

# Gurkha recruitment in British army

37 posts / 0 new [Login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

Last post

spinoza

Aug 6 2015 19:19

#1

Hi

I posted this in the Asia-Nepal section, however I believe it is worth posting here. apology if i'm breaking any rule. This is an article about ending Gurkha recruitment in the British Army.

<http://dissentvoice.org/2015/07/time-to-end-gurkha-recruitment-in-the-british-army/>

curious what peeps think of this.

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

## Featured



### The real movement we need

Some thoughts on building mass movements and organising, in relation to the Labour Party



### The dialectic of exploitation and repression, forms of self-organization, and the avoidance of vulgar workerism

Gayge Operaista writes about some of the strengths and weaknesses of anarchist political organizations, the IWW and solidarity networks in the U.S.

[Comments \(3\)](#)



### Red Emma speaks: An Emma Goldman reader

Alix Shulman has provided a truly elegant collection of Emma Goldman's speeches and writings. Shulman's introductions also display a rare and genuine knowledge of anarchist political...

[Comments \(1\)](#)



Follow @libcomorg 16.2K followers



Reddebrek

Aug 8 2015 18:15

#2

Well I've worked with several Gurkhas and I have to say their experience doesn't really tally with your description. The ones I know come from very wealthy land owning families in Nepal. At least one of them even has a serf working on the family farm (the family moved either to Britain or the Nepalese cities) though he does `generously' allow the serf 50% of the income generated by the farm. Another owns at least one block of flats and other real estate.

Several of them have told me they don't need to work but did so to help smooth over immigration, or because they just can't do nothing all day, and need to be self reliant. Now that's only a handful so I don't know if that's representative of the majority of Gurkha's, but I can't really see Grimsby attracting so many wealthy descendants of Nepalese feudalism by accident.

Also a quick search on the net confirms that Gurkha's are indeed originally recruited mainly from Nepal's ruling castes. I'm curious to see if this practice has been maintained.

To be honest the impression I get from the Gurkha's isn't a tale of the desperate poor trying to escape the gutter, its more like a group of people whose entire (social constructed) identity revolved around martial traits. That would explain why they seem so willing to go along with conflicts that have nothing to do with them, and why the only organised complaints and grievances have been about discrimination, pay and conditions and access to opportunities.

I do agree with you about the portrayal of Gurkhas in the UK being bollocks though.

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

spinoza

Aug 9 2015 00:00

#3

hi above,

could you provide some documentation/links of this? I don't get that impression at all, and i've also met and know some Gurkhas. here's another article on it:

<http://democracyandclasstruggle.blogspot.co.uk/2015/08/british-army-gurkhas-dissolving.html>

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments



Auld-bod

Aug 9 2015 10:04

#4

This is probably a complete waste of time however a few points:  
Some fellows I worked beside, who'd been conscripts in the British Army, held the Gurkhas in high regard. Brave and dependable was how they were

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

## Featured threads

[Writing for "Black Flag"? \(20 comments\)](#)

[Funniest thing you read today \(482 comments\)](#)

[So, turns out David Cameron face f\\*cked a dead pig \(43 comments\)](#)

## Posting guidelines

Please read the [posting guidelines](#) before posting. If you see anything which falls outside them please use the down' button on the

described and when you're fighting for your life, nothing is more important.

To differentiate the Gurkhas (as 'mercenaries') from the rest of the British 'Professional' (not conscripted) Army is laughable. Most people who join up are doing so for mercenary reasons, to learn a trade, etc. Though there may be a few deluded patriots and an occasional psychopath. If in doubt, look at the unemployment areas where the armed forces get most recruits.

I watched a TV documentary some months ago which focused on the recruitment of lads from Nepal. There was approximately two hundred applicants for every vacancy. The selection appeared 'open' and largely based on physical abilities and competitive 'games'. It was hard to tell the class composition of the lads though most appeared to be 'off the land'. Why would upper or middle class people publicly demean themselves, being assessed as physical specimens, and risk public rejection?

To back a campaign to stop Gurkha recruitment in the British Army may well prove counterproductive, as the British public are sentimental and our duplicitous government could feel it expedient to reverse the cuts. Just the sort of gesture politics the left is rather fond of - no hope of success but lots of moral indignation.

