

Cesspool of Intrigue

South East Asia, the cesspool of intrigue. One can liken it to the North American Gold Rush, with Britain (Malaysia), Indonesia, America, China (North Viet-nam) staking their claims.

Malaysia was born as the result of artificial insemination, the purpose, to enable British interests to have a stake in S.E. Asia. The Americans have dug well in financially pouring over £200 million a year into the defence of south Viet-nam. China on the other hand plays to the crowd supporting the struggle against poverty and imperialism. Obviously the Chinese line must appeal to the workers and peasant population, these people think and talk in terms of 'food in the belly' and if the Communists can offer 'two bowls of rice as opposed to one', the workers and peasants will have it and who can blame them. It is no good spouting to them all the bull about the 'free world' and 'western democracy' when their kids die of hunger and disease before reaching the age of ten years.

Since the war Britain has poured money, men and materials into Malaya to safeguard her commercial interests (rubber and tin) and also the S.E.A.T.O. base of Singapore. Just how stable is Malaya itself? Tunku Abdul Rahman, Prime Minister of Malaysia and Lee Kuan-Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore may play golf together, but their policies are poles apart. Tunku represents the politically lethargic Moslem Malay, Lee represents the industrial Chinese. Lee, down to earth politician, Rahman the benign 'divine right' ruler. Conflict is inevitable. Singapore contributes 40% of her income to the Central Government. The Central Government now suggests 60% thus adding to the existing tension.

What of Indonesia? With the bluff, big-headed Sukarno in charge. If only the West could pin the Communist label on him and make it stick, they would be far happier, but they can't. He has governed for 19 years without having a Communist at the head of any department or in the Cabinet. He has refused the Communist Party's demand to arm ten million peasants to crush Malaysia, he doesn't mind C.P. support for his anti-Malaysia campaign, but Sukarno has no stomach for a potential 'crush Sukarno' campaign.

Economically Indonesia is rocky, the utter incompetence of the government has bankrupted the country. Opposition is not tolerated against the Sukarno regime, therefore a scapegoat has to be found, a common enemy—'Malaysia'.

The controversial territories are Sabah and Sarawak, which were included in the Malaya Federation because Malaya feared Chinese domination although they are a minority. Sarawak's Chinese population is increasing, over a recent 10 year period they have increased by 51% while the overall population has increased by 35%. Maybe the Chinese will become the leading

people of North Borneo thus accentuating Malay's internal problems.

The two territories are difficult to administer. At the moment there are British Civil Servants in control who will have to be replaced by Malays, who are not popular in these parts, making development plans difficult to implement. The test-tube baby of Britain has problems with more to follow.

Continued on page 3

ONCE UPON A TIME we of the left used to sit around dwelling on the particular iniquities of a section of the capitalist class known picturesquely, but accurately as 'The Merchants of Death'. The late radical Lord Brockway wrote (or collaborated on) a book called *The Bloody Traffic*; there was even, for the eggheads, a vast tome called *The Private Manufacture of Armaments* by Philip Noel-Baker. But we had to wait for the second Labour Government to see demonstrations by workers for the 'right to work' on the instruments of death and destruction incorporated, for the privilege of sharing in the gravy for the bloody traffic, for the public ownership of TSR2, and for the wider dissemination of the blessings of Buccaneers and frigates.

We are continuously being told that the expenditure on armaments would be sufficient to endow numerous schools, universities, hospitals, houses, etc. The French anarchists for example recently put out a poster with the following statistics. One atomic bomber = the wages of 250,000 teachers per year or 30 faculties of science with 1,000 students; or 50,000 tractors. Fifty hospitals would equal the cost of one atomic submarine.

Ironically enough as Vicky in the *Evening Standard* was quick to see, this protest came upon the day that the report was released that £3,000,000,000 was necessary to re-equip the schools.

The argument that the money spent on armaments could easily, and more beneficially, be spent upon schools, etcetera, is too simple to be true.

In the first place were the Government

THE MOVEMENT ABROAD

The groups of Lyon, Grenoble, St. Etienne, Mâcon, Roanne, Annemasse and Geneva have constituted an autonomous region of the Rhône-Alpes, including groups belonging to and independent of the Anarchist Federation. The first activities of the new region will be protests against the repression of anti-Franco militants by the French police, and a campaign for Spanish political prisoners. The Anarchist Federation has contacted other organisations with a view to establishing an anti-election committee. Michel Tepernowski, 16 rue Neuve-de-la-Cardonnière, Paris 18, is hoping to establish a study group on the question of anarchism and non-violence. The comrade, Guy Quintin, who tried to become a conscientious objector under the law which is now two years old, was denied his application on a technical point and has now been arrested. (*Le Monde Libertaire*, Paris, January, 1965.)

