

# Many were cold but few were frozen

ON TUESDAY February 1, a demonstration organized by the London Committee of 100 was held in the 'Strangers' Gallery' and the 'Lobby' of the House of Commons.

During the afternoon the Speaker had refused to allow a motion on Vietnam to be moved. He said that the American bombing did not directly concern the British Government and therefore, was not the business of the House.

All of that day people had been busy contacting others so as to get them into the Commons at regular intervals. Letters had been written, telephone calls had been made. The greatest care was taken to prevent the police finding out about it.

The first arrest (removal is more correct since we were not charged, but held until the House rose... so we couldn't cause any more trouble I suppose) took place at about 7.15 p.m. and the last at 10 p.m. This means that for almost three hours the important business of the House was being continually interrupted. The important business was: (a) Should we buy planes from the US or should we rely on British ones to do the job? (Guess what the job was!); and (b) Salmon and Trout. These two things were what OUR MPs were spending their valuable time on.

When I got into the Gallery about ten people had already been taken out. It was interesting to see that there were only a couple of dozen of THEM down there. And one of them was asleep!

After about 15 minutes (of this Irishman talking about giving planes to Belfast) there was a snigger from below about all the noise in the Gallery. Needless to say, I leaned forward and yelled out, 'And what about Vietnam!' Then this arm comes round my neck from behind and pulls me out of the seat and onto the floor. There's no real point in saying anything other than... I was dragged (by the neck, arm, leg) and kicked (by an Inspector) into a lift and taken down into the dungeons where the other disruptive elements were waiting.

The police tried the old trick of getting you to empty your pockets without them having charged you. One person was searched against his will even though he objected strongly. For some reason I wasn't searched when I told them that they would have to bring some charge against me before I would allow them to see what I had with me.

By nine o'clock this was the situation: there were ten men in a large cell which had one window and a door that led into a sort of charge room where they were keeping six women.

From 9 p.m. till 12.35 a.m. we did the things that everyone does while waiting in a cell: we tried to burn the door down, we tried to cut the window out, we pulled the iron grill off the door, and we covered the walls with drawings and pieces of poetry and statements concerning freedom. One of the cops became very angry when he saw what we had done to his beautiful cell (Guy Fawkes was probably the last guy to be in there). (Having visions of seeing him at Midnight walking through the wall.)

The police were their usual selves: apart from me being kicked, someone else was punched on the jaw and numerous people were pulled and pushed all over the place.

Everyone was allowed to make a phone

call (only if it was in the London area, and because of this one man could not let his wife know what had happened to him), and go to the toilet, but they would not give us anything to drink (not even water). One cop said: 'Where do you think you are, on a holiday?' when asked for some water.

One of the important things to come out of this demonstration was that the press and radio and TV gave it as much publicity (good publicity!) as any Committee demonstration has ever had. It also marked the return (?) of Pat Arrowsmith... from out of the oblivion of writing.

The important thing that must be done now is a follow-up. Could this be not only the return of Pat Arrowsmith, but the return of the Committee as it once was. Perhaps in two weeks time we will be able to fill Parliament Square and/or the Lobby of the Commons. If these are important things! Perhaps the Committee can once again be a threat (?) to the State that has tried its utmost to destroy all of its opposition, but, as always, looks as if it may fail.

TONY JACKSON

## BOND WASHING

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS GENERALLY have an aura or mystique around them that confuses people and this, in many cases, is a deliberate reason for the presence of the mystique. If the same things were described in the terms of the race track or more commonplace ways, the fiddles involved would become too outrageous to be accepted.

This is the case in the recent outburst over 'bond washing' where to call it a fiddle or conspiracy would be a too ungentlemanly way to describe the discreet goings-on in the City of London. With references to 'cum' and 'ex' dividend bonds instead of odds, weights, distances or the intricacies of pools, the issues have been rather confusing even for the 'experts' who have presented it in the financial pages of the Press.

No one—and all are so patently and transparently honest about the business—is quite sure how it was done, who, except those proclaiming themselves free of guilt (!), were really involved and who exactly benefited.

