

## Spanish Students demand Free Unions

**RENEWED DEMONSTRATIONS** IN Spain against the imposed military rule of General Franco prove yet again the rottenness of the regime. It deliberately slows down the pace of the nation and keeps it far behind the rest of Europe, lest the wave of prosperity that other countries have enjoyed should benefit the Spanish people too. It relies upon poverty as one of the means of coercion over a defeated nation. It does everything in its power to lower the standards of the workers, using mass unemployment and hunger-levels as a lever against the unofficial strikers. So far does it put the screws upon the nation that even the middle-class, with a vested interest in social stability, is moved to protest. When economic pressure and police action fails, in every case Franco relies upon military oppression. He can never forget the victorious part he played in the second Moorish Conquest, the subjugation of Free Spain.

### IT'S MUTINY!

The students of Spain cannot be equated with those of England or of most other countries, where educational grants and advanced education have allowed a freer University entrance since post-war years, at any rate. In Spain, the possibility of entering the University at all is entirely bound up with what one's parents can afford, and their degree of loyalty to State and Church. But students cannot be restricted in a closed society like that of Old Japan, kept apart from radical influences. They too are capable of seeing the degradation imposed upon the nation by its Army. And even the Church is finding out with alarm that it is becoming increasingly isolated, and that if it continues to be exclusively bound up with the Franco regime, it will fall when that regime falls. Hence the dissident Catholicism and latter-day 'Christian Democracy' of the Spanish Universities.

Rebelling against the loyalty tests and other checks upon their political reliability, which are designed to

haunt them from school to the grave, the students have asked for some of the elementary rights granted in European universities since the Middle Ages. This has caused the maximum alarm in ruling circles, which fear any sort of unity between the students—not yet corrupted by professional and business life or stagnated in comfortable middle-class mediocrity—and the working classes, who have been striking against fascism by one means or another for the last 25 years, making it impossible for the Army to pretend successfully that it has ever formed a normal governmental administration even by dictatorship standards. Spain is still governed by the mentality that was created on Moorish campaign grounds, and the rebellion of the students is treated as a mutiny. If it persists, it will be treated as an enemy campaign. Today the students are being arrested and court-martialled; if this is not successful, the Universities will be closed and the students will be shot down.

Following the line taken by many dictators, Franco does his best to divert matters by staging an international crisis. Gibraltar is an ever-present possibility in this regard. He knows full well that the British Government do not intend to give it up, so he is quite safe in fulminating for its return. In this way, the general of Spain's occupying army can show himself in the unaccustomed role of Spanish patriot, without the least cost to himself, and if it disrupts southern Spanish economy, this is hardly a matter on which a general can be expected to disturb himself.

### 'UNDER ORDERS'

Whilst every rising in Spain is suppressed with untold degrees of blood and suffering—and we must never forget that many good men and women have suffered in jail for over 20 years for their opinions—it is not sufficient to blame Franco alone. After his death every one of his hangmen generals, every Falangist and police official, every torturer, will want to seek refuge in the excuse: 'I acted under orders', and this will be accentuated by the fact that Spain is under military rule. The Spanish Resistance should make it clear that full note is being taken of the identities of those responsible, under Franco, for the present excesses. Only the existence of a Black Book of the Spanish Military criminals will induce them to moderate their actions against the Spanish people, which are otherwise bound to grow as Franco nears his end and tries to make the country 'safe' for his chosen successor, whoever it may be. If his plans go astray, and the Spanish workers and peasants break their bonds, the students will be able to render a major service to the revolution by exposing the men responsible for the military terror. This is the only weapon they have against persecution today.

INTERNATIONALIST.

# The Price of 'Face': 75,000 DEAD!

**SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND PEOPLE KILLED** in S. Vietnam since the beginning of the guerrilla war. How many died fighting the French is anyone's guess. A military playground for the Pentagon. The \$64,000 question—how to end the war? At the moment this is impossible.

The Americans demand the ending of Vietcong activities, when Vietcong controls two-thirds of S. Vietnam. The Liberation Front demand the evacuation of American forces from S. Vietnam which the Yanks refuse because of losing face to China. Also, of course, America is the champion of the *free world* and is not prepared to step down.

There is growing opposition in the States to the continuance of the Vietnam struggle. Most of the demands for negotiation are coming from the liberal Senate Democrats. It is gradually seeping through that the war in Vietnam cannot be won on a military basis. Frank Church, Idaho's Democratic Senator stated, 'There are limits to what we can do in helping any government surmount a Communist uprising,' he said, even before the latest in the string of coups and counter coups. 'If the people themselves will not support the government in power, we cannot save it. . . . The Saigon government is losing its war, not for lack of equipment, but for lack of internal cohesion. The Vietcong grow stronger, not because they are better supplied than Saigon, but because they are united in their will to fight. This spirit cannot be imported; it must come from within. . . . the question really is not whether we should negotiate, but when.'