The Dutch Libertarian Socialist

District Fire Officer Pearson. Died in the year 1911 in London Hospital, White-chapel of injuries sustained attending a fire at Sidney Street, Stepney. The fire brigade arrived upon the scene shortly after the outbreak, but a Cabinet Minister who was present at the fire refused to let the firemen put the fire out since a detachment of the Scots Guards were trying to get some gunmen, allegedly anarchists, out of a building in Sidney Street. When the brigade members were finally allowed to enter the burned-out building, the wreckage collapsed and Officer Pearson's spine was fractured from which he died. The Cabinet Minister was the Home Secretary, Winston Churchill.

John Henry John (21), a tinplate worker of Llanely was shot during riots on August 19, 1911. A detachment of the 1st Worcester Regiment was detailed to protect trains run by non-strikers and John was among a stone-throwing party. Major Brownlow Stuart tried to reason with the crowd but the only response was more stone-throwing and a soldier was knocked senseless. A bugle was sounded and the Riot Act read but the crowd did not disperse. Major Stuart warned the crowd that they would open fire if they did not disperse within a minute. In fact one shot was fired before that minute was up. Five or six rounds were fired in all. 'And,' said Major Stuart at the inquest, 'the stone-throwing temporarily stopped. I then went to the man I took to be the engine driver, and endeavoured to persuade him to make an effort to get the train on the

IN MEMORIAM

move again. He either said he would not or could not, I don't know which. Seeing that I was of no further service there, I withdrew my men from the railway station.' Benjamin Hansbury, a lad employed at a tinplate works said that John was on his right-hand and said to witness, 'Don't go, they won't shoot'. The verdict brought in, on the suggestion of the coroner, was 'justifiable homicide'. The jury added the following rider, 'That we think it would have been better if other means than giving the order to fire had been adopted by Major Stuart for dispersing the crowd'. The troops were called to the district under the instructions of Mr. Winston Churchill, Liberal Home Secretary in consultation with the Defence Secretary.

John Doe of the Royal Naval Division killed in action November, 1914, at Antwerp. He was a new recruit and badly armed and was flung into action by The First Lord of the Admiralty who felt that the Belgians could be sustained to hold out against the advancing Germans. The First Lord himself volunteered to command in the field and give up the Admiralty. Asquith did not accept this offer. John Doe had never fired a rifle nor handled a trenching tool and saw that the Belgians had had enough, their officers had to beat them with the flats of their swords to get them to fight. The First Lord got away before the action, not so eight or nine hundred prisoners, 138 wounded, and 57 including John Doe died. The First Lord was Winston Churchill.

Richard Roe of the New Zealand

Infantry Brigade killed in action 10 August, 1915, of wounds. He lay in the sand crying for water for many hours. The Turks had bombarded the position for hours and their snipers were very accurate. The Dardanelles did not fall into our hands so that we could gratify Russia's desire for Constantinople despite half-a-million men sent out to the Dardanelles. Of this total 43,000 British officers and men had been killed, taken prisoner or posted as missing, or died of disease. The British casualties included those of evacuated sick had amounted to 205,000—those of the French to 47,000. At this point Winston Churchill was ousted from the Admiralty and the War Cabinet and became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Thomas Atkins died at Murmansk in an expedition despatched to support Admiral Kolchak against the newly formed Soviet Republic. This expedition was backed by the British War Office then in the charge of Winston Churchill.

Joe Soap died at Narvik April 9, 1940, when German naval forces broke through the Kattegat and Skaggerak seizing on the pretext that Britain had sown mines in Norwegian territorial waters. It was said by the First Lord of the Admiralty that all German ships entering the Kattegat and Skaggerak will be sunk. They were not sunk hence the death of Joe Soap. The First Lord of the Admiralty subsequently became Prime Minister because of the mistake committed by him, when he, Winston Churchill, was First Lord of the Admiralty. J.R.

The blood-stained pay-packet

of this country ever to save money on armaments, it would be part of a general economy campaign and schools, housing, etcetera, would suffer to the same degree.

In the second place the expenditure upon armaments is of a different order to that of expenditure on hospitals, etcetera. All classes can more easily be persuaded by the State that the expenditure upon armaments is justified for reasons of security and the easy appeals to fear.

THE CONSUMER ARMY

The expenditure upon armaments is ideal from the point of view of a consumer society. Armies are the ideal consumers, they produce not, neither do they stop consuming. Armaments from the viewpoint of an eternal quest for an illusory 'security' are the ideal outlet for industry with a built-in obsolescence which is inherent in the nature of armaments. The countryside

is literally littered with the remains of obsolete projects—Black Knight, Blue Streak, the Brabazon, all obsolete before their brief moment of glorious fame. Now TSR2 is threatened with the axe in the same way that the joint Anglo-French project Concorde has been threatened. The deadly saraband of defensive and offensive weapons have led already to the anti-missile-missile why not the anti-anti-missile-missile-missile and so on to the nth power?

Until the day dawns that an irresistible force meets an immovable object there is no security or stability in armaments. The new merchants of death will see to that. The new merchants of death have, like merchants of all other commodities, changed their technique. No longer do we have the hard sell of the crude huckstering of Mr. Shearer, or of the Navy League ('we want eight and we won't wait'), but we have the soft sell of government-sponsored research into these deadly weapons or carriers of weapons, then civil aviation takes over the production and marketing and the air routes of the world are subsidized by governments who know they can convert airliners into military transports at a moment's notice.

