

--- SOLIDARITY

FOR WORKERS' POWER

Volume 2 Number 12

6_D

A CALL TO LONDON'S BUILDING WORKERS

We print below the text of a leaflet issued by the Building Stewards Committee of London sites and jobs, Mowlem's job, 10 Downing St., W.1. As it is a far better proclamation than most coming from the same address, we are pleased to print it in full.

RALLY IN SUPPORT OF THE WAGES CLAIM

TUESDAY, JULY 30, 10 a.m. - HYDE PARK, MARBLE ARCH

MARCH TO WAGES TALKS, CAVENDISH STREET.

London's building workers welcome the unions' stand in support of the claim for 1/6d. an hour and the 40 hour week. We reject the employers' attempt to use the Tory government NIC to resist our just demands. We express our determination to secure our claim.

For too long have building trade workers been subject to speed up and rationalisation resulting in huge profits for the employers and the take over tycoons who batten on the industry. New techniques and increases every year in productivity entitles us to demand the implementation of basic trade union principles of payment for the extra value of work done.

OUR CASE IS JUST

London rates of £12.6s.9d. for craftsmen and £11.0s.6d. for labourers are far too low for a 42 hour week. Never was the time more opportune to lift the status of the worker in this most casual of all 'hire and fire' industries. We welcome the gains made by our Scottish brothers of the 40 hour week and 3¹/₂d. an hour increase from November 1963. We too have the right to enjoy a higher standard of life.

ACTION IS NEEDED NOW !

We fully support the NFETU rejection of the employers' paltry offer and especially support the demand for no widening of the wage differential between tradesmen and labourers, and for no three year 'spreadover' of wage increases.

We call for a sustained campaign NOW backed by the unions and NFETU along the following lines:

1. The full strength of the unions to be used, with industrial action if necessary, to enforce the claim.
2. Complete rejection of the employers' present offer.
3. No widening of existing differentials.
4. An all-London mass meeting called by the NFETU Regional Council.
5. 100% trade union organisation and recruitment on all sites and jobs.

MAKE THIS THE BIGGEST, MOST POWERFUL, UNITED, DEMONSTRATION IN THE HISTORY OF LONDON'S BUILDING WORKERS.

LET THE ASSEMBLY AT MARBLE ARCH AT 10 a.m. ON JULY 30th SHOW THE EMPLOYERS AND OUR TRADE UNION LEADERS THAT WE MEAN BUSINESS AND ARE DETERMINED TO SECURE JUSTICE.

INTO ACTION

'SOLIDARITY' welcomes the struggle of the building workers. We will give it every support we can. We will try to get the real facts known as widely as possible. There are sure to be distortions and lies in the capitalist press.

We welcome the demand for 'no widening of the wage differential between tradesmen and labourers'. Labourers too have wives and kids who need a decent living. The employers like to keep and widen these differentials. Our interest lies in narrowing them and eventually wiping them out altogether.

We welcome the march on July 30th. The employers must be shown the full united strength of building workers. A mass demonstration of this kind, if properly followed up, will have more effect than any number of resolutions.

We agree with the Building Stewards Committee that the march should 'show the employers and our trade union leaders that we mean business'. There must be no deals behind the scenes. We have been done too often in this way, by people paid to be on our side, but whose only thought is to compromise when the heat is on. Unity, yes. But unity in action.

Building workers must prepare for this struggle. This means getting the fullest possible support from all jobs, and all trades. Every brickie's labourer in London must know what's going on and realise that it's his fight.

Attention should be given to money so that the fight isn't fought with empty bellies. We cannot leave it to levies approved by the branches. Numbers of building workers are non-union, partly at least because of the record of the trade union leaders. These workers too can be mobilised. Their interests are also at stake. Meetings should be held on all sites to discuss what support they can give and regular whip-rounds should be organised. Workers not directly involved (such as electricians and other construction workers not associated with the demands) should be called on to give support and take solidarity action where necessary. Even workers outside the building industry should be informed of what is going on. They could be a valuable source of moral and financial support.

Leaving it to the trade union leaders has got the building workers nowhere. They will not solve our problems for us. But the struggle can be won if we take it into our own hands and carry it through ourselves. We are the ones who make the sacrifices. We are the ones who should take the decisions.

Job organisation, links between jobs and solidarity between trades must be built again from the ground up. Only when this is done can we succeed.

Real power lies in our hands. If we use it, we will win. And as long as we keep it there, we can't be sold out.

CHIPPIE.

PUBLIC ORDER, 1963

On July 9, the Public Order Bill, 1963, was given a second reading without a division.

Mr. Brooke, the Home Secretary, put it quite bluntly. 'The government has no intention whatever of tolerating the abuse of free speech by extremist characters. Penalties under the Public Order Act, 1936, and the Public Meeting Act, 1908, were too small'. 'Public order must be maintained and the courts must be adequately armed to ensure that those who disturb it don't get off too lightly'.

This Bill is a vicious piece of class legislation. Despite all the double-talk it is not directed at Fascists. And it has little to do with preventing racial incitement. It is part of a deliberate policy by the Authorities to render protest ineffective. It is consciously aimed at every working class, radical or revolutionary organization, at every supporter of CND or of the Committee of 100. It is aimed in fact at anyone who at any time may wish to demonstrate on the streets.

Last year nearly half a million sincere but misguided people signed a petition calling for legislation against the incitement to racial hatred and discrimination. The new bill was introduced under this 'civil rights' smokescreen. Fenner Brockway, George Brown, the Labour-controlled LCC, the National Council for Civil Liberties and the Communist Party have now got the legislation they have been clamouring for. With a vengeance!

The trouble with some people is that they refuse to learn. Or even to look at the world around them. Governments represent power and privilege. Laws are made to protect the rights of property and the authority of the state. It is not their function to preserve or extend civil liberties. These have constantly to be struggled for and to be imposed by mass action from below. They are never granted on a platter.

The record of the government and the attitude of the police on these matters should by now be known to thousands. It is not only naive, but it is a positive menace to call on the government to legislate freedom and to expect the police to implement this legislation.

Shielded by the muddle-headed good intentions of Brockway & Co., and amid much blather about the preservation of free speech, the government has slapped in a law which in effect will make demonstrating an expensive hobby. There is nothing new in all this. In France, in 1958, the Socialists and Communists voted 'special powers' to de Gaulle 'to fight the OAS'. De Gaulle promptly used his new powers... against the 'left'. Only the mass action of the people can keep the fascists off the streets. To call upon our rulers to legislate against fascists doesn't weaken fascism. It only strengthens the state.

There are other recent experiences from which we should also learn. When we effectively challenge the ruling class we cannot expect to be protected by its laws. At the Wethersfield trial we saw how the law could be 'interpreted' as a means of intimidation. At Marham and during the Greek demonstrations we have seen how the technicalities of bail, remand and 'time to pay' could be used as a means of enforcing imprisonment, where 'the law' made no provision for such a sentence. The anti-bomb movement is now busy learning lessons which many workers learn during their childhood. Lessons about class justice and about the police and prisons required to enforce it.

This year the movement has had a number of modest successes. Aldermaston, where we broke out of the bureaucratic straight-jacket. Marham, where we called the state's bluff and they had to climb down on the original charges. Porton, where we broke their conspiracy of silence and talked to troops who were not unfriendly. We were not intimidated by the searches that preceded the 'Queen Fred demos'. And Henry Brooke has been reduced to gibbering rage because his queen was booed. Gone is the last of the sacred cows.

