

'Build for Peace' March

WEST MIDLANDS REGIONAL CND asked Birmingham Anarchist Group to give support to the two-day industrial 'Build For Peace' March held on Sat./Sun., September 18/19. The CND were worried about a probable lack of support due to the unfortunate 'failure' of the National CND HQ to put details in either of the last two Newsletters and the refusal of London Regional CND to put a coach on unless West Midlands paid the cost. Also there had been murmurs about strong, banner carrying, turnouts from the local CP and YCL.

The Anarchist Group felt it was necessary to make clear to the worker the relevance of defence production, of whatever type, to the warfare state and future world peace, and the need to take action at the local level and at the shop floor to prevent war production and not to merely rely on Governments and trade union leadership. In order to make the anarchist position crystal clear, fifteen hundred copies of a special leaflet were produced. One section of this leaflet was specifically aimed at one firm, Rubery-Owens, which had recently threatened, through the works paper, 'Owen News' to sack anyone associating with an unspecified anti-British organisation, namely CND, or protesting about Apartheid (someone had dared to put CND signs and Anti-Apartheid slogans on crates for South Africa).

A general circular was sent around all the groups in the AFB and SWF and other 'known militants' in, or supporters of, the Committee and other libertarian groups. It brought donations of £2 2s, and one comrade from Manchester, so much about the crying need for an anarchist federation. Birmingham Group, and the newly formed—Stoke Libertarian Group went it alone.

On the first day, the demo was to march from Wolverhampton to Dudley via Walsall. The technique we adopted was to keep the bare minimum on the march, with the banner, changing these as often as convenient, while the rest went ahead of the march to each centre of urban population, well before the march, and staying there during, and after, the march passed. By this means we effectively leafleted and sold our papers, giving the march a greater impetus and overall effect than a mere march through would have done. We did this at Bilston, Darlestone Green, Walsall, Wednesbury, Tipton and Dudley (though the latter two had little effect due to the time of day). At Darlestone Green we made an especial effort, picketing the three main gates of the Rubery-Owens factory and leafletting the shift as it came off at 12 o'clock. The workers seemed pleased at our action and many even stopped their cars and lorries to receive copies of our leaflets, especially when we told them it was a reply to the obviously hated 'Owen News'.

On the second day, part of the group went direct to West Bromwich and the rest joined the march at Dudley. By

this means we lost none of our potential effect while walking past large areas of industrial wasteland. In West Bromwich these swelled our ranks for the march into Birmingham. By then we were practically out of leaflets and papers anyhow, even selling old copies of ANARCHY.

As far as the general public were concerned, we were well received and very few refused pamphlets and many copies of periodicals were sold including 2 doz. *Solidarity*, 2 doz. *Resistance*, 1 doz. *DA*, 1 doz. *PN*, a score of *DA* Pamphlets, some fifty odd LAG Pamphlets ('Six Essays by Modern Masters'), and 1 doz. ANARCHY back numbers unfortunately 4 doz. FREEDOM and 2 doz. *DAs* did not arrive on time). Amongst the marchers there were the occasional sarcastic comments about us riding in cars, from those who forgot that this kind of demo has a distinct purpose other than a personal endurance test. There were also a few objections from those who organised the *Sanity* sales who accused us of using 'their' march to sell 'our' literature, though no one could answer the simple question 'When did *Sanity* ever give the anarchist viewpoint fair play?' These, however, made little objection to members of the CP or YCL selling the *Daily Worker* or *Challenge*, or the frequent communist slogan shouting. However, this happens at every CND demo, but on the whole most CNDers were very pleased with our effort, especially as we had troubled to produce a special pamphlet. Even the CP seemed pleased at our attack on Rubery-Owens.

What have we learned from this? That a little planning and forethought are necessary before each venture. That a specific pamphlet should be produced, if possible, with a strong local bias. The personal touch is also necessary and therefore those selling or giving out leaflets should not necessarily be too closely timed to the main demo. Further, the presence of a car or two will vastly increase the mobility and potential of both leafletters and sellers and enable a very wide area to be covered in a very short time, whilst enabling those at the main meeting or demo to be relieved and rejuvenate themselves by doing a different task. The focal point can therefore still be maintained and a dozen people can have the potential and effect of a hundred.