One last point, an 'identity revolved around martial traits' rather encapsulates the British Army (the cant of the 'Highland Regiments', 'The Old Contemptables', one Englishman is worth ten Frenchmen, etc.). Why not simply ask folk to stop joining the British Army and join the peace pledge union? (Joke)

offending post to flag it for the moderators' attention, or in the case of spam, click the 'spam' button. Site admins are listed [here](#), and feedback can be posted in the [feedback forum](#).

## Log in for more features

Click [here](#) to register now. Logged in users:

- ▶ Can comment on articles and discussions
- ▶ Get 'recent posts' refreshed more regularly
- ▶ Bookmark articles to your own reading list
- ▶ Use the site private messaging system
- ▶ Start forum discussions, submit articles, and more...

---



**Auld-bod**  
Aug 9 2015 10:04

#5

Sorry double post. [login or register to post comments](#)

---



---



**Reddebek**  
Aug 9 2015 11:08

#6

**spinoza wrote:** [login or register to post comments](#)

---

*hi above,  
could you provide some documentation/links of this? I don't get that impression at all, and i've also met and know some Gurkhas. here's another article on it:*

<http://democracyandclasstruggle.blogspot.co.uk/2015/08/british-army-gurkhas-dissolving.html>

What? Well no unlike Nixon I'm not in the habit of recording personal conversations.

And I notice that neither article you link to goes into the social backgrounds of Gurkha's either, which is an odd oversight given your focus on this issue.

This Gurkha site however does acknowledge that many Gurkha's have a family tradition of joining and that all of the recruits come from tribes/clans.

<http://www.ayo-gorkhali.org/index.php/en/gurkhas/who-are-the-gurkhas>

Edit: I can tell you that the Gurkhas I know the richest tend to be Rai, (which looking on wikipedia says they were given many privileges in Nepals landowning and tax collecting) while the two who haven't said anything about money or extensive land holdings back home are Limbu's, and again a brief look on wiki says they're mainly relegated to subsistence farming. The other really wealthy ones don't use clan names. So what are the clan names of the ones you know?

**Quote:**

*I watched a TV documentary some months ago which focused on the recruitment of lads from Nepal. There was approximately two hundred applicants for every vacancy. The selection appeared 'open' and largely based on physical abilities and competitive 'games'. It was hard to tell the class composition of the lads though most appeared to be 'off the land'. Why would upper or middle class people publicly demean themselves, being assessed as physical specimens, and risk public rejection?*

Err well probably for similar reasons that middle class and above Brits subject themselves to such tests when joining the military, I'd imagine. You're kidding yourself if you think the British military below the rank of officer is only full of lads from the sink estates.



Auld-bod  
Aug 9 2015 11:49

#7

Where did I say being a British squaddie or NCO was exclusively the preserve of people from sink estates?

[login or register](#) to post comments

For some years I used to go into several rural schools, about thirty percent of the children were from service families. On several occasions I had the opportunity to meet parents and they were just ordinary working class people.

You obviously never saw the TV documentary I referred to, as for much of the time the recruits' families and other interested people were looking on as the selections were taking place. It was more like attending a highland games, not the usual recruitment procedure in the UK (not even among the clannish Scots). This was what I meant by it being 'public'.

Perhaps the middle class and well to do gravitate towards the Guards Regiment or the Household Cavalry? Expect the menials feed and do the grooming.



Reddebek  
Aug 9 2015 12:45

#8

#### Auld-bod wrote:

*Where did I say being a British squaddie or NCO was exclusively the preserve of people from sink estates?*

[login or register](#) to post comments

I inferred that by your comment in which you stated a bafflement at the idea of middle class and richer people actually take part in a military selection process. i.e. "Why would upper or middle class people publicly demean themselves, being assessed as physical specimens, and risk public rejection?"

#### Quote:

*You obviously never saw the TV documentary I referred to,*

Ah I see we have the classic 'you disagree with me, therefore you couldn't possibly know what I'm talking about' assumption. I have absolutely no idea if I've seen the doc you did (how could I with such little information given) but it may shock you to learn there's been more than one documentary about them. I have however seen documentaries about them, well one was about Nepal in general that devoted a few minutes to them.