Senator McGovern of South

Dakota in the Vietnam policy debate said 'We could pulverize the great cities of China and North Vietnam and still not end the guerrilla warfare. It is not our mission to play policeman to the world.' (*Newsweek* 1.3.65). At the moment this point of view has the support, private and public, of 20 or more Senators. Of course it is only fair to say that the Pentagon policy of *smash everyone and everything* has the support of the reactionaries.

President Johnson is balanced precariously on the tight rope, using Russia as a stick to beat China. When he visited S. Vietnam under the Kennedy regime he promised the S. Vietnamese that America would keep them *free*. Maybe he regrets this, but you can rest assured CIA who are *accountable only to themselves* will not.

What of the S. Vietnamese governments? Take your pick, their interests lie in maintaining the status quo. Corruption is item one on the agenda, if you are in the swim you live it up at a price, if you are not then you are one of the 2,000,000 who can just afford their daily rice and fresh vegetables. French culture and catholicism are still strong in Saigon, the 'haves' don't want to lose this and are willing to prosecute the war at the expense of millions of peasants over a period of 50 years if necessary. This is the *free Vietnam* America wants to maintain, it's as transparent as a pane of glass.

'Vietnam is suffering too much—we want to end the war with honour' (my italics) so said the premier of S. Vietnam, Phan Huy Quat on 25 February in Saigon. Deputy Premier Tran Van Do

declared 'We want Peace—but not at all costs'. Until the Vietcong withdraw the time was not ripe for talks. CIA speaks in many languages.

Britain stands patiently by as head cheer leader for American power politics. Wilson will scratch Johnson's back in Vietnam in the hope that Johnson will do the same in Malaysia.

The pseudo left-wingers in the Labour Government are working hard with their resolutions. They may rock the boat a little but they won't risk sinking it. On this issue Wilson is well supported by his Tory and Liberal colleagues.

According to tonight's news (7.3.65) more American advisers have landed in S. Vietnam, they used to call them US marines, and so it will go on, in the eyes of the big powers a necessary skirmish to maintain their foothold in S.E. Asia, from there they can keep their eye on Laos and Cambodia, and it's a further base to intimidate China.

Arthur Cook summed up the situation well in the *Daily Mail* (6.3.65) 'It is those peasants who suffer most now as the bombers and Government troops blast their crops and villages trying to get to grips with the ever-growing Vietcong.'

'Only recently I landed by helicopter next to a bamboo village which had been the scene of a battle. An old lady rummaged in the wreckage of what had been her home, fished out her dead dog and threw it at the American "advisers" just ahead of me.'

'The woman spat and turned back to her rubble. She had expressed the feeling which is sending her sons to fight with the Vietcong.'

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

## THE RHODESIAN BETRAYAL

**SOUTHERN AFRICA HAS** recently witnessed the consolidation of the white settler oligarchy. The Labour Government which, on coming to power, was so critical of the Rhodesian Prime Minister has, it seems, betrayed the African people of Rhodesia. Mr. Ian Smith, having obtained an acquiescent visit from the Labour Colonial Secretary, Mr. Bottomley, and Lord Gardiner, must be well pleased with the statement which ended the Labour Minister's visit.

This statement rejects African demands for a Constitutional Conference and does

'not seek to stipulate how it (independence) might be achieved or when this stage might be reached'—thus leaving the way open for independence for Rhodesia with the present Constitution. Commenting on the statement by Bottomley, Micheal Leapman, of the *Sun* writes that 'This could mean that Britain would now accept the present constitution as a basis for independence, despite the fact that Labour fiercely criticised it when it was introduced in 1961. It would be anything from 10 to 30 years before the 1961 constitution led to an African govern-

ment.'

One needs to emphasise that the former Chief Justice of the defunct Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Sir Robert Tredgold, has estimated—as a leading legal constitutionalist—that the present Rhodesian constitution would enable settler minority rule for another sixty years. A remark made by the settler *Rhodesian Herald* a short time ago might also be borne in mind: 'If this (1961) Constitution will stave off an African Government for 10 to 15 years, hang on to it like grim death.'