The specific results of this venture are still difficult to assess, except in group morale which is now very high. As a CND demo it had very little apparent effect, as, due probably to the reasons given already, it got very little support from outside the Midlands, though in many ways it was more important and specific than an Easter March. As an anarchist demonstration, working through a co-ordinating body, it worked quite effectively, though as I have said we did hope that other groups would join us and the response was pitiful, many did not even reply to say they were not coming—it would be interesting to know why! The pamphlet tried to get people to ask more questions, especially about what their firm was producing, what it was for and where it was going. Even if all we have done is to get people to think a little more and to discuss peace and anarchist ideas, we have begun to put another nail into the capitalist's coffin—for this we shall be satisfied, for the moment. Sufficient to say that one more YCND Group is thinking of forming themselves into an anarchist group, and another person has asked for more details about anarchism, even these were more than we expected.

PETER NEVILLE.

Don't blame the BBC!

NOBODY REALLY LIKES criticism, but most of us have to put up with it because there is nothing we can do about it. Governments are different; they have the power to suppress it. Democratic governments do it democratically—i.e., with kid gloves—totalitarian governments do it despotically—i.e., with the iron fist and no nonsense.

By and large, one can gauge the strength of a government by the amount of criticism it allows. The weak and fearful state allows no breath of criticism, hoping that its suppression will be mistaken for strength. The government broadly based on the acquiescence of the people will allow considerable amounts of opposition within the limits of ineffectiveness and according to the needs of the moment.

Just before the last election, the satirical TV programme TW3 was suspended because it was thought that its continuance right up to the election would be harmful particularly to the Conservatives who, as the Government, were naturally the target for most of the satire. Since the Labour Party has become the Government they have naturally replaced the Tories at the target position, but such is their slender majority that they have shown themselves particularly sensitive to any kind of criticism or ridicule.

This has now come to a head following TV coverage of the Labour Party Conference, and one can sense the weakness of the Government by the bleating that has gone up over what they are calling the 'slanting' of BBC interviews with various ministers and delegates to the Conference.

What in fact must have happened is that in some way the Conference must have gone sour on the Government. According to the voting, and the results on paper, Mr. Wilson should be feeling very pleased with

himself. The so-called 'controversial' issues before the Conference were all carried by the platform. The Government's policy on immigration, on wages-prices control, and its lack of policy on steel nationalisation—all of which raised some heat at Blackpool (but not enough to scorch the pants off any Minister)—were all weathered by the Executive with comfortable voting majorities.

And the bulk of the TV coverage was in fact straight reporting illustrated by news-reel shots of speakers at the microphone. It was not until the evening of each day (true, the peak watching time) that speakers were brought to the television studios for interviewing by the sharp boys, like Robin Day, for personal grilling before the cameras.

It was one such interview between Robin Day and George Brown, where the interviewer probed away at what were the powers Brown was seeking to back up his National Plan in the event of the 'voluntary' principle failing, that has upset the Government. Another point of complaint is that a 'Left-wing' critic of the incomes policy (Clive Jenkins) was allowed to air his opposition views before the cameras.

Now what in fact is the Government complaining about? The chief points from all the main speeches from the platform were televised direct. The Ministers put their cases not only to Conference but to the whole nation. Highlights of opposition speeches were also shown direct from the Conference hall. They can't complain about that, surely?

As far as studio interviews were

concerned—what did the Executive want? Did they want just another opportunity to present their case without question? Did they want to be accepted as right because they are Ministers and because they had the block vote victories of the Conference hall under their belts? What leaders of all parties must realise is that they have plenty of opportunities to present their cases without interruption or heckling in their party political broadcasts and in the general run of interviews. And they get so used to this feather-bedding that when they come down to having to face a hostile audience—even of their own infuriated supporters—and to have to argue their case before the public, they resent it if they do not get across as they would wish. But whose fault is that?

Now we may have all sorts of opinions about the sinister nature of television as a mass medium, as an advertising force, as a persuader, as a purveyor of tripe reducing us all to telly-jelly and all the rest of it. But there is one great public service that it does provide; it enables us to see for ourselves in close-up, just what our statesmen are like.

The crafty sideways glance, the lip-licking nervousness, the evasive answer, the pompous cliché, the rigid neck, the stiff upper lip, the rotten teeth, the ambition, the ruthlessness, the dead eyes, the ill-concealed dishonesty, the hunger for power and the smug determination to hang on to it—all, all are there, plain to see in our own homes.

Who could trust Wilson or Brown, Gunter or Bacon, after their performances last week? We will not go so far as to say that the camera cannot lie, but if our Government has come over as a bunch of shoddy tricksters then they should not blame the BBC, for this time the image is exactly right. P.S.