We should not be surprised if the authorities react by instructing their police to punch, kick, twist arms and commit perjury a little more enthusiastically. After all that is what they are paid for. As our struggle becomes more effective the democratic mask will slither off a little further. Mr. Brooke himself has said that 'there was no limit to the penalties on conviction for sedition. And one day a prosecution for sedition may well be brought'.

Eighteen months ago (*Solidarity*, I, 9) we wrote that as resistance grew the government 'would be compelled to withdraw the iron fist from the velvet glove. It would have to administer justice along increasingly obvious class lines. It would reveal still further the fraudulent nature of capitalist democracy. It would attempt intimidation by invoking legislation already on the statute book but of which ordinary people are quite unaware. Or it would churn out new legislation so quickly that it would amaze people....'

We cannot expect the traditional politicians of the left to do anything about this. Their minds are set in the ways of authoritarianism and of bureaucracy. And after all, within a year or so, they, in their turn, will have to administer the capitalist state. Let's not forget that the 1945-51 Labour government used troops to break strikes on several occasions, prosecuted dockers for striking, and used the police to stop a May Day march. This is the real answer to Martin Ennals' pathetic query (*Tribune*, July 19): 'Why didn't Labour formally register its protest at this Tory attempt to curb civil liberties?'

WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE TO
solidarity?

9 shillings for
12 issues (post free).

from: Bob Potter, 18 Kingsley
Road, London SW19.

YOUR RIGHTS IN THEIR HANDS

THE CODE.

The increased bureaucratization of capitalist society and of all its institutions has led to the growth of thousands of minor bureaucracies at local levels, in the Labour Exchanges, the National Assistance Boards, and the local councils. These 'little men' are the cogs in the hierarchical machinery of the state: the would-be Fuhrers who gratify their lust for power and importance at the expense of their less fortunate fellow beings.

The National Assistance Board, in particular, offers great scope for the would-be dictators, in that individual officers have a tremendous scope for 'exercising discretion'. N.A.B. officials are issued with 'guide books'. The information contained in them is secret and must not be disclosed to the public. The officer must sign a declaration pledging to maintain this secrecy. Should he permit any of this material to pass into 'unauthorized' hands, he is liable to immediate prosecution under the now infamous Official Secrets Act.

The guide is known in the trade as 'The Code'. Office managers also have a 'code', which is equally inaccessible to the inquirer. Attempts to obtain information regarding these documents through the government's Public Relations Office invariably fail. They are not even available to people doing sociological research.

This procedure gives the N.A.B. officer the widest possible scope for making up his own rules and regulations; it also makes it extremely dif-

ficult for the applicant to argue against any decision reached. The whole set-up clearly shows the utter contempt of the ruling class for those it rules.

If the worker has any 'rights' to National Assistance, he certainly is in no position to verify them. A Solidarist recently applying for assistance was refused on the grounds that he had 'no permanent address'. We suspect this particular regulation was one invented there and then by the N.A.B. officer concerned; the Official Secrets Act forbids us to find out definitely one way or the other.

Under these conditions National Assistance is no longer a right. It becomes something very arbitrary. A distressed person in most cases will at least get his rent paid, but this is not always so.

ARBITRARY DECISIONS.

One of the most appalling aspects of the set-up is the way in which the petty bureaucrats capitalize on the fact that a relatively high number of N.A.B. clients are inarticulate and reluctant to protest when they are pushed around. This applies particularly to women, who lack experience of the wiles of officialdom. Petty officials consequently abuse this advantage and may even deny claimants the paltry sums to which they are entitled.

The most needy, the most exploited, and the most alienated workers are often the worst hit. When unemployed many of them are caught in a

descending spiral of increasing oppression. It would be interesting to study the psychology of the creatures who manage the Assistance Board offices, and to investigate the kind of kicks they get out of literally taking the bread out of babies' mouths.

A further example will show how arbitrary the whole system is. Another Solidarist, also recently unemployed, was awarded 2/6 a week. He protested, sending a nasty letter and giving notice of appeal. The next day, sure enough, a little man actually called at the home of the comrade and increased his grant by 1100%.... to 27/6.

Those of us who have been involved in strike actions will know that while on strike workers cannot claim benefit, regardless of the issue in dispute. Again, there is a 'wages stop' applied, which ensures a worker cannot be better off on National Assistance than he would be at work. This greatly affects a worker whose previous employment paid poor wages, and who, at the same time has a large family to keep.

These petty bureaucracies extend into all government and semi-government departments. Their basis often lies in the very wide application of the Official Secrets Act, as was pointed out by no less a personage (!) than Mr. Cecil King, Chairman of the Mirror Group, on a recent television programme, 'The Censors'. 'The criticism of any Government office is now becoming almost impossible to be detailed or documented, because to do so would be a breach of the Official Secrets Act'. Asked to give an example of the unwarranted use of the Act, Mr. King referred to its being invoked in the case of a dispute between patients and nurses at Broadmoor!

One thing is certain. If our friends the 'Spies for Peace' ever get sent copies of the various 'codes', I am sure their publication would throw a lot of interesting light into some of the darker recesses of our bureaucratic society.

* * * *

TREATED LIKE DIRT.

I have recently been reading through copies of the 'Western Telegraph' for March and April of this year. Virtually every issue of this paper gives an illustration of these petty bureaucracies in action.

On March 7 the paper gives its readers an insight into the workings of the Haverfordwest National Assistance Board offices. David Allen, married with five young children started by coming along, seeking assistance. He finished up by leaping the counter and belting the civil servant concerned.

A charge against Allen was dismissed. The local press quoted Mr. Allen as saying: 'When Mr. Wise (the N.A.B. officer) came back into the office I was reading one of the pamphlets. He said that if I couldn't be bothered to listen to him, he couldn't be bothered to waste time. He then went through to another cubicle. I stood up and asked if he would come back. He would not come. So I asked him if I could see the manager. He refused. I went and rang the bell for attention but no one came. He walked over to the side where I was standing with his arms raised in a sparring manner. I went to him and told him that if he wanted it that way he could have it, whichever way he wanted. He was in a very offensive mood.'

Mr. Allen concluded by saying that the N.A.B. people treated applicants 'like a bit of dirt'.

Moving forward a few weeks, the same 'Western Telegraph' splashed on its front page on April 25:

'Pensioner Has "Means Test" After Hospital Visit'

'An old-age pensioner, aged 70, waiting to return to Cardiff Royal Infirmary for an operation, was so distressed after a visit from an Assistance official that he withdrew a claim for travelling expenses.

'The official was very sarcastic', said the pensioner's son. 'He told my father, who was an £8 a week worker at Trecwn until he retired a few years ago, that he must have money saved up. To get rid of the man my father signed to withdraw his application'.

COLLECTING RENT.

Also reported is the case of Mr. Peter Brake, a 'rent collector' for Pembroke R.D.C., who went to collect current rent from tenant George Morgan, and finished up with a cut mouth and ear, but no money. Here is the rent collector's side of the story, as reported by the local press:

'Mr. Morgan opened the door to me and I told him I had come to see him about the rent. He told me that I could not have the rent that week, and gave no reason. I asked him if I could come inside to discuss the distress warrant with him, and he told me it was inconvenient. He eventually let me into the house and I explained the distress warrant to him and he read it.

'I then began to make a list of the articles in the house which I thought could be auctioned to pay his debt. The procedure is that I take

the list back to the office and they decide what should be impounded.

'While I was doing so Mr. Morgan was abusive and kept saying that I had no right to be in the house. It was then that a dispute arose over a record player. Mr. Morgan told me it belonged to his step-son, and I asked him to produce a receipt for it. Then Morgan began punching and pushing me'.

