

The Causes of War

One Step Forward Two Steps Back for Labour

ONCE AGAIN YOUTH are in trouble, hardly a day goes by without someone rucking about them. This time it's the Labour Party. Since the war the Labour Party has mucked around with their youth movement and by a gradual process reduced it to a gang of youngsters doing the leg-work at election times.

Immediately after the war the Labour League of Youth was formed, but died in 1960 through starvation. The NEC tried again with the Young Socialists who had their own Annual Conference and National Committee, but according to the NEC report to be presented to Labour Party Conference, this is far too libertarian. They are recommending to Conference that the new Labour Party Young Socialists shall discuss at their own Annual Conference only documents presented by the NEC after consultation with the National Committee of the Labour Party Young Socialists. Resolutions submitted must only be on organisational matter and subjects of special concern to youth, like Bingo, Top of the Pops, and my favourite girl friend. Discussion on socialism, war and peace, and industrial matters is strictly taboo, obviously they are too controversial, the Grandmas and the Grandpas of the Labour Party know best. But, to make sure that the youth delegates really conform, they will be elected by local Labour Party branches and not by Young Socialist branches as at present. We can rest assured that the said delegates will be well briefed on the question of public toilets, and bobbing and weaving in the selection of candidates for local

elections.

Of course, the Labour Party is not the only organisation to be embarrassed by its youth, the Communist Party has had similar trouble. Only its youth refuse to believe that black is white, and didn't have the mental capacity to accept the quick changes of the Party line, even though in some instances they were given an hour's notice.

The Conservative Party is not bothered with this problem, its youth appears to be more reactionary than the adult party dares to be (with regrets no doubt).

The trade union movement in the shape of apprentices is suffering from youth trouble, and funnily enough, it's always the youngsters who are in the wrong when in actual fact on many occasions they have proved their case to be correct.

Both the Labour Party and Communist Party blame the Trotskyists for the mutilation of their youth movements, and the only solution they can offer is repression from the, oh so wise, adult movement. The best solution for youth in any political party is to tell the adult politicoes where to get off and leave them to it. They will never change the political parties however much they struggle. The leaders are always right, control must always come from the top. To get to the top one must conform, and to stay there one must control the rank and file.

No one has all the answers, not even the youngsters with fire in their bellies, but at least they should be free to make their own mistakes.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE

WHAT HAPPENED AT Porton last Sunday will be discussed for years to come. After months of thorough preparation by a small but dedicated group, and the added publicity of Douglas Kepper's London-Porton walk, a crowd of about 300 demonstrators, mainly young and determined, assembled at Dunstable Farm about a mile away from the gates of Porton. We had already noticed that the police had no intention whatsoever of defending the several miles of wire-fencing that surround Porton. The local paper's headline was 'Secret Plan by the Police'. What did that mean? The troops were there, too, and helicopters sliced the air above our heads. Were they to stop the column, arrest everybody and put them in army trucks and dump them 20 miles away? Now, of course, after the event the explanation is obvious. The clue was there in the headline of the local paper. It was not a secret plan, but a secret plan. As long as the rest of the world did not hear about the horrors of Porton, let the '100' and the troops enjoy their fun and games. Let there be no arrests, no incidents. Somebody in Government circles must have studied the pattern of '100' versus Press relationship. 2,000 arrests may earn a front-page headline, 200 arrests get an editorial rebuke,

20 arrests result in a funny picture. No arrests, no mention.

Two months ago in a private letter I said that, from an anarchist point of view, for this demonstration to be a success one of the two following conditions had to be fulfilled: 1. The place is left unusable for military purposes, 2. The secrecy is lifted. The first point has only theoretical value. Upon the second was the 'battle' fought.

Now let us examine who was initially helping the Committee. There could have been ten times as many people there if the entire resources of the peace movement had decided to help generously.

How many papers helped? FREEDOM (very generous coverage, probably accounts for the great number of activists there from London, Birmingham, Cardiff, Oxford, Scotland, etc.). ANARCHY (not one word—yet wasn't it the ideal place for theoretical discussion?). Direct Action (one advertisement and an article). Peace News (only 'sent-in' stuff, no editorial opinion, an unbelievable aloofness). Sanity (not a word—CND on such showing will lose its entire youth movement). Socialist Leader (very good coverage, entirely due to the enthusiasm of its editor). Solidarity (not out on time). Resistance (ditto).