THE LEADER DOES IT AGAIN!

HE'S DONE IT AGAIN! It doesn't matter much who he is for he changes every so often: Ramsey Mac, Clem Attlee, Hugh Gaitskell, and now Harold (once the darling boy of the left). A little taste of power (usually just becoming leader of the party is enough) has shown him to be responsible and in fact to be the darling boy of the capitalists.

But then it's so easy with the Labour Party. You just turn up to face your left wing enemies (who were once your friends) who have charges against you of racialism, warmongering, strike-breaking and even of behaving like a dictator; you make a speech where you threaten all and sundry, talk about 'them' (meaning the Tories), say that one Labour reserve is worth two front bench members of any other party; point to the bad old days under farmer Jones (no wonder they hate George Orwell) and the silly bastards will rise to give you a hearty cheer, completely forgetting that you represent everything that they've spent their whole lives fighting against; that you are in fact, more 'tory' than the Tories.

VIETNAM DAY

THERE APPEARED in FREEDOM a request from the Berkeley students for us to take part in two days of international protest against the war in Vietnam. (FREEDOM, 14.8.65.) This request has gone round the world and support for this demonstration of solidarity has been received from Canada, France and Japan. Now there is news, that the London Committee of 100 is to make a major effort on October 16-17. Their plans are very ambitious and could make all the difference to the state of the peace movement. Details are as follows: Trafalgar Square Rally (October 16, 4.30 p.m.), then, at sunset, procession to US Embassy where there will be a 36-hour vigil. On Sunday, at 6 p.m., there will be a public assembly in Grosvenor Square. Further details will be announced in FREEDOM next week.

OVER AND OVER AGAIN

It happens at every single Labour Party conference, and if something should go wrong (like the decision against nuclear weapons) you just ignore it and wait till next time, when this or that clown can get up and wave a piece of paper saying that he represents so many million workers, and change it back again.

One feels very sad at this constant repetition and wonders why the 'socialists' will stay in the Labour Party. I know they stay to 'bore from within', but they never convert the leadership and if they become leaders themselves are reduced to impotency as George Lansbury was.

WHY IS THIS?

The answer to it all lies in the fact that you cannot change things from the top. It has to be done from the bottom. When the people want 'Socialism' we shall have it, but not before.

I for one certainly think that socialism (by this I mean a society where all the means of production and distribution are held in common, under the direct control of the people through producers

and consumers co-operatives so that the wealth of that society is shared by all men) is a thing that is worthwhile achieving, but how many people are in the Labour Party to achieve this?

This writer thinks that the answer to that one must be very few. Certainly not the right wing types; the Wyatts and Co., with their diming with duchesses and hobnobbing with hoo-rays; certainly not the SLL with its dreams of the gutters running with Wilson's blood when 'the masses' rise in revolt, comrade (no doubt under the leadership of Mr. Gerald Healy). These good folk see the people as 'masses' and therefore don't see them at all. They are not behind the times, indeed they have never been with the times for they believe that we must find a strong 'socialist leadership'. This idea compared with anarchism is wildly utopian, and the reason? Human nature, friends, the 'historical process' that one sees over and over, is that he who was left, becomes right. Scientific fact is based on experiment, if you get the same result again and again it becomes fact, but these scientific socialists will not see this, or perhaps cannot see it. They prefer to go on and on and on, endlessly attempting to seduce the rank and file, hoping that one day a miracle will happen.

NATIONALISATION

What of the others, however, who are in the party to make the world a better place? One woman at the conference this year said that: 'They all agreed that nationalisation by itself was not socialism. One of the objectives was to see workers participating in management.' But she warned it was important to recognise that this was not easy.

It is certainly not easy, especially when one remembers that Herbert Morrison was one who talked the workers in the transport industry out of trying to get a share of management.

The left wing of the party sees nationalisation as a 'holy cow'; they will never surrender on this issue in spite of the fact that it has nothing whatever to do with the achievement of a socialist society. After all the tobacco industry

Continued on page 3

ANARCHY 56

WOMAN IN A MAN'S WORLD

ANARCHY is Published by Freedom Press at 2s. on the first Saturday of every month

Turriff's Lock-out must be defeated

THE BIGGEST DISPUTE in the building industry, since the one at the Shell Centre on the South Bank, is now taking place in London on the Barbican Development Centre and involves the basic rights of all trade unionists, the right to strike and to organise.