#### Quote:

*as for much of the time the recruits' families and other interested people were looking on as the selections were taking place. It was more like attending a highland games, not the usual recruitment procedure in the UK (not even among the clannish Scots). This was what I meant by it being 'public'.*

Ok, so your argument boils down to, you don't think posh people can handle public rejection and you base this on the behaviour of British people. Well thanks for sharing but I think I'll put more stock in what actual Gurkhas have told me, if its all the same to you.

spinoza  
Aug 9 2015 12:46

#9

i guess the issue is that they are not British, and attempts to stop Gurkha rec by the Nepali government have been halted, according to the article, by the British government. that is a difference.serving in a foreign army.

[login or register](#) to post comments

why not recruit Bangladeshis into the British army? or that of any other third world country that has a labour surplus?

according to the second article, there is a definition of 'mercenary' used by the UN, and the Gurkhas fall under that. it is a standard definition in international relations. The French Foreign legion also are mercenaries.

broadly speaking, yes, as the heavy metal band System of a Down sing ' why do they always send the poor'. this is the case with every army in the world, people join up because of poverty. I have friends who couldn't get a job, and later joined the army. didn't know a thing about geo politics. not always the case, but more often than not. Muhammad Ali's famous quote, 'the Vietcong never called me a N-word'

the British public may be sentimental, but that is neither here nor there, as i see it. with a propaganda campaign with Joanna Lumley etc, they've been conditioned to be sentimental and not question many things about war. ie the British army are far from 'clean' in Iraq and Afghanistan. armed forces day, etc.promotes this sentimentality.

the left does make a lot of gestures, that is true, but i dont see the left supporting this. the articles seem to come from Maoist types, who are a fringe of a fringe. the first article praises the Maoist War in Nepal.

above who said 'this is probably a complete waste of time'. what isn't? most left/anarchist type actions are a complete waste of time, if looked at in a certain way. I went to every stop the war demo, and it didn't stop the war. was it a waste of time? maybe, but i still go on them. Is Corbyn mania a waste of time? probably. what about the Class War demos? it all depends on how you see it, in my opinion.

i posted them not to agree or disagree with them or pose as an expert (which i'm not) but just to see what people think. after all, nobody usually talks about this.there's no need for 'bad feeling' over a couple of articles about which few people seem to know about.

it is rather weird tho, to recruit for two hundred years people from another country to do the British army's dirty work.

---

spinoza

Aug 9 2015 12:50

#10

also curious if peeps know much about the French Foreign legion?

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

---



Reddebek

Aug 9 2015 13:04

#11

**Quote:**

*it is rather weird tho, to recruit for two hundred years people from another country to do the British army's dirty work.*

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

---

This was another problem I had with your article, this claim of uniqueness is utterly **false**. Its a very common feature of warfare to use soldiers from other nations. Its not even unique to Britain, look at the **Irish**? Hell you'd be hard pressed to find a national army that didn't have an Irish brigade/regiment.

American military personnel have a long history of enlisted in other armies to take part in conflicts that the USA stayed out of. Thousands of Canadians fought in Vietnam under **Americans**. The US military is also employees troops from the **indigenous tribes**. Now a lot of them live in the USA proper but some come from the reservations which are technically `sovereign`.

I just don't see why the Gurkha situation is being depicted by you as being such an aberration.



Auld-bod

Aug 9 2015 18:33

#12

**Reddebek #8**

**Quote:**

*You obviously never saw the TV documentary I referred to, Ah I see we have the classic `you disagree with me, therefore you couldn't possibly know what I'm talking about` assumption.*

[login](#) or [register](#) to post comments

---

**Quote:**

*Quote:  
`Ok, so your argument boils down to, you don't think posh people can handle public rejection and you base this on the behaviour of British people. Well thanks for sharing but I think I'll put more stock in what actual Gurkhas have*

*told me, if its all the same to you.'*

This is rather sad. I assumed only that we were having a discussion and thought my observation on a documentary may be informative. Your response is that I'm undermining your opinions (or should I say argument?) by making the correct deduction that you have not seen it.

Yes I do normally assume that different cultures, races and classes share broadly the same characteristics under capitalism. The ruling elite have much in common.