Our rent collector is then cross-examined by the defence:

'Did you ever use abusive language to Mrs. Morgan?'

'No'.

'Did you not say to her when she was telling you about her health, "There is all wrong with you"?'

'No'.

After admitting it was his practice to tap at the door and walk straight in when collecting, Mr. Brake was asked:

'It would have been very embarrassing had Mrs. Morgan been changing or in a state of undress, wouldn't it?'

'Yes'.

For the benefit of those unable to read between the lines, here is the tenant's side of the story, as reported by the Western Telegraph.

'Mr. Brake pushed the door open and pushed past me into the hall. I then told him he had better come into the front room. He had a piece of paper in his hand; he said it was a warrant.

'When I asked to see it, he said, "It is my business. It is none of your business".

'I did not like his attitude. He was acting as if he was head of the council and his attitude seemed to be "Morgan you are dirt". He kept prodding me with a pencil and I told

him to keep his hands down and said that we didn't want that sort of thing. He did not stop, and I told him I would call the police. He then said, "What do you think the police can do?"

Among the witnesses called by Morgan was Mr. T.Thain who had previously collected rent. He stated that at no time had he ever been threatened by violence; on the contrary there was usually a cup of tea awaiting him, and he often sat chatting for ten minutes about the children and other things.

The Bench found Morgan guilty.

ADVICE FROM ON HIGH.

Not all the bureaucrats are appointed by the authorities. Sometimes they are elected by the people.

The 'Western Telegraph' of the same period carries some interesting advice for its readers. It appears that Mr. Donnelly, Labour MP for Pembrokeshire, addressed a mass meeting at Milford Haven, at a time when 18% of Milford Haven's workers were unemployed. We must assume, from Mr. Donnelly's speech, that this really served them right. He said:

'It is not a scrap of use asking us to get industry here until the Trade Unions are going to act in a responsible fashion. We will play

fair by them, but they must realize the situation and act in the interests of the community as a whole and not in the limited interests of one section of the community.'

It is only fair to point out that at the time in question the local boiler-makers were involved in an unofficial action, battling against the usual united front of trade union bureaucrats and employers. We assume that Mr. Donnelly didn't really bear a grudge against the unions as such, but only against the bloody members who wouldn't do as their bosses ordered.

We can sympathise with Mr. Donnelly. Wouldn't it be nice if they could have unions without these constant disputes between the rank and file and the leaderships? Or if they could arrange it so that there were no workers applying for National Assistance and the N.A.B. officers were left in peace all day, to do cross-words? Or if there were no tenants, needing to pay rent, and disturbing the peaceful deliberations of local councils with noisy petitions and demonstrations?

In a sense, that's the kind of society we're out to build. But when we do, there won't be any place in it either for the Donnellys or for the thousands of little bureaucrats who today clog up everything around us.

BOB POTTER.

POLITICAL ASSESSMENT

Communist Party District Chairman: This (Solidarity) is a front for the SPGB!

Seller: Explain please.

CPDC: It's just a cover for Healy's mob.

Seller: Oh, you mean a front for the SLL.

CPDC: Well, whoever produces it, it must be subsidised at that price.

a modern fairy tale...

Once upon a time - in 1769 to be exact - a Scottish engineer called James Watt patented a toy called a steam engine, which he had been playing with for some time. Some 50 years later an English engineer called George Stephenson started the first public steam railway in the world - from Stockton to Darlington.

All the people in the land were very happy. The 'iron horse' made it possible for them to travel about in great numbers and much faster than before. The rich factory owners were especially happy. The new invention enabled them to transport raw materials to their factories and manufactured goods to the ports and to markets all over the country.

And it came to pass that in the fullness of time anyone could look at a time-table and say: 'There will be a train at such and such an hour' - and lo! there was a train! Going on holiday was great fun. You could stick a pin in a map and then go there by train. Travelling to work was less fun, but anyway there was always the faithful train, panting and hooting, to greet the worker however early in the morning it might be. People came from all parts of the world to admire our trains and marvel at our complicated time-tables. Two world wars and much heavy bombing failed to disrupt the system.

Then one day, without much warning, a wicked financial wizard called Baffler Beeching was put in charge of 'modernising' the railways. He was not an engineer or a railwayman and he could not tell the difference between a tender and a guards' van, because he had never had any toys to play with when he was little. With the help of little wizards who waved slide rules and were called economists, he made a 'report'. The bang was so great that all stations, North, East, South and West of Kings Cross suddenly disappeared from the map.

Everybody clapped their hands at this wonderful trick. But they started crying out loud when he said he couldn't make them come back again. 'Never mind', said Baffler, 'I'll keep a few trains for us to play with. They'll go non-stop at 400 miles an hour, so that no one can get on to them'.

'What about getting to work?' cried the commuters, which was the rude name given to millions of people who had to go into town every day to slog their guts out in offices and factories. 'You won't have any work when I'm finished' Baffler replied. 'And in any case my friend Magic Marples will be doing some tricks of his own for you, on the roads. You'll be able to travel that way'.

Unfortunately Magic Marples had just performed his biggest trick to date. He had blocked all the roads up with traffic wardens (in plain clothes) and with thousands of parking meters. He hadn't had time to build many new roads or to order the thousands of lovely lorries needed to replace the trains.

In any case all those lorries would only have blocked the new roads up, which hadn't been built anyway. So they didn't waste money building them. Or ordering the lorries as there weren't any roads for them. This was the cleverest trick of all.

The two magicians were declared very clever and worth every penny of the big salaries they were getting. They were knighted and put into orbit, where they met another magician, Rags-to-Riches Robens - who had made all the coalmines disappear, thus making sure that there wouldn't have been enough coal for the engines anyway.

All three of them had a good laugh together, drank a toast to nationalisation, and lived happily ever after at the taxpayers' expense.

JIM PATERSON

... AND SOME hints from Ireland!

Foxford is a small town in County Mayo, Western Ireland, whose livelihood depends on the wool industry. Goods and passenger trains used to draw up at its station, on their way from Ballina to Dublin. Recently the C.I.E. - the nationalised Corporation running the Irish Railways - bureaucratically decreed that the station was expendable and that it should be closed down. The local population used all the traditional methods of protest, but to no avail. So they decided on some direct action. The following extracts are from the weekly paper 'Western People', the 'leading journal of the Provinces'.

JUNE 22, 1963.

'A C.I.E. goods train on its way from Ballina to Dublin was held up for about fifteen minutes at Foxford last night as demonstrators who had marched from the town bridge to the station drove motor vehicles across the line and despite requests by Gardai and others refused to remove them as a protest against the closure of the station by C.I.E.

There were minor incidents between members of the Gardai Siochana and a section of the crowd as Gardai in an effort to clear the line began to push a motor van from the line and were hampered by a portion of the gathering, who pushed it back to its original position.

Extra Gardai from other stations

in the area, including Swinford, Kiltimagh and Kilkelly, were drafted into the town before the protest march.

Placards borne by the demonstrators bore slogans such as 'Cruel Injustice Enforced'; 'We Want Our Station'; 'Foxford Demands Justice'; 'Some Sod, This Todd'; 'We Want Justice'; 'Stop Your Todding, Doc'; 'Democracy How Are You.'

The locals who came to the station in about thirty motor vehicles and many on foot carrying placards left the town at about 7.45. The leading cars in the procession were driven over the line and about the third vehicle in the row was stopped on the line as the driver stepped outside, locked the door and walked away.