THE OUTBREAK OF war between India and Pakistan has shocked the world because it is so apparently senseless. Thus *Peace News* asks, 'How can two countries as poor as India and Pakistan go to war? How can the dispute over Kashmir have gone unresolved for 18 years, and why is it worth going to war over?' The *New Statesman* headlines its leader 'Suicide of a Sub-continent' and goes on, 'Few episodes in history are more tragic than the spectacle of two huge, poverty stricken and fundamentally peaceful countries hurling themselves at each other's throats for the sake of a mountainous province. . . . The war over Kashmir is a crude travesty of all that is irrational in the world.' The *Observer* comments that, 'Two large nations, led not by power-mad megalomaniacs but by sane, civilised and level-headed men, are fighting each other.'

Here, then, is a war in which within a few days, thousands of people have been killed, and many more thousands rendered homeless, and yet for which no one can find a rational cause, and which defies the traditional analyses of why wars break out. India and Pakistan are not fighting for markets, for control of colonies or for living space. They are not fighting because either of their governments have been taken over by maniacs who invade other countries for no better reason than personal dislike, as in the favourite traditional explanation of war! Furthermore, the war has broken out despite the fact that most other governments disapprove of it, that India is thought of throughout the world as a neutralist state, and that Pakistan is a member of countless pacts and treaties all designed in theory to keep the peace and prevent aggression.

At least for once, the apoliticism of *New Society* has enabled it to offer an explanation in general terms. 'The basic factor in Kashmir politics has endured, century after century; this is the utter indifference

of those who rule Kashmir to the hopes and fears of the people'. The writer, Hugh Tinker, concludes optimistically, without giving any reasons, that, 'One day there will have to be a political solution which takes account of the Kashmiris' aspirations.'

Discussion in all the newspapers is befuddled by the use, typical of unthinking political commentators, of words like 'India' and 'Pakistan', indiscriminately, to represent tracts of land, groups of people and governments. It is perfectly clear that the armies are fighting for control of tracts of land, that those who are suffering as a result of the war are the peoples of the two countries, and that the invasions and the counter-invasions are ordered by the governments. The all pervading assumptions of patriotism lead people to identify all these units under the single national banner, and to conclude that because the already poverty stricken peoples are having additional sufferings laid on their shoulders by war, it follows that the politicians, 'sane and civilised men', must be acting irrationally. They are certainly acting against the interests of their peoples, but is it so clear that the war is not very much in the interests of the rival governments?

DO STATES NEED WAR?

Ayub Khan is the military dictator of a theocratic state, one of the many totalitarian regimes allied to the free West, although that has not deterred him from seeking support from China, having learned that fundamental adage of British diplomacy that a state has no permanent friends or enemies, but only interests. What is the justification for a dictator if there is no enemy waiting on the frontiers ready to attack? The government of India, which is attempting to wield various ethnic groups into a single powerful state, has been finding trouble with non-Hindi speaking linguistic groups, Sikhs, Nagas, etc. As several commentators have pointed

out, there is a tradition of non-violence among certain Indians, but is this not even more of a reason why the government of India, at the same time as wanting to unite all the diverse peoples of India against a foreign aggressor, should find it important to demonstrate clearly the need for a strong army and military discipline?

To put it briefly, states need tension and war, and the more insecure a government is, the more unhappy and discontented its people are with their lot, the more likely will it be that the state will feel inclined to embark on military adventures to bolster up its strength. The people's tragedy is the state's advantage. It may well happen that the present war will fade out without either side having 'won', and leaving the questions about which it was allegedly fought as far from solution as ever. What will also persist, unfortunately, will be the power of both governments to unleash further military action as and when it suits them. Although the 'sane, civilised men' who make up these governments probably do not want anyone to be killed or rendered homeless because of their activities, they are prepared for this to happen rather than give up their political power.

Because we believe that the fundamental reason for warfare of this kind does not lie so much in the specific issues over which fighting takes place, but in the political institution of government, which will always throw up an issue, anarchists have little faith in missions by UN personalities or Commonwealth Prime Ministers to the governments concerned. The only way to prevent wars like this taking place is for the people concerned not to take part in or support them, for people to consider themselves as human beings with value in their own right, and not as Indians, Pakistanis, Hindus or Moslems, and least of all as willing cannon-fodder for unscrupulous power politicians. P.H.

In other words, because it was a '100' demonstration, it could not call on the support of the 'self-seekers' of the peace movement.

