

8636

# **LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST REVIEW**

---

**JOURNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY ANARCHISM**

---

- Building the Party?
- Wage Freeze.
- Sectarianism.
- Reviews.
- The Two Octobers.
- State Capitalism.



**WINTER 1974**

**15p**

**FOR WORKERS POWER**



## EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

British Anarchists, unlike those in other countries, have in recent years shown an almost total disregard for the development of a theoretical understanding of the world in which we live and the ways in which it has to be changed. In the 1960's we had the "Revisionist Anarchism" of Colin Ward and those grouped around the magazine *Anarchy*. What passed for 'theory' among this group was in fact a reformist recipe of liberalism and pacifism in approximately equal proportions. *Anarchy* almost totally ignored class struggle and had no recognition of the central role of the working class in changing society.

On the other hand we had the mindless activism of certain groups and individuals within the Anarchist Federation of Britain (now defunct). They implicitly accepted the revisionist notion that "the movement is everything - the goal is nothing." Many of them worked very hard in single issue campaigns - e.g. the peace movement, squatting, etc. These campaigns tended to be seen as an end in themselves, rather than as part of the struggle against capitalism. Inevitably when these struggles lost initial momentum the 'activists' either dropped out completely or turned their attention to the worthy cause where the whole wretched process could be repeated. Without a coherent theoretical basis to direct these activities, the effort expended was largely wasted and the real possibility of a revolutionary Anarchistic presence in the British working class was lost.

The organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists has no intention of repeating these mistakes. We base ourselves firmly on recognition of the class nature of capitalism and the fact that the working class is the only revolutionary class within capitalist society. But this in itself is hardly enough. It is necessary for Anarchists to develop from this basis a relevant theory of modern capitalism which analyses its strengths and weaknesses so that the system can be fought more effectively. Such theory, and its development through practice, must also be capable of defeating the authoritarian ideas of Leninism and Stalinism which presently dominate the British left. *Libertarian Communist Review* has an important part to play in the development of such a theory, and of the ORA.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Contents

Building the Revolutionary Party ?.....	2
Sectarianism: why it's necessary .....	7
Behind the economic crisis .....	9
The Two Octobers .....	13
Notes on Russian State Capitalism .....	17
Reviews .....	19



# Building the Revolutionary Party?

by Geoff Foote

Since the 1917 Russian Revolution, it has been generally accepted on the left that a revolutionary party, in the sense of a 'van-guard', is necessary for a successful revolution. Anarchist criticism has been shrugged off as coming from a numerically insignificant group of purists, who, unlike the Leninists, have never carried out a successful revolution. However, the denunciation of Stalin by Khrushchev, and the crushing of the Hungarian revolt in 1956 (among other things) has made it manifestly clear to all but the most blinkered that the revolution in Russia has been a failure. It might have been thought that Leninism would have been completely discredited, but myths about Stalin have been replaced by myths about Mao or Castro, or in the case of the Trotskyists, the myth that the revolution could have been successful, if it had had the 'correct' leadership. Leninism, in its Stalinist or Trotskyist forms, remains the dominant ideology of the revolutionary left, partly because the emphasis on authority and leadership is more comprehensible to people raised in an authoritarian society than is the Anarchist rejection of authoritarianism. Anarchism has often gained ground *after* a revolution, when people resent attempts to reimpose authority on them. But though in the present situation in Britain, the Anarchists are numerically even more insignificant than the Trotskyists, our ideas remain important since they not only raise the question of the nature of post revolutionary society, but also the related problem of how to launch a successful revolution. This is seen above all in the Anarchist rejection of the revolutionary party in its Leninist sense.

The main argument of this article is that the party is the reflection of the society it seeks to create. In looking at the major left groupings - social democratic, Stalinist, Leninist, Trotskyist - there is obviously a certain simplification. For instance, I ignore theories put forward by Gramsci and Luxembourg as well as groupings like the left of the Labour Party (a peculiar amalgam of Methodism, Social Democracy and Stalinism). A lack of space does not allow as complete a discussion of the problem as I would like, and certainly people like Gramsci should not be ignored. However, at this time it is necessary to concentrate on the main party groupings.

