

11716 Sol.

Solidarity

FOR WORKERS' POWER

VOLUME 6 NUMBER 3

FORD workers, beware!

'Third Worldism' or Socialism?

Germany - Ireland - L.S.E.

FORD WORKERS, BEWARE!

The struggle for parity in the motor industry, spearheaded by the demand of Ford workers for an all-round £10 a week increase, mutuality,* and the ending of the residual penalty clauses, has reached a critical stage. There have been a number of ominous developments as well as some positive ones. This article attempts a long cool look at the present situation at Fords and at how we got to be where we are. It tries to reach some conclusions while it is still possible to act about them.

Parity is the most important single issue in the motor industry today. Not only parity between Ford, Vauxhall, and the Midlands car plants, but even parity within the Rootes and British Leyland empires, where the differential between factories in a given group is as wide as it is between quite different companies.

There have already been several strikes, all unofficial, to achieve parity, notably at the Speke factory of Standard Triumph (BLMC) and that at the British Leyland commercial vehicle factory at Bathgate, Scotland.**

The recent settlement at Vauxhall is a pointer to the way things are likely to go at Ford if we don't watch out. At Vauxhall the AEF and the NUVB settled a demand for parity by bringing the rate up to an insulting 10/10d an hour for production workers. At the same time the unions conceded a stiffer disciplinary procedure, the employment of more women at lower rates (except for those who agree to work shifts) and accepted a number of provisos which increase the company's right arbitrarily to change work standards. The unions also agreed to help stamp out unofficial action. Fortunately this fiasco has had positive results. We hear that militants at Luton and Dunstable are coming together in an ad hoc grouping called Vauxfam with a view to remedying the situation there.

* Mutuality means joint agreement by workers and management before the establishment of new work standards.

**

At Bathgate the men struck for a £10 a week increase. They were instructed to return to work by the AEF Divisional Organiser on the basis of an interim offer of 30/-! The final settlement was a £2 increase plus a further maximum of £2.10.0 if a 10% increase in production is achieved ... a very unlikely event, we hear.

FORD: THE OFFICIAL RECORD

The struggle to organise Dagenham was a long and bitter one. Ford only signed its first collective agreement with the TUC after an unofficial strike in 1944, and only signed its first comprehensive negotiations procedure with the unions in 1946 as a result of a further strike.

The organisation of the Briggs plant (then a separate company, but now the Ford Body Group) had a similar history. There was an unofficial strike there in 1941 over the sacking of a shop steward. This led to a Court of Enquiry which recommended a unique system of plant bargaining * without the intervention of national full-time officials. These proposals were adopted. Consequently the Briggs shop stewards were able to achieve one of the best organised plants in the country and were a continual thorn in the flesh of the officials. Agreements of this kind, conceded by the employers at the most difficult period of the war, have not been heard of since.

In 1952 Ford took over Briggs and the two firms were merged. The shop stewards retained their autonomy and there was a mounting wave of disputes as Ford attempted to achieve back-stairs standardisation.** These culminated in the sacking of Johnnie McLoughlin, the famous bell-ringing shop steward, in 1957. In August 1958 the union leaders gave away the local autonomy of Briggs workers in the Standardisation Agreement. At the same time they removed the right of all Ford shop stewards even to negotiate on a wide range of 'managerial questions', such as the transfer of men and the introduction of new production methods and machinery.***

Early in 1960 the management signed a secret agreement with the AEU and the NUGMW in which the unions accepted a much lower rate at the yet to be completed Halewood plant, in return for preferential facilities to recruit members.**** The TGWU protested, but only because it had been excluded from the deal! This error was soon rectified. The Merseyside men only achieved parity with Dagenham when they had a massive overtime ban in March 1962.

* See HMSO CMDE 6284 (16/5/41).

** Between February 1954 and March 1957 there were about 600 'incidents' at Briggs.

*** This agreement, with all its restrictions, has been incorporated into a more recent agreement signed in September 1967 (see Agreements and Conditions of Employment 'Blue Book' - 1968 Edition - p. 34). Among the signatories is none other than H. Scanlon, current darling of the left!

**** See Halewood Story (Solidarity, vol.II, No.9) and Two can Play (Solidarity vol.II, No. 10).

In October 1962 the unions agreed to a joint statement on 'labour relationships'. This proclaimed: 'The Trade Unions recognise the right of the Company to exercise such measures as are expressed within the Agreements against employees who fail to comply with the conditions of their employment by taking unconstitutional action.'

Five days after the signing of this statement Bill Francis, Deputy Convenor of the P.T.A. plant was sacked. The men immediately walked out and remained out for over a week. They only returned to work after repeated promises of official strike if Bill Francis was not reinstated. With the bulk of the men back at work the Company was able to refuse to take back a number of other militants. After protracted negotiations, a Court of Enquiry, and no less than five separate 'deferments' of the promised strike action, the unions did nothing. The 17 remaining victimised men were left out in the cold.**

Following this defeat to job organisation the management were able to carry out a massive speed-up. According to figures presented by the Company to the Jack Court of Enquiry they increased productivity by one-third following the sacking of Bill Francis. This process continued during the following years. For example in 1965, 64,000 workers produced 630,000 vehicles; in 1968, 61,000 produced 712,000. At the same time the relative wages of Ford workers fell to the lowest in the industry (see scale printed in this issue).***

If this was not sufficient, in July 1967, in return for a pathetic wage increase, the unions accepted the Grading Agreement which allowed the Company to grade jobs according to standards known only to themselves.

THE 1969 STRIKE

By late 1968, following a series of lay-offs, Ford workers had had enough. They had a massive overtime ban. Early in 1969, workers heard that a new agreement had been negotiated and agreed. 'In return' for another paltry **rise**, the Agreement promised a new and outrageous disciplinary and appeals procedure, penalty clauses, and a blueprint for the 'continuous improvement in the efficiency of the Company's operations'. (In plain English this means more speed-up combined with a reduction of

* See 'Blue Book' (1968 edition), p.15.

** For a detailed account of this struggle, see 'What Happened at Fords' by E.Stanton and K.Weller, Solidarity Pamphlet No.26, price 1/-. Also 'What's Wrong at Fords', Solidarity vol.II, No.11.

*** For some of the results of this intensification of the labour process, see 'Fords: Inside the Plant', Solidarity vol.III, No.10; 'After the Ford Defeat', Solidarity vol.IV, No.2; 'Too Old at 50', Solidarity vol.IV, No.3 and 'Murder at Fords', Solidarity vol.IV, No.4.

the already pretty limited 'rights' of the worker to refuse to work overtime and to resist arbitrary transfer without significant warning from job to job, plant to plant or even from one shift pattern to another.) During the strike which followed (which was initially unofficial) some of the officials changed their tune. The 'Agreement' was modified, although what was left was bad enough. The men returned to work after 3½ weeks on the basis of clear and repeated promises by the officials that parity with the Midlands, mutuality, and the ending of the remaining penalty clauses would be achieved forthwith.*

Fortunately the effects of the agreement which the unions finally signed were drastically mitigated by the increased strength of shop organisation, particularly at Halewood, where management have been unable to achieve either the quantity or quality of output they would like. We welcome this development. After all, one of the slogans of management is 'a fair day's work for a fair day's pay'. What kind of work do they expect for a lousy day's pay?