The technical details are difficult to explain and, one would hope, fail to benefit FREEDOM readers, but the prerequisites of 'bond washing' deals are, firstly, the peculiar legal approach to taxation, which makes the fine distinction between tax 'avoidance' (which is lawful) and tax 'evasion' (which is unlawful); secondly the application of special tax exemptions to holders of British Government Bonds not legally resident in Britain; and finally the deliberate and convenient blindness of the stock-jobbers (people who buy and sell bonds and shares on their own accounts and not for clients as a stock-broker does), who are given special privileges by the tax authorities.

The general conclusion from the recent events is that if you are stupid enough to work and pay tax, there is a happy conjuncture of old boys' clubs in the financial world, including lawyers, stock-brokers, stock-jobbers, bankers, account-

# The Language of Power

'Does the US seek wider war?' (FREEDOM, 15.1.66.)

'Danger of war in South-East Asia—American warning to West'. (Times, 5.2.66.)

IN OUR ARTICLE we suggested that Thailand is being prepared as the bulwark of the West. The Times reporter from Washington places the argument on its head. This is the relevant quote:

Mr. David Bell, the administrator of the Agency for International Development, said that Chinese troops could intervene, not only in Vietnam but elsewhere in the area.

North Vietnam had given clear and open notice that it was about to start a war of liberation in Laos and Thailand. It had already started in Thailand, where police and border guards in the north-east provinces were being murdered, but the Bangkok Government hoped to throttle the war.

In all fairness to the reporter, who has in the past been a unique source of information of the chicanery that goes on in Washington, we do not know whether his despatch was shortened. A previous article, that appeared in The Times from their correspondent in Northern Thailand, flatly contradicts Mr. David Bell's account. It simply says that there is no insurrection and the men don't want to be ruled by either Peking or Washington, not even Bangkok. The fact that police and border guards occasionally get killed, is the natural reaction of people who have lived

without the trappings of government and police and suddenly find themselves in the heat of an 20th Century struggle for power.

Mr. Bell, 'a former Rhodes scholar who is not given to exaggeration' is also not given to amplification. The Americans would not be building port facilities in Bangkok, and cutting a road to the Mekong Valley, with airports dotted all over Thailand at a stated cost of \$200m. unless they wanted to shift the theatre of war to Thailand.

How do we know all this? In last week's FREEDOM a writer said (in the context of another article where his anarchist analysis proved correct):

Well, there it is, and I am not one of those anarchists who are supposed to be getting tired of saying, 'We told you so'. The more we are proved right the more will people be compelled to admit the usefulness of the anarchist analysis and attitude.

In the opinion of another anarchist, our method is merely inspired guesswork where our natural distrust of governments comes in useful. When governments spend \$200m. in a country ten thousand miles away from its own, on military installations, conclusions can be quickly arrived at. Neither do we trust the government of Hanoi. The orders for the 'liberation' of Thailand may have already been given. Hanoi must act quickly, before the Americans have completed that road and settled themselves com-

fortably on the backs of the Thai-

If this was printed in a daily newspaper accessible to the people of this country, or in an international newspaper accessible to the people of the world, I am sure there would still be time to stop the war in Thailand. But to bring us back to reality, here is another quote from a paper that does go round the world, the Daily Telegraph:

It is of little use to shower dollars on a battlefield; and those who condemn Mr. Johnson for showering bombs on North Vietnam should be invited to propose some speedier way of ending the war—no bombing brought no peace.

And again:

And it is not surprising that some Americans, watching the growing menace of Peking, would prefer to confront China now rather than wait until she attains full nuclear power.

No doubt the man who writes the editorials in Hanoi or in Peking has learned to be as callous as the Telegraph's editorial writer. Between these people there is no human dialogue, they call for wars as others call for tea. As an anarchist I can only guess, I can only surmise; I am not in possession of all the facts, neither is my opinion asked or of any consequence. Nevertheless I am revolted by the intellectual acceptance of human suffering which makes it possible for another war game player, this time in the Observer, to refer to the Vietnamese as the 'Asian Serbs'.

R.

