

NB Duplicator:

- 1. Btu wishes to retain:
- 2. PB to do AWA IB:
- 3. Stk horder - have 2 - might be prepared:

# LENINISM and TROTSKYISM

Tuesday 5th July 140, EDWARD ST.  
8.30p:

B.A.G/?

- 1/ Public Meetings
- 2/ Flyposting:
- 3 Newsheet: ??

fortnightly  
a co-ordinating etc:  
articles  
distrib to factories  
Name?  
TC reports  
Headlines by offset:

4 Money.



on Leninism and Trotskyism

1. AR's essay is confused, leaping from the interpretation of the October Revolution, to the counterposing of the WSL's industrial base at Cowley to the IMG's link with the "Unified" Secretariat of the Fourth International (USFI), and back again via a reference to the superiority of the USFI's economics (unproved, and in my view demonstrably rubbish).
2. This fact is much more a criticism of the AWA than it is of AR. This being so does not excuse AR from some responsibility for her own political education. It has been argued that 'activism' was a problem with AR and that more study would be useful.
3. AR raises implicitly all the questions of revolutionary history and theory over the last 100 years. Such a far reaching questioning is a good thing and we shall have to take up each episode and item relevant to the development of libertarian communist militants. For the moment we have to choose certain key ones.
4. The references given are not an intellectual device to give weight to argument. If a reference is given it is because it offers some information or insight into the question. I shall deliberately try and restrict references to make their checking easier.

THE QUESTION OF LENINISM, THE LENINIST CONCEPT OF THE PARTY, AND WHY OCTOBER FAILED.

references: I'll stick mainly to Bolsheviks and Workers Control published by Solidarity but I'd recommend: Stanley Cohen "Bukharin"; E.H.Carr's Penguin paperbacks on the History of Soviet Russia; Roy Medvedev "Let History Judge". There are many more but these will suffice to show that Stalinist and Trotskyist orthodoxies are agreed in re-writing certain key sections of history.

My theme can be developed from the summary below:

The central problem of the relation between revolutionary organisation and the working class ("Party and Class") is the problem of substitution. On this I agree with Trotsky's critique of Lenin (reprinted in International Socialism 31 or 33 - can't find my copy to check it). I am in accord with the article by NH in LCR2 and the article translated by him from the French ASRAS in that issue.

I agree with the arguments that lead us to conclude that we are out to construct a vanguard and that our role today is to create a cadre organisation. Having come this far then it is probably inevitable that people who haven't looked at the questions closely - the 'left' tendency, the IMG leadership, and cde AR - should conclude that we are Leninists.

The Leninist concept of the single leading Party representing the historical interests of the working class (the 'conscious element' in the best formulations) ~~exists~~ for a whole historical period is in itself a metaphysical and not a dialectical concept. See my notes on Engel's 'Feuerbach' for an understanding of the method which leads to this conclusion.

It is this total lack of clarity about the actual relationship of Party and Class during the revolution and the transitional period that leads to the problem of substitution - not any ahistorical judgement on the morality or good faith of Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The Leninist concept of the Party is at best a Sorelian myth (see Laurens Otter's essay Introduction to Revolutionary Anarchism - ORA pamphlet no.5, which is clear in explaining this idea at least.)

To see the problem simply it is probably enough to read both "State and Revolution" and "The Bolsheviks and Workers Control". Compare and contrast as the examination papers say.

The first and main objection to this will be "civil war...etc. Dislocation, famine... special circumstances..." In answer to this I make two comments.

- i) see Engels' strictures on the nature of revolutions (often used to bate libertarians by the way) and ask how one judges revolutionary theory that operates badly in a revolution. If we give no quarter to the CNT why should we allow Bolshevism special pleading?
- ii) Let's look at questions other than the famous events or the Civil War period.



From simple generosity I'll leave for the moment the Makhnovist movement (although a reading of Archinov's book is enormously valuable); the Kronstadt Revolt (best explained by Ida Mett, a comrade of Makhno and Archinov, in her pamphlet published in the UK by Solidarity); the General Strike in the 'Red' Vyborg district of Petrograd against the differential rates of rationing, which was broken with artillery. We'll leave the question of the "Workers Opposition" and other groups inside the Party (see Kollontai's pamphlet published by Solidarity). Let's take just two questions to find evidence on substitutionism.