THE BRAIN DRAIN

The vast amounts of capital needed to finance research in these days can only come from the State; private enterprise is not enterprising enough (or mug enough), to sink money into a gamble. Rather would it sit on the sidelines to wait for the taxpayer to subsidize their 'enterprise' and calmly proceed to take over afterwards.

The same double standard applies to technicians. The 'brain drain' to America is not the only drain. For example, in this week's *The Aeroplane* appears an obituary of Captain M. Luby, R.N. (ret'd.). Captain Luby was from 1938-41 supervisor of naval aero-engine repair and maintenance at the Air Ministry and Ministry of Aircraft Production. In 1944 he was appointed Deputy-director of Aero-Engine research and development; becoming Principal Director in 1952. He then moved over at 39 to private industry, being vice-chairman and general manager of Rotax

Ltd. until 1961 when he joined High Duty Alloys as a director.

OVERGROWN CHILDREN

The perpetual wail from the aircraft industry that they are being sabotaged, justifies the remark attributed to Mr. Denis Healey: 'It is not the duty of the Ministry to wet-nurse overgrown and mentally retarded children.' But nevertheless it is not the duty of the workers to copy their masters and beseech for work on these instruments of destruction, the supersonic hedge-hopping bomber on which apparently their livelihood, and to believe the papers, the future of the whole British economy depends. One would have thought that in these days of full-employment that the possibilities of a sudden plunge into absolute joblessness was remote; the most dreadful thing that could happen would be a transfer to another job possibly in another town but at the moment there are no Jarrows in prospect.

Let it not be thought that this is a defence of Harold Wilson's dauntless pacifism against the belligerence of Sir Douglas Home and the Tory press. Mr. Harold Wilson has no intention of cutting down British armaments. Much as he would wish to give the appearance of disarming to appease his pacifist wing, nevertheless his trade union wing will insist on armaments jobs being retained—even for the export market, because the British worker, like the merchant of death of pre-war days has a vested interest in the bloody traffic.

It is enough to make Fenner Brockway turn in his grave.

JACK ROBINSON.

ANARCHY 47

PRESENTS JAMES GILLESPIE

Towards Freedom in Work

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

'The boy who took a dead-end job' - Evening Standard

FREEDOM is still in a transition stage. More changes are likely and we hope they will make for a more balanced paper.

Readers will already have noticed that new contributors are coming forward, and in some cases, old contributors are being persuaded to reactivate themselves. We are aiming at an anarchist journal that will continue the function that FREEDOM has always set itself: of presenting all anarchist points of view as long as they are adequately and articulately presented to us.

To this end we are trying to build up a team of writers throughout the country who will undertake responsibility for working with the paper and will take seriously the job of presenting copy on subjects of interest to themselves and the rest of us, and get it to us in time.

We have already found a number of comrades who are prepared to commit themselves to write for us regularly on various topics. What we still need are comrades who will regard themselves as our correspondents in their own locality and will provide us with news items of particular interest to this journal. This would ideally mean news of anarchist activity in your area, or news of events that deserve attention from the anarchists but that hasn't gathered attention in the national press. Too often do we have to limp along behind the capitalist papers with news and comment because we have no news-gathering resources of our own.

Since we have no financial resources to buy the services of reporters, or of news agencies we must rely on the voluntary services of non-paid contributors. If you want to see matters dealt with in these columns that seem to be ignored, the answer is obvious: provide us with the material yourself!

At the same time, please recognise that our space is limited, and something that may seem of overwhelming interest to you, may not seem so to others. While we welcome—are indeed soliciting—contributions, we clearly cannot guarantee automatic acceptance. But if you are prepared to make yourself of use to the **only weekly anarchist journal in English in the world**, without acting like a prima donna or getting huffy if your stuff is not accepted, then we are waiting to hear from you.

What we need is topical material from all over the world to be able to build up an authoritative international coverage. We also need topical comment on events in this country. If you are an anarchist you will know what we need.

The biggest of our changes has obviously been the reorganisation of our back page—already dealt with thereon. We have made this new arrangement in order to give our anarcho-syndicalist comrades more support in distributing the paper in industry, and to give more representation of specifically anarcho-syndicalist arguments and analyses,

hitherto sadly lacking in this country. For those comrades who are not primarily interested in industrial matters, we should like to say that work is of vital importance for the individual, while production and distribution are of vital importance for the community. The ideas of anarcho-syndicalism seem to us to represent the most effective means of relating anarchist ideas to the wider issues of industrial life. But if the new arrangement offends, just ignore the back page! There are three other pages devoted to other subjects and other interpretations of anarchism.

But those comrades in industry who welcome the new presentation—please give it your support by contribution and by circulation.