The two final words 'grim death' are indeed appropriate because the 1961 Constitution depends for its workability on the co-operation of the African population which has already shown its contempt for it by a near 100 per cent boycott of the last election. If I know anything of Joshua Nkomo and his African friends in Rhodesia they will see to it that the British Government receives the raspberry it deserves for the betrayal perpetrated by Wilson and his henchman Bottomley.

Also, let it be known, that the continuance of the Commonwealth depends on the co-operation of the African Governments in that organisation. They will see to it that just because Mr. Wilson is scared to bits because only three shaking seats separate him from the loss of power, it is no reason to betray the African people of Rhodesia.

Those who have put pressure on Wilson might remember that they may well have destroyed the Commonwealth—yes, and all the lovely loot that organisation means—by putting Wilson in a straitjacket. Harold Wilson, that man who said the ideal position for a Labour leader was 'left of centre' might recall that socialism has certain principles and that those who betray these principles of human solidarity deserve the contempt of silence—at the next general election.

J.W.

INTERNATIONALIST.

STUART CHRISTIE STILL HAS 1,014 WEEKS TO DO. WHAT ARE YOU DOING?

## ANARCHY 49

NOW ON SALE IS ON

## AUTOMATION

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





# The BMC Strike

**THE STRIKE** BY 300 maintenance men's mates at the British Motor Corporation plant at Longbridge, Birmingham, soon affected production not only at this factory, but throughout the BMC empire and this has led to other workers being laid off, 25,000 at the time of writing. This withdrawal of labour, unlike many in the motor industry has been made official by the unions. They are demanding a pay increase of 10% to give them a wage that would amount to 80% of the earnings of the skilled maintenance men.

In hard cash this would amount to 80% of the earnings of the skilled maintenance men.

In hard cash this would mean another £2 per week, but it seems that during the negotiations, this figure has been watered down to 12/6d. After all there has been plenty of time for watering down, since this claim was first submitted in November 1963. Negotiations were broken off last June, then the claim was re-submitted a few weeks ago and once again was rejected by the BMC management.

The action now being taken is long overdue. In fact it has been reported that the reason that the claim was re-submitted recently is that there are forecasts of a slack period in the industry at the end of the year. With full order books, BMC have been working to capacity, but this fact so far has not made them willing to meet the demands of the strikers.

Most of the strikers belong to the Amalgamated Engineering Union, others to the Electrical Trades Union and the Heating Engineers. At local level, the

union officials, to their dismay, do not seem to be getting anywhere with the BMC management. They tried to get the dispute handled by the national leaders, but they passed it back to the local officials. Carron & Co. of the AEU have asked that the local officials attend a meeting of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions. Other unions whose members are being laid off, have called for a meeting of the Confederation at national executive level.

## UNIONS HOPE FOR A COURT OF INQUIRY

It seems from this that only the management is united and determined to resist any pay increase. The workers, for their part, are divided up into so many unions, with each union leadership stressing differences of craft, semi-skilled and unskilled. The unions with members on the assembly lines don't want their men thrown out of work and will try to get a resumption of work. The strikers' unions at the moment do not seem to know which way to turn. Their only hope in the face of the determination of the management is that the Ministry of Labour will get them out of trouble and set up a court of inquiry.

What are the reasons for this stand of BMC, especially with full order books? Obviously a company of BMC's size can stand a prolonged strike without feeling the pinch, but it seems that if this increase was granted it would be the green light for claims by other workers at BMC's plants as well as all workers in the engineering industry who are affected by the engineering 'package deal'. This

present claim is outside the deal, having been submitted before this agreement was accepted, so not only is it in the interests of BMC to stand firm, but by so doing they are safeguarding other firms who are watching this dispute closely.

The unions involved in the dispute have no stomach for the struggle against the BMC management. They have just had to go along hoping that something will come up to get them out of the situation. The strikers make up an important section of workers in the car industry, a vital one if production is to be maintained. The claim for 80% of the craftsmen's wages is quite justified. The question is can it be won by the present action? A work-to-rule would, I think, have been a better method, run by the men themselves and not by the union officials, who will get the strikers back at the first opportunity with no regard to the demands.

An organisation at grass roots level in every BMC factory, linking up with one another, is needed. We have the embryo of this in the shop stewards committees. When a dispute of the present nature crops up it illustrates how necessary it is for these rank and file organisations to be in existence if claims like that of these men are to have any chance of being gained.

P.T.

# Freedom For Workers' Control

MARCH 13 1965 Vol. 26 No. 8

## Harold-The Patriot

**I**N HIS NATION wide television broadcast he was wonderful—calling for 'a fair days work for a fair days pay'. He went on, 'At this critical time in our history let the watch-word of everyone be this—not what our country can do for us, but what each of us can do for our country'.