Firstly look at the first act of the Bolshevik government, usually presented in the history as 'simply enacting what the working class had already created' - the draft decree on workers' control. Note this is before the Civil War, before the German advances, before Brest-Litovsk.

Ref.p-15 and on Bolsheviks and Workers Control.

Within this first act there are three problems.

a). "the decisions of the elected delegates of workers and employees are binding on the owners of enterprises" but they can be "annulled by trade unions and congresses".

For the role of the unions in the crisis see various of the sources. We are not defending 'socialism in one factory' or 'collective capitalism'. It seems obvious to me that each factory should, in clear and defined areas, be subordinate to the higher bodies which they elect and control jointly with other factories. This is not the case, in fact the Bolsheviks sabotaged the creation of these higher organs of workers democracy (see the rest of the book itself for copious details).

b). the decree stressed "in all enterprises of State importance" all delegates elected were "answerable to the State for the maintenance of the strictest order and discipline and for the protection of property." The full meaning of this is revealed when such enterprises are defined

c). they are defined as "all enterprises working for defence purposes, or in any way connected ~~xxx~~ with the production of articles necessary for the existence of the masses of the population."

These items occur in the draft decree. After a long struggle, detailed in the book, the final result was even worse.

From the first, before the civil war, before the interventions, before the famines, the struggle was between the organs of workers democracy and the workers' State.

Now let's jump the episodes we've charitably agreed to leave aside, to the period when the Civil War was effectively won. The debate over the 'militarisation of Labour'. This is the key to why Trotsky had no support inside or outside the Party when his conflict with Stalin came to a head.

The argument advanced was that "we have a State in which the working class is the ruling class. Therefore the working class needs no protection from its own State. The right to trade unions and to strike are irrelevant and indeed reactionary. The needs of the State are the needs of the working class on a historical level are understood by the Party, and the State. The State needs to be able to draft 'labour armies', direct labour where it is needed, discipline elements of the class looking back to "bourgeois" rights such as striking". This was TROTSKY'S argument. This was linked with his scheme for industrialisation. It is a Trotskyist myth that although Stalin stole ~~xxx~~ Trotsky's programme when he liquidated the Kulaks and began the drive that led to Stakhanovism, he did it in a way that Trotsky would never have accepted. All the measures from 1929 onwards are prepared, along with their justification, in Trotsky's arguments of 1920. To his credit, Lenin criticised Trotsky for the extremity of his arguments and the bureaucratic danger they represented, although on key areas he supported him (see Bolsheviks and Workers Control pp.56 on).

E.H.Carr is the best source for a great amount of detail in this period.

So, is substitution an anarchist myth? Could Bakunin's comments on the dangers of authoritarian socialism be better paraphrased than in Trotsky's arguments?

\*\*\*\*\*

Before coming to the IMG and the USFI we must construct some link between 1920 and today. Key elements, each of which would make an article, on this are:-

a) The 'myth of the Party' expressed in Trotsky's loyalty to the apparatus and the leadership (not the rank and file) when it was agreed to suppress Lenin's 'Testament' which urged the replacement of Stalin (and criticised Trotsky too). Not only did he



3 concur in the Central Committee decision to bury it but, when young supporters of his published the Testament he publicly lied about it, denounced them and concurred in their disgrace. (It's from this period that the ~~Redist~~ slogan on the ~~Posadist~~-Trotskyist paper comes - "With the Party we are everything, without the Party we are nothing").

2. The view that Trotsky held almost to his death that the USSR was a form of workers State. The essay The USSR and War suggests that he was shaken in this because he began to set a time limit to the durability of such a peculiar and unstable form as a 'degenerated workers state' existing for a whole historic period. He said in that essay that WWII meant either revolution or capitalist restoration in the USSR. Libertarian Communists have characterised the USSR as State Capitalist since 1920. Some comrades have argued that elements of the bureaucratic collectivist theory are correct since the mid-30's. (These are important questions but need separate treatment.)