Efforts by Gardai Superintendent P. Barrett to have the driver remove the impediment failed as crowds awaited the arrival of the 8.30 pm. goods train from Ballina which was scheduled to pass through Foxford Station at about 8.45. Saturday was the last time the train was scheduled to stop at Foxford.

Then as time grew close, the driver of the van which was owned by a local firm got into the vehicle and drove it from the line. As soon as this was removed from the area another was driven up to take its place, but this time however the driver did not lock the door. Crowds gathered round shouting as Supt. Barrett demanded the keys from the driver.

The Supt. then saw that the vehicle was out of gear and handbrake taken off before ordering members of the Gardai to push it from the area. As Gardai pushed it from the line, they were hampered by a section of the crowd, who rushed in against the Gardai. There were minor incidents before peace was restored.

UNSCHEDULED HALT.

It was shortly after this that the shout went up that the train was on its way. As it pulled up at the station on its unscheduled halt a group of locals went to the rear and handed a letter of protest addressed to the Chairman of C.I.E.,* Dublin, to the guard Mick Higgins, Claremorris. The line was then cleared and shortly afterwards the train went on its way.

Mr. Tommy O'Hara, County Councillor, addressing the gathering, said that it should be borne in mind how badly the people of Foxford had been treated by C.I.E. They were right in demanding back the services they had been accustomed to in the area. "It is a scandalous thing that the representations made by the deputations were not heeded by the government officials.

"I know and you know that Foxford has always been paying C.I.E. As one of your neighbours I join with you in raising my voice in protest against this scandalous behaviour. This evening you have shown you are in earnest. I sincerely hope that C.I.E. will take note of this meeting. We all regret to see the men who had been working here being paid off and it is only right and proper that we should protest in the strongest possible manner."

* * * *

JUNE 29, 1963.

'Further protests were staged in Foxford last night over C.I.E.'s closure of the local railway station. The 8.30 pm. goods train, bound for Dublin

*

Coras Iompair Eireann is the Irish National Transport Undertaking. It is the only concern operating a rail service in the Irish Republic. In 1961 it was responsible for all 1,747 miles of the railway network... and is now busy cutting services!

from Ballina, was held up for over an hour when the protesters blocked the twin lines with disused railway sleepers, iron gates, empty oil drums and boulders.

Gardai from the Swinford district supplemented by members of the Force from the Claremorris and Castlebar areas were detailed for duty in the tension-packed industrial centre. The Guards were stationed at various points around the town and a group of about 14 was on duty at the level crossing on the Foxford-Pontoon road.

A protest parade, headed by the local Brass and Reed Band, assembled on the Bridge. Motor vehicles on which were placed protest placards and conveying hundreds of protesters, moved off towards the station after the band.

Along the route rousing marches were played and there were shouts of "We Want our Station".

The protesters arrived at the level crossing at 8.10 and were stopped in dramatic fashion by Garda Supt. Patrick Barrett, Swinford, who signalled the parade to halt by raising his right hand. The band kept on playing "A Nation Once Again", while a protester joined in with "A Station Once Again".

There was a spell of jeering and booing before a motor van was driven through the crowd towards the gates. The van was stopped by the Gardai but the driver informed them he was going on towards Pontoon and they allowed it to proceed on its journey. The vehicle stopped however on the railway tracks and the driver refused to remove it.

Supt. Barrett had a conversation with the driver and he still refused to drive the vehicle onto the road off the lines. The Supt. informed the driver he would have to be removed from the vehicle by force.

The driver was then taken out by Gardai who pushed the van off the tracks, while protesters pushed it on again. Eventually the Guards succeeded in clearing the line and in an ensuing skirmish batons were drawn and the order was given to close the level crossing gates. Crowds of protesters were pushed outside the gates.

A speaker told the protesters over a loudspeaker to get on the lines as soon as they heard the train coming.

SCENES.

The protesters on the Pontoon side of the level crossing rushed down a laneway to the end of the station when shouts of "tear up the tracks" were heard. Phone calls were flashing between the signal guard station at Foxford and the Ballina Railway centre. Piles of disused railway sleepers were strewn across the tracks, and stones were thrown as Gardai and plain-clothes detectives endeavoured to clear the lines. The jeering protesters were pursued across the fields by members of the Garda Force. Empty oil barrels were rolled out onto the tracks and iron gates were thrown from the station platforms when the cry went up at 8.45 "the train is coming".

The train, drawing 40 wagons, was stopped as a precautionary measure by the driver, Mr. Ml. Doorly, Claremorris, about half a mile from the station.

MORE OBSTACLES.

As the Gardai worked feverishly to clear the lines more obstacles were thrown on the tracks and at this stage it looked as though it would be some considerable time before the train would get through. The train proceeded at snail pace towards the crowded station as the path was cleared and a direction to the protesters was then given by Supt. Barrett: "Off the lines. I will use force if you don't go". The

order was met by further boos. The sleepers were eventually pushed aside and the train, having exploded fog signals which had been placed on the tracks moved into the station at 9.10 p.m.

PATIENCE TRIED TOO FAR.

When the crowds were leaving the station they were addressed by Mr. Miko Browne, T.D. (F.G.) who told them he had travelled specially from Dublin to attend the protest. He wished it to be understood that they were a tolerant people in the west of Ireland but their patience could be tried too far.

At the eleventh hour he appealed to C.I.E. and all concerned to make immediate arrangements to meet a deputation from the Foxford district to reconsider the permanent opening of the station.

Mr. Browne said he would ask the Minister for Justice in the Dail if he would restrain the Gardai at Foxford from preventing the people making an orderly protest against the closure of the station.

The deputy told our reporter that he is going to propose to C.I.E. that they should allow the goods train to stop at Foxford for a trial period of three months and that records be kept of the volume of traffic during that period at the station. If C.I.E. agreed to that Mr. Browne said he would appeal to the Foxford people to stop their protests.

POSTSCRIPT.

The 7.40 p.m. passenger train to Ballina had an unscheduled stop at Foxford on Monday night when the communication cord was pulled as the train roared through the station. Three passengers descended and collected their luggage while local people

who had entered the station rushed to greet them. The train was held up for ten minutes as the two Foxford exiles, one of them with his wife, disembarked. There was only one Garda on duty at the station at this time but reinforcements were rushed out after the stoppage.

The communication cord stoppage startled C.I.E. officials.'

RUMOURS

- Third man Kim Philby was really a high official in M.I.5. He reached this position under a Labour Government. No wonder both Harolds want to keep mum !

- A well-known ministerial bicycle was recently seen chained to a parking meter in Devonshire Street. 2/6 an hour?

- Hugh Gaitskell isn't really dead. The bodies were switched at Transport House. This is why the Labour Party isn't developing socialist policies.

The American Embassy will soon be redecorating. Wood panels are planned for bathrooms and other conveniences. All users to register with the Birch John Society?

THE LAND-CRAB

The little land-crab had reason to consider himself a progressive 'critter' for, did he not - unlike his shirt-tail cousin, the crayfish - always travel forward? Did he not, unlike the sea-crabs who wandered back and forth over the sandy bottom of the bays, always travel in a straight line?

With the first signs of Spring, the little land-crab prepared to leave his winter quarters to commence his annual trek to the Ocean. But during his stay in the wooded hills, a line of telephone poles had been placed along his route. The land-crab trudged forward until he came to the first pole.

'I'd move over a little if I were you,' said an Old Raven Who Had Been Places And Seen Things and so considered himself something of a tactician, '... that is, if you want to get where you're going!'