Reddebek  
Aug 9 2015 20:54

#13

**Auld-bod wrote:**

[login or register to post comments](#)

*This is rather sad. I assumed only that we were having a discussion and thought my observation on a documentary may be informative. Your response is that I'm undermining your opinions (or should I say argument?) by making the correct deduction that you have not seen it.*

Which documentary? How do I know if I've seen it or not if you don't tell me which one it is. I have to say I find your assumption that I haven't seen it based solely on the fact that I seem to be disagreeing with you rather pompous.

For the record, yes I have seen the Gurkha training and selection process, which I think is your `smoking gun` what of it?

To be clear I objected to your statements because I don't see how your coming to those conclusions, based on what you've told me. I'm sorry but I don't find your `Posh Brits wouldn't do something so Nepali's wouldn't either, because capitalism` rather strange and not at all helpful. And as for undermining me, well I'll just have to take your word for it.

spinoza  
Aug 9 2015 21:15

#14

hi R,

[login or register to post comments](#)

no it is not totally unique, but it is an aberration, or perhaps abomination? the second article i posted discusses the Irish and even quotes an Irish Fenian song.

Not my articles, but supportive of the main thesis of both of them, and I hope Gurkha rec ends personally. as an anti militarist.

i've been to Nepal, but mainly as a hippie traveller, Cat Stevens and all that.

i've read about the Buffalo soldiers. I think any Native American fighting for the US is perhaps on the wrong side. i also think that Black and Muslims should never join the British army.



jef costello  
Aug 9 2015 22:15

#15

**spinoza wrote:**

[login or register to post comments](#)

*hi R,  
no it is not totally unique, but it is an aberration, or perhaps abomination?  
the second article i posted discusses the Irish and even quotes an Irish Fenian song.  
Not my articles, but supportive of the main thesis of both of them, and I hope Gurkha rec ends personally. as an anti militarist.  
i've been to Nepal, but mainly as a hippie traveller, Cat Stevens and all that.  
i've read about the Buffalo soldiers. I think any Native American fighting for the US is perhaps on the wrong side. i also think that Black and Muslims should never join the British army.*

As an anti-militarist why would you only want to stop one ethnic group joining the military?

I don't know a huge amount about Nepal, but I have read about the selection and they have minimum weight requirements etc and lots of endurance tests

etc so they want healthy troops. It is a status thing (such as being a Marine SAS etc) as well as, as said above, a way to get citizenship. The arguments over pensions were based iirc on the fact that pensions were lower if you retired in Nepal, because a UK soldier's pension is a lot in Nepal, but not if it's been locally adjusted.

To go back to the idea of status there has always been this idea of the brits as a warrior race, including scots usually etc. And the idea that certain indigenous people shared these values, especially if they could be used as a force to control the empire, ie Gurkhas, Sikhs etc Of course this warrior tradition could just be attacked and destroyed if it wasn't suitable.

I think this is a little confused and I don't see the point. I'd rather see organising preventing under-18s being recruited, cadet forces etc.

Incidentally the mercenary distinction doesn't mean much, It seems gurkhas are motivated by the same mixture of pride and economics as most soldiers. The French Foreign Legion is mostly composed of French Nationals these days, it's not like it used to be (if it ever really was)

---

wojtek  
Aug 9 2015 23:01

#16

**Quote:**

[login or register](#) to post  
comments

*i also think that Black and Muslims should never join the British army.*

which ones?

---

radicalgraffiti  
Aug 9 2015 23:17

#17

people who are part of groups who are racially discriminated against obvious have particularly strong reasons to not join the army, which is what i assume spinoza is getting at, of cause this doesn't mean its fine for white people to join the army

[login or register](#) to post  
comments

---

spinoza  
Aug 10 2015 00:20

#18

i admit there are complexities. not pretending to have the answers. if i did, i wouldnt ask people their opinion. perhaps the best thing is precisely this, looking at things rationally and with comparison to other experiences. not hiding it and dressing up an ugly thing with bullshit from Joanna Lumley.

[login or register](#) to post  
comments

I think the gurkha issue is unique in the sense that it has gone on for two hundred years and from one country, from selected hill tribes, and there is political support in Nepal to end it, from Maoists and others. i hope the nepali government do end it, if the british gvt dont. national sovereignty and all that. according to the first article, maoists called it 'dishonourable'. quite right, it is dishonourable as i see it.