3. The view that Stalinism was a 'centrist' current in the workers' movement (ie. stood between reform and revolution precariously balanced) although this was later amended to say that it was centrist but could only move rightwards. This was the official view until 1933 although it seems to recur through later writings (as required) eg. in the writings on the ILP in Trotsky's Writings on Britain Vol.3. Trotskyists today still seem confused on this - apart from the history of Pabloism (see below) we have the current confusion over the LCDTU and "Eurocommunism".

Libertarian Communists have, correctly, characterised Stalinism as counter-revolutionary since the late 20's, the left of the CNT (who kept the tuberculose Makhno going with their solidarity until his death in 1935) who supported the Platform and who became the Friends of Durrutti, were particularly clear on this.

Side Note: It is possible now to construct the physical links between the Platform group; the Friends of Durrutti/Guerra di Classe/FIJL; the wartime and postwar Union des Groupes Anarchiste Communiste (in various guises and names); the French ORA and ourselves.

4. The taking of the rise of Hitler in Germany to power in 1933 to mean the conclusive finish of the Comintern as a revolutionary force. From this the necessity for the 4th. International was argued. Questions that immediately spring to mind are: Why was the Comintern proved counter-revolutionary by this but not by its disastrous policy in China in 1927 when it destroyed hundreds of thousands of workers and tens of thousands of communists with a criminal and reactionary policy of support for the Kuomintang and Chiang Kai Shek? Why was not the crucial point the debacle of the British General Strike and the Anglo-Russian Trade Union Committee alliance of Stalinists and reformists which helped build the traitors a position of trust amongst even communist militants - the CP went into ~~xxx~~ 1926 with the slogan "All Power to the General Council"!!!!????? Why wasn't the tragic farce of the 1923 putsch in Germany the key? The only element differing in the equations is that Trotsky was outside the Comintern leadership by the last date. (Note. This is not to suggest that Trotsky, or Bukharin, or Zinoviev supported the dangerous policies, although the history has been written and rewritten so much that it is actually difficult to make clear the exact responsibility most of it lies with Stalin and his immediate clique, *tho' not for Germany in 1923.*

5. Trotsky's writings on Germany and the struggle against fascism are excellent. There is no doubt that revolutionaries can gain a great deal ~~about~~ from their study. Indeed if the IMG read some they'd not publish quite so much vacuous balderdash as they do about what ~~Socialist~~ "Socialist Challenge" may or may not mean as the case may be. They'd be a great deal clearer about united work and principled politics.

There are enormous errors in a lot of his other writings. And many unexplained gaps.

- the prediction of war between the USA and the UK.
- the really confused (if not dishonest) because contradictory explanations of the need for the Trotskyists to turn first to centrist groups like the ILP (which are presented as the key to the whole period then equally swiftly written off as the disappear before most of the Trotskyists had carried out the turn.
- The following discovery that there were revolutionary forces inside the Labour Parties That the 2nd International recognised as dead to class politics since its sections supported 'their' bourgeoisie in WWI, was now the place for Trotskyists x (this was called the French Turn (- largely because the majority of the French Trotskyists refused to carry it out and broke with Trotsky perhaps?) This break off was the origin of Lutte Ouvriere - the largest revolutionary group in France and one with a much better appreciation of State Capitalism than either Cliff or Dunayevskaya. This turn to reformism is the origin of entrism. "Militant" too can quote Trotsky to prove how orthodox they are.