This, of course, applies to all of us—all of you! FREEDOM badly needs many more readers. We have all sorts of ideas for improvement, from simply re-introducing red into our heading, to presenting more illustrations (blocks cost money!) to increasing the number of pages, to bringing out special issues on special subjects when the need arises, to advertising more, and providing Freedom Press—Freedom—15 — 15 means for sales drives—and all sorts of ways in which this journal could serve better the anarchist movement and spread the anarchist idea.

For all this we need help. Money for the Press Fund is the simplest, but very much better would be new subscriptions for new readers. We need to double our circulation in 1965 just for a start! This means every one of you buying the paper today to find someone else to do the same within the next twelve months. Too much to ask?

If you are an anarchist, this paper exists for the purpose of presenting the ideas you believe in. It can survive only through the support of those who share your beliefs. Please don't let sectarian differences of interpretation or petty personal animosities deprive the movement of your contribution. Work with us to make FREEDOM a paper that will not merely comment upon other people's activities—help us to make it a paper that will influence events and move society in the direction we want it to go!

P.S.

Continued from page 1

The situation is macabre to say the least. Canada was supplying planes to Indonesia with assurances of course that the planes will only be used for peaceful purposes. America is buying more rubber from Indonesia than from Malaya, Indonesian rubber is cheaper. The U.S. is granting Malaysia a defence loan only at 5% interest and for not more than seven years, and she is pouring millions of dollars into Indonesia. Australia is supplying Indonesia with technical equipment of military value—trucks, cranes, transmitters and radio equipment. Australia justifies this action by claiming that

THE MANCHESTER MUNICIPAL Handbook 1964-65 listed among the honorary freemen of the City Field Marshal Lord Montgomery as dying June 12, 1963. This old soldier, in fact, has not died and is writing a 'massive book' on the history of warfare. On the other hand Admiral Darlan, ex-collaborator, who was assassinated when the Allies no longer had any use for him, was reburied at the French naval cemetery at Mers-el-Kebir. This was after negotiations with De Gaulle that he should be buried in the Invalides which was scaled down to Mers-el-Kebir; a small vessel was substituted for an aircraft carrier and haggling went on about the numbers present at the ceremony, the son wanted 50, the Government said three, but they compromised on 10, but without government representatives. Mr. Kruschew became an 'unperson' being deleted from the Soviet calendar, and once again *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* was withdrawn. The *Evening Standard's* obituary of Lord Alexander the co-op peer is headed THE BOY WHO TOOK A DEAD-END JOB. . . .

IN WEST GERMANY public demand for the

restoration of the death penalty has led to 27 applications for the job of public executioner which was abolished in 1949. *The New York Times* reports that after Stanleyville was recaptured by Belgian paratroops, more than 500 Congolese including men, women and children were executed as 'rebels'. The executions were carried out without trial. The suspects were led into the Patrice Lumumba stadium, one by one, if the spectators cheered or clapped, the suspect was released. If they booed he was condemned to death. Victims were driven to a lonely road and mown down with machine guns. A man aged 19 was sentenced to death at Berkshire Assizes for the capital murder of his girl friend by shooting. January 27 has been fixed as the date of the execution of Ronald John Cooper. It is possible that in view of Mr. Silverman's anti-hanging bill neither of these sentences will be carried out. Dr. Mathews the Dean of St. Pauls said that the intention to pray for the Central Criminal Court (the Old Bailey) on Sunday had nothing to do with the increase of crime and the abolition of capital punishment. . . .

FRENCH CONSCIENTIOUS objectors doing

alternative service have been told that they cannot speak to meetings or publish writings without the authorization of the superior authority. It is forbidden for them to comment on any subject in connection with social, political or religious questions or matters relating to foreign powers and armies. The second article says that any paper, leaflet or writing contrary to discipline will be forbidden inside the unit. It is also forbidden during the period of service to be a member of any movements for the support of social, religious, political or professional objects. The C.O.s at Brig-noles are not prepared to accept this regulation. *The South Wales Echo* denounces as 'Wicked', leaflets sent to Welsh Servicemen from the Committee of 100 advising them how to become conscientious objectors and get out of the Forces. Mr. George Thomas who is Parliamentary Under-Secretary at the Home Office said: 'This is the most staggering thing I have ever come across. It is completely irresponsible and I shall ask the Home Office to carry out a full investigation.' The leaflets give the addresses of the responsible parties including Hampstead Committee of 100. . . .
JON QUIXOTE.

Leyton please love me

The 1964 General Election was fought in a spirit of good humoured intolerance. Someone threw an egg at Sir Alec Home and a heckler managed to take the pee out of Harold Wilson at Chatham.