'Can't be done!' replied the land-crab with condescending patience. 'If I were to 'move over' as you put it, I might become re-oriented. Might lose my direction and freeze to death in the mountains. Besides, were I to change ever so slightly to the Right, my fellow land-crabs might well regard me as a Right-wing Opportunist; were I to alter my path to the Left, I'm sure I would be looked upon as a Left-wing Sec-tarian. Great Theoreticians of the past surveyed this path many, many years ago, and I am certain it is the correct one. Besides, my goal lies directly ahead and it is a mathematical certainty that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points'.

The Old Raven, who was in no mood to argue dialectics, flut-tered off, and the little land-crab began to climb the pole. He spent the day climbing up the one side and most of the next clambering down the other side. He did not deviate the width of a hair, but trudged on till he came to another pole where he had another terrific climb, up and then down again.

Thus he continued day after day, and when the warm season was past, the Old Raven found the body of the poor little land-crab at the bottom of one of the poles, scarcely half-way to the Ocean which he might have reached easily in a day had he been willing to move six inches from his charted line of travel.

Herbert Kelly.
(Reprinted from 'PRESS', June 1963)

MORAL:

So far the Radicals have only interpreted Marx. The point, however, is to change him!

THE SCIENTIST AND THE COMMISSAR

'.... much present day thinking and discussion about research is underlaid by a genuine conflict of aims. On the one hand there is a strong interest in science and scientific research....., on the other there is the urgent need for rapid technological progress to help solve the country's economic problems. There is a conflict between what many research people want to do, and perhaps feel they are best at, and the sort of contribution the country needs from them.'

Mr. W.C.F.Hessenberg, Dep. Director of
B.I.S.R.A., New Scientist, 6.12.1962.

'In theoretical organic chemistry the problem before Soviet chemists is to generalise the voluminous experience gained by Soviet organic chemical industry..... and to use the results obtained..... in every way which may help solve the practical problems in the establishment of Communism in our country.'

Uspekii Khimii (1950), 19, 529-44.

'Solidarity' has so far stressed a particular theme. The bureaucratic societies of East and West are coming to resemble one another more and more. Their industrial workers face increasing managerial domination and alienation in their work. The work itself becomes more and more fragmented and more and more meaningless.

It might appear that all this is confined to industry and in particular to processes involving mass production and high degrees of mechanisation. This is far from being the case. We here wish to discuss alienation and managerial domination in the field of scientific work and in particular in the field of scientific research.

The two statements quoted highlight the kind of problem which faces any scientist who wishes to think or work freely. The problems are real ones and are beginning to cause concern to practicing scientists. Dr. Simon Marison * writes:

'One of the worries of the chemists is the increasing role of government and industry in research, with the feared possible conse-

* Marison, S., reviewing 'The Professional Scientist' by A.L.Strauss and L.Rainwater, in 'Chemical and Engineering News' (1963), 70.

quences of bureaucratisation, standardisation, and restriction of freedom. This is linked to the view of many that there is "too much domination of the field by business". Chemists, as other scientists in industry and government are shown as facing the same fundamental problem of being both scientists and employees. As employees they desire to have better salaries and working conditions and more participation in policy decisions. As scientists they would like to have more autonomy, more time for basic research, and would like to be appreciated more for their scientific contributions.'

THE GENERAL PROBLEM

To discuss with any meaning the problems facing scientific workers we must first of all recognise the existence of a fairly distinct division of labour between pure research workers, technologists, and those whose work lies between the two.* It is in this latter group that the strain is most felt and where the greatest contradictions are apparent.

Taking a general view first we can immediately see the basic reasons for the 'conflict of aims'. Management (using 'management' in the general sense to include State, industrial, military and academic decision-makers) and the individual scientist have different interests and totally different outlooks on life and on work. The conflict derives from a complete inability of management to understand the motivating forces that drive science and the scientist. With society organised as it is, this conflict is inevitable.

In general managers are motivated by the requirements of power, of financial gain and of social status in agencies outside the framework of their employment. On the other hand most scientists are motivated by desires to deepen their understanding and control of external reality, to satisfy their curiosity and to give meaning to their work and lives within this context. They like to feel they are essential to posterity. Above all they find satisfaction in the status gained by recognition of their scientific skill by other scientists.

Kornhauser has summed the situation up quite accurately:

'The academic training of scientists is rooted in a tradition of deeply probing research and the advancement of knowledge. The experience of industrial managers, on the other hand, initially disposes them to use professional specialists as mere technicians for routine operations.'**

* This increasingly rigid division is itself the product of the evolution of knowledge and of technology in a hierarchically organized society.

** Prof. W. Kornhauser, 'Strains and accommodations in industrial research in the U.S.', *Minerva* (1962) vol.1, No.1, p.31.

In a society where decision-taking is dominated by 'management' these different aims must inevitably lead to conflict. Modern capitalism seeks increasingly to manage all activity, including scientific research, from above. But to the extent that it succeeds in doing so, it defeats another essential prerequisite of its efficient functioning, namely the creative participation of those it seeks to dominate. This is the real, inherent contradiction of bureaucratic capitalism - and it is seen most clearly in the relationship between research worker and industrial manager.

Bourgeois scientists have again perceived this much more clearly than many in the traditional left. Kornhauser, for instance, has written that

'The tradition of science as a profession teaches that the research worker must be free to work on problems of interest to him. Industry has curtailed this freedom in work in order to increase the chance of securing scientific results that can be commercially exploited. But at the same time, industry must depend on the scientists' initiative.....' (ibid. p.33)

THE VARIOUS GROUPS

The situation of the technologists is closely related to that of the industrial workers - which is fact they are. Problems spring both from low wages and from the same trend towards the reduction of individual skill necessary for the job. The technologist tends to become either an automaton, repeatedly performing the same trivial technical task, or a highly qualified minder of a particular kind of complex machinery. He may occasionally be promoted, as a minimum of social mobility is necessary to provide 'incentives'. But as a junior manager he becomes a mechanism for transmitting decisions in the making of which he had no part. Although he is now one step up in the bureaucratic pyramid, he has no more real autonomy than those below him. The contradiction is made the more ridiculous in that his whole training and education have led him to believe that he is paid to think. He is lucky if the confrontation with reality only results in cynicism. For some it can be disastrous.

For the scientific worker whose work is neither technology nor pure research the conflict is even sharper. The paradox comes in that he is paid to think - but only in a certain way, only along narrow lines defined by the immediate needs of the industry or state department in which he is employed. Although he wishes to think on a much broader front and follow his own ideas, he is restricted by an administrative apparatus which is totally unresponsive to his wishes, does not understand his motives and is concerned only with a product, or a particular set of results, not related to the pursuit of knowledge, but to the pursuit of profit or of power.

His agony is heightened by the fact that he probably regards himself primarily as a scientist. For him research and the pursuit of knowledge take precedent over profits and products. More often than not he will

have replied to an advertisement for a 'Research Scientist' (a good advertising line!). He will have been bullied up at the interview with a glossy picture of freedom to publish results (which he will never be free to obtain) and with offers of a 'flexible' research programme (which turns out to be flexible only from the top). He soon finds his work subjected to the control of administrative and 'sales' departments who are incapable of understanding his work or his motives.

'The scientific community places a very high value on its freedom from outside control, and on the autonomy of the individual scientist. The ideal form of professional control is advice and consultation among colleagues, leaving the final responsibility for professional judgment to the individual. This procedure is subject to considerable pressure from the organization. For the characteristic mode of organizational control is a structure of authority in which orders are given by superordinates to subordinates.' *

A classical example occurred to a chemist colleague of mine. He was provided with a number of samples of a commercial product and asked to make certain tests after storage for three months under various climatic conditions. After one month, he had a letter from the sales department asking why he had not sent in his results!