THE SITUATION NOW

On November 23, 1969 there was a mass meeting at Dagenham to discuss the parity claim and to mobilise support for it. As we have come to expect at Dagenham the meeting was a farce. The platform consisted of 7 full-time officials and a Labour M.P.! All spoke. And spoke. And spoke. They were consequently 'unable' to find time for questions from the floor, let alone allow anybody to speak from there. The only useful part of the meeting, which seemed almost to be added as an afterthought, were the speeches of Les Moore and Eddie Roberts, convenors at Halewood. They at least saw the path to victory as being based firmly on job organisation rather than on a re-enactment of the bitter experience of Ford workers with 'their' officials.

The actual content of the officials' speeches was crappy. Not only did they repeat one another ad nauseum ('Forget about the past. This time things will be different'), but not one of them even mentioned mutuality. This further reinforced a number of nasty suspicions that this demand will be the first to go into the waste paper basket when they get into negotiations. There was a fair amount of heckling of the officials, which turned into booing when the local official of the NUGMW (who scabbed during the last strike) came forward to speak.

Judging by the organisation of this 'mass meeting' and by the attempt to restrict attendance at the coming National Meeting of Ford Shop Stewards at Coventry on January 18th, it seems as if certain elements at

* For an analysis of the development and implications of this strike, see Solidarity (North London) vol.V, Nos. 8 and 9.

the top of the Works Committee hierarchies at Dagenham are frightened of unleashing the frustration and anger of the men, fearing (justifiably) that some of the lightning would strike them. It seems to us that one of the more positive things which could come out of the current struggle would be a drastic reorganisation of the shop stewards machinery at Dagenham.

So far, apart from three rather poor leaflets, some stickers and badges, and a very belated issue of a magazine, there is an almost total lack of information at Dagenham about what is going on. It seems to us that it is important that concerned militants at Dagenham should come together urgently, on the broadest possible basis, to discuss what should be done now.

At the Halewood plants the situation is healthier. Not only was the mass meeting far better attended but they were able to proceed without the dubious aid of either officials or M.P.s. They have used the breathing space since February to good effect. Shop organisation has been greatly strengthened. Already they have been able to exercise considerable 'influence' over the speed of the track. In the struggles to come we, at Dagenham, must make sure we pull our weight and don't leave the Halewood men in the lurch.

The November 28 issue of the Ford Company's house magazine (the 'Ford Bulletin') published the full text of Ramsay's (Ford Director of Labour Relations) reply to the demand. This reply, like the original submission of Moss Evans, Chairman of the union side of the NJNC, does not even mention mutuality. But apart from this interesting fact, it is the usual Company melange of half-truths, distortions and statistics-chopping to justify paying Ford workers their pitiful wages.

It comes as a great surprise to Ford workers that the main plank of Ramsay's response is that the Company is the champion of job-security, and that it is this concern which causes them to pay such low rates. Those workers who were repeatedly laid off in 1968 will find this assertion rather difficult to swallow. In any case, it is worth noting that workers on a three day week in the Midlands will get as much as a Ford worker on full time!

We also hear that Moss Evans is privately on record as stating that Ford workers 'don't really mean' their demand for £10 a week, and that they would be prepared to accept parity with Rootes Linwood - namely 12/4d! We only mention these unpleasant facts because we want to do what we can to give Mr. Evans a chance of denying them - and to prepare Ford workers for an attempt at the usual squalid settlement.

SOME PROPOSALS

The needs of Ford workers can be considered under 3 main headings:

(1) ORGANISATION. The creation of strong factory organisations firmly controlled at all levels by the rank and file. We should insist on more mass meetings, on the end of secret diplomacy, and on the widest and

speediest dissemination to the rank and file of all relevant information. A regular and substantial shop stewards' paper is an obvious requirement. Such a development will face the bitter hostility of the officials. But this will be nothing new. It is about time we started biting the foot that kicks us.

(2) DEMANDS. We must insist on the full demands. As we go to press there are rumours that the Company intends to offer a 10% wage increase. It must be made clear that this is not acceptable. We must also insist on mutuality for without it parity will not exist. The plight in which the Ford worker finds himself today as a result of leaving his fate in the hands of the officials has two aspects. Firstly he is the lowest paid worker in the motor industry (see scale). Secondly he works hardest. Wage parity will enable him to solve the first part, but mutuality is essential to achieve real equality.

(3) METHODS. It seems to us that much more serious attention ought to be given to the problem of how the struggles to come must be fought. It seems obvious that every effort should be made to ensure that the company does not build up stockpiles, particularly of some critical parts, for example those pressings which are essential for continued production at the continental factories. We must also consider whether it is worth while occupying the factories: If they could do it at the Flint factory of General Motors (and win),* if they can do it at Renault and Fiat (and win), why not here too?

Mark Fore

F O R D L E A F L E T

1200 copies of the following leaflet were produced and distributed by Solidarity (North London) at the mass meeting of Ford workers at Dagenham on November 23, 1969. A further 1400 copies were distributed at Halewood by Solidarity (North West) on November 30. A modified version was distributed by Clydeside Solidarity. It was well received everywhere. The coordinated work of several Solidarity groups is a welcome development.

In the Sunday Times Business News of December 21 there was a full page article by Stephen Fay dealing with parity in the motor industry. In the article, entitled 'Flashpoint of the Seventies', Fay quotes our leaflet extensively and gives it the following unsolicited testimonial:

'It (the leaflet) is in many ways a frightening piece of paper. It reached me via a Ford worker who rather desperately asked how much substance there is in the claim for parity. To many Ford workers it must seem a convincing document.'

We have never deluded ourselves that attention to us in the press has any relationship to our real significance. Nevertheless the response of Ford workers to this effort has been most heartening.

FORD: ROUND 2 BEGINS

The second stage of our struggle to achieve wage parity and decent conditions within the factory has begun. Now is the time to consider how to fight.

The demand for a £10 a week (5/- an hour) all-round increase is moderate and reasonable. But even if achieved in full it will still leave us about 2/- an hour behind what many Midlands car workers now receive, and we still have to work much harder to get it. This is why it is essential that the demand for MUTUALITY (i.e. agreement by the workers before work standards can be established) should be insisted upon. Without mutuality real parity will not exist, and it will not be possible to retain it or to extend it.