All this clock-watching game has got to stop. If the job takes a little longer, stay with it 'Your Country Needs It'. Strikes are out of order, one must be patient and get the problem settled. How long this takes doesn't matter so long as production is maintained.

These bad industrialists who tackle the easy home markets instead of getting into export, they also felt the lash of patriotic Harold's tongue. I was really disappointed at the end of the broadcast they didn't play 'Land of Hope and Glory'.

Labour Party patriots have been warned, the class war is over, treat your employer as a friend—he is there to help you, if you 'play ball with him, he will play hell with you'. The system must be

maintained at all costs. Harold boy, keep your clanger-droppers out of the lime-light and you will win the next election to lead a National Government.

The official strike of 100,000 provincial busmen didn't get off the ground. The Minister of Labour is to set up a committee of inquiry into their dispute over pay and conditions. (This committee of inquiry game must be a fair old number, I wonder if it's classed as skilled or semi-skilled.) The unions claim is for 15s. a week, the same award as the municipal busmen. One thing about these 'enquiries'—the workers are expected to accept the usual attached strings, but any in their favour, the employers drive a coach and horses through. Remember the Phelps Committee? 'No reduction of London Bus Services'; LTB hasn't reduced the service, it's cut it to ribbons.

Guerrilla tactics employed by the provincial busmen would have paid dividends, one is sceptical about the rate of interest from a 'committee of enquiry'.

## FORDS SAY 'WE'RE SORRY'

**FORDS, EMPLOYERS, DAGENHAM,** refused to accept the shop steward's credentials as a member of the T&GWU. The company suspended the steward for alleged 'insolence'. To be insolent it must be presupposed that one is addressing one's betters. As that is impossible where's the charge?

The company admitted that it had committed a 'technical' breach and should have discussed the position with the T&GWU, before taking action.

### OPEN HOUSE FOR FAIRVIEW CARAVANS

**THE INDUSTRIAL COURT** has awarded against the National Union of Vehicle Builders in the test case involving union recognition at Fairview Caravans, Harwick (Essex). The NUVB dispute with Fairview Caravans began in November when the firm dismissed nine active union members including three branch officers, because they were regarded as being 'unsuitable'. About 70 union members have been on strike since that time.

Mr. D. L. Hammerton managing director of the Fairview Caravans said: 'I am naturally delighted with the decision of the Industrial Court which completely supports our policy of happy, satisfactory and workable negotiations with our employees without the necessity of union participation.'

'The decision means that union recognition is not part of the terms and conditions of employment and that employers and employees are free to negotiate in the manner best suited to their local conditions.'

He hoped that the strike would now be quickly resolved and added that he was prepared to take some of the strikers back. An NUVB official said in reply that the strike would continue.

This dispute has had the active support of other workers in the area, this must be stepped up if the similar situation at Denby (elsewhere on this page) is not to be repeated. Donations urgently needed: M. C. Jones, 15 Fryatt Avenue, Dovercourt, Essex.

## DENBY STRIKE ENDS

**THE DISPUTE** AT the William Denby Dyeworks at Baildon, Yorkshire, which has lasted since October, 1963, has come to an end in defeat. The 114 men and women who continued to picket the dyeworks are without jobs. Their union, the National Union of Dyers, Bleachers and Textile Workers, has decided to give in to the Denby management and will try to get jobs elsewhere for their members.

This dispute started when a foreman operated a machine during a meal break, when there was a slack period at the firm. Men took immediate strike action only to be given their cards by the management. After this, Denby's advertised for labour, got it, and was able to break the 'closed shop' that had been operating.

The tragedy is that other trade unionists have been working at Denbys, crossing the picket line each day. These are members of the Cloth Pressers Society,

Electrical Trades Union and the Transport & General Workers Union. To their credit, the Amalgamated Engineering Union did withdraw their members. It seems that solidarity did not mean a thing to the leadership of these three unions or the members who continued to work at Denbys. They have broken the very principle on which trade unionism was built, solidarity with the strikers in not crossing a picket line when a job is in dispute.

The actions of the members and their union executives are to be deplored, for if solidarity had been the principle of action, then this dispute would have had a much speedier and different ending. As it is, one can only salute those who did maintain the basic principle of solidarity and kept the picket lines going for so long.

P.T.