Can any lesson be drawn? Perhaps all it goes to show is that the Great Train Robbers got caught and convicted because they were neither gentlemen nor astute. If they had registered as a member of a stock exchange or become a public company, they might have got away with it. Instead they used force—ungentlemanly except against natives—and stole private property—money belonging to banks—to the extent of over £2 million. They were strenuously hunted down and got 30 years apiece for their pains when caught.

On the other hand, another set of like-minded conspirators are at the moment successfully getting away with apparently between £3 and £4 million of money belonging to tax payers. Conveniently the authorities do not appear willing to act swiftly as yet, because they

are not sure whether it is legal, illegal or merely semi-legal—a curious state of affairs. The Stock Exchange, enjoying special favour and virtual subsidy from the State, has asked its members to police its self-made rules, more honoured apparently in the breach than observance, like gentlemen, otherwise the State might reluctantly be forced to intervene. The perpetrators on the other hand—apart from some loss of honour: a quality valued highly among thieves—have where 'identified' been reprimanded or suspended from something, or other for a short time without monetary loss while the majority remain secure in their anonymity and in possession of the lolly.

As Proudhon once asked, 'What is Property?'

I. A. P. SOCK.

## On his Own Jack

porting Goldwater. But he did have reservations about the way the Vietnam war was being fought, and, presumably, he preferred the University to the Gulf of Tongking.

The US Navy decided to collect him on the morning of January 21. Bruce's girl friend had just called round to go to a lecture with him, when a member of Leeds CID arrived, and politely informed Bruce that two US naval officers were waiting outside for him; they wanted to take him down to London and it would be better if he 'came quietly'. Bruce was taken off in their car, and the girl friend hurried to see the university authorities. They expressed their sympathy, but told her there was nothing they could (would—?) do about it. The Students' Union was much more helpful.

The secretary, Jack Straw, put phone calls through to the Home Office (not much joy) and the National Council for Civil Liberties, who contacted English and American lawyers. By now, other people in London had got to hear of what was happening.

When Bruce arrived in London, he was taken to the Navy's offices in the American Embassy to talk things over. After a while, the American official had to leave poor Bruce alone to answer a

rather long telephone call. When he got back, Bruce had disappeared.

By now the Embassy staff must have been rather embarrassed. They got permission from Washington to set up a tribunal and review Bruce Jack's case—in his absence. On the following Monday, the tribunal discharged the missing Bruce Jack from the Navy 'with dishonour', and saved themselves the further embarrassment of searching the British Isles for him.

It's hard to see why the American authorities risked a lot of bad publicity by trying to abduct a genuine student from a foreign country. Perhaps it was an administrative blunder; perhaps they didn't care about the publicity. More likely, they'd hoped to hustle Bruce quickly back to the States, without any complications of Bruce escaping and giving the case a lot of publicity.

Is this sort of thing likely to happen again? And how often has it happened before? The position of many Americans studying here must now be in question. It would be interesting to know how much the British CID collaborates with American armed forces. Maybe the Labour Party's new Home Secretary will tell us, just for the record.

ANDREW LLOYD.





# Protest by 'Direct Labour'

**S**OUTHWARK COUNCIL seem to have taken a leaf out of McAlpine's book in terms of importing labour. Southwark Council are importing labour from Scotland, whereas McAlpine imported Irish labour.

Southwark Council have flown in bricklayers from Scotland using potential earnings of £40 per week as bait. The minor point being that the workers will have to work an 84 hour week to earn that kind of money.

I understand that the living accommodation is really palatial, they were given beds from a reception centre and slept in a first aid shed on the site. I suppose an 84 hour week doesn't leave much time for anything else other than sleep.

I don't doubt for one moment that the Scottish building workers are only too pleased to earn a few bob, and their acceptance of the job is up to a point understandable, but obviously this is not the solution either to Scotland's unemployment or Southwark's labour shortage.

Some local councils are notorious for the low wages they pay. They pounce on the fact that most of their labour is local, and therefore the workers will put up with anything because they can get home to dinner and have very little travelling expenses.