## 1. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

In bourgeois democratic society the structure of these political parties which support the existing social order - conservative or reformist - are mirrors of a hierarchical authoritarian society. In the same way it can be said that those organisations which seek to transform society in the interests of the working class reflect within their structure the type of society they wish to create. The social democratic party, for example, derives its structure from its attitude towards bourgeois authority. Social democrats seek to create a socialist society on behalf of the working class, but fail to challenge the institutions of bourgeois democracy. Since social democrats accept the authority of the bourgeois state and law, they become agents of that authority. They make the mistake of assuming that the state stands above the class conflict, to be captured at elections by the representatives of the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. In fact the State is in the midst of the class struggle, operating as the armed wing of the ruling class. This can be seen not only in this country, but also in other European Social Democratic parties (eg. the French socialists under Mollet sent troops on an imperialist expedition to Suez in 1956 - and justified it in Marxist terms. The German social democrats have a long history of acting as instruments of bourgeois authority, from their suppression of the Spartakist revolt to their support for the West German emergency laws). The contradictions of social democracy - a result of its attitude to authority - resolve themselves into the position of undermining the revolutionary potential of the working class.

The social democratic vision of a new society - essentially the same as the old one in all respects but with the exception that the people are ruled with a beneficial paternalism which will end inequalities - is mirrored in its organisational structure. The leadership is a small bureaucracy running a mass party. The most important section of the leadership - the parliamentary party - is completely out of control of the mass organisation. Nominations for parliamentary candidature must be approved by the leadership. In Britain, the Labour Party group which draws up policies for the next election (the National Executive



Committee) is elected by non mandated conference delegates, and is thus out of control of the membership. When left wing policies are put forward they are ignored (eg. Gaitskell over CND, in 1960 and Wilson during and after government office). The mass membership of the party has all the abstract freedoms of bourgeois society - freedom of speech, freedom to hold radically different ideas etc., - so that Trotskyist 'entrust' groups like the Revolutionary Socialist League can co-exist with rightists like Woodrow Wyatt (and millionaire capitalists like Robert Maxwell) without upsetting the party. The parallels with bourgeois society are made complete by the fact that as soon as 'subversive' groups begin to pose a serious threat, as did the Communist Party in the 20's or the SLL in the 60's they are expelled en masse. Of course this does not mean that social democratic parties are any more free of mass pressures than are the ruling class. They need to win elections, and are often driven to absurd promises, like calling for a price freeze in a capitalist society caught in the throes of international inflation - a policy made more absurd and phoney by the fact that it is proposed by Wilson and Callaghan, instigators of the 1966 wage freeze. We can see from this that the institutionalised formal democracy of social democratic parties - a form without any substance - is a mirror of the social democrat's vision of socialism as a bourgeois society without the bourgeoisie.

## 2. THE STALINIST PARTIES

Unlike the social democrats the Stalinists (and I do not count the British CP as Stalinist but as left social democrat) seek to challenge bourgeois authority. However, they do not do so in the interests of democratic liberty, but in the interests of an opposing authority which claims to be more efficient than the bourgeoisie. Capitalist 'anarchy' will be replaced by bureaucratic planning which will end bourgeois exploitation and inequality of distribution. The Stalinist view of a socialist society - a bureaucratic State on the model of the USSR, with a monolithic ideology, where a small leadership dictates policy to the masses, - is reflected in the structure of the Stalinist parties. Because of its historic origins in Leninism, the party is committed to democratic centralism, but real democracy is absent, because of the banning of factions, and the demand that the membership must submit completely to the policies worked out in the Central Committee. The Stalinists' subjection to the need to defend Russia often leads to a situation where it can be revolutionary (eg. the big strike called by the Communists in France and Italy in 1947/48) or, more usually, counter-revolutionary (eg. Stalinist opposition to the Spanish revolution of 1936, their attitude to the May revolt in France in 1968). The contradictions of Stalinism attempting to change society are no less great than those of social democracy.