- The TL could never have been, after writing of the anarchists before even the 2nd International, that the Libertarian Communists were "the vanguard of the



- The FI and Trotsky never explained, after writing off the anarchists before even ~~the~~ the second international, how it was the libertarian communists were "the Vanguard of the Spanish working class". Yet Felix Morrow's book (written as Trotsky's envoy) states just that.
- There is a great deal of material from which we can learn about the 'turns' and the opposition to them. Oehler in the USA was one of the clearest critics of the turn to social democracy. (Joe Thomas is probably the best living source on this perhaps London comrades could try to get photocopies and tape interviews with him on this?)
- Trotsky's views of events at the founding of the FI and the beginning of the war were totally wrong. He said quite clearly (and it was adopted by the FI and became an article of faith) that the war meant the collapse of Stalinism (because as a transitional form, a parasitic bureaucracy on a workers state, it could not survive a crisis of such magnitude). This was true IF the characterisation as a workers state was true. He also said that capitalism could not reconstruct, that the war meant the Western European revolution. He was wrong on both because he was wrong on the first. Stalinism did have the strength because it was not just a parasitic growth (a side argument here is that Trotsky reduced socialism to equalling nationalisation of production, we have seen the falsity of that so it needs no further arguing). Stalinism was a new and viable form of class society, historically progressive for Russia. A new form of production. It did have the strength to survive the war, to extend itself by conquest - the mark of class societies since the dawn of history - into those areas where it could play the role of centralising and developing the means of production
- The mistakes (understatement!) of the postwar period derive from these totally incorrect positions of the FI. The documents of "The Origins of the International Socialists" show the ludicrous twists and turns of the FI to explain the new Stalinist run states in Eastern Europe - the People's Democracies.

A proletarian revolution is necessary for a workers 'state' but there had been none. Some concluded that the Russian form exported on the bayonets of the Red Army could not be a workers state - and they came (late) to State Capitalism (Cliffe and Hallas belong to this group). Others cast around for workers revolts, a few strikes, very minor actions, and some heroic but isolated attempts at workers power (although they omitted to mention that these, specifically in Czechoslovakia, were put down bloodily by the Red Army) juggled them about and said that there had been a revolution but it had happened too quick for anyone to see! The FI majority decided to ~~fix~~ fit events to orthodoxy and stretched the already threadbare 'transitionality' of the 'degenerated workers state' to include 'deformed workers states' which came about through the Red Army carrying both Stalinism and the spirit of workers statism on its boots! All the roots of sectarianism, opportunism, idocy and ~~political~~ chaos ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in the FI ~~sk~~ took hold in this period. Method, analysis, materialism, dialectics all got lost or safely canonised.

The FI simply couldn't handle questions like - if a workers state comes into being without the action of the working class why can't a restoration occur peacefully? Perhaps the Chinese were right, Stalin died and in the middle of the night Khrushchev and Malenkov restored Capitalism while no-one was looking! Or, worse, if a workers state is created without a proletarian overthrow of the old mode of production ~~xxxxxxxx~~ (and production relations) then why is reformism wrong? Or is it right under certain arcane conditions?????????\_???

The characterisation of Stalinism, which we have noted as confused if not opportunist, leaves it open for sections of the bureaucracy to move left in some circumstances SO.....when Tito and Stalin quarreled about who was more equal than whom the FI went nuts. Tito was "an unconscious Trotskyist"!!!!!! The same honour has since been given to Ben Bella, the Chinese CP, Ho Chi Minh, Castro (almost to Nasser but that's another question again).

All these confusions led to the major split in the FI in 1953. On the left the International Committee of the Fourth International (ICFI) comprising the SLL, the French OCI, the American SWP and their satellites - I once knew 30% of the Irish Section who claimed that his vote was crucial at this time!). On the right the International Secretariat (ISFI) of Michel Pablo, Mandel (then called Germain) and the group that now lead the USFI (IMG and Co) International.



5 The differences can be best understood by reading the many annihilating and true things they each said about the other.

The Pabloites (that's ~~where~~ that swear word comes from) looked for a War-cum-Revolution with Stalinism playing a revolutionary role and looked forward to 'centuries of degenerated workers states' (how transitional and unstable can a parasitic growth get?) The logic of this side is best preserved in the Posadist-Trotskyists (the British Revolutionary Workers Party) - Nuclear War will come and if and few proletarians survive the victory of socialism is assured!" (Conscious<sup>ness</sup> surely must determine history, as Tariq Ali once explained in his book Revolutionary Socialism). Essentially they'd adapted to the postwar strength of Stalinism as to completely capitulate to it. A lot of them followed the logic of their position after the split and joined the CP's or set up groups like the ~~the~~ Posadist 4th International or Pablo's own International Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the Fourth International which play at being more Soviet than the CP's and more pro-reformist than the CIA.