Southwark Council is no exception to the rule, the wages they offer are chicken feed in comparison with other contractors. The council's 2,500 strong labour force has threatened to strike over conditions

in general, i.e., reorganisation proposals, bonus disputes and finally importing of labour. Several trades claim unpaid bonuses still owing.

Most local councils just tolerate 'direct labour force' and every attempt is made to expose them in terms of 'inefficient and expensive'. Other departments within the council take every available opportunity to pass on their 'on costs'. 'Direct labour forces' are the Aunt Sallies for all and sundry, even when tendering for a contract they are at a disadvantage. Local councils would far sooner spend their money on all the pomp and bullshit that goes with mayoralty than on council workers.

Bermondsey Trades Council suggests that Southwark's direct labour force should have its own training scheme. This is fair enough provided it is a proper training scheme and not an excuse for cheap labour.

'Importation of Labour' is a well-known game among building trade employers, it is used as a 'divide and rule' tactic, and unfortunately

all too often it succeeds. In many instances the 'imported labour' is non union, and non union for the worst possible reasons, higher pay under worst possible conditions, safety regulations taking a back seat.

Southwark Council workers are right to oppose the principle of imported labour under these conditions, but having said this, integrated rank and file should go into action for the benefit of all. The 'brickies' of Scotland must not be treated like someone from another planet and on the other hand Scottish workers must assist Southwark workers in improving conditions.

As has been said before, 'unemployment' is England's favourite export to Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales, and will continue to be so until we do something about it. 'Chauvinism' is the policy of governments and their lackeys, 'Solidarity of the Joe Soaps' must be the policy for us if we are to keep our heads above water.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

## Is Glasgow Giving Up the Struggle?

**A**T A RECENT rank and file conference in Glasgow, Harry McShane, veteran revolutionary agitator, spoke of the shame he felt over the Fairfields situation. Anyone who knows the history of Glasgow can understand how he felt. This city had the only effective anti-war movement Britain has known—the Clyde Workers' Committee, during the 1914-18 War.

In the '20s, Clydeside trembled on the brink of revolution. There was the Clydebank Rent Strike, which lasted three years and ended in victory for the tenants. Evictions were attempted at dead of night, but loudspeaker vans would roam the streets shouting 'Evictions! Evictions!' and men and women would rise from their beds to do battle with the police and authorities.

In George Square, Glasgow, John McLean told assembled shipbuilding workers, 'The distance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Republic of Scotland is the distance between George Square and Maryhill Barracks'. Soldiers were locked in Maryhill to prevent them being contaminated by the spirit of revolt. The ruling class were so frightened they brought in soldiers from other parts of the country and posted them as snipers on rooftops in the city centre. Tanks were stationed in the meat market. In 1926 came the General Strike, and the government went to the extraordinary length of sending battleships up the Clyde and turning the guns on working class districts. (Would the Navy have fired if it came to the push?) No wonder Lenin called Glasgow the vanguard of the international working class struggle. He was wrong about a lot of things, but for once he spoke the truth.

Through the years Glasgow has remained a militant city. Many working class advances have been won. But has something been lost? When the owners of the Fairfields Yard announced that, in spite of having orders to last for years to come, the yard must close, where was the militancy for which Glasgow is famous? A number of Fairfield workers wrote a leaflet, which was produced for them by the Solidarity Group, saying, 'Let us take over the yard ourselves'. The majority of workers did not think this a practical solution. Why not? If they said 'The capitalists have failed, we will prove that the workers can succeed', there would be widespread support for them. But the workers dithered, and what we have now is a shabby compromise.

At the same time as transport workers in New York went on strike 'till hell

freezes over', the men of Fairfields were making concessions to yet another capitalist, Mr. Stewart, who had graciously consented to exploit them. While an Irishman in New York, as the spokesman for a group of people of many different races, told a judge to drop dead in his black robes, the workers of Glasgow licked the boot which kicked them.

What made Glasgow so militant in the past was not just poverty, but also propaganda. Great chunks of revolutionary propaganda, year after year. It must be so in the future. Not only in Glasgow but throughout Scotland. We anarchists have a job to do, to spread the message of revolt through the length and breadth of Scotland. Harold Wilson has said he would like to be the Prime Minister who solved the Irish Problem (he thinks he can solve it with trade agreements). I think it's high time we gave him a Scottish Problem.