Ever since this huge development scheme started, trade unionists have met with considerable opposition from the managements in their efforts to organise the site and Turriffs have been no exception to this. The present dispute was a result of some carpenters being unable to produce tickets at a number of TU ticket inspections. These 'nons' work for small 'labour only' sub-contractors and the rest of the 'chippies' decided that they would not work with them until they joined the union and so came out on strike. Turriffs sacked these strikers the same day and rest of the 380 unionists on the job came out in sympathy. These in turn were sacked by the management and so a general lock-out of organised trade unionists began.

Contact Column

Meetings. 13 Prince of Wales Terrace, Kensington, W.8, 7-9 p.m. Thursday, October 14: 'Sexual Freedom for the Young'. Thursday, October 21: 'Community Living in London'. Friday, October 29: 'Forming "intentional" families'.

Minus One. Individualist anarchist review. No. 10 now ready at Freedom Bookshop. Price 6d. or 9d. post-free from S. E. Parker, 2 Orsett Terrace, London, W.2.

Harlow Demo. For Peace and Disarmament. YCND Assemble 10.30 a.m. Epping Church. 11 a.m. March to Harlow. Re-assemble 2 p.m. Town Hall Square for Public Meeting.

Federation Mujeres Libres Lecture. 'Energy and Human Progress.' Juan P. Fabregas. Sunday, October 10, 3.30 p.m. Royal Hotel, Woburn Place, W.C.1 (in Spanish).

FML Spanish Lessons commence Wednesday, October 13 at 6.30 p.m. till 8 p.m. at 159 Ledbury Road, W.11

Furnished Room to let, £3 per week, at Balham. Must be reasonably quiet person. Otherwise no restrictions. Phone evenings after 5. Sam Cash, KEL 2436.

Chris Holmes, London. Birmingham Group would like to hear from you. Write Geoff Charlton, 9 Pembroke Road, Birmingham, 12.

To Aid Dave Cunliffe. Poetry Reading Saturday, October 16. Live poets. Free admission. Collection, 7 till 10.30 p.m. Basement of 75A Ladbroke Grove, W.11.

Cuddon's Cosmopolitan Review. September issue now out, 9d. The least-read literary review — stories, satire, poetry, etc. (Writers and artists might like to look at it and possibly contribute to making it less read).

New Poster
War Waste Want Why?
Politics!
34d. each plus postage. Orders to Bill Sticker, c/o 17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.

Youth Against War in Vietnam. Glasgow YCND March, Saturday, October 16. Contact Alan Sinclair, Flat 3a, 39 Mallaig Road, Glasgow, S.W.1. GOV 3995.

New Zealand Federation of Anarchists. First Annual Congress, December 26 to January 6. Enquiries Box 5455, Auckland CI, NZ.

Vietnam Posters. 'Who Loses in Vietnam—Always the People'. 4d. each. 30/- per 100. Orders to Freedom Press.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

Turriffs, in claiming that the strikers were in breach of agreement under the Contracts of Employment Act, have used this Act, which was supposed to bring benefits to employees, in order to smash their organisation. The management obviously used this Act as a means to sack men who take unofficial action. They are also using older methods, for they have said that they will only take men back 'selectively' on condition that they signed a document stating that they will not take part in any unofficial disputes.

SYMPATHY ACTION

Since the lock-out started, Turriffs have recruited 'scab' labour, which has been smuggled in and out of the site every day. The size of the site makes it difficult for pickets to prevent these 'scabs' from getting in and so workers from other sites have assisted on the picket lines. The management claims that they have a labour force of 124 men who get in with police assistance by all manner of ways, from being driven in by coach to crossing the railway line and crawling up over the embankment. On the same centre, Laings sacked 64 men who had taken time off to help on the picket, but after the rest of the men came out in sympathy, the management climbed down and reinstated the men.

Last Tuesday, September 28, the dispute went before a commission, which stated that there should be 'unconditional reinstatement of all workers'. Turriffs turned this down and another commission was arranged for last Friday. A huge demonstration of solidarity had been organised to co-incide with this by the stewards of the jobs. A number of other sites decided to strike for the day in support and many men from these came to help on the picket lines.

I am afraid that this major effort did not manage to keep the 'scabs' out, but they got a hell of a shake-up. Some came up to the main gate in a coach to be met by a six deep picket line and only one copper to help them through. The coach turned round and went out again, but the 'scabs' got in over a wall that was not so well manned. They opened the gates and tried to charge the picket, armed with acrows, stones and crowbars, but they soon went back and stones started to fly back and forth over the fence.