A danger we must avoid is that of placing any reliance on national trade union officials. Collectively, they are responsible for the unfavourable position in which we find ourselves today. They have participated in every defeat of Ford workers, while every advance has been a result of the action of the men.

The campaign must be firmly controlled by the rank and file. We are sick of going to meetings where the platform is dominated by full-time officials. Ordinary Ford workers must have their say. They bear the brunt. They must decide. If there are still any illusions about the present role of the trade union officials the outrageous recent agreement at Vauxhall (which gave assembly workers a rate of only 10/10d an hour in return for as many strings as a tennis racket) should dispel them. This agreement was signed by the AEF, NUVB and the ETU, who were the sole negotiators. We have to make sure that the same thing does not happen here. And the only way to do this is by keeping control of the struggle ourselves.

We hope today's mass meeting will be the first of many. It is important that every major decision should be discussed and decided upon by the rank and file. What must be avoided are meetings like the one held at Leys Road Baths on March 19 this year, which decided on the return to work. At this meeting the only speakers were 7 full-time officials! We hope that today the time allowed to the officials will be severely limited.

Between now and the expiry of the deadline on January 18, 1970, we have a period in which to prepare, not only in physical terms (by the setting up of shop funds and the tuning-up of shop organisation), but also by doing some hard thinking about how the struggle should be waged. In our view NOW is the time to begin ramming home to management and trade union leaders alike that we mean business. In this light it is obvious that we must do everything in our power to stop the Company building up stockpiles which would allow them to weather the storm. It seems to us that a phased restriction of output would be a useful contribution.

Another suggestion which we offer with some diffidence is that when the crunch comes we should consider occupying the factory. This tactic has several advantages. It does away with the problem of blacklegs. It is more effective. And it is warmer. It could be used to mobilise mass support on a scale unlike anything seen in Britain for a long time, although common nowadays in France (i.e. Renault) and Italy (Fiat).

At the moment initiative lies where it should be: in the hands of Ford workers themselves. This meeting must ensure that it stays there. It is the only way to victory.

WAGE RATES FOR CAR ASSEMBLY WORKERS, NOVEMBER 1969 (40 HOUR WEEK)

Alvis (Solihull), BLMH	Piecework	Average	21/-	per hour
Daimler, BLMH	Piecework	"	19/-	"
Volvo (Sweden)			18/9	"
Massey Ferguson (Coventry)	Piecework	"	17/5	"
Rootes (Ryton) Hrly rate all assembly workers			17/5	"
Pressed Steel Fisher, BLMH (Coventry)	Piecework	"	17/-	"
Rootes (Stoke) Hrly rate all semi-skilled			16/4	"
Austin (Longbridge), BLMH	Piecework	"	16/-	"
Jaguar, BLMH (1)	Piecework	"	16/-	"
Morris (Oxford), BLMH	Piecework	"	16/-	"
Maudsley Motors (Alcester), BLMH	Piecework	"	15/6	"
Albion Motors (Glasgow), BLMH	Piecework	"	15/6	"
Opel (Germany)			13/4	"
Rover (Solihull), BLMH	Piecework	"	13/3-14/-	"
Volkswagen (Germany)			13/1	"
Pressed Steel Fisher, BLMH (Castle Bromwich)	Piecework		12/6-15/-	"
Rootes (Linwood) Hrly rate all semi-skilled			12/4	"
Ford (Germany)			12/1	"
Vauxhall (Ellesmere Port, Luton, Dunstable)	Hrly rate		10/10	"
Ford (Great Britain)	Hrly rate		10/6 $\frac{1}{2}$	"
	(after 4 years' service!)			

(1) Rising to 18/- in 1970.

The Company and its allies constantly make the point that most of the rates above are for piecework. This is true. But what is never mentioned is that Ford workers work much harder than any pieceworkers. In 1968 each Ford worker produced 11.7 vehicles (worth £8000) compared with 8.9 vehicles (worth £7240) produced by each Rootes worker and 5.6 vehicles (worth £5180) by each worker at BLMH.

'THIRD WORLDISM' or socialism?

In the two decades that followed World War II, the political scene was dominated by the struggles of the colonial people to liberate themselves from the direct political and military rule of the imperialist countries. The Chinese revolution, the Cuban revolution, the Algerian war, the Suez war, Guatemala, Kenya, Iraq, Congo, Indonesia, Vietnam, are but some of the places where colonial peoples have fought fierce, bloody, and courageous battles against a vastly superior imperialist enemy. Often winning these battles, they have gained varying measures of political 'independence' against heavy odds.

While these anti-imperialist battles raged all over the colonial world, the working class in the imperialist countries fought few politically significant battles against its own rulers at home. In none of the industrialised capitalist countries did the proletariat rise against the bourgeoisie, to challenge its political rule. There were certainly many militant strikes, but few of these transcended economic demands. The 1956 uprisings in Hungary and Poland were events of historical significance, but since they occurred in countries where the private ownership of the means of production had already been abolished, they did not fit into the orthodox Marxist analysis of social dynamics, and their deeper significance was ignored (like that of the Kronstadt uprising in 1921). It was in these circumstances that the theories of 'third worldism' emerged.

'Since the Bratislava Conference the counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia have continued to intensify their anti-socialist activities. This compelled the solid elements of the Communist Party and of the State to appeal to the armed forces of the USSR and its allies with a view to defending the socialist regime. It is with this noble objective in mind that the fighters of the armed forces of the USSR and its allies penetrated Czech territory on Wednesday morning.'

Radio Hanoi, August 21, 1968

Like many other theoretical make-shifts they were an attempt to rationalise and generalise that which had occurred (the struggle of the colonial peoples) and that which failed to occur (proletarian revolutions in the industrialised countries) and to graft these onto the fundamental assumptions of Marx's theory. The resulting rationalisation runs something as follows:

1. The proletariat of the industrialised countries does not rise against its bourgeoisie because it is fed crumbs of the plunder extracted from the colonial world. This deadens its revolutionary initiative. The proletariat of

the imperialist countries is 'corrupted' and incapable of rising against capitalism.

2. The people of the colonial countries, whose labour supplies the raw materials necessary for imperialism, constitute a 'world proletariat' (even if they are peasants, and not engaged in any industrial activity). On a world scale, they constitute a revolutionary class. It is at the expense of their misery that the imperialist countries thrive. And it is they who have risen in armed struggle against imperialism.

3. The anti-colonial revolution is therefore the socialist revolution of our epoch.

4. The world peasantry will rise in armed struggle and surround the urban centres of the world (just as happened in China and Cuba). Eventually, these centres will collapse through economic crisis (being cut off from their sources of raw materials, markets and manpower). The urban proletariat will at this stage join the victorious colonial peasant revolution.

This is the theory, perhaps somewhat simplified, which we mean when we speak of 'third worldism'. Like any other orthodoxy it has many variants, each claiming to be the only authentic one. However, the four points mentioned above constitute the common denominator of those who uphold these views.