MICHAEL BUCHANAN.

## Contact Column

**Harry Michaels' father**, of the FAS is in Hackney Hospital, Ward A5 and would like visitors. Visiting 7.30 p.m.-8.00 p.m. daily, except Thursday and Sundays 2.30 p.m.-3.30 p.m.

**Glasgow Anarchists!** A meeting will be held to discuss AFB Conference. For details write to Dave Coull, 89 Dalriada Crescent, Motherwell.

**Help!** Help wanted, male or female, to clean and redecorate room in East London. Evenings or Saturday afternoons. Remuneration by arrangement. Box 22.

**Help Wanted.** Thursday evenings from 5 p.m. onwards with folding and despatch of FREEDOM. No remuneration. Apply in person on Thursdays at Express Printers, 84a Whitechapel High Street, E.1 (up Angel Alley). Near Aldgate East Station. (Art Gallery exit.)

**Room to Let.** £2 5s. per week. Girl preferred. 31 Ongar Road, S.W.6. See John Pugh.

**Help Wanted.** To sell FREEDOM. West Ham Anarchists. At Brick Lane (Petticoat Lane). Meet Sunday morning, 11.15 a.m. at Bishopsgate entrance, Liverpool Street Station.

**Accommodation.** Wanted, libertarian working girl to join West London (near Marble Arch) mixed community in mid-January. Own sordid room. Rent £2 10s. including electricity and gas. Box 20.

**Accommodation.** Couple wishing to 'legalise' quite soon; must find accommodation before doing so for selves and 2½-year-old daughter as soon as possible. Cheap rent perhaps in return for some work in house, garden, etc. Town or country; anything, anywhere considered. Please contact Stella A. Fauser, 242 Amesbury Avenue, London, S.W.2.

### New Poster

War Waste Politics!

3½d. each plus postage. Orders to Bill Sticker, c/o 17a Maxwell Road, London, S.W.6.

If you wish to make contact let us know.

# Freedom For Workers' Control

FEBRUARY 12 1966 Vol 27 No 5

## BUSMEN:

# A Revolutionary Solution

**T**HE LONDON TRANSPORT debacle proves once again that workers who have no control over the Industry they sell their lives to, are likely to be as disgruntled by one government as the next.

The London Transport Authority imposes its timetables on its workers and public alike, and rejects out of hand any proposals of the Stewards' Committees, and rank and file. The only expression of the rank and file is to resort to go-slows, strikes, work to rule, etc. (from which they are often the losers).

Now none of these mentioned might be the anarchist solution, but then again, many anarchists might not have the problems either, but busmen have! and to be dogmatic about the revolutionary solution, etc., doesn't help one iota. What surely does help, however, from the anarchist point of view, is the fact that a practical and revolutionary solution does exist. What, after all, could be more practical than bus crews convening at their garages and working out a rota over which, that which is beneficial to them, is the criteria of how the rota works. After all, it doesn't matter how many surveys the Transport Authorities make of road conditions, the crew alone knows the work involved. Workers' control of transport, as of anything else, is based on the practical satisfaction of need, in the most responsible and humane way.

Part and parcel of the concept of workers' control is, surely, that in its practice, workers have the opportunity to be outside the label of 'workers' and look for the human solutions to the problems of capitalist economics, leading up to its elimination. Under workers'

control the worker, involved in the everyday responsibility of performing useful functions, would be extending and developing his individuality, through taking part in co-operative enterprise as opposed to submissive labour.

### TO SATISFY A SOCIAL NEED

Now many anarchists will say, 'But do we want transport, or, for that matter, industry at all run in any way at all?' (e.g. arms factories, human cattle-trucks, etc.). This writer's answer is no. But the getting rid of them is only going to come from those people who are now working in them, realising that there are other aspects to living and organising than the ones they are faced with at present. With the transport for example, controlled by the workers, it might become a service designed to satisfy not only a social need, but also social needs will change under workers' control, thus changing aspects of industry and behaviour, and putting everyday living onto a more sane basis.