Many workers in this fringe group are employed by the state. Their work is often 'pure research', but in fields and along lines chosen because of their potential military or long term industrial significance. Much of this work is worthy of publication. But research workers in many government projects and in some industrial establishments are completely restricted here. The 'Official Secret' (or its industrial equivalent) rears its ugly head. Silence is enforced. There will be no publication in learned journals, no free discussion at conferences or symposia. Little can be more frustrating than to read papers on one's own subject being published by other workers, whilst one's own personal contributions are censored by some pin-striped bureaucrat in Whitehall.

THE PRESSURE OF IDEOLOGY

It is part of the mythology of the 'left' that all these problems spring from the private ownership of the means of production and that nationalisation and 'planning' will somehow eliminate them. Let us look at this claim a little more closely.

We have little accurate information concerning the situation facing scientists in Russia. But in view of the obvious similarities in the lives of industrial workers both East and West - similarities which we have

* W. Kornhauser, *ibid.* p.34.

repeatedly pointed out - we may surmise that many of the other strains felt in the West are also experienced in the countries of total bureaucratic capitalism. Managerial drives to raise the norms, to increase productivity, to set ever higher targets and the constant pressure for technical 'advancement' must be much the same as they are here. The effects on workers and technologists must be very similar. However, the pure research worker, and in particular the theoretical academic, is subjected to a new kind of pressure, which is only applied to a very limited degree and in an indirect way in the West. This is the pressure of ideology.

Science is not just about how to make technological changes. It is about life, nature and knowledge. As such it is closely related to - indeed an integral part - of philosophy. In the past science has constantly come into conflict with the prevailing ideologies. During the Dark Ages science was reduced to alchemy and witchcraft, because truth was held at a premium by a small ruling class who claimed to be the source of all knowledge, a knowledge which was to be found in books, not in the experience of real life. More recently the theory of evolution had to battle against religious bigotry. The science of genetics was perverted by Nazi ideology. In Russia theoretical organic chemistry recently collided head-on with Marxist theory.

In 1950 the journal 'Uspekhi Khimii' (Progress of Chemistry) * carried a report ** on the present state of the theories of chemical structure. Although disguised as a report it was little more than a polemic against one theory - the theory of resonance (see below) - and a personal attack on two Soviet scientists who had favoured this theory.

It is worth digressing a little at this point to say something about this theory. Why did it clash with Marxist scientific teachings? Why was it necessary for a 'correct' line to be introduced, together with a pep-talk about the struggle to build 'Communism'?

The theory is one concerning chemical structure. It is recognised by many chemists as useful, but limited. There are many points on which there can be genuine scientific doubt, but the theory has certainly done much to further understanding in the field of chemical theory. The basic feature of the theory, and the point at which it clashes with Marxist teaching, is best described by a quotation from G.W. Wheland: ***

'..... resonance is a man-made concept in a more fundamental sense than most other physical theories. It does not correspond to any intrinsic property of the molecule itself, but instead it is only a mathematical device deliberately invented by the physicist or chemist for his own convenience'.

* Uspekhi Khimii (1950) 19, 529-44. Translation in 'The Journal of Chemical Education' (1952) 29, 2-14.

** Report of the Commission of the Institute of Organic Chemistry of the Academy of Sciences, USSR, for the investigation of the present state of the theory of chemical structure: approved for publication by the Scientific Council of the Institute of Organic Chemistry of the Academy of Sciences, USSR. Translated by I.S. Bengelsdorf, J. Che. Ed. (1952) 29, 2-14.

*** G.W. Wheland, 'Theory of Resonance and its application to Organic Chemistry', 1944.

The clash with Marxist dogma becomes obvious. Let us look at Lenin, on the subject of the development of science:

'Reactionary aspirations are being bred by the progress of science itself. The wide advance of the natural sciences, the approach to uniform and simple elements of matter, the laws of motion which can be mathematically treated produce the oblivion of matter by mathematicians. "Matter disappears", equations alone remain. At this new stage of development, and in a quasi-novel fashion there occurs the old Kantian idea that the mind orders the laws of nature.' (Works, vol.14, p.294, 4th ed.).

As to the 'attack' itself, the jargon and the polemic speak for themselves:

'The decisions of the Central Committee of V.K.P.(B)* in regard to ideological problems and the sessions of the VASKLNIL ** have mobilized Soviet scientists for the solution of the problem of a critical analysis of the present state of theoretical concepts in all fields of knowledge and the struggle against the alien reactionary ideas of bourgeois science.

'The crisis of bourgeois science (connected with the general crisis of the capitalist system) has manifested itself in the theoretical concepts of organic chemistry now being developed by bourgeois scientists. These have led to the appearance of methodologically faulty concepts, which are slowing down further scientific development'.

This is followed by the usual pep-talk:

'In theoretical organic chemistry the problem before Soviet chemists is to generalise the voluminous experience gained by Soviet organic chemical industry and all those branches of industry served by organic chemistry, and to use the results obtained by the theory in every way which may help to solve the practical problems in the establishment of Communism in our country.

There is no doubt that Soviet chemists educated in the great traditions of the Russian chemical science founded by Lomonosov, Butlerov, Mendeleev, armed with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and guided by the great party of Lenin-Stalin, will successfully attain the objectives before them'. ***

It is interesting to contrast this outlook with that of a dissident Communist, who had the courage to speak his mind and for his troubles now languishes in the gaols of the Yugoslav 'Workers' State':

* All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)

** All-Union Lenin Academy of Agricultural Sciences.

*** What's the Russian for Bollocks?

'What can the unfortunate physicists do', Djilas * writes, 'if atoms do not behave according to the Hegelian-Marxist struggle.....? What of the astronomers, if the cosmos is apathetic to Communist dialectics? What of the biologists, if plants do not behave according to the Lysenko-Stalinist theory on harmony and cooperation of classes in a "socialist" society? Because it is not possible for these scientists to lie naturally, they must suffer the consequences of their "heresies". To have their discoveries accepted they must make discoveries "confirming" the formulas of Marxism-Leninism. Scientists are in a constant dilemma as to whether their ideas and discoveries will injure official dogma. They are therefore forced into opportunism and compromises with regard to science.'

At about the same time as the 1950 'report' was published, another article appeared in 'Voprosi Filosofii' (Problems of Philosophy). ** It was written by V.M. Tatevskii and M.I. Shakhparanov and combined further polemical attacks on the theory of resonance in general (which it termed 'machistic') and on Syrkin and Dyatkina in particular. The article justified the actions of the state in terms which clearly demonstrate the features common to all class societies:

'Soviet society has the right to require a party approach to the exposition of scientific problems from our publishers and from our authors - who are Soviet scientists. This exposition must fully indicate from the point of view of Soviet patriotism the role of Soviet scientists in the elaboration of these or other scientific problems.'

Further to this:

'There is no doubt that progressive Soviet chemistry by maintaining the glorious tradition of the great Russian chemists, Lomonosov, Mendeleev, Butlerov and Markovnikov, and by leaning on the only scientific world outlook (the world outlook of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin), by discarding and exposing the pseudo-scientific theories of bourgeois scientists, will attain, in the near future, new progress in the development of a theory of chemical structure and in the solution of the most important problems of theoretical chemistry'.

It is a mystery how Russian scientists have managed to work at all under such a cloak of oppression. It is worth noting that in fact they have not contributed much to the developing theories of chemistry. Their real contributions have been almost entirely in the field of technology and of experimentation.

* Milovan Djilas 'The New Class' (1957), p. 30.