'Third worldist' Marxism ignores the basic assumptions of Marx's analysis of society. According to Marx, a revolution is not merely a revolt against misery. It is an upheaval which legitimises a new set of social relations, which have come into existence before the revolution, due to a new

technology of production. Revolution may be the midwife of history, but a midwife can only help to bring into the world an embryo which has for quite a period matured and developed on its own. According to Marx it is not the revolution which produces a new society, but a new society which produces a revolution, which then allows it to develop. Thus the great French revolution could only legitimise the new social order which bourgeois society had been producing and generating for decades before 1789.

What kind of society matured in the colonial countries prior to their struggles for independence? The struggles of the colonial people were, primarily, peasant revolts. The industrial proletariat of the colonial countries could not, and did not, play a decisive role in any of these revolutions. No wonder, therefore, that none of these struggles produced a new social system which can stimulate and inspire revolutionary socialists elsewhere.

Dr. Fidel Castro ranged Cuba on the side of the Soviet Union last night. In a broadcast speech he said: 'The Czech regime was marching towards capitalism, inexorably towards imperialism'.

The Times, August 24, 1968.

This does not mean that these revolutions were meaningless in their own right. One only has to remember the extreme misery, starvation, and barbaric despotism which previously prevailed in these countries (and which gave birth to the colonial revolutions) to realise their importance and significance for their own populations. Where thousands die of hunger every year it is irrelevant to complain about a lack of democracy, the only meaningful thing is to have a full belly. If the Chinese, Cuban, and Vietnamese revolutions did no more than secure one cup of rice daily for every person in those countries they have already done a lot. In fact they did more, for they have abolished illiteracy, abolished private land ownership, commenced to industrialise their countries, introduced national health insurance and education, and all this within a decade or two. But none of this can be considered, either implicitly or explicitly, as having anything to do with socialism. Socialism is not primarily about food, literacy, industrialisation or national health insurance. The advanced capitalist countries can and have provided these... and still we criticise them without mercy. Socialism is about a fundamental change in the relations of production: the abolition of the order-giver and order-taker relationship in the productive process and in all aspects of social life. It is not about the replacement of one type of order-giver by another. It is therefore no accident that the undoubted economic achievements in the 'third world' have failed to produce any revolutionising impact in modern industrialised countries. They did not inspire any section of society to rise up in a revolutionary struggle. They did not produce a new kind of social order meaningful to industrial society.

Revolutions led by semi-military parties, and achieved through predominantly military struggles, produce regimes deeply stamped by their origins. The political structures produced are in the image of the former struggles for power: regimentalised, authoritarian, doctrinaire, bureaucratised. Moreover, the amount of national political autonomy existing in many such states is often very limited. Economic and military aid, the ubiquitous 'advisers', inheritance of particular political structures, and established trade

patterns tend to leave some such states in a position of dependence on their former imperialist rulers. Where the upheaval has been more thorough, new political structures and trade patterns are created and the country concerned generally finds itself coming under the growing influence of other super-states, not renowned for their wide political freedom. Cuban and Vietnamese support for the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia showed the

'Dr. Nkrumah is the true leader of Africa. He knows what needs to be done.'

Stokely Carmichael, ex-'Prime Minister' of Black Panther Party, in interview with Jonathan Power, Sunday Times Magazine, 2.11.1969.

'The more I read of Marx, the less I understood ... it just confuses me.'

Stokely Carmichael, *ibid.*

measure of their political independence. Cuba was in fact so dependent on Russia's purchase of the sugar crop that Castro had to support the advance of Russian tanks on Prague; the trading of principles is linked to the principles of trade.

Such new regimes cannot inspire the millions in modern industrialised countries, whose struggles are precisely against milder versions of similar structures. Every revolution in an under-developed country has produced the absolute rule of a military or political bureaucracy. Even when tolerated by their own population (frequently only after the incarceration or execution of all opposition - that on the left included) these regimes

cannot serve as a model, or desirable goal, to broad layers of the population in a modern industrial society.

'The sleeping masses must be bombarded with the correct approach to struggle through the activities of the vanguard Party ... if the masses do not have knowledge of the Party, it will be impossible for the masses to follow the programme of the Party ... The masses are constantly looking for a guide, a Messiah, to liberate them from the hands of the oppressor...'

Huey P. Newton, 'Minister of Defence', Black Panther, April 20, 1969.

Even the 'economic collapse of the metropolitan centres' due to the loss of their sources of raw materials failed to materialise - as anyone even remotely familiar with the primacy of the internal market in modern capitalism could easily have predicted. It turned out (surprise! surprise!) that the industrialised countries depend less on the under-developed ones than vice-versa. Not only can man-made fibres replace,

say, cotton, but cotton-producing countries are a very poor market for, say, cars or computers. The modern industrial states become less and less dependent on their former colonies, either for raw materials or for markets, than in the past. Holland loses Indonesia, Belgium loses the Congo, France loses Indochina without their economies 'collapsing'. Both theories of revolution (that proclaiming the 'total collapse of the economy' and that prognosticating an uprising against 'increasing material misery and exploitation' in the industrialised countries, as a result of the struggles of the colonial peoples) prove, daily, neither to correspond to modern social-economic reality, nor to inspire people to transform it.

Yet the very struggles of the colonial peoples (as distinct from the regimes they produced and the rationalisations which frustrated revolutionaries attempted to impose on them) made a contribution to the revolutionary movement. They demonstrated that the most powerful regimes in history can be confronted, challenged, fought, and eventually defeated by popular struggles. To realise the significance of this fact one has to judge it against the background of the 1950s when the military-technological-scientific power of the West appeared invincible. That poorly-armed peasant populations could withstand the enormous forces of modern imperial-

ism, and even defeat them, shattered the myth of the invincible super-state. Moreover, these struggles were a constant reminder to the people of the imperialist countries of the corrupt, ruthless, and racist nature of their regimes. The Suez War, the Algerian War, and the Vietnam War have each exposed to new layers of people in Britain, France and America the continued brutality of capitalism, well-known to previous generations in these countries. Thus these struggles themselves, rather than their outcome, slogans, or economic effects, drove many in the industrialised states, especially youth and students, to come out in struggle against their own imperialist regimes. In Britain, for example, the struggles in more than one university were sparked off when students discovered that either the University funds - or firms managed by members of their Board of Governors - invested extensively in South African or Rhodesian companies.

The struggle against imperialism and support for the struggles of colonial peoples does not, however, imply support for this or that political organisation, engaged in that struggle. Support for political organisations should depend on their political programme. When revolutionaries support, say, a nationalist-rightist-militarist organisation despite the political programme which reveals it non-socialist character, and only because 'independently of its declared aims, it serves, temporarily and non-consciously, the struggle against imperialism' (or because 'the dynamics of the struggle are bound to transform it'), they surrender their own revolutionary initiative and independence, and trail behind **that** of others. This is a fitting role for politicians' politics, not for the politics of revolutionaries. It is the politics of those who repeatedly adapt themselves to 'objective conditions' rather than of those who dare to challenge and transform them.