Only Smethwick lifted a stone to show what lay beneath the cheerful insults and the phoney statistics for here the stench of the Deep South became a major issue and of their fear, the voters of Smethwick spawned a Mr. Peter Griffiths as their Conservative member for Parliament. Fear was the whip that drove the people of this dreary industrial town to register their shame, fear for their jobs, their homes and their customs. Fear that an increasing alien minority might usurp the controls of their narrow world and of this parochial evil they produced a Mr. Peter Griffiths to cry their hate and mouth their collected whimpers. And Gordon Walker, Her Majesty's Unelected Foreign Secretary, was tossed out of this safe Labour seat, to publicly humiliate himself before the people of Leyton that they should send him to the House of Commons on Thursday the 21st of January as their elected representative. To achieve this it was necessary to

hoist the elderly Reginald William Sorensen into the House of Lords and the stage was now set for the farce. Monday at three o'clock we had assembled outside Leyton Town Hall to watch the candidates make their official bow. A dull day and a dull event until a political clown of Colin Jordan's British National Socialist Movement, with face smeared with brown colouring and wearing a West Indian costume, came running past us and into the Town Hall there to file his nomination. But the whole 'happening' was a heavy-handed gag for the Nazi group refused to deposit the required £150 and Jordan, his wife Françoise and their tame clown grinned as the cameras clicked. The Jordans gave their Nazi salute to a few half-hearted boos and for the conscience of the Left I blew a vulgar raspberry, but Colin gave out with his schoolboy smile while Françoise gazed through me with a look of Imperial Contempt.

It was at 8 o'clock that the first of the official political meetings was to take place and, despite the fact that there are five candidates standing for this by-election, Gordon Walker is the focus of attention and discussion. The drizzling rain had turned the dark streets

to a greasy black and the lights of the closed shops in the High Street made islands of loneliness in this sprawling suburban scab of terraced houses and cheap 'contemporary'. We entered Sybourn Street primary school (see the suppressed Hogg report on Education), passed a guard of police into that familiar world of municipal brown tiles, sick green washable paint and parquet flooring, there to sit out once more the long and boring meeting. That this was to be no ordinary meeting became noisily obvious for a third of the floor space had already been taken over by press and television crews. Men in sheepskin jackets trod among the maze of cables and arc lights fizzed and spluttered in preparation. We sat and we waited and the hall quickly filled. There were few young people and only a small squad of CND, bearded and duffle-coated, broke the pattern of dull uniformity.

We were but 300 seated and the mass of press and stewards formed a solid barrier around the three walls. The stewards were, in the main, men of middle age and soberly dressed and one knew that if anyone was thrown out it would be done with courtesy and gentleness but one would surely be thrown out. Only the press lorded it with a studied contempt for local feelings. At 7.59 p.m. Gordon Walker walked through the clicking cameras and at 8.04 p.m. a scuffle broke out at the back of the hall yet ere we were on our collective feet it was over and the dissenter left leaving only his echo.

I had come to mock but in that audience of hostile cameras one could not join the well-dressed rabble. There under the harsh camera lights one was all too well informed of the shine on the blue serge suit of Arthur Bottomley, the Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, and his street corner rhetoric flowed past one. We sat in this pool of indifferent press agents, Mrs. Walker in her puce costume, Gordon Walker with his bottle green waistcoat, and we of the audience, and the cameras clicked and clicked in our faces.

Gordon Walker rose to speak and one watched with sympathy the film of sweat beneath his thinning hair. He spoke quietly and with courtesy yet said nothing of importance and after but three or four questions the meeting faded to a dismal end for there were neither Nazi punch-ups, witty heckling or intelligent questions. One brief action of Gordon Walker won a measure of support and that was when, without hesitation or apology, he literally shoved a cameraman away and for that we silently thanked him.

We left for the rain-filled darkness to the jeers of a small waiting crowd, leaving behind a public repudiation of the ideals of the socialist twenties that was nurtured in these same school meetings, for this is the sad dichotomy that faces all who seek power by virtue of political mass support, that to win that support they must surrender the principles that were the dynamic of the founding fathers and at this meeting police and press manipulated us while we shuffled obediently along at their demands.
ARTHUR MOYSE.

CESSPOOL OF INTRIGUE

the Colombo Plan is to make our possible enemies love us. 'Give the Indonesians the gadgets to make themselves happy and the tension will be over.'

Incidentally, Australian troops are helping to fight the Indonesians in Borneo. Also in passing, a couple of years ago Australia informed Britain that shipments of weapons and other offensive material to Indonesia would be unwelcome. Eventually a series of Committees were established which vetted commercial contracts as they arose. These local wars are very handy to 'get into' commercially, providing of course, that you are not the poor bastard trekking through the bloody jungle, or the wife or mother sweating on the top line at home.

What's the score now? Indonesia is half in, half out of the United Nations. On January 14, Sukarno announced that he would accept the recommendation of a U.N. investigating committee and abide by its decision. A U.N. survey team did visit Sabah and Sarawak in 1963 which led to the two states being admitted to the Malaysia Federation. Sukarno rejected the decision on the grounds that the survey was held under the threat of British bayonets.

It is reported that Indonesia is seeking to use the good offices of Japan to obtain a settlement. Pakistan is ready to consider medi-

ing. Tunku Abdul Rahman has a deep distrust of Sukarno. Britain is building up a sizeable land, sea and air force so all in all the ground looks far from fertile for any sort of settlement.