Brits fighting in the british army is, in a sense, natural, just as Germans fighting in the german army, or Spaniards fighting in the spanish army. However, if we heard of Vietnamese fighting for the French army, and for two hundred years, would that not be something to question why its happening? Nepali should join the Nepal army, not the British.

the mercenary distinction is not to do, as i see it, with motivation, but how things are classified according to the UN and international relations. I dont look down on mercenaries, and i've had jobs, ( not fighting, but by analogy) which could be seen as mercenary. i didn't agree with the job, but i had to pay the bills.

i would want to stop, as the first article suggest, one mountain people from nepal, joining the british army to fight against another, the afghans. it strikes me as sick and extremely cynical. the historical info in both the articles goes through the various things gurkhas have done, including the amritsar massacre. are they not partly responsible for that?

i think there are differences between the experiences of black people and white. i imagine the reason there are not too many muslims joining the british army is because they know they are fighting against their own people in Afghanistan, Iraq etc. I think most white british people support their army, even if they dont agree with the wars. sorry if it is not politically correct to say so, but that is what

i think and generally have experienced. i dont believe race or sex is a social construct, frankly. i would also go along with some of the kind of stuff Malcolm X and others like him argued. But again, I have limited knowledge of the US army and its recruitment. i do notice, however, in news and documentaries, a large number of black and hispanic soldiers in the US army.

there is an interesting article about MPs planning a Sikh division in the British army

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2966143/MPs-want-Army-create-new-British-Sikh-regiment-like-ones-fought-UK-world-wars.html>

i can see, if this is formed, and serves in the middle east, clashes between Muslims and Sikhs in the cities of England.

curious what peeps make of the Daily Mail (forgive me for posting a DM article, but it is worth reading) article.

another interesting one is put out by the FLN in Algeria regarding Harkis, or algerians who joined the french army. short and worth reading:

<https://www.marxists.org/history/algeria/1960/harkis.htm>

'bulldogs of french imperialism' the FLN called them, and they were severely punished for siding with France against their own people. I guess i consider the Gurkhas 'bulldogs of British imperialism'.

as i said at the beginning, these are thoughts, because i think this subject is kind of interesting and hardly discussed at all. i am not pretending to have the 'final answer' that everyone must agree with, nor even of being completely consistent. as i see it, we're discussing. and its alright to not have all the answers. i'm not the spokesman for any party.

i've been on the left for years, and am not a consistent anarchist or marxist entirely. i hope Corbyn wins, because it is better than nothing, even tho he is hardly a revolutionary.

i do think that military recruitment of young people in schools etc as wrong, and should be opposed as well. I think there are some groups that do that. VFP veterans for peace etc do good work, what little i know about them. also, the number of homeless veterans i come across, asking me for a fag etc, and i chat to them is sick. i mean, they fight, suffer psychological distress, post traumatic stress etc, then are on the streets. I would hope that groups such as stop the war bring up these issues, but they dont.

curious of peeps views on the sikh DM article, and the FLN one.

---

ajjohnstone  
Aug 10 2015 01:03

#19

I'm surprised no mention yet of the Sultan of Brunei's Gurkhas

[login or register](#) to post comments

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gurkha\\_Reserve\\_Unit](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gurkha_Reserve_Unit)

Or that the present Indian Army still have Gurkha troops

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gorkha\\_regiments\\_\(India\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gorkha_regiments_(India))

I am also minded of the large number (relatively) of Fijians who have joined the Brit army. Perhaps it is urban legend but it supposedly began when the Fijian military band was performing at the Edinburgh Tattoo and learned that because they were commonwealth, they could join the British Army at wages ten-fold their current wage. When they returned to Fiji, there was a mass exodus to enlist in the British Army.

---

 Auld-bod  
Aug 10 2015 06:24

#20

**Reddebrek #13**

*'I'm sorry but I don't find your 'Posh Brits wouldn't do something so Nepali's wouldn't either, because capitalism' rather strange and not at all helpful. And as for undermining me, well I'll just have to take your word for it.'*

[login or register](#) to post comments

Please do not paraphrase me as if it's a quote – it rather cheapens the 'argument'.