'Stalin played a very important part in the Russian revolution and he played an important part in the first Socialist State ... we say there is no such animal as a Stalinist, and that Stalin was truly a marxist - leninist. It's just a matter of people and history in its totality and telling the true story of what took place ... The one thing that we respect about Stalin is that Stalin was able to capture the will of the people more than anyone else ... He was not just a theoretician, he was a practitioner of the theory.'

David Hilliard, 'National Chief of Staff', Black Panther, April 20, 1969.

Our refusal to support political organisations with nationalistic, bourgeois or state-capitalist programmes is not merely a question of abiding by revolutionary moral and ideological principles. It is also a question of political solidarity. In most cases under consideration it turns out that next to the large, rich and vociferous organisations there exist small groups of militant, internationalist revolutionaries, in bitter conflict not only with imperialism but with their own nationalistic 'partner'.

Those advocates of 'realism' who grant their support according to size rather than programme, according to 'objective conditions' rather than subjective consciousness, betray not only their revolutionary principles but also those who struggle for the same principles in the particular country involved. One could almost say: 'tell me to whom, and to what, you give your support, and I will tell you your ideas both on the Revolution and on Socialism'.

A. O.

LETTER FROM A FRIEND IN RUSSIA

'... It seems that no one can erect the protection afforded by the words 'my own business' since all business is the property of the state. I'm not simply making a pun, but there are times when I weary of the interferences of complete strangers. There is in this partially developed society an ideal of 'kulturnost' - the behaviour expected of cultured people. It is perhaps my imagination, but it seems to me that they have deputed a large number of grandmothers, aged at least 50, fat, and with the ubiquitous kerchief, to enforce this ideal. Everywhere, on the buses, in cafeterias, or merely on the street, advice or criticism is gratuitously handed out. "Young man, don't smoke so much!" or "Dress more neatly" or "awful beard". I hear the last remark quite a bit, since I have not shaved for many months. In sum, there is an official standard of behaviour, not written down, but enforced by these legions of ancient busy-bodies. An anecdote may illustrate what I mean. I was recently in an old city not far from Leningrad. I entered a beer hall just after the break, and left my coat at the cloakroom, since I know that Russians consider it ochen' nekulturny (very improper) to wear one's outer garments indoor. But the rest of the crowd was probably thirsty and made for the bar. They were immediately pursued by several waitresses, who pulled at their coats, yelling "undress! undress!". This is typical of the 'cultured' way in which the canons of kulturnost are enforced.'

Read SOLIDARITY

A paper for militants - in industry and elsewhere. Attempts a total critique of modern society, and a systematic 'demystification' of its values, ideas, and forms of organisation. Discusses what libertarian revolution is all about. 10/- for 12 issues, from SOLIDARITY (North London), c/o H. Russell, 53A Westmoreland Road, Bromley, Kent.

FILM REVIEW

ADALEN '31

Like "The Organiser", "Viva Zapata", "October", "Salt of the Earth" (and a few others) this 'committed' film will be remembered when many others have been forgotten. But it will be remembered for rather different reasons.

The story itself is simple. In the early 1930's the depression hits a small Swedish town. Employers in the woodpulp industry impose a wage-cut. The workers strike and others come out in solidarity. After several weeks, having failed to starve the men into submission, the employers bring in scabs. The strikers break into the docks and forcibly evict the blacklegs. The local police can't cope. The government sends in a train-load of troops. The temperature rises and the strikers decide to march to a nearby town to mobilise mass support. The authorities panic. After the march has set out, they decide to stop it. Soldiers with machine guns are placed at the exit of a village on the route of the strikers. Banners flying and singing the 'Internationale' the unarmed marchers refuse to stop when summoned by mounted policemen. Troops and police open fire. Several people are killed. The march is halted. Stunned and horrified the crowd counts its dead. Word of the ambush spreads. A general strike brings down the government.

But this threadbare and depersonalised summary conveys no idea of the film's impact. The photography and use of colour are breathtaking. There is something ethereal in Widerberg's vision of the Swedish countryside, light and sun-drenched in the late summer, all iridescent lakes and streams, tall grass and almost transparent trees. The red and gold banners of the strikers, and their blood shed on the soil, almost melt into this background. The pictures, however, never lapse into mere prettiness. There is an organic link between the images - which have a truly lyrical beauty - and the story of those involved. This link is so obvious that no explicit endorsement of the 'beauty' or merit of the strikers' cause is needed. Relations between people - and between people and their environment - are painted with great insight, subtlety and love.

Images and scenes will be remembered long after the main theme is blurred by time: Kjell and Anna, the young lovers, discovering themselves as they discover one another; kids catching sunrays in their mirrors and diverting them into the eyes of soldiers, compelling them one by one to turn round (the ludic element in struggle?); the arguments between Harald, Kjell's father, who is a constitutionalist, and the young workers who want to spread the strike; the collective pulling down of the dock gates (the historical antecedent of LSE?); the fidgety hands of an experienced superintendent, rightly anticipating 'trouble' in a confrontation when the

participants themselves are not as yet aware of what is to come; Nisse, Kjell's friend, undressing a successfully hypnotised girl - and then abandoning her, in her birthday suit, for the greater excitement of another kind of direct action; The 'Internationale' wafting across the still waters of the lake, as the march sets off; the soldier camouflaging his machine gun with a sprig of lilac; the drunken officer, after the massacre, cursing the 'civilian bastards' on whose behalf the shooting took place; the factory owner who willed the end but was not prepared to accept responsibility for the means; the haunting wail of the steam whistles, from mills and factories, ships and sheds, threnody to the dead and call for further action; finally the courageous attempt by Kjell's mother and the now orphaned boys to pick up life's fragments and start anew.

There is no space to discuss some of the more challenging political implications of this film or to comment on the consciously low key in which it is set, which will certainly annoy many voluntarist, 'blood and thunder' revolutionaries. People are depicted as they are, neither idealised nor dehumanised as in so much 'committed' art. But is there really such a diffusion of responsibility within class society (the enemy being almost invisible and intangible until one is confronted with his bullets?) Did the Swedish unions in 1931 really identify so fully with those they claimed to 'represent'? If so, they have travelled a long way in a short time, for referring to the recent strike of 5,000 iron ore miners in Kiruna (N. Sweden) Roland Huntford recently described them as "bureaucratic institutions (which) now exist not so much to defend the workers but, exaggerating only a little, to promote the careers of their own officials who now form a private hierarchy".* Opinions may differ as to what they were like four decades ago. Few however would disagree with the film's parting shot. The 1931 events in Adalen brought down the Conservative government. The Social-Democrats took power and have ruled Sweden for some 40 years. But among the pines and fjords there is neither equality nor real freedom.