The ICFI were the orthodox wing. They held to the need for the FI; to the crisis that would save their bacon if only they could hang on long enough. They enshrined the errors of the preceding decades and proceeded, like the Bourbons, to learn nothing and to forget nothing. However they do (to me at least) represent a more proper link with Trotsky, warts and all, than the Pabloites who once they'd found one short cut to revolution via the Kremlin have spent the last 25 years discovering others, equally shortlived but fun whilst they last.

The Pabloites represented an accommodation to the post-war boom. They totally over-estimated Stalinism, they gave up on the working class as the force which is alone essential for the victory of socialism. Mandel developed a nice theory of 'epicentres' of the world revolution to explain why they'd given up for a time on the working class and were now acting as publicity agents for the Algerian FLN, for Castro, for Masser (the theory was as complex and wrong as Ptolemy's epicycle theory of the movement of the solar system compared to Copernicus'). The ISFI/USFI adapted to every turn of events. Stalinism was moving left. Reformism ditto. (study Mandel's role in the Belgian General Strike of 1960). There was a new 'youth vanguard' outside the working class, automatically broken from Stalinism and Reformism and raring to go - this was the period of the famous "Let it Bleed" line on the 1970 election which was far to the left of that the left opposition\* in the AFB was putting! (\*the origin of ORA, ASA etc most of whom are now in and around the AWA). There was the "Red Bases" theory of student vanguards. Then guerillas were the in thing. All the time the essence of proletarian politics was lost. It was announced that "Blunt Instruments" could make perfectly good revolutions. So Castro could be an unconscious Trotskyist\* (whilst imprisoning his conscious fellows and shooting anarcho-syndicalists who had called the general strike that was the final, fatal, blow against Batista). Cuba could be a workers state (but was it degenerated, deformed or just 'blunt'?)

Mandel developed (just as the crisis of the late 60's was breaking) the theory of Neo-Capitalism (don't hear too much of that today, do we?) This served as a cover for the inability to explain the stabilisation that had occurred just as much as Kidron's permanent arms economy. Both theories went too far in that they were unable to explain the mechanism by which crisis was reintroduced into the system - revolution became an abstraction, a moral call. Then the crisis broke and both theories were quietly put away and the USFI and the IS revealed that they'd known ~~about~~ all along about it.

The Polemics between the SLL and Pabloites (Pablo had gone too far by the mid-60's and was dumped) are remarkably clear in showing the divide between sectarianism that was at least honest and opportunism that at times was just funny - in 70 or 71 the Red Mole carried an interview with John Lennon by Tariq Ali and Robin Blackburn which showed that Lennon had a much clearer idea of things particularly about Ireland, the Labour Party, and the British Working Class than either of these 'leaders of the 4th International'. No wonder he didn't stay around long. (Its quoted in Banda's pamphlet Theory and Practice of Revisionism - 15p from the WRP).

The most tragicomic episode of the FI history in the 60's has to be Ceylon. The US SWP was angling for a return to work with Mandel and co. They both agreed about Castro's unconscious Trotskyism and the SLL's orthodoxy was a bit too prickly. In 1963 the 'unification' began (to create the Unified Secretariat of the FI (USFI)). During this period the showpiece of the ISFI/USFI was the LSSP of Ceylon. Hailed as the one place in the world where Trotskyism had constructed anything the size and influence to merit the name Party. The LSSP had some bad habits. It seems to have got lost somewhere



in one of the discoveries of 'new forces' and 'blunt instruments' and was discussing a Popular Front (see our conference documents on definition) with the Bandaranaike national capitalist party and the Ceylonese CP. Elements of the ISFI thought this should be looked at. The International Executive Committee specifically forbade this so that it wouldn't rock the boat of unification! How's that for principal? For their part the SWP took a similarly principled position and didn't mention to the rest of the ICFI how far the 'unifying' had got.