** Voprosi Filosofii (1949), 3, 176.

THE REACTION

How are scientists reacting to this situation? Let's be realistic. There is no revolution of scientific workers on the horizon - or even well over it. And by itself such a revolution would be meaningless. What does exist among scientists is a gradual development of a consciousness concerning the conflict between professional aspirations and the demands of class society. More than this, there is a growing concern at the abuse of scientific knowledge, and at the misuse of scientific manpower. Not so long ago most scientists would have agreed that they were not responsible for the use to which knowledge was put. Now that their work includes making H-bombs at Aldermaston or cultivating plague germs at Porton Down many are realising that this attitude is no longer valid. It could once be said that if men refused to fight there would be no wars. The situation is gradually changing. A situation might sooner or later arrive where in fact politicians and small military cliques could fight a war out, needing only the aid of a few scientists to provide the weapons. As scientific workers realise this, they tend to become more conscious of their power. Some are even becoming conscious of their responsibilities.

The form this consciousness is taking is as yet by no means revolutionary. But it is appearing for the first time amongst a group of workers who might justly be accused of having shown terrible irresponsibility towards humanity in the past. Pugwash conferences and advertisements in the 'New Scientist' will not stop the exploitation of science any more than works conferences will stop the exploitation of labour. They may however increase the awareness of other scientists. But they show that scientists are increasingly beginning to discuss the nature of the contradictions which surround them (a necessary precursor to acting against them).

Contributing to this tendency are a number of recently published books. In this country a new journal has also been launched - 'Minerva - A review of Learning, Science and Policy'. Let us say straight away that this is a bourgeois journal offering bourgeois solutions. Compromise between managerial pressure and professional aspiration is offered as a solution - not control from below. In reality only management will gain by this. But even if the solutions offered do not basically challenge the social institutions from which the whole problem is really derived, real problems are being discussed, and this for the first time. It is worth quoting from the editorial of the first issue, to demonstrate what ideas are gradually growing in the minds of scientific workers:

'The claims of society must always be examined with regard to their impact on the primary aims of science and scholarship, which are the attainment of truth. ... The claims of government must be examined to see whether they really are conducive to the welfare and progress of society. Scientists and scholars must not allow their judgment to be dominated by the thought of the public honour or material advantage which comes from service of their earthly rulers. ... The politics which have been a bother and distraction to scientists ... are the politics of

national prestige and partisan advantage, the politics of demagogy and of ideology.....'

The wording may be pompous, but the feeling is genuine. Such commentaries and the demands which will grow from them are clearly not revolutionary. But that is not to say that they should be discarded and written off as mere bourgeois protests, incapable of making any contribution to the revolutionary movement. To do so would be to write off the beginnings, the blind fumbblings of a movement of great potential. An examination of 'the claims of government' might lead a good many people to a point well beyond mere 'bother and distraction'. It might lead them fundamentally to challenge the values and the whole structure of class society.

The only hope for any real revolutionary struggle is that it should spring from the experience and consciousness of those involved. Whatever social form human society takes on, it will be a society based on an advanced technique. It is for workers themselves (including the scientific workers) to make sure that it is a society in which humans dominate machines, and not a society in which machines dominate men, and men dominate each other. In a free society, man can never be relegated to the role of a mechanised appendage of a power and profit making contraption. In the struggle for a free and humane society in which workers are masters of their own fate and of their own lives, both in production and out of it, scientists and technologists hold an important position. Their struggles - however small - to retain and improve their freedom are the concern of all revolutionaries.

Edwin Barry.

TAME DRAGONS AT THE GEORGE

On Saturday, July 13, seven of us (vaguely Lambeth YCND) witnessed a rather sad episode in the life of Lambeth Trades Council (TUC affiliated).

We had been told (via Brixton YS) that the Trades Council were organizing a 'sit-in' at 'The George', a public house in Railton Road,* where the publican refuses to serve coloured people in the saloon bar.

When we arrived we noticed that of the 20 odd people waiting outside the pub, less than half a dozen were members of the Lambeth Trades Council. The others were mainly members of Norwood and Brixton YS. The newly elected Labour Councillor for the Effra ward was also there.

* This is geographically in Brixton, but electorally in Norwood, which is narrowly held by the Conservatives. A massive coloured vote for Labour in Norwood could tip the balance. So forwards for Civil Rights!

We were asked to join a 'picket line' outside the pub, and were given posters to hold, although the slogans on most of them were hardly relevant to the real issue: equal rights in the saloon bar now. One of us objected to holding the poster given to him which said: 'Coloured and white unite to fight the Tories'. He claimed that if one must have slogans of this kind it should be 'to fight Capitalism', and not just 'the Tories'. 'Don't you realise' we were told, 'that the Tories support the employers and financiers?'. We pointed out that the Labour Party did too. 'Ah,' the young Trot explained, 'but you see they are not supposed to'. This makes it hardly necessary for me to tell you which school of thought most supporters of the Lambeth Trades Council belong to.

Two leaflets were now being distributed to the would-be 'sit-in-ers' and to people passing by. In these leaflets there was no mention of a sit-in. Instead there was a plea to 'join us in a deputation'. The leaflets described how Lambeth unemployment and housing problems had caused racialism to appear. They then offered the miracle cure: 'Put in a Labour government pledged to a socialist policy'!

It was now 6.0 p.m., half an hour after the sit-in was due to start. Someone asked why we were waiting. She was told that someone from 'The People' was coming and we just had to wait. Meanwhile four of our group nipped into the private bar for a quick one. We were denounced for 'splitting the working class and aiding the Tories'.

At 6.15 p.m. about 40 of us, including the representative of 'The People', finally entered the saloon bar. The landlord said he was not serving any of us. He was not going to be intimidated by threatening letters received from the Lambeth Trades Council (TUC affiliated). The forty of us - including about 10 West Indians - then proceeded to occupy almost every seat in the place.

The Lambeth Trades Council 'leaders' then proceeded to argue with the publican. A Jack Warner type policeman then came in and informed us that the only thing there was to do, if we felt strongly on the matter, was to oppose the publican's licence, when it came up for renewal. At this stage three crop-haired yobs appeared in a squad car. This proved the turning point in the revolutionary tide.

The leadership of the Lambeth Trades Council (TUC affiliated) decided to make an announcement. It went something like this. 'Comrades, we have reached the end of the first round of our struggle against racialism. We will now leave and go round the corner and hold a meeting to discuss further action'. A number of us, including several of the West Indians, did not want to leave. We felt the action was just starting. But the disciplined majority obeyed the leadership. The ranks having been broken, and not wishing to be arrested as members of the Lambeth Trades Council, we left, in disgust.

Our main objection to what happened was that we had been tricked into going to the pub. We expected action. If we'd been told it was to be just a deputation we wouldn't have gone. We could not really complain about the Lambeth Trades Council's remedy for racialism. We had heard it all before, many, many times.

'The People', surprisingly enough, gave an accurate account of the whole incident. The 'South London Advertiser' and the 'South London Press' gave false accounts, only publishing the publican's views. The mid-week issue of the 'South London Press' (July 23) quoted the publican as saying that there would be bloodshed if the Lambeth Trades Council (TUC affiliated) did not stop making trouble. The paper also printed a rambling attack on the Lambeth Trades Council, hinting it was a subversive and revolutionary organization. This is of course quite inaccurate.

John. Bell.

BIG JOE

It is ten years since Big Joe died. Some people think his pals did him in; others that his big heart just bust. We may never know the truth. But history has recorded his cherished last words :
'Don't cry for me; go out and terrorize!'