*The Observer, Jan. 4, 1970.

M.B.

—NOW available—

SOLIDARITY (ABERDEEN) No.4. Strikes: dustmen and Lewis's - Consolidated Pneumatic - Aberdeen students - The class struggle in Portugal. From N. Roy, 138 Walker Rd. Torry, Aberdeen

SOLIDARITY (WEST LONDON) No.2. Italy - The Economic League - Furniture Workers - N.W. Polytechnic - Punfield: the struggle continues. From M.Duncan, 15 Taylor's Green, London W.3.

SOLIDARITY (SOUTH LONDON) No.8. Carry on, Kingsnorth - Equal pay for foremen - Parsons knows - Of shares and men - S.S. men. From 44 Sturgeon Road, London SE17.

polemic

In our last issue we published an interview, recorded in London, between Bernard Reichenbach, one of the founding members in 1919 of the Kommunistische Arbeiter Partei Deutschland (KAPD) and a young German revolutionary of today. The response has been interesting. From a comrade in Munich, active in the German New Left, we have received the following letter (which reasons of space have forced us to shorten somewhat). We hope to publish further comments in subsequent issues.

It is an irony of the history of the extreme left that Bernard Reichenbach should declare, in 1969, that 'a revolution in the traditional marxist terms' was inconceivable by him today. Reichenbach was an activist. For this reason his altered evaluation of 'classical' revolutionary tenets, as recorded in his statements, should be made crystal clear, unless of course one considers these a purely individual matter, the case of a revolutionary grown old. But in that case why the deliberately structured interview, which at least in its printed form gave the impression that interviewer and interviewed were united about the description of a situation and about a misuse of history to prove their own beliefs?

In his history of the KAP(D)* Reichenbach attacked Ruhle,** one of the 'teachers' of the interviewer (who was, incidentally, influenced in no small measure by Ruhle's writings in developing his own anti-authoritarian theories).

'The conflict with the "Einheitlern"*** under the leadership of Ruhle coincided with the development of a widespread tendency among the working class, a tendency of an outspoken anarcho-syndicalist nature, shot through with petty-bourgeois ideology and negating the Party as an organ of the proletariat altogether, merely advocating the coalescence of the econ-

* Printed in the Grundberg-Archiv, Leipzig 1928, pp.117 et seq.

** Otto Ruhle, biographer of Marx, founding member of the KPD, and later of the KAPD. Alone with Karl Liebknecht, Ruhle had voted against the war in 1914-15.

*** A tendency in the KAPD opposed to the parallel existence of both political and industrial organisations, and calling for the dissemination and implementation of the ideas of workers' management of production and the power of the workers' councils to be carried out by a single organisation. (Ed. - Solidarity)

omic organisations and unions* on a federal basis, with complete autonomy for the separate districts. The fight took place essentially within the Allgemeine Arbeiter Union (AAU).** A group split off as the Allgemeine Arbeiter Union (Einheitler).*** The supporters of this tendency accepted the ideas of the American IWW and their principle of "one big union".

This presentation contains false claims and politically-motivated false interpretations (for example that Ruhle demanded autonomy for the districts, which he never did - or the accusation of syndicalism which has never been proved theoretically). The aim of the essay was a rehabilitation of the KAP which had been slandered by the KPD historians, the rehabilitation to take place through proving that one was oneself the purest representative of the revolutionary class interests of the proletariat in the political sphere. The aim was also to show that the KAP had fought against a petty-bourgeois dilution of Marx's teachings and that the blame for the failure of the revolution was not due to its own strategy but to the Social-democrats and Moscow-communists who had seduced the workers into opportunism.

What should be criticised in the interview is the naive way in which history is misused so as to allow Reichenbach to feel its heir. There is no discussion or retrospective evaluation of the processes of conflict, of the emergence of tendencies, of correct or false decisions which themselves soon became part of the total reality and therefore of history itself. Instead one gets platitudes to help along a simplified identification. The questioner should have asked (after some research on the subject) why the KAP(D) had, already in 1920, expelled people from the Party because they had warned against Russian usurpation of the Third International in the limited interests of Socialism in one Country. (The self-same KAP(D) was to be thrown out of the International, despite its moans, by an ultimatum of the Third Congress, in 1921.)

If this kind of questioning and analysis had been done, mistaken decisions, evaluations and strategies would have become meaningful. These matters are relevant to our current preoccupations: questions like the criticism of revisionism, questions related to the organisational debate (today so dogmatically carried out in the German New Left), questions relating to the role of intellectuals in the working class movement (treated equally dogmatically). The whole area of the KAP(D) was ideal for an exemplary critical study of real problems, related to a real subject.

* The author does not mean trade unions but groupings of industrial militants that had developed in the period, somewhat similar to shop stewards' committees.

** A trade union federation, under KAP(D) influence.

*** or AAU(E).

But nothing of all that is contained in the interview, which only assists an unreflecting type of identification with the past. It therefore has just such an un-emancipatory function as the process of 'consuming' Che, of prostration before Mao or of finding Lenin above all criticism. In the interview the causal relations between phenomena are over-simplified. The failure of the KAP(D) is reduced to a wrong assessment of the activity of the proletariat. The Social-democrats are credited with a 'more realistic view of things'. Avoided are the problems of the endless divisions, of 'putchism', of the significance of the KPD, of the approach to the class struggle at the point of production, of the role of intellectual cadres and of the unsuccessful educational activities of the KPD in relation to those workers who had begun to develop political interests. (This was one of the main preoccupations of the KAP.)

Thereby the authority of history becomes the basis for pushing forward the spectre of resignation; in an 'objectively revolutionary situation' which did not lead to revolution the theory of marxism must prove itself false, because the leaders certainly did their best. According to this approach we, who were born later, can learn nothing from history. In this perspective we could save ourselves the trouble of reading about the old men of the former radical left: it would be more valuable to start off by reading Lenin - he at least was historically 'successful'. An old man in his resignation has the right to gloss over mistakes, but we who are interested in the history of the KAP and of the AAU (because we see in them the beginnings of a policy and the basis of an organisational form of the proletariat, under highly developed monopoly capitalism) must deal with the causes of these failures in a more differentiated way. Which thoughts and actions of the early 1920s failed because the conditions were not yet ripe? And which failed because they only reflected intellectual preoccupations? Why did dogmatic ossification set in? These thoughts should be thought through on the basis of today's socio-economic and political conditions.

Only in this way can we really learn from the history of the KAP(D). A premature and purely formal identification with the KAP (and correspondingly abstract historical statements) can only lead on the other hand to an identification with the creeping revisionism of Reichenbach.

COMING SHORTLY: MAGNUM OPUS

THE BOLSHEVIKS AND WORKERS' CONTROL 1917 - 1921

WANTED: a) Advance orders; b) Bulk sellers; c) Publicity

ALSO COMING SHORTLY: BILLS for printing, covers, binding.