I have no interest in undermining you and if you prefer the views of your Gurkha acquaintances that's your choice.

I think despite superficial differences, wherever capitalism is established the same economic imperatives operate. Within the system the ruling elite protects itself by attempting to mask its failings. It hates to lose face, just as it did in earlier economic systems. The British Army is an example of this, where criminal practices are portrayed as aberrations committed by the lower ranks.

I was for a year at college with a young woman from a very sheltered army background, her dad was a senior officer in an armoured regiment. This lass's naivety was so great that she had no inhibitions in showing her utter contempt for the squaddies. I rather liked her, as it was refreshing to talk to someone posh who blithely believed all 'sensible people' thought alike. All the working class people she'd met were 'grunts', as I didn't grunt, I was not working class. This thread informs me middle class people choose to join the lower ranks, well that may be true, though I am a little dubious. Over and out.



jef costello

Aug 10 2015 06:47

#21

I don't see how a British muslim is fighting against 'his own people' if he's sent to afghanistan any more than christian bombing Serbia etc. Muslim unity, pan-arabism etc are recent.

There was an interesting article recently, don't have a link I'm afraid, about Isis replacing Al-Qaeda and that the latter was more inclusive and avoided sectarianism whereas Isis has jumped right into it.

Lots of Fijians in British Army, as well as south africans, new zealanders, australians etc.

[login or register](#) to post comments

spinoza

Aug 10 2015 10:32

#22

hi A

the articles do mention sultan of brunei i think, but i guess the target of the articles is the british army. both articles do mention gurkhas in the Indian army, and give numbers. maybe you read the article quickly and missed it. i guess their target is the British army, not the sultan or the indian.

J costello

you might not see it how a Muslim might feel they are fighting against their own people if they go to afghanistan, but nonetheless, many do feel that, i'm fairly certain. there is not completely parity in all things between all ethnic groups in the UK. i'm pretty sure a Pakistani British guy joining the British army to fight against Afghans must feel he is fighting his own. could be wrong, but dont think so. if they dont feel that, they should feel like traitors to their own by joining the british and US armies.

as i mentioned, i believe most white british people identify with their army, even if they dont support the wars. I posted and had this conversation with non white people as well, and the responses tend to be quite different. I am guessing that most of the comments are by white anarchists (not too many black anarchists, a few). who like other white British people, support their army. I dont know this, I GUESS, from the responses to this.

ie most white British people typically tend to dismiss the issue of Gurkha recruitment as unimportant, and say things like J Costello above ' 'd rather see organising preventing under-18s being recruited, cadet forces etc.'

ie dont look at this issue, there are more important ones.

not claiming to know from internet peoples race/ethnic background, but from the limited contact i've had with various, i've found most white british have this response, while most non white british have a different one. curious.

[login or register](#) to post comments



Auld-bod

Aug 10 2015 10:39

#23

spinoza #22

I've never met an anarchist who supported ANY army of ANY state.

[login or register](#) to post comments

spinoza

Aug 10 2015 12:12

#24

just my impression dude.

[login or register to post comments](#)

most anarchists like most marxists or anyone else, are just like anybody else, and have the same prejudices of the rest of the society they are born into. its only human. not a problem with anarchism as such.

i think Kropotkin, who i greatly respect, at one time supported the Russian side is the great war, and i think a few other examples can be found.

dont some anarchists support the PKK in Rojava?

radicalgraffiti

Aug 10 2015 12:19

#25

anarchists getting stuff wrong occasionally isn't equivalent to supporting the british army

[login or register to post comments](#)



kurremkarmerruk

Aug 10 2015 12:26

#26

I knew this would eventually come to Rojava. However spinoza equalizing state armies with voluntary guerrilla forces (of people who are oppressed by states) is artificial at best in my opinion (though YPG is currently -and temporarily- not a voluntary force). Moreover as far as I know no anarchist rejects the right of people to defend themselves against the war or similar external violence. Anyway I do not know much about Gurkhas, so excuse me...