Men were continually arriving to give their support and following a meeting near the gate, well over a thousand of us marched to the offices of the Association of Master Builders where a Regional Disputes Tribunal was meeting to discuss the dispute. When we got there, the police tried to hurry us by but they were outnumbered and some of us planted ourselves on the steps. The police had a tough time getting us off.

POLICE ASSIST 'SCABS'

The tribunal was a complete waste of time again, for the management refused to take back all of the sacked men as they already had 124 men on the site, while the union officials and the Federation steward were insisting that all should be taken back. Later on this deadlock was reported back to the lads at a meeting outside the entrance gates of the site. Some union organisers gave their support saying that the pickets were official, whatever that means, but that so far the executives had not made any decision. One speaker said that they did not need the officials as action, such as had occurred that day, would win the dispute.

After the meeting, the police cleared the area, leaving just a few

pickets at the gate. As 'knocking-off' time approached, the tension mounted and more police arrived to assist the 'scabs' off the job. A coach had been hired for this purpose, but on arriving, the driver was won over and said that he would not cross any picket line. The 'scabs' finally came out in a cement mixer, a closed wagon and a lorry. As they came out into the road, the police held us back while the 'scabs' threw bricks at us. Some of them, I am glad to say, found their way back.

The police then started arresting people. Two brothers from my own job were arrested by plain-clothes men. One of these was trying to plant bits of asphalt on one of the brothers. Later he was only charged with 'obstruction and using insulting words and behaviour', for they must have realised that they could not make an 'offensive weapons' charge stick in view of the fact that there had been so many witnesses.

This was one of the largest demonstrations of solidarity that London has seen for years and proved that there could be a link up between sites at rank and file level. This was no spontaneous thing, for the stewards have been working to this end for some time now after they realised the necessity for it during the months prior to the national strike in 1963. It has been a long, hard job, but at least it is paying off.

GAIN MORE SUPPORT

A further tribunal is to meet on Tuesday, but it is this type of action that is effective where the employers are concerned and is therefore going to win disputes. Turriffs must not be allowed to get away with this denial of the right to strike, for other employers on the Barbican scheme, which will not be finished for at least seven years, will be quick to follow their example. We must not be satisfied with our present efforts alone, but should work towards gaining further support, both in and outside of the industry. Financial and moral backing has already come from other industrial workers, but this Act can be used against anyone and we are all in it together.

A leaflet, brought out by the Lock-Out Committee, says that 'A lock-out has been imposed as an attack on the right to strike and organise. Mass victimisation is being attempted and non-union labour forced onto the site.' Surely under these circumstances the union executives should have made the dispute official straight away. Whether they will when they get back from the Labour Conference remains to be seen. Many lads look to official recognition and their payment of lock-out money, but so far the executives have not given a damn. Perhaps official blessing may be forthcoming when the men have been forced to find other jobs and there are only a few holding out. The pay out will be a lot smaller then, or they will do a deal with Turriffs to take back only sufficient to make the 'scab' labour force to a full complement.

So far the dispute has been fought by the rank and file and this is how it will be won. The leaflet says, 'job support, financial backing and solidarity action will be decisive. Rally round the Turriff's locked out men.' The rank and file, by their own efforts, can bring this dispute to a successful conclusion, with all of the 380 men back.

Readers can give assistance by getting support at their own place of work, or by sending any spare cash to T. McAuliffe, 13 Carleton Road, N.7. Receipts will be sent out after the end of the dispute.

P.T.

Freedom

For Workers' Control

OCTOBER 9 1965 Vol. 26 No. 31

Hand in Hand

CAR MANUFACTURERS and union leaders have just managed to come to an agreement concerning their problem of 'wildcat strikes'. The big white chief, Mr. Wilson, set them a time limit to put their house in order. With the assistance of Ray Gunter they have put forward their solution, which is an independent chairman who will be able to step in to examine disputes which 'threaten unemployment and interfere with production'. He will have all the powers of a chairman of an industrial court of inquiry to call evidence and examine witnesses.

Sir William Carron, President of the AEU, promised full co-operation along with his partner Lord Rootes. It is possible to see a fantastic situation developing whereby in fact, workers will be encouraged to go on unofficial strike to get their problems dealt with quickly without going through all the usual rigmarole. On the other hand, of course, when this bod investigates the dispute the classic statement will be issued, 'Get back to work lads whilst I sort this lot out'.