State-controlled industries we have now learned (some of us knew) are an extension of the profit system. Workers' Control of Industry is also to do with profit, but in this case, profit changes its meaning. All can profit from the free availability of necessary commodities. We do not have to regurgitate the 'glorious anarchist past' to understand that workers are capable of organising jobs more efficiently than bosses or even union bosses; what we have to do is to stimulate interest amongst workers, not in the catchphrases and lies of the modern public relations gimmickists, but in the old truths, which need yet to be tried.

Revolutionary precepts don't follow the fashions of the day. For ages, thinkers have realised that who owns the work controls the workers. The anarchists say fair enough.

The worker must control the work!  
F.H.

FORD'S

## Who will gain from the Inquiry?

**T**HE UNIONS and the Ford management have agreed to an inquiry into the work schedules of the paint sprayers. This is the outcome of the recent thirteen-day strike, which seems to have been provoked by the management. They tried to reduce the rest period from 104 paid minutes per day to 53 minutes. Paint sprayers were asked to sign a form which set out this reduction, but they refused and came out on strike immediately.

During recent negotiations, the unions had turned down all suggestions for a cut in these rest periods. They wanted an extra 4d. per hour, but finally settled for 2d., with an official 'failure to agree' being registered on rest periods. Fords say that this reduction would put the Dagenham sprayers in line with those at Halewood, that the paint shops are very similar and that the Halewood rest periods compare very well with those in the plants of other car manufacturers. They claim that the present paint shop, which was opened in 1959, is much better and long rest periods are not needed. It has certainly taken Fords a long time to realise this and their statement about the rest periods at Halewood must be incorrect because union officials there have been trying, unsuccessfully so far, to extend the rest periods there. Apparently these fall below the standard set in the Agreement.

Even with improved spraying and extraction equipment, the job still remains an unpleasant one. Work is done

in booths, with the men wearing protective masks for health reasons and so frequent rest breaks are essential. It seems that Fords think they have good grounds for cutting the rest periods. Although the unions did not accept the cuts at the last negotiations, they do sit on the efficiency committee with the management. They also agreed to co-operate in what Fords call 'efficiency measures as part of the general wage settlement last December'. With over £200m. invested in the last five years in the United Kingdom, Fords are after getting this back by way of increased productivity. In this they have the backing of the Government. Even one of the unions involved, the Transport and General Workers Union which was the first union to declare the dispute official, is all in favour of increased production with higher wages, but it seems that the present Ford scheme was going even too far for them.

### EVERYTHING TO GAIN

This dispute has shown that shop floor organisation is on the mend after the 1962 debacle. The sprayers were getting the support of the other sections, but I am afraid the calls for action were addressed to the union executives and not to the rank and file. Shop stewards were calling for a national official stoppage at all Ford plants. While the inquiry is taking place, the sprayers will operate the old work schedules. Fords wanted them to work the new ones, but finally accepted the 'status quo'.

The *Daily Worker*, on one hand, has called this a 'retreat by the management from their tough "work first, query afterwards" line', while on the other hand, the *Financial Times* says that the company 'agreed with obvious reluctance to allow work to be resumed on the unions' terms'. But the important thing is the nature of the compromise that is going to be reached by Mr. Scamp's inquiry. For it will be a compromise, meaning that rest periods will be reduced, not perhaps to the extent that Fords planned, but nevertheless reduced. So Fords have everything to gain. Perhaps the unions and Fords realised that, with the mounting pressure for extending the dispute, some agreement had to be reached in order to save the face of both of them.

The strike has brought to light the differences in conditions between Halewood and Dagenham. Surely the thing now is to try to bring the Halewood rest periods up to those at Dagenham. In order to do this, liaison and close co-operation is needed between the workers at the two plants. This is a must if further moves by the management are to be defeated. It is also necessary to prevent any worsening of the work conditions of the sprayers after the inquiry. It is not an inquiry that is needed, but action to bring the rest periods of the paint sprayers at the plants at Halewood and of other car manufacturers up to those at Dagenham.  
P.T.