WANTED: BREAD (in the form of loans and donations from friends and relations)

Your surplus half-crowns and 10/- notes rushed to our bank .

DISPEL YOUR CHERISHED ILLUSIONS FOR 5/-

REVOLUTIONARY SUPERMARKET

Theory of theory 1.	Non-theory of theory 2.	Non-practice of theory 3.	Practice of theory 4.
Theory of non-theory 5.	Non-theory of non-theory 6.	Non-practice of non-theory 7.	Practice of non-theory 8.
Theory of non-practice 9.	Non-theory of non-practice 10.	Non-practice of non-practice 11.	Practice of non-practice 12.
Theory of practice 13.	Non-theory of practice 14.	Non-practice of practice 15.	Practice of practice 16.

1. Editorial Board, New Left Review

2. The trad. left (CP, trots, IS, etc)

3. Left academic

5. The Principled Eclectic

6. Any anarchist

7. The Principled Eclectic (on vacation)

8. Most hippies

9. The S.P.G.B.

10. 99% of the population

11. SPGBer (caught on barricade)

12. The S.P.G.B.

14. The Mindless Militant

15. Mindless Militant (under sedation)

16. Narodnik terrorist.

4 + 13 : Solidarity programme

BOOK REVIEWS

HOLY WAR IN BELFAST by Andrew Boyd. Anvil Books, 1969. 8/6

ULSTER: WITHDRAW THE PRIESTS (AND PARSONS). Solidarity (North London) VI, 1.

STRUGGLE IN THE NORTH by Mike Farrell. People's Democracy pamphlet. 2s.

Andrew Boyd's book consists largely of reporting, rather than analysis, of religious conflict in Belfast in the 19th century, with added chapters on more recent events placing the publication on the bandwagon of topicality. The main part has been researched in some detail, although the result is often an impression of 'scissors and paste' journalism and inadequate arrangement of material. Analysis of the non-religious background is little more than minimal and is overshadowed by the long catalogue of incidents, but the first chapter does show that division along religious lines has not always existed in such a significant form and cannot be traced directly from the 17th century events so prominent in its folklore; the United Irishmen of 1798 provide the prime example of cooperation against a common enemy. Later there is some indication of how sectarian strife was exploited by politicians such as Randolph Churchill as well as by religious fanatics. The analytical element in the final updating section is not very strong either. Comments tend to be superficial, the purely religious factor is over-emphasised, and the assertion that the history of religious riots in Belfast is but a 'repetition of the same story with variants' (though borne out by the way Boyd has presented it) is not helpful.

The book, however, has its uses and might correct some misapprehensions; it might even have been profitably referred to by the author(s) of the 'Ulster' editorial in Solidarity (North London), VI, 1. This article voiced some necessary criticism of the Civil Rights Movement and the tactics adopted towards it by some English political groups. At the same time its own view is open to challenge, especially with regard to the alleged 'self-activity' of the Protestant working class. The idea that when the workers are throwing stones at police we should be on the side of the workers must undergo some modification when the motive of the stone-throwing is to get past the police in order to attack, much more violently, another group of workers. Similarly the organisation of street patrols and the building of barricades cannot be equated with the same actions undertaken for defence against the oppressive forces of the state and its allies. As reference to Andrew Boyd shows, readiness to fight police and troops is nothing new for Protestant workers, although admittedly they had less tendency to regard the 19th century police as being on their side in the first place. Socialists should not find themselves supporting violence and oppression by the police and army against workers, but they

must also avoid the assumption that the worker is in some way always right. Solidarity should beware of making 'self-activity' another increasingly meaningless catch-word of the left, denoting something invariably good per se; it cannot be applied with equal inflections of approval to the practices of the Shankill Road 'defenders' on the one hand, and to the measures taken by the people of Derry (long notorious as a city of apathy) on the other.

A more convincing analysis of the Protestant backlash is presented by Michael Farrell in his recent pamphlet. He too observes a change in loyalist attitudes to established authority, but sees a danger of this resulting in a form of fascism under leaders like McKeague, disowned by more respectable extremists, rather than in any drawing of revolutionary conclusions or identification with the Catholic working class (although he perceives a possibility of receptiveness to socialist ideas). The pessimist outlook accords much better with the observable behaviour of the Orange proletariat, whose position Farrell describes effectively. His powers of analysis are extended to the whole structure of Unionism and to a critique of the set up in Eire.

This is all useful stuff, as are the criticisms of the 'moderate' and 'militant anti-partitionist' sections of the Civil Rights Movement. The weakness of the pamphlet is that the same critical approach is not brought to bear on the rest of the C.R. Movement. It fails to assess the extent to which an independent, self-active rank and file may be distinguished from the leadership of specific groups, and above all fails to criticise the People's Democracy itself. This organisation originated as a student debating society and developed into a conglomeration of Civil-Righters of whom only a small though articulate and vocal vanguard could be called socialists; yet it is to the People's Democracy that Farrell apparently looks to fulfil the 'socialist strategy' he outlines. (There is after all not much choice: for example, the Young Socialist Alliance long ago opted for total immersion in Civil Rights and P.D., while - for a more obscure example - the University Socialist Society confines itself to such morale-boosting though largely meaningless activities as breaking up Unionist meetings and sabotaging SRC elections.) The vanguard may have succeeded in persuading the P.D. that it is a good idea to struggle for the '32-county workers' and small farmers' republic', in the familiar Connolly-nostalgic phrasing, but at the moment the struggle seems to consist of good works (e.g. relating to housing), publications, personality clashes, and self-propagation. The hint that industrial activity might be undertaken has no discernible basis in actuality, industrial contacts being people who come from industry to the P.D., not channels for an approach by P.D. into industry. And the other, almost impossible, strategic task of breaking down the resistance of Protestant workers and 'explaining to them' cannot be said to have got under way.

British comrades exasperated by Northern Ireland's 'chronic political underdevelopment' should realise that the task attempted by Farrell, of devising and implementing a socialist strategy, here presents extremely

complex problems. Any individual or group attempting industrial agitation must face the fact that if they are tainted by association with Civil Rights their name on a leaflet would make it immediately unacceptable to the majority of the proletariat. Even an unknown person making contact with workers would almost inevitably become involved in a discussion of his position with regard to the C.R. Movement; to express support would alienate, to express opposition mislead most Protestants. Thus it would not have been possible for socialists to ignore Civil Rights, even if they had wished to abstain from the issue foremost in the minds of all sections of the community and to dissociate themselves from the self-activity of substantial numbers of workers. Their mistake was not in getting involved with Civil Rights, but in submerging themselves in this one aspect of the social struggle to the exclusion of all else, so that it is now difficult to revert to a coherent programme of meaningful socialist activity.