So two events occurred very close to each other. The FI was 'unified' without any discussion of the principles of the ten year split. The LSSP went into coalition government on a lukewarm reformist programme and left the FI (it was expelled just to keep the books straight). I have yet to come across any real explanation of either event.

Cde TZ has (in a lecture given in York recently) advanced a critique of the role of the various Trotskyist factions in the May 68 events. I ~~xxx~~ hope this will be published soon so I'll leave that question to his, more expert, attention.

To bring us up to date a short resume is needed before turning to the IMG and WSL today.

The FI is in splinters, but this has been going on since before its formal creation. There has never been any mass experience in the FI - today in Spain is perhaps the first chance. The two chances, the POUM in Spain and the LSSP in Ceylon, both went over to centrism and reformism when the test came.

The USFI is about to split again, between the SWP and the Mandel group, probably at the World Congress this autumn (if it doesn't that will signal even deeper degeneration - if they can stand each other.....they can stand anything). The SWP represents a further turn to social democracy and Mandel the usual eclectic, impressionist, opportunist tendency that has become the hallmark of Pabloism. They have started expelling their opposing minorities - the SWP expelled the Mandel faction last year, the Mexican section conference ended in a pitched battle (according to USFI internal sources)

There exists today in the UK 27 different Trotskyist groups, according to Pennington of the IMG Political Committee. By my count there are 13 different international tendencies which "are the FI" or are "constructing"/"reconstructing"/"rebuilding"/etc. the F.I.

In no country do any of them exist as the major force on the revolutionary left. In most they are far smaller than maoists and in many (including Italy, Spain, Greece and Germany) than the anarchists.

None of the FI's represent a history of successful practice. The strongest represent both the strengths and weaknesses of the FI up to Trotsky's death in 1940. These are the ICFI groups, although Healy and co seemed to have learnt about 'epicentres' and 'blunt instruments' with their current fetish for Ghadaffi, the PLO and Algeria. It seems the Newsline needs wealthy friends. This leaves the groups that have broken from the ICFI - some for bad reasons like the Spartacists others for better like the WSL. In these are the remnants of Trotskyism to be found.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### THE IMG

Represents all the weaknesses of Pabloism laid on top of those of the historic FI. Its current 'unity' call is a manoeuvre on the part of its leadership who are themselves in trouble with internal factional strife. IMG members in opposition tendency in York and Leeds make the point that the members are as uninformed about the meaning of this project as we were when we discussed it at our last Conference.

Conclusions. We should fight for our principled position in united fronts. Make clear our differences and extend united work, particularly with the tendencies in opposition to the IMG leadership. We should be quite right to be suspicious of the IMG - conversation with Pennington has convinced me that simple opportunism and a certain desperation lies at the base of the Socialist Challenge project. The failure in the Labour Party (where members have been lost not just to MILITANT but to straightforward reformism itself); the pressure of the IS/SWP filling the ground of centrist and opportunist campaigns, have forced this tactic upon the IMG. It must be brought off quickly since the 'prestige' of 'the International' will look a bit tarnished by the end of the World Congress.

This means we have to be very conscious in our united work. The line agreed by Conference is right. The need for united work on a clear basis around a definite minimum platform...



7 This means that we have to be very conscious in our united work. The line agreed by conference is right. The need for united work on a clear and principled basis gets more and more urgent as the struggle around the Social Contract builds up.

Yet already in the SSA and STA (in the North, I don't know about elsewhere) we have seen the manoeuvring of the IMG to bring in Stalinists, reformists and simple careerists so as to blur the base of the ~~campaign~~ organisations. At the same time we have encountered organisational tricks to put the machinery in their hands - such as telling the Leeds STA that Hull STA hadn't organised the Northern Area conference (when details were already set and known). This was an attempt to organise 'their' conference with them able to put forward their chosen resolutions. It was a move to isolate the MM and the independent STA group in Hull. It was defeated. There has been great difficulty in getting discussion on tactics and policies for fighting in the NUT rather than about conferences about conferences about conferences which they love to operate in and make themselves responsible for.