## ANARCHO-SYNDICALISM **THE WORKERS' NEXT STEP** 7

**T**HE driving force behind industry in capitalist society is the profit motive. Those who own or control the means of production do so for the purpose of extracting profit from them by exploiting the labour of those who have 'nothing to sell but their labour power'. Human needs are not the first consideration; profit is, and perfectly useless articles will be produced by the million if people can be persuaded to buy them, while necessities will be destroyed if profit economy demands it.

Examples of this are too well known to need stressing here. The systematic destruction of food—wheat, coffee, potatoes, fish, vegetables—is a regular feature of the capitalist world, and goes on while millions of people throughout the world haven't enough to eat because they can't afford to buy what is there, and since it would be 'unprofitable' to lower the price to a level where they would be able to buy, the food has to be destroyed in order to keep the price up.

It would be easy at this point to get involved in a complicated explanation of the workings of capitalist economy, but I have no wish to do that. Nor, in fact, is it necessary to do so. The average worker is quite content to agree with William Morris when he says:

'It is enough political economy for me to know that the idle class is rich and the working class is poor, and that the rich are rich because they rob the poor.'

Although, I must admit, there are many workers who not only do not see that they are robbed, but will strenuously deny it. This is understandable, of course, for nobody likes to admit that he is being cheated every day of his life. It makes him feel a bit of a fool. So he will mumble something about getting a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, and about how it's only right the boss should get more because he put money into the factory, and takes more responsibility—and so on.

But, in fact, whoever it was who first coined that phrase about a 'fair day's pay . . . etc.' has done the working-class just about the worst disservice possible. For it established in a popular way the idea that there was something fair in working for somebody else and getting paid for it.

Well, there isn't. The worker is a man with a pistol at his head. He works or starves, and when he works for a boss, he is given back at the end of the week a fraction of the value of what he has produced. The rest goes to 'meet the overheads', to pay for raw materials (on the production side of which another boss has exploited other workers), to pay for the boss's plant, to pay the landlord, to cover the costs of the unproductive employees, to keep the boss and his family and the shareholders and their families and—of course—to pay taxes to the government to protect the boss's property. All this and many things I have left out—have to be paid for by the productive workers. And by giving him a wage, the employer deceives him that he is getting a fair return for his labour!

Anarcho-Syndicalists are completely opposed to the wage system, and are not interested in perpetually fighting for extra fractions when it is obvious that a worker's wage can never represent even the money value of what he produces, let alone the social value. And the usefulness of the gains the unions are so proud of winning for their members are shown—in the present inflationary period, blatantly—to be

purely temporary and ineffective. A wage increase this week is nullified by increased prices next week, and it is an undignified waste of energy to continually chase that will-o'-the-wisp, a living wage, hoping to break even.

Money, itself, is an artificial economic invention. At one time based upon something which was considered precious (gold), it is now not even that. The argument that it is merely a convenient means of exchange, now no longer holds water, since money is a commodity to be bought and sold and profited upon through currency exchange, interest and all the business of banking. Money has no relationship whatsoever to real wealth, which is the material product of man's labour applied to the raw materials of the earth. In fact the peculiar thing about the money system is that the more useful you are to society, the less money are you likely to get for your efforts. Farm workers produce our food, miners our source of power, light and heat, building workers our shelter, clothing workers our clothes, sewage workers prevent disease, transport workers distribute the things we need—all these and others supply the absolute necessities of life but are among the lowest paid members of the community. They do the hardest, dirtiest work, and get the least reward.

Anarcho-Syndicalists think that there is only one thing to do with the wage and money system—abolish it. There is no just way of assessing the socially useful labour of one against another, and with the abolition of money, millions of people would be released from unproductive occupations in offices and banks who could play their part in useful production and at one and the same time help to create the abundance that is possible and shorten the working hours necessary to do it.

Should we then return to barter? No, not even that. Most production today is social production. And everybody to a greater or lesser extent, depends on everybody else. Our knowledge, our skill, our environment, are the heritage of countless men and women of the past from whom we have learned, and it is quite impossible to say truthfully what is mine and what is thine, so how can any of us justly claim the right to barter a certain amount of one product for a certain amount of another?

All we can do is to give to society the best that we are able, and take from it what we need. 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need' is the only basis for social equality. All our needs may be different, but we can have the same opportunity to satisfy them. All our abilities may be unequal, but no man can do more than his best.

The institutions of the State and private property absorb the energies of millions of conscientious, hard-working folk, bribed into monotonous, boring and useless toil. To break the shackles of money and the State would release such a tremendous social initiative that all the petty arguments about 'What will you do with the lazy man?' and 'Who would do the dirty work?' would fade into the insignificance they merit. When people are free and equal, they can be really constructive and social beings.

P.S.

(To be continued)