I dreamed I saw Big Joe last night
Alive as you and me.
Says I, 'But Joe, you're ten years dead.'
'I never died,' says he. (twice)

'In Moscow, Joe, by God,' says I,
'They killed you in your bed.'
'They framed you at that Congress, Joe,'
Says Joe, 'But I ain't dead.' (twice)

'Big Joe ain't dead,' he says to me,
'Big Joe ain't never died.'
'Where bureaucrats drive Cadillacs,
'Big Joe is at their side.' (twice)

And standing there as big as life
And smiling with his eyes,
Joe says, 'What I forgot to kill
'Went on to terrorize.' (twice)

'From Brest-Litovsk to Vladivostok
'In every mine and mill,
'Big Joe's old buddies run the show,
'So I'm the Leader still.' (twice)

REVIEW

PAINTING THE LEOPARD'S SPOTS

Perhaps one of the most important effects of Spies for Peace and Aldermarch 1963 has been to bring to the boil the widespread lack of confidence in the CND leadership. This has shown itself in many ways. One of the most fascinating has been the growth of a Loyal Opposition.

This group - consisting of people like Stuart Hall of 'Steps Towards Peace', David Boulton of 'Sanity', Nigel Young of London Region CND, and the ubiquitous George Clarke - has been meeting for some months in the Russell Hotel. * At an extended meeting of the National Council of CND, held on July 13 and 14, the group presented a 19-page document called 'The Politics of the Nuclear Disarmament Movement'.

The document represents an important move in the struggle for power in CND. But it also shows a number of significant and welcome trends. It recognizes CND as an 'umbrella' movement containing people with different strategies and philosophies: it believes in what it calls 'constructive fragmentation'. It believes the role of Carthusian Street should be to 'serve and equip groups and individuals to put into play the strategy of their choice' (their emphasis). It calls for the 'Chairman's office to be limited to one year at a time', and for 'the present organization at Carthusian Street to be radically changed'.

All this is admirable. But some of the remedies are more suspect. Annual Conference should 'discuss three or four of the most critical issues that face the movement'. 'The right of every group to submit a resolution and amendment should be modified.' The Standing Orders Committee 'should be charged with the task of ensuring the choice'. 'The outline' (for special projects) should be 'defined by the Center: its detailed application and modification is the responsibility of the local group'.

The Russell Hotel Manifesto did not make the National Council boil over. Two days of woolly discussion decided little. The manoeuvres go on behind the scenes, and the CND Conference this autumn will probably only have to rubber-stamp a palace revolution. The new leadership will be an improvement on the present one: the real point however lies not in reforming various bureaucracies, but in making them redundant. How many of the local groups who reprinted Spies for Peace got the approval of the Labour Party hacks on their local CND Executives? They were too busy either dissociating themselves from it or passing resolutions expressing more or less critical support.

Jon Tinker.

* No, not the HQ of the Russell Secretariat!

WILL WE ALL GO TOGETHER WHEN WE GO ?

I used to think nuclear war had one advantage over conventional war: the people who started it got killed just as surely as their working-class cannon fodder. But, according to research conducted by the U.S. Office of Civil Defence, it seems that the H-bomb is as class-biased as any bomb of World War II. It respects the lives of Top People.

I worked for four months in an American University Research Center studying 'post nuclear attack demography' for the government. For every possible pattern of nuclear attack, we would be given the number expected to be killed in each area. We would then check this against the U.S. Census figures on race, occupation, age, religion, political opinions, tolerance of communism, Atheism, non-conformity, etc, for the area. We fed the data into an electronic computer, and up would come the probable social characteristics of the surviving population.

American cities are, of course, segregated by class and race. If you are Negro, working class, Roman Catholic, or of recent immigrant stock, you tend to live near the center of the city. If you are white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant and upper class, you are likely to live in the 'exurbs' - semi-rural settlements as far as 50 miles from the center. The middle classes, true to form, live in between, in the suburbs.

Farmers of course, are safest of all. But the American 'family farm' was wiped out long ago. The few farmers remaining are prosperous businessmen who hire seasonal labour.

Many of these farm labourers live in cities when they're not working.

I thought I saw a bright spot in the unusually low survival rates for Washington, D.C. A day-time attack would catch all the bureaucrats in their offices (day time attacks are more egalitarian, because they get the upper classes in their offices rather than their homes). But there are two things to remember about Washington, D.C. First, its Negro population is about 55 per cent (our rulers need a lot of servants). Second, it is the only place with deep blast (not fall-out) shelters, underneath buildings like the Pentagon. Foiled again! The day after a nuclear attack, then, the bureaucrats would be 'safely' holed up either hundreds of feet below the Pentagon and White House, or, if it was a night-time attack, on their Virginia estates. With a year's supply of tinned food.

Safest of all of course would be the files and records. All important government records (and most trivial ones) are duplicated and stored in blast-proof shelters in the Virginia hills, far from Washington, D.C. Moreover, all bank records everywhere in the country are similarly duplicated and stored. So while you're floating 40,000 feet over the Atlantic as a radio-active dust cloud, they will know you owe \$50 in taxes and \$500 in hire-purchase, with \$5 in the bank to take care of it.

More important than the study are the studiers. I never met the people in Washington who filed our results in duplicate (one copy for the waste-basket and one for the blast shelter

in Virginia). But we six in the California Research Center all considered our job a patriotic duty: wasting government money helps stimulate the economy, you know. If someone came in fifteen minutes late, he was frowned upon as a slacker. Half an hour late was about right; being an hour late made you a hero of labour. In ways big and small we did our bit to avoid recession. Once we spent an entire day (48 man-hours) arranging to buy an unnecessary electric typewriter. And we took home paper clips whenever steel production dropped.

How did we feel about the exact nature of our work? Political consciousness in our office was high. Everyone was at the very least some sort of peacenik. Yet none of us felt guilt about our part in war preparations. Some rationalized that we were syphoning defence department money away from directly destructive weapon development into merely useless projects. Others felt that some of our startling findings might shock people into seeking peace. (Alas, the fact that an attack killing about 20% of the protestants would also kill 35% of the catholics and wipe out over 50% of the jews would only encourage our generals!). But we all felt wasted: our brains and our hands were simply rented out. We worked all day (albeit sluggishly) without ever making anything that anyone wanted or needed.

We knew, of course, that we were not doing any harm. But we worried about the people in Washington. Did they take this stuff seriously? Or were they just helping avoid recession, like us? Perhaps there was a man in Washington whose sole job was to think up new projects. If they took it seriously, the implications were ominous. The questions they asked were aimed, crudely to be sure, at techniques of manipulating and dominating the surviving population. Only two of their factors - age and sex - were directly concerned with reconstruction work. All the rest were concerned with social background and political attitudes. They were in effect doing post-attack Gallup Polls.

Our rulers have learned to control the American population through a century-long process of trial and error. They know their public-relations techniques will be disrupted by nuclear war. But they apparently think they will be able to adjust to the new situation. When the first politician crawls out of his blast shelter and grasps a microphone, will he 'call on the peoples of the world to live in brotherhood now that the totalitarian threat has at last been overcome'? Or will he declare: 'Ma fellow citizens, now that the niggers are out of the way, we can really get to work again to rebuild our great nation'. Post-nuclear demography may help him decide.

BARBARA GARSON.

CAPITALISM IS THE ACCUMULATION OF JUNK.

STATE-CAPITALISM IS STATE-SPONSORED ACCUMULATION OF JUNK,
ON A MORE EVEN LEVEL...

THE WORLD IS DIVIDED INTO TWO GREAT JUNK YARDS

CLANK ! CLANK !