Power politics is having a ball and the ordinary people be they Malay, Chinese, Indonesian or British are paying the price with their lives, and until they cry halt, and take action they will always be the dispensable two bit actors in political wars.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

PRESS FUND

FINANCIAL STATEMENT
WEEK 2, JANUARY 16, 1965:
Expenses: 2 weeks at £70: £140
Income: Sales and Subs.: £171
SURPLUS £31

Sweden: H.P. 2/-; Birkbeck College: M.D. 10/-; New York: P.L. £4/7/-; Kings Norton: F.D. £10; Boston: A.L. 14/-; Woldingham: F.B. 5/-; S.E.5: R.T. £3; W.C.2: K.M. 10/-; Reading: D.K. 10/-; Wolverhampton: J.K.W.* 2/-; J.L.* 3/-; Oregon: J.C. £1/8/-; Cardiff: C.H. 2/6; Liverpool: T.W. 10/-; Belfast: W.G. 5/-; California: J.C. £1/15/-; Strausburg: 10/6; E.6: B.S. 2/-; Cheltenham: L.G.W.* 10/-; Torino: P.A. £1/1/6; Honolulu: M.M. 14/-; Edgbaston: J.M. 1/9; Mount Lehman: D.B. 7/-; Madison: E.T. 14/-; N.W.3: B.S. £1; Glasgow: A.J. 2/-; Kely: A.M. £1; Penzance: J.G. 5/-.

TOTAL £30 11 3
Previously acknowledged £26 4 8
1965 total to date £56 15 11

*Denotes Regular Contributors.

MAKE SURE OF YOUR ANARCHIST JOURNALS BY SUBSCRIBING!

Freedom WEEKLY
Price 4d. Every Saturday except the first in each month. (40 issues per year.)
BY POST:
1 year (40 issues) 20s. (U.S. \$3)
6 months (20 issues) 10s. (\$1.50)
3 months (10 issues) 5s. (75c.)
SPECIAL RATE FOR 2 COPIES:
1 year (40 issues) 30s. (U.S. \$4.50)
6 months (20 issues) 15s. (\$2.25)
BY AIR MAIL:
1 year (40 issues) 45s. (U.S. \$7)
FREEDOM by AIR MAIL, ANARCHY

Anarchy MONTHLY
Price 2s. (2s. 3d. or 30c. by post)
Appears first Saturday of each month.
BY POST:
1 year (12 issues) 25s. (U.S. \$3.50)
BY AIR MAIL: 1 year 47s. (\$7)
JOINT SUB. FREEDOM/ANARCHY:
1 year 40s. (\$6), 6 months 20s. (\$3)
3 months 10s. 6d. (\$1.50)
2 COPIES OF EACH:
1 year 63s. (\$9), 6 months 31s. 6d. (\$4.50)
BY SURFACE: 1 year 65s. (\$9.50)

Cheques, P.O.'s and Money Orders should be made out to FREEDOM PRESS, crossed A/c Payee and addressed to the publishers:

Freedom Press
17a MAXWELL ROAD,
LONDON, S.W.6 Phone: RENown 3736

Dockers! Aim at CONTROL!

From the Press this week, it emerges that the port employers and the Transport and General Workers' Union have admitted that they failed in their attempt to get the dockers to work week-ends. It seems that they will now wait for the report by the Devlin Committee, which has now started the second part of its investigations into the docks.

It is almost certain that this committee will recommend a reduction in the number of employers, which when last counted amounted to 444 in the London docks alone. Although some of the smaller firms might not like the idea, it seems inevitable that they will be swallowed up by the larger outfits.

The need for increased mechanisation will also figure largely in the report, and this in itself would force some of the smaller firms out of business, as the employers say that further mechanisation would be unprofitable for them, unless the new machines are used to capacity. This will lead to the question of shift-working being brought up for, if mechanisation is to be more widely used by a reduced number of employers, then there should be no need to work the number of hours per week that the dockers do at present. If shift work is necessary and desirable from the dockers' point of view, then there should be say two shifts per day, but with a cut in the actual number of hours worked daily per man.

BLIND ALLEY OF NATIONALISATION

The employers, both private and State (of which the railways are an example), would rather have their employees working excessive overtime than introduce more mechanisation or employ more workers. It is true that some more dockers are being trained now, but since the war, the number employed has fallen considerably though the volume of goods handled, with the help of mechanisation, has increased tremendously.

STILL A PERSONAL TRAGEDY

Wide coverage was given in the national press, capitalist as well as communist, to the 10,000 strong march on London by aircraft workers. They are threatened with redundancy if the Labour Government carries through its expected cancellation of the TSR2, the supersonic nuclear bomber, and other similar defence projects.

The *Daily Worker* described the protest as a demand for the 'right to work' and wrote with some relish of the calls for nationalisation of the industry by some of the marchers.

Previously when these projects became uneconomical they were slowly run down. While this was being done, some new project came along which was taken up. Meanwhile more public money was being poured down the drain or rather into the pockets of the aircraft employers. With present defence spending putting more and more strain on the economy, something had to go. So now it looks as if these projects will be cancelled and instead of starting new ones, ready-made planes, which will be less expensive, will be purchased from the U.S., or made here under contract.