L. A. W.



Do you want to die from natural causes, too?

L.S.E.: THE NATIVES ARE RESTLESS - A report on student power in action
by Paul Hoch and Vic Schoenbach. Sheed and Ward, London 1969.
10/- (including postage) from Solidarity (North London).

This is a well documented and informative account of the struggle at L.S.E. between October 1968 (when the students occupied the School as a base for the Vietnam demo) and the end of 1969. Written by two activists of the 'Brand X' tendency (as the Secretary of State for Education and Science so well defined it), it is more than a report: it is a revolutionary's description of his struggles.

The authors are protagonists of 'confrontation tactics' (i.e. of public challenges to authority). What confrontation means depends on the circumstances. Contrary to what many believe, it does not necessarily imply physical violence. The book describes a case where militants entered the Senior Common Room, trying in vain to have a confrontation with the Academic Staff and to provoke them into a discussion. There was no question of violence or shouting. Where all verbal attempts failed it was the simple gesture of taking the portrait of the Chairman of the Board of Governors off the wall that let all hell lose.

In order that an act become one of 'confrontation' it must be seen in public to be a defiance of, and a challenge to, authority. Once such an act takes place the confidence trick of 'authority' is seen for what it is. Everyone has to come out openly on the side of the existing authority relations ... or against them. The mere fact that confrontation tactics work (i.e. that in the wake of a confrontation, a considerable number come out against the existing relations) indicates that we are knee-deep in the period of revolution. There were long periods when confrontation failed to mobilise significant numbers. That is definitely not the case today. The list of bodies whose role was seen, during confrontation, to be very different from what they wanted it to appear is amazing. It included not only the Academic Board, the Senior Staff, the Press, the Political Parties and the Students' Union, but even such 'militant' bodies as I.S. and Soc. Soc.

It was the highest University authorities (rather than the traditional revolutionaries) who first fathomed the significance of confrontation tactics. Some of their comments are most revealing. 'I favour representation because it is the one practical alternative to confrontation' (Lord Annan, Provost of University College). 'The Vice-Chancellor today is only too well aware that University authority (I do not think I am giving away any valuable secrets here) is vulnerable and delicate and depends on consensus - or if you like. bluff' (Earl of Longford, House of Lords, June 19, 1969).

How true! But today this applies not only to Universities but also to factories. All that is needed is for the idea of confrontation to gain hold on the shop-floor. We have no doubt it will.

The book stresses and demonstrates how the act of confrontation has a revolutionising effect on the mind. It is not merely something outside of us that is challenged. It is the whole consciousness through which we grasp and rationalise authority. Confrontation is an inner as well as an outer challenge. It has a demystifying effect. It can reveal a revolutionary to be a liberal, while transforming a liberal into a revolutionary. It is well known that where people change their views through a process of reasoning, it still requires an act of confrontation to finalise the process.

We stress the merits of confrontation tactics because they were buried by the traditional, institutionalised and academic revolutionaries. It is high time for their revival. While confrontation tactics expose the confidence trick called 'authority', they do not necessarily transform a radical into a revolutionary. For this it is necessary to have a total critique of society, a grasp of its dynamics and a vision of a goal. It is much easier to achieve this when the starting point is the experience of confrontation rather than the reading of books. But that experience should never be a substitute for coherent thought. While revolutionaries should embed confrontation tactics in their theories and actions, it is imperative for those who start from the tactics to embrace a broader analysis of social dynamics and to clarify their ideas concerning the goals of the struggle.

We strongly recommend this book to every militant in University and factory. Its subversion value can be judged from the fact that Smith (and many other bookshops) refuse to sell it. In fact, readers are invited to place their order through this journal. One of the authors, Paul Hoch, is awaiting trial and may be deported to the USA. It is necessary to inform and mobilise students to his defence. For information, write to B. Williams, 9 Sandwell Mansions, West End Lane, London NW6.

A. O.

WHO SAID IT?

'... how these people propose to run a factory, operate a railway, or steer a ship, without having one deciding will in the last resort, without one-man management, they of course do not tell us.'

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Henry Ford | 4. Aleksei Grigorievich Stakhanov | |
| 2. Duncan Sandys | 5. V.I. Lenin | 7. Friedrich Engels |
| 3. Alfred Robens | 6. Karl Kautsky | 8. Otto E. von Bismarck |

Answer p. 26

ABOUT OURSELVES

We are pleased to announce the formation of two new SOLIDARITY groups: Solidarity (Romford) and Solidarity (Dundee). The Romford group contains a number of ex-I.S. and S.L.L. members, recently active among the GLC tenants. The Dundee group has already begun work with the Aberdeen group on a joint project concerning the Coulter-Guard Bridge Paper Mills.

Sales of our latest pamphlet on the Flint Sit-Down Strike have gone well. 1500 have been sold and we have already had to reprint. The pamphlet has been circulated, to our knowledge, in at least 14 car factories. We hope it will contribute to the struggles to come.

We have also had to reprint Modern Capitalism and Revolution for which there continues to be a demand both at home and abroad. We are currently engaged in the production of two new pamphlets, one on the NUGMW (a case study of how bureaucratic a union can be), and one on 'The Irrational in Politics' (a study on conditioning for the authoritarian society and on the fear of freedom).

A Portuguese translation of 'As we see it' has just been produced and we look forward to hearing of translations into other languages. We have also just heard that the Vancouver (Canada) group of the Educational Workers' Union (I.W.W.) have reprinted our pamphlet 'Socialism or Barbarism' for local distribution.

Our magnum opus on The Bolsheviks and Workers' Control - 1917-1921 (The State and Counter-Revolution) is now being printed. It will be a pocket-sized book of about 120 pages, costing 5/- and should be available fairly soon. We have invested all our capital in this venture but still badly need loans and donations as our costs are considerable. We are sure there will be a wide demand for a fully documented account of this critical period. The book contains much information from original sources not readily available.

AUTONOMOUS SOLIDARITY GROUPS

London (West)	c/o M.Duncan, 15 Taylor's Green, London W.3.
London (North)	c/o H.Russell, 53A Westmoreland Rd., Bromley, Kent.
London (South)	c/o J.Shreeve, 44 Sturgeon Rd., London S.E.17 (new address)
Romford	c/o Tony Reed, 26 Seamore Gdns., Ilford, Essex.
Aberdeen	c/o N.Roy, 138 Walker Road, Aberdeen.
Clydeside	c/o D.Kane, 43 Valeview Terrace, Dumbarton.
Dundee	c/o F. Browne, 444 Perth Rd., Dundee, Angus.
North West	c/o P. Cockcroft, 102 Carter St., Moss Side, Manchester.

Published by SOLIDARITY (North London), c/o H. Russell, 53A Westmoreland Road, Bromley, Kent. - January 19, 1970.

Answer: F. Engels (Letter to Theodor Cuno, January 24, 1872.)