Some of the car manufacturers have climbed on the band-wagon regarding the suggestion of compulsory union membership, though they insist upon calling it 'closed shop'. The payment for this service required from the trade unions is far more discipline of their members to the extent of expulsion from the union if the members don't toe the line. For the moment anyway, the union leadership is not prepared to pay this price and, fair warning if they do, they will have more trouble than enough.

WHEN IS 'OFFICIAL' 'UNOFFICIAL'?

An official unofficial movement is reported to be challenging the Port Liaison Committee. To quote the national press, namely the *Financial Times* of 1.10.65, three dockers acting on their own initiative (but with the sponsorship of the T & GWU) organised a meeting to tell their colleagues that the time had come to stop knocking down every construc-

tive proposal for the docks from an official source. Unfortunately, two of the dockers will be at Ruskin College in the near future and therefore, will be quite a distance from the docks. But I'm glad to report that they will be coming back during the hols to give the lads the benefit of their experience. The idea of these lads calling a meeting on their own initiative with just the bare support of the T & GWU, is remarkable. A dock employer said this was great, any official unofficial movement supported by the T & GWU, must be on the right road. To where?

DANGER—LONDON TRANSPORT AT WORK

Last month the London Transport Board introduced new timetables on bus routes in Ealing, Southall and Greenford. Why have these new schedules brought strike action from your local busmen? What do these new timetables mean?

For passengers: The new timetables mean fewer buses on already infrequent routes such as 232. They mean more delays and longer queues. Therefore every passenger should be supporting the busmen's fight to change these timetables by strike and go-slow.

For busmen: The new timetables mean increased work for the same pay. This will mean that London Transport will find it more difficult to recruit drivers and the service will become worse still.

What you can do. Don't be fooled into blaming the busmen. Their strike is a strike for better services for you. Blame London Transport.

The solution to an inadequate service is more buses. The solution to staff shortage is staff recruitment. The only possible basis for effective staff recruitment is better pay and much improved conditions. For a start £20 per week, basic for a 40 hour week. The only people who can get this is the busmen themselves, looking to leaders is like praying to the Sun God with the same results.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

FILM REVIEW

THE ORGANISER

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT'S history is full of small men. Jimmie Higginses, the small men 'scorned of men' who Sacco and Vanzetti would have been if they had not been trapped, the men who Lenin said (and as he once was) must 'go hungry, work illegally and be anonymous'. These are the men who work on at their task, whether it be paper-selling, chalking walls, bill-sticking, sticking on stamps, organizing a strike, or going on the picket-line. Hunger, illegality and anonymity were neither in the air of Brighton or Blackpool but it is salutary to be reminded that such men exist and have existed even if only at the cinema.

The *Organizer* with Marcello Mastroianni had a rather checkered background. Mastroianni, the star, is chiefly known for play-boy parts (although one of them, I do remember, had an improbable anarchist father) and this role is a new departure for him. The film was made by a French-Italian company with a French-Italian cast, acknowledgment is made of Yugoslav assistance (perhaps they gave the idea of workers' control which crops up?).

Not since the Russian film *Strike* has the atmosphere of a factory been so adequately and evocatively portrayed. The factory workers in a textile mill want a reduction of hours from fourteen, to the Utopian thirteen. They make an abortive plan for one of their number to sound the hooter one hour before the usual time and they will stop work. The casual appearance of a boss when the hooter blows is sufficient for them to

lose heart and carry on working. This, and his penalization, so infuriates the workman (Folco Lulli) who had volunteered to sound the hooter, that he accuses them of cowardice and a running snow-fight takes place.

In the midst of this a freight train draws up at the level crossing and after due precautions, such as ascertaining the name of the suburb, Mastroianni in tramp-like garb descends.

He makes his way to a class-room where a teacher is struggling to teach adult-workers how to read. Mastroianni shows a letter of introduction to the teacher, it appears he is wanted by the police, and he is given a bed in the back of the schoolroom. He is awakened from his sleep by a rowdy meeting of the mill-workers. They have elected a new chairman, who is ejected from the position by Folco Lulli, who has decided to come back. The feeling of the meeting is for strike action. But 'The Professor' (Mastroianni) makes a dramatic intervention and points out that if they are really going on strike they had better lay in stocks of fuel and provisions on credit for they will get no credit once they are on strike.

The rest of the film is the history of the (unsuccessful) strike. The hardships of the men, and 'the organizer', the solidarity of the railway goods-workers in letting them steal coal; the solidarity of (wonder of wonders!) the soldiers—at the beginning; the episode of the prostitute; the march on the factory; the firing by the soldiers, and the eventual

Continued on page 3