But surely these workers knew that it could not last forever. As mentioned on another page, this redundancy will not mean any great hardship expressed in national terms, but nevertheless it is a tragedy where each worker and his family is concerned. What amount of severance pay will he get? Will he be able to get another job within easy reach of his home, or will he have to move to another town?

The Labour Movement of the country

The dockers do fear possibility of a shortage of work if the labour force is increased and I'm sure the employers would object to paying fall back money to these extra men when trade was slack. It seems to me that there is a need for the dockers themselves to draw up a plan for the industry, forgetting the question of actual ownership and concentrating on that of control of the job. They should not be side tracked into the blind alley of nationalisation, which is employment by the State, the biggest and toughest employer of them all. If workers can control the conditions under which they work, then it does not matter whether the boss resides in Whitehall or the City.

GAINING CONTROL

Various Left-wing political groups are now plugging the idea of nationalisation. This is nothing new, but they are now coupling workers' control with it, which is ludicrous. What they are in fact suggesting is that the State, although retaining ultimate control, will hand down to the workers a mandate to run the industry for themselves, providing they work within the confines of the plans (capitalist) of the State. Of course this is not full workers' control, for that cannot be handed down from above, with the boss retaining a controlling interest, but must be seized from below, with no strings attached. However, I think the whole question of nationalisation of the docks is out as far as the Government is concerned.

Control of the job must be the aim not only of the dockers but of workers in other industries and should cover many facets. They should press for a wage on which they and their families can live without working any overtime. If more mechanisation is necessary, then this should be agitated for, but keeping in mind that at the same time it should be for their benefit. The hiring of labour should also be under their control but this should not be abused in order that more

was at one time much influenced by an anti-militarist as well as a more revolutionary view of the role it could play. It was not pacifist by any means, but there did exist a solidarity which exceeded national boundaries. There were minor successes in the anti-military sense, but the movement did not prevent two world wars.

These aircraft workers who are now threatened with the sack are really only giving support to their employers. What they do not realise is that while it is in the interest of the employers to keep the war economy going, it is not in theirs to do the same. They might have done very well on it so far, but their security has not lasted.

Of course it is the Anarchists' job to persuade workers in jobs connected with military defence to give them up. We have to point out that solidarity is not just a thing that exists among workers in a factory who are threatened with sackings, but crosses national boundaries, for in their present protest, a strong national feeling has been expressed.

Obviously their skills are more useful for peaceful purposes and it should be stressed that it is far better that they should be used in this way. But because this is a personal tragedy for all who will be made redundant, they are still entitled to their wages. After all, millions of pounds have been wasted so far and surely it is far better to spend money on redundancy payments than to waste it on the TSR2 or on other armaments. P.T.

money may be taken home through overtime. Adequate fall back money should be paid when trade is slack. At the moment this is so small that it is more profitable for the employers to pay overtime rates at week-ends to get the work done and then to pay fall back money for a couple of days in the week when there is no work.

There are other aspects such as safety and canteen facilities which need improving. It is along these lines, trying to gain control, that all workers should be going. As more decisions over different aspects of the job come within their grasp, so will they become more united, by stronger ties of solidarity, with fellow workers.

This solidarity exists in the docks and from this can be built a movement to gain control. Following this example, workers in other industries can make similar inroads into control of their industries. All this will illustrate that employers, be they private or the State, are unnecessary for the needs of society. P.T.

Freedom For Workers' Control

JANUARY 23 1965 Vol. 26 No. 3

Office Workers Take Action

Government employed typists and machine operators at the headquarters of the Post Office Savings Bank in Kensington decided to work-to-rule in protest over the delays by the Treasury in coming forward with a 'satisfactory offer' to their pay demands. Protest meetings, attended by over 1,000 workers, were held at which they called for either official union support for their work-to-rule or a full organised stoppage.

This pay offer was supposed to be made last month but so far nothing has been forthcoming. However, it seems that this action in London and a short stoppage at the Newcastle-upon-Tyne offices of the Ministry of Pensions might have ginged up the Treasury.

The branch secretary of the Civil Service Clerical Association, Mr. Sean O'Brien, managed to get the members back to work but he did not feel this

would be the case if further unofficial action was taken. He said, 'Although I stressed to the girls that it would be better to have a co-ordinated campaign nationally, I believe that if their claims are not met speedily they will take action as threatened.'

A further cause for discontent is the uncertainty about their jobs, for the P.O.S.B. headquarters are likely to be moved to Glasgow. This will affect about 8,000 staff and so it is small wonder that action was taken. With the unrest and resentment at delays, any action taken at Kensington is likely to spread to other clerical workers affected by the Treasury's hold-up of the wage offer. This, no doubt, would be the last thing their union would want, but might be necessary if an offer is not made shortly. P.T.

ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM THE WORKERS' NEXT STEP 2

VERY early in the development of capitalism, the workers began to realise that although, as the producers of all wealth—they were indispensable, they were so *only as a class*. The individual worker, with no resources to fall back on, was completely at the mercy of his employer, who owned the means of life.

The early days of capitalism saw working conditions that make one's flesh creep just to read about to-day. The invention of great new potentials for production brought to the people, not wealth and more leisure, but savage exploitation and long hours of slavery.

But when it became apparent that the new industrialism was here to stay, it also became clear that new forms of struggle must be adopted, and out of the vague feelings of class solidarity engendered by common suffering, grew the knowledge that 'unity is strength'.

The story of the association of the workers into unions is a story of hard and bitter struggle. From the Combination Act of 1799-1800, when any form of combination by workers was punishable by prison, to the Trades Dispute Act of 1906, which made trade unionism legal, every step forward was not only resisted by the employers but also by the State. And now, the Rookes-Barnard decision has made certain trade union activities illegal again. The ruling class has always clearly seen the danger to its power in a freely organised working class.

But freedom from domination was never the purpose of trade union organisation. In spite of the methods of direct action which the unions regularly used, there has never been anything revolutionary about them. Content always to remain wage-bargaining bodies within the framework of capitalism, trade unionism has never seriously challenged the capitalist system itself. Its rôle has been merely to gain a few extra crumbs for the workers without pointing out to them that, after all, they produce the whole cake.

In order to achieve legality, the trades unions developed a political wing—now the Labour Party—and from the Anarcho-Syndicalist point of view this has been a fatal development, for the interests of the political party have prevailed over the real interests of the industrial workers. When Labour is in Opposition, token resistance to the more outrageously capitalist demands of a Tory Government may be mounted, and even this is forgotten when it is most needed—as in times of Labour coalition with wartime Tory Government. But when Labour is in power the cry is 'Don't embarrass OUR Government!' or 'Don't rock the boat!'. The freedom of the union as part of the State machine then becomes much clearer.

Under free enterprise capitalism, they had degenerated into coffin clubs and friendly societies. The immense funds they had accumulated were invested in capitalist enterprises, in war loans and government bonds; they were prosperous concerns with well-paid officials. But with the coming of nationalisation, the panacea for which the unions has always campaigned, they became much more. They became organisations for the maintenance of discipline over the workers. Their main function became, not the representation of the workers' point of view in disputes with the boss, but the maintenance of industrial peace through collaboration with the boss. The unions became, in the nationalised industries, the impersonal machinery through which workers' complaints reached the

managers. The unions have become organs of the State and apologists for the Government.

In these respects, the trade unions in Britain differ very little from those in totalitarian states—or from those in America. They are all stooge organisations for their governments. In U.S.A., the leaders of the C.I.O. and the A.F.L. proudly state that they are in favour of private enterprise ('The more profits for the boss, the more wages for the worker—therefore let us make capitalism more efficient'), while in the U.S.S.R. the unions are frankly State organs ('The first task of the trade unions is to penetrate the large masses of the workers with the idea that they do not work for a capitalist State, but for their State, the State of their own class', and 'The member of the T.U. must, by setting an example, bring all the workers to participate in socialistic emulation and to become shock workers [udarniks and stakhanovites]*'). In Britain under the Labour Governments of 1945-51 the unions accepted the wage freeze, the production drive and talked the miners into giving up the five-day week to save the Government from a fuel crisis. Today, we wait with interest to see what they will arrange for the dockers in respect of a seven day week!

I have said nothing about the structure of the trade unions. Our main criticism on this point is that, whereas Anarcho-Syndicalists advocate *industrial* organisation, the T.U.s are organised in *crafts*, which means that workers in the same industry—in the same factory—may belong to different unions, so that common action is difficult. This suits the trade union official very well, for his first concern is to prevent action being taken. But the division of the workers by the unions has now reached such lengths that one union will actually blackleg upon another (a classic example is that of London Transport tube trains running while the bus workers were striking in 1958) or will force another out of existence *with the assistance of the employers* (the Transport and General Workers' Union demanded that the London Passenger Transport Board force a dozen tram drivers to leave their own smaller union and join the big one—or be sacked!)

The structure and nature of the unions, too, provide perfect channels for the job-hunters. Permanent jobs with high salaries make trade unionism, which used to be a risky business, an attractive career to-day. Nor does it stop there. If you get to the top, you can always step out into a cushy job in a nationalised industry. A member of a State Board receives a salary of anything from £5,000 to £8,000 a year—a considerable advance on a worker's pay. Or you can, like Ernest Bevin or, now, Frank Cousins, accept high office in the Government.

How can workers delude themselves that either the unions or nationalisation operate in their favour? Instead of the old free enterprise economy they lead to a State planned economy, with the workers still at the bottom, taking orders from above. They still have a struggle to make ends meet—and the struggle for improvements is now harder than it used to be. For now, whenever the workers take action in their own interests, it is not only against their employers they must struggle, but also against the State—which may be the employer—and their own trade unions!

*From the rules in the Russian T.U. member's subscription book.