[login or register to post comments](#)



Khawaga

Aug 10 2015 15:54

#27

**Quote:**

*you might not see it how a Muslim might feel they are fighting against their own people if they go to afghanistan, but nonetheless, many do feel that, i'm fairly certain. there is not completely parity in all things between all ethnic groups in the UK. i'm pretty sure a Pakistani British guy joining the British army to fight against Afghans must feel he is fighting his own. could be wrong, but dont think so. if they dont feel that, they should feel like traitors to their own by joining the british and US armies.*

[login or register to post comments](#)

Essentialising bollocks, and rather racist in how it homogenizes Muslims. The obvious counter evidence to this poor argument is what is currently happening in the Middle East. Plenty of Muslims fighting Muslims over some piece of land or nation that arguably means that nation (or tribe) is more important than the ummah.

And your line "they should feel like traitors" betrays an inherent nationalism on your part. And not to mention this whole white non-white thing, which again homogenizes a large group of very disparate people.

Rather pathetic and alarming argumentation, especially if you consider yourself an anarchist/communist. Your poists reminds me more of what a right winger would post in a Daily Mail comments section.

spinoza

Aug 10 2015 22:08

#28

hi,

[login or register to post comments](#)

i think i made it clear that these were impressions, not anything so worked out as 'essentialising' and other pomo poco type stuff. i posted the daily mail article as it was about the Sikh regiment, not because agree with anything about its views. in fact, i think its wrong and disgusting that there is a Sikh regiment in the British army.

again, i am not putting all in one basket. as Malcolm X spoke of the 'field Negro' and the 'house Negro', it seems to me to be something like that or close to that. I kind of think of Muslims who join the British army as vaguely equivalent to 'house negro' that Malcolm X spoke about. My opinion, not the final truth, not

asking you to accept it.

Likewise, Italians and Greek and Irish Anarchist/Leftist i've discussed this issue have a quite different reaction to British Anarchists, and black and Asian British have also a different reaction to White British. I am not claiming to have the answers or solutions, but i cannot completely ignore it either. Rather than denounce me as this or that, why not give clarity.

As i said, i am more of a pragmatist, as long as its progressive, i will support it, but doesn't mean necessarily that i will support blindly. ie Chavez and Venezuela i support, because i think life has improved for the majority of the poor people under his rule. Was he perfect? No, but better than the other options. That is more my view, especially as I get older. I'm frankly too old to go on Black Bloc antifa type things, and have come to prefer A to B marches. They achieve about as much.

I dont claim to know a lot about Rojava, and anyhow, its the discussion on anther thread. I know enough about anarchism and been to enough anarchist bookfairs to know there are different types of anarchist. some i feel close to, others not so much. I kind of like Bookchin's ideas to be honest, but I wouldn't call myself a Bookchinite.

i'm familiar with this pomo poco accusation of 'essentialism' etc. I dont care much for that kind of postmodern trendy student Bullshit, or these labels that are so easy to throw. thought crimes.

nationalism. not really, but i can do support some forms of third world leftist nationalism. If they take a libertarian direction, thats good as well. but it is not the main factor for me.

Anyhow, i guess the main question is only this do you think that Gurkha recruitment should end. Just asking. nothing more to contribute, this discussion aint going nowhere, but not uninteresting anyway. So, should Gurkha recruitment in the british army end. three choices

- A) Yes
- B)No
- C) Not sure
- D) not a major issue.

theres not much more to say. I am helping in promoting this event, in which these issues are discussed. I do not necessarily agree with everything that a particular writer or movement may stand for, but there is enough agreement to work together. Just as i do march alongside Anarchists and Labour reformists at demos.

<https://www.facebook.com/events/804883099624575/>



Reddebek

Aug 10 2015 22:39

#29

Well, this went in a curious direction, Spinoza, you have a rather curious tendency to pigeon hole people in ethnic categories and then speak for them. I'll be honest I had a suspicion based on your earlier comments but well its pretty out in the open now.

[login or register](#) to post comments

One other thought, that's just occurred, why are you so concerned and outrage about a group of people pledging allegiance and fighting for a nation that isn't "there own"? At first I thought you were a British activist trying to be tactical, but your repeated comments and the articles you link to suggest you find something specially galling about Nepali's fighting under a different flag. For me the issue isn't that Ghurka's are being recruited for the BA or IA or XYZ. Surely the real issue here is that thousands of men are being recruited into *any* army at all, right? So what makes it so vile to be enrolled in the British Army rather than the Nepali Royal Guard, or the new national army?