So the IMG represents the worst of the Trotskyist tradition which is itself flawed.

This is no reason to withdraw into isolation. Influence can be won by sticking to a clear and principled position. At the least this can lead to some decent work being done, at the best we shall be able to turn the 'unity manoeuvre' into a means of influencing the opposition tendencies within the IMG itself. The conflicts developing know will really surface when the contradictions in the USFI come to a head in the near future.

#### THE WSL

Represents the 'orthodox' tradition. I was a founder member. At the beginning the WSL agreed to study the history of the FI right back to origins. This would have led to far-reaching conclusions and enabled the WSL to develop as a considerable force. However it was decided to limit the history to the justifications for the 53 split and some criticism of the ICFI elements in that.

Thus the WSL now travels the path of the SLL with all its strengths (it at least is quite clear about 'blunt instruments', 'youth vanguards', 'red bases' etc. etc.) and its weaknesses. It sees the Campaign for Democracy in the Labour Movement (CDLM) as its front. The CP has the LCDTU, the SLL the ATUA, so the WSL must have.. the CDLM.

However the application of principled united work can serve to bring back the questions of the roots of the FI onto the agenda. The WSL is open to principled debate and it is probable ~~that~~ that it would accept the creation of local, delegate CDLM groups (we should totally oppose open groups as being an excuse for the IMG to dilute the CDLM from a grouping of industrial militants to a popular front style mess). Once created these will provide a concrete base for us to extend the CDLM into a real movement rather than staged conferences and thus raise all the questions of workers democracy and united work put forward in our documents and resolutions on trade union work.

\*\*\*\*\*

A methodological comment. AR is wrong to look for linear traditions in historical development (even if the FI represented such). The development of proletarian politics is, like the operation of dialectics itself, a process of unity and conflict. There are long periods of co-existence (the proudhonists, social democrats and bakuninists, with Blanquists in the First International, Lenin and the rest of the Second, perhaps, Trotskyism and the 3rd; libertarian communism and the anarchist movement) and periods of sharp breaks when the class struggle intervenes to force decisions.

AR has complained that she tends to lose arguments with the IMG. There are two ways of approaching this question. First to make sure that we know the libertarian communist arguments (its true that anarchist ones very often don't stand up). Then, if they do not hold up to see if they are basic. Whether the conclusion is to totally accept the opposed view or seek a synthesis.

Finally it is difficult to find in the history of the last 60 years any instance of forces to the left of Stalinism leading sections of the working class in revolutionary struggle in a clear and principled way.

One example stands clear and is available from ICFI sources - Pierre Broue, a member of the French OCI, co-author of Revolution and Civil War in Spain, testifies to the strength of the libertarian communist movement in Spain. He mentions how the libertarian communists, fighting on a programme of extending and safeguarding the revolution. He does not give detail of this but elements are given in Morrow and Chomsky's essay



Objectivity and Liberal Scholarship in 'American Power and the New Mandarins', Penguin. They include the creation and organisation of workers councils; for the disarming of all units not under their control; for the seizure of the gold reserves; for a revolutionary foreign policy. They had begun to have an impact upon the Stalinist and Socialist rank and file. Pacts of unity were signed on the basis of this programme with the Socialist Youth, Communist Youth and Unions of the Socialist UGT in Levante, Asturias, and Catalonia in the spring of 1937.

The May Days in Barcelona were prompted by Stalinist counterrevolution and CNT bankruptcy because of the success of libertarian communists fighting in a principled way for revolutionary unity.

That is a historical example ~~worth~~ worth considering.

### To Follow

- NOTES ON 'PROGRAMME WE NEED' + USFI DOCUMENTS OVER LAST 10 YEARS.
  - MORE ON ORGANISATION, DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM ETC.
  - 1923 Germany \*
  - 1923 Foundations of State Capitalism\* in USSR. Zolssy's role.
- (\* ref: E. H. Carr. "The Interregnum Penguin 50p. 1923-24")