What about the Government side? They have managed to keep the news out of the nationals (except for snippets) and play it down on the BBC but where they have lost is locally, which is a complete triumph for Richard Harvey and the local Salisbury group.

The place is now known and there was praise for the committee from local people. One farmer living in the district said: 'I've lived here all my life, Porton is a disgrace. If I were younger I would emigrate. To think I used to feed the deer in those woods!'

Nationally the Government has not been able to rely on complete censorship which may be applied to hard news but how can it suppress features? Not a word did I see in the *Sunday Mirror* for example, but they let an article through by Anne Nightingale which gave the words of several anti-war songs by Dylan, Donovan, Baez and this one by Bob Dylan: 'But now we got weapons, / Of the chemical dust, / If fire them we're forced to, / Then fire them we must, / One push of the button, / And a shot the world wide, / And you never ask questions, / When God's on your side.'

All in all however the Government managed to survive the day.

Going through the wire fence was a simple matter. Well over 50 people did so while the rest picketed the gates. To think of all that good arable land wasted, 7,500 acres of it. What is it all used for? Acres of woodland, too. A potato field which may have been cultivated two or three years ago. I could see the red and black flags dotted on the hillside, army cars and trucks

moving to and fro, helicopters above. Roger Sandell and myself must have reached almost the other side when we bumped into two rather nervous servicemen. John Papworth was detained at the same time. His cultivated English voice rang out: 'I wish to inform you,' said he to the soldiers, 'that you are trespassing on land that we have claimed for the World Health Organisation.'

Outside the gates there was a sit-down to prevent the trucks leaving with the 'prisoners'. There were no arrests. One by one the demonstrators were brought out, duly applauded by onlookers. An impromptu public meeting started which showed the Committee in its best light. It gave a chance to Dr. Ronald Sampson, who was too late for the public meeting in Salisbury, to give academic backing for the views of the Committee. His speech, which was warmly applauded by the demonstrators and by at least one policeman until he checked himself, asked for the Hippocratic oath to be extended to scientists so that they should use their knowledge for the alleviation and not for the causing of suffering. A student doctor continued the theme and warned that scientists have no control over micro-biological organisms and he feared the possibility of an epidemic. Richard Harvey castigated the Bishop of Salisbury, who sees nothing wrong in germ warfare, for his 'un-Christian' views.

The meeting then was suddenly interrupted as screams were heard from an army truck which stopped on the main road halted by the traffic. You have never seen a meeting finish so quickly with everybody running to the truck, completely surrounding it, some sitting down in front, some unloosening the ropes holding the canvas on the side,

while the rest chanted: 'Let them' out'. Military policemen came and chucked some people in the ditch, but the numbers and determination of the demonstrators forced the officer in charge to give orders for the release of our comrades.

William Hetherington who resumed the meeting said that 'stopping army trucks and insulting soldiers is not the policy of "100".' Then he closed the meeting formally although at that time Douglas Kepper and Pete Polish and others were still believed to be inside Porton. The Committee of 100 is one of the most human organisations, putting a formal gloss on it can only tend to dehumanize it.

JOHN RETY.

P.S. On the 300th anniversary of a bubonic plague epidemic which killed two-thirds of the population of Eyam in Derbyshire, a celebration was held. Souvenirs such as plague tea-towels, chamber pots, etc., were on sale. Tourists numbered 12,000.

RELEASE SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE POLITICAL PRISONERS!

Demonstration:
3 p.m., September 19th
Belgrave Square

Demonstrators are asked to carry a placard stating a prisoner's name, length of sentence and whether he is Franco's or Salazar's prisoner. They are asked not to bring other banners, flags or posters.

THE TUC FARCE

THE VOTE by the Trades Union Congress on the proposal of their General Council that they should vet pay claims by the unions, has been a farce. The whole thing has been a well staged performance but who do the TUC and the Labour Government think they are kidding?

Mr. Woodcock may have won sufficient votes for his proposal to continue keeping the Government's incomes policy within a voluntary framework, but the Government, for their part, are not satisfied that this has worked and want to use coercion. Mr. Brown plans to introduce legislation next December to put the National Board for Prices and Incomes on a statutory basis and to give the Government power by order—power which would be used only for consultation with the TUC and the Confederation of British Industry to require notification of price increases and pay claims and, if they are referred to the Board, to require their deferment until after the Board has reported.