Oh and for full disclosure I'm Irish (whatever that's worth), this shouldn't mean anything but I'm curious to see how this fits into your racial profiling.

radicalgraffiti

Aug 10 2015 23:46

#30

@ spinoza, why do you hate communism?

[login or register](#) to post comments



jef costello

Aug 11 2015 10:08

#31

**spinoza wrote:**[login or register to post comments](#)

*you might not see it how a Muslim might feel they are fighting against their own people if they go to afghanistan, but nonetheless, many do feel that, i'm fairly certain. there is not completely parity in all things between all ethnic groups in the UK. i'm pretty sure a Pakistani British guy joining the British army to fight against Afghans must feel he is fighting his own. could be wrong, but dont think so. if they dont feel that, they should feel like traitors to their own by joining the british and US armies.*

*as i mentioned, i believe most white british people identify with their army, even if they dont support the wars. I posted and had this conversation with non white people as well, and the responses tend to be quite different. I am guessing that most of the comments are by white anarchists (not too many black anarchists, a few). who like other white British people, support their army. I dont know this, I GUESS, from the responses to this.*

I think khawaga has already pointed out your problem but I'll point out that you're speaking in terms of nationalism here and supporting it, while heavily implying that I am a nationalist.

You're also using that technique of expecting others to leave your statements alone as they're your opinion but criticising those of others. It's an unproductive way of contributing, leaning on some 'right' to have an opinion. You're on a forum. You have a right to express yourself (within reason, there are some rules here) but if someone disagrees with something you say then they can question you, call you out and offer counterarguments etc.

Debate works when it is an honest and open exchange of ideas, facts and arguments and works best when the people involved are more interested in finding a solution rather than getting people to agree with them and defending their point.

**Quote:**

*ie dont look at this issue, there are more important ones.*

Quite frankly yes. It's not because I'm ignoring an issue affecting a minority community, it's because I don't want to make an issue into one about a minority and specifically based on a false feeling of solidarity built on nationalism. The problem is that armies are killing, raping and doing all the shit that they pretty much always do. Not that Muslims are killing 'their brothers'. That is not a communist or anarchist argument.

If a community is being persecuted then they should be supported, but joining an army (as opposed to being conscripted) is a choice and if you feel that there are other factors pushing people to join (as I do) then you take that into account.

Would you tell a white guy not to kill brother christians in Serbia? I'm pushing the comparison a little but this is where you end up. **We do not kill or exploit our fellow humans** is where you want to end up.

I believe the Police Force is racist, the paramilitary section even more so. I almost burst out laughing the first time I saw an 'arab' (in this case used to mean north african rather than arab in terms of an ethnic group if you want to make that distinction) in their uniform. Why would an arab join a force who spend a large part of their time beating the shit out of arabs? He could be a traitor, or a jew, or druze, or secular, or from a military/bourgeois family, he might even believe that the police are there to help people. I don't know which is the case, but I do know that making lazy assumptions isn't helpful and organising to discourage people of north african muslim backgrounds from joining the police seems to me to be about as ridiculous as it gets (present company excepted)

I've said my piece and I don't have anything more to add. I will read your response if you write one, but I'm not going to repeat myself if you do.

1 2 [next >](#) [last >>](#)

10/1/2015

## Gurkha recruitment in British army

Phil - The real movement we need

Cross-Border Amazon Workers Meeting

Against borders and capital: an interview with Eduardo Romero

American labor on the defensive: A 1940's odyssey - Stan Weir

Empire Logistics - Chicago, Illinois rail conference report-back

Capital's utopia and dystopia: refugee/migrant crisis

Deja Vu (Part 1 of 2): the parallels between the Sisters' Camelot & Jimmy John's anti-union campaigns

1978-1979: Winter of discontent

Angry Language Brigade - Language workers got Tallents!

Wear the white poppy with pride

Fascism / Anti-fascism - Gilles Dauvé

Quakertown blues: Philadelphia's longshoremens and the decline of the IWW

[libcom.org](http://libcom.org)

[about](#) | [donate](#) | [help out](#) | [submitting content](#) | [other languages](#) | [a-z](#) | [contact us](#) | [site notes](#)