desire to keep a foot in the door.

It appeared to me that the GPO regarded ignorance as its greatest weapon. From the moment you enter its Bristol building, one of the gloomiest and ugliest in the city, you get the feeling that "they" don't really want you to know anything. In fact, the impression is that "they" are doing "you" a favour by employing you for the work before Christmas. There was a vast impersonal building with not even an enquiry office and not the slightest hint as to where would-be employees should go.

When you finally found your destination, you were told to sign the Official Secrets Act, which is even proper to the given a starting card and told where to report. No mention of wage rates, unless you asked, nothing about tea-breaks, nothing about anything in fact. Soon you find yourself in an interview, only a detailed application form which asks about your past criminal record and demands two testimonies from mature and responsible persons (e.g. clergyman, headmaster, magistrate?) who have known you for two years.

You learn everything the hard way; there is no attempt to volunteer information. If you are asked whether you want to work overtime, there is no mention of overtime rates. And no wonder: you asked, nothing about union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop.

When you eventually got your destination, you were told to sign the Official Secrets Act, which is even proper to the given a starting card and told where to report. No mention of wage rates, unless you asked, nothing about tea-breaks, nothing about anything in fact. Soon you find yourself in an interview, only a detailed application form which asks about your past criminal record and demands two testimonies from mature and responsible persons (e.g. clergyman, headmaster, magistrate?) who have known you for two years.

You learn everything the hard way; there is no attempt to volunteer information. If you are asked whether you want to work overtime, there is no mention of overtime rates. And no wonder: you asked, nothing about union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop.

When you eventually got your destination, you were told to sign the Official Secrets Act, which is even proper to the given a starting card and told where to report. No mention of wage rates, unless you asked, nothing about tea-breaks, nothing about anything in fact. Soon you find yourself in an interview, only a detailed application form which asks about your past criminal record and demands two testimonies from mature and responsible persons (e.g. clergyman, headmaster, magistrate?) who have known you for two years.

You learn everything the hard way; there is no attempt to volunteer information. If you are asked whether you want to work overtime, there is no mention of overtime rates. And no wonder: you asked, nothing about union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop.

When you eventually got your destination, you were told to sign the Official Secrets Act, which is even proper to the given a starting card and told where to report. No mention of wage rates, unless you asked, nothing about tea-breaks, nothing about anything in fact. Soon you find yourself in an interview, only a detailed application form which asks about your past criminal record and demands two testimonies from mature and responsible persons (e.g. clergyman, headmaster, magistrate?) who have known you for two years.

You learn everything the hard way; there is no attempt to volunteer information. If you are asked whether you want to work overtime, there is no mention of overtime rates. And no wonder: you asked, nothing about union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop, nothing about the possibility of union shop.