This is the job the TUC has voluntarily taken on, but even Mr. Woodcock seems uncertain that they can do it. He said, 'I will not assume in theory that our job is impracticable until it has been proved in practice that it is.' One could say why trouble, for it has been pointed out that the TUC has not even got the staff to do this

job, and all sorts of jealousies would creep in as trade union leaders investigated each others' claims.

BOTH NEED ONE ANOTHER

The whole thing is a stage-managed face-saver, not only for the Government, but also for the TUC. *The Economist* says, 'Had a Conservative Government asked the TUC to do something of this nature, it would have met with an angry refusal. But there is a more than special relationship just now between Labour and the TUC. The Labour Party needs its link with the trade unions, for their money and for their local workers. But the TUC (as distinct from the trade unions in general) needs its link with the Labour Party more, in order to preserve the myth of its power and influence over events that in practice go rolling along without it.'

Both the TUC and Mr. Brown know that voluntary restraint will not work, but say they prefer it to legislation. Mr. Woodcock even goes as far as to admit that giving the Government statutory powers in this matter is very dangerous. It was pointed out at the congress that this would be 'the thin end of the wedge'. Let's face it, this is what it amounts to for the futile exercise which the TUC will perform in the coming month will play straight into the hands of those who want a working incomes policy. It will give them reasons for legislation which will restrict wages, but will leave profits unhindered. In fact these were up by 16% in the quarter ended July against 11.9% for the previous quarter.

The unions who voted for the TUC proposal have surrendered to the Government the reason for their very existence, i.e. to gain the highest possible rewards in wages and conditions for their members. Now they are saying that they will go along with the Government in a policy which will serve not the interests of their members, but those of big business. This is no new departure, for trade unions have been doing this in one way or another since the time of their conception. It has been a case of compromise all the way along and they have never challenged the in-

terests of big business. So it is not surprising that in 1965, when the present day developments of British Capitalism demand a restraint on wages so as to become more competitive in the world markets, that conservative body known as the TUC should submit with hardly a whimper.

A RANK AND FILE MOVEMENT

How will all this affect the dues-paying members? Pay increases will be further delayed and further legislation can be expected to keep pay awards down to some acceptable norm. In fact we can expect more State control. On the other hand, it could lead to the shifting of negotiations to the shop floor with workers themselves taking a more active part, for they know what can be expected from their leaderships. This trend in itself will weaken the power of the union officials. In fact further alienation will occur between union leaderships and the members, bringing about more unofficial strikes.

The trend today is for more control over the rank and file union members. The TUC has failed to do this and it has failed in reforming itself. The Royal Commission will give whichever party is in power plenty of recommendations to act upon, such as the breaking up of any unofficial movements among workers. However, opposition can be organised to prevent this, for there are today several rank and file groupings in industry, some tied to political factions, some not. These groupings should be built up, independent of any political control, into a movement within the official trade union movement, covering industries and not crafts, and bringing all workers together in a struggle not only against union executives, but also the employers.

It should be a movement which sees the State as an instrument of oppression, an institution which assists the employers and opposes the interests of the workers. We hope the rank and file turns along these lines in their endeavour to find an answer to the problems which now face them.

P.T.

Contact Column

Glasgow. Glasgow Anarchist Group are having a 'bus run to Edinburgh on week-end September 25-27 as a get-together for libertarians and sympathisers. Cost per head 50/- including Saturday lunch; bed and breakfast Saturday-Sunday. Twelve seats still available. Raffles in aid of food parcels, etc. for Stuart Christie. Contact R. Lynn, 2b Saracen Head Lane, Glasgow, C.1, if interested.

Hull—Accommodation. Painter-teacher, man, wants lock-up living/working quarters (reasonable rent) from beginning October. Unfurnished if possible. Central or other busy district preferred. Box 12.

Secretary Wanted. London Committee of 100. Post vacant end of September. Enquiries and applications to London Committee of 100, 13 Goodwin Street, London, N.4. ARC 1239.

New Poster
War Waste Why?
Politics!
3½d. 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.

Room Wanted—London. Shift worker would like room with mod. cons. South, or West Kensington. Box 11.

Leicester Accommodation. Unfurnished cheap weather-proof accommodation wanted by mature (?) student, wife and two children. Any proposals (sharing, etc.) considered. Mike Radford, 90 Westfield, Harlow, Essex.

London Accommodation. Couple and son (two years) seek 2/3 unfurnished rooms, North London. Box 8.

Kirkdale School. South London's new co-educational and progressive day school offers skilled teaching by qualified teachers, small groups and modern methods to children of 3½ to 13 years. 186 Kirkdale, S.E.26. Tel.: SYD 0149.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

Freedom

For Workers' Control

SEPTEMBER 18 1965 Vol. 26 No. 29

Ford's Offer 'Take it or Leave it'

ON AUGUST 19, the Ford Motor Company put their workers on a four day week—just like that. The unions had no prior knowledge whatsoever, in fact the Ford plant at Halewood not so long ago disciplined car workers for not working overtime.

The reasons for this action have been many and varied. Ford's management take the easy way out and claim that the credit squeeze is responsible for lack of demand. The naive politicians claim it is deliberate sabotage against a Labour Government. This is a load of cod's wallop, Ford's would not stop making money just to have a go at an insipid Labour Government.

The main reason is fairly obvious, simply 'OVER PRODUCTION'. The industrial editor of the *Financial Times* date 20.8.65, makes the point quite clearly, 'Ford is the first to break the ice, principally because it has not suffered from strikes or labour shortages and has been able to keep production in line with sales. Its share of the market has increased slightly this year, but not enough to offset the general decline in sales.'

Mr. Stan Newens, MP for Epping, put it another way, 'If it wasn't for the

good relations on the shop floor at Fords, there would not be any short time working.' So in a nutshell, by piece-time working and general speed up, the car workers at Fords have worked themselves on short time.

Another aspect of this calculated swindle is the fact that Fords, England, doesn't work in isolation but in conjunction with Fords, America and Fords, Europe. And if the necessity arises can cut back in one place or the other. It has been reported that Fords, England, are prohibited by the master plan from entering certain overseas markets, so, therefore, British workers are at the mercy of the American juggernaut (American or British what's the difference?).

The solution to the problem is in the hands of the Ford workers. If the production in the four days that they are working drops, due to nervous tension, anxiety state, then the fifth day would be needed to pick up lost production. Fords can well afford to consider the health of their production workers and if they can't, the production workers themselves can enlighten the Ford hierarchy.

PANDORA'S BOX IS OPENED

THE TRADE UNION reform hounds are on the trail. Disturbances in the motor industry have given them a further taste of blood. The appointment of a Royal Commission whetted their appetite but now this is too slow, they want action now. The TUC pre-warning system is a start, backed by the insertion of teeth into the Prices and Incomes Board.

On August 29, in the *Sunday Telegraph*, Desmond Donnelly, MP, in a centre spread article, decided that a Royal Commission is too slow and that the Government should take legislative action on three points: (a) Incomes and Prices Council should be invested with statutory powers; (b) Recognised contracts between management and union should be legally enforceable, either side have the right to sue the other if it defaults. A statutory period of notice before any strike action can be taken should be enforceable; (c) Certain statutory rules must apply to all unions including the introduction of the secret ballot before strike action can be taken. Mr. Donnelly puts forward these suggestions for the good of his party and his country.

There is a 'whiff of anarchy in the air,' says Donnelly; that scent to me would be sweeter than roses if it were true. After claiming that the trade union movement is failing and failing disastrously, from the viewpoint of national interest, he goes on to support a policy of a fake industrial unionism, one union, one factory, wherever practicable, so that the union official can be brought closer to the shop floor. Donnelly would also like to see more centralised negotiating machinery in which annual increases are agreed across the whole range of industries, within the overall capacity of the country to pay.

The whole tone of the article is a proposal to force the rank and file worker into a well planned trap so that he can only move by permission of the state.

At the end of the article he knocks

the employers with a feather duster when he states 'I am equally critical of the employers' representatives in certain industries. I have seen many of these employers conduct a charade during negotiations.' Mr. Donnelly strikes them with a feather duster because, 'they give way often because they are gutless, or because they are only too ready to pass on increased costs. They too have their responsibility. But that is another story.'

Obviously Mr. Donnelly favours the corporate state. That's okay, that's his opinion, but many MPs and trade union leaders support his views. The next eighteen months could mean a tough time for all workers; once the openings are made, any government can and will push forward the necessary legislation, all in the NATIONAL INTEREST. The only people who can force the plan to fail are the Joe Soaps, not by looking for, and following leaders, but by their own efforts. Surely we must have learnt by now, all governments are the same, history to date proves the case.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

ANARCHY 55

DISCUSSES

MUTUAL AID

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