## 3. LENIN'S CONCEPT OF THE PARTY

Unlike social democracy and Stalinism, Leninism seeks to challenge bourgeois authority in the name of revolutionary freedom. Lenin in 'State and Revolution' called for a society where the State - defined as an instrument of class oppression - would eventually disappear. The paradox emerges when a Leninist government suppressed freedom and smashed the attempt of the Russian working class to free itself from rulers. This paradox is made clear only if we keep in mind that the revolutionary party is a reflection of the social order it seeks to create. It is significant that Chris Harman should write that: "It is important to note that for Lenin the party is not the embryo of the workers' state." (1), while at the same time attributing the

failure of the Russian revolution to the fact that it took place in a non-industrialised country racked by Civil War and international bourgeois intervention. While nobody can underestimate the tremendous consequences of such 'external' factors, it would be completely misleading to ignore 'internal' factors such as the Leninist theory of the Party and the relationship between the party and the working class.

Lenin's theory of the party is derived from his view of the nature of revolution and the role of revolutionaries. Revolution, Lenin correctly saw, is of necessity authoritarian. As Engels wrote: "A revolution is certainly the most authoritarian thing there is: it is an act whereby one part of the population imposes its will on the other by means of rifles, bayonets and cannon, all of which are highly authoritarian means." (2) (This does not mean of course that a revolution cannot be the most liberating thing there is). From this arises the idea that a transitional regime - the dictatorship of the proletariat - is needed to smash any attempt by the bourgeoisie to destroy the revolution. The role of the revolutionary party in this situation is the role of political leadership of the working class. "There could not have been social democratic consciousness among the workers. It would have to be brought to them from without...the working class exclusively by its own efforts is able to develop only trade union consciousness" (3). Lenin later modified this position to take account of the undeniable spontaneity of the class. ("The economists have gone to one extreme. To straighten matters out one had to pull in the other direction, and this is what I have done" (4). Lenin often pointed out that the proletariat was sometimes more revolutionary than the party. But the primary role of creating consciousness lies in the party: "The working class is instinctively, spontaneously social democratic, and more than ten years of work put in by social democracy has done a great deal to transform this spontaneity into consciousness." (5) Leadership is absolutely necessary for revolutionary success because of the fragmentation of consciousness and the organisation of the ruling class. But the nature of this leadership is more than mere persuasion and raising of consciousness. Such leadership is inevitable in any situation where many people are confused because they have never thought about the issues and listen to someone who has - who is in that sense a leader. An organization which seeks to link local struggles and explain a future course is, whether we like it or not, necessary. But the Leninist party is not only concerned with ideological leadership. It seeks political leadership of the State, since the proletariat, unlike a democratic centralist party, does not necessarily have the 'concrete view' even after a revolution. Even in his most 'libertarian' text Lenin writes: "By educating the workers' party, Marxism educates the vanguard of the proletariat, capable of assuming power and leading the whole people to socialism" (6) Lenin later explains the reason for this vanguard of the proletariat: "We are not Utopians, we do not dream of disposing at once with all administration, with all subordination.... No, we want the socialist revolution with subordination, control and foremen and accountants." (7) Any notion of self emancipation and self education is missing in Lenin. Realising the strength of the authoritarian culture he attacks and underestimates the speed with which many people overthrow authoritarian ideology in a revolutionary situation. He fails to see that "if the proletariat itself does not know how to create the necessary prerequisites for the socialist organisation of labour, no one can do this for it and no one can compel it to do this.. Socialism and socialist organisation will be set up by the proletariat itself, or they will not be set up at all. Something else will be set up - State capitalism" (8).



#### 4. LENINIST SUBSTITUTIONISM.

Just as in the transitional regime of 'proletarian' dictatorship the hierarchy of authority and subordination remains, so in the party there is in the Central Committee and its policies. There is a hierarchy of authority. District and factory circles, local and territorial committees are elected and their decisions are then communicated from the top down. Opposition from the subordinates is quashed, or at best tolerated. In Russia the Left Communists were hounded out of existence in 1918. From the Democratic Centralists and the Workers' Opposition were frowned upon, and eventually, in 1921, after a party Congress which oppositionist claimed had rigged delegations, all factions were banned within the party (like most permanent bans, this was 'temporary'). The Cheka was then used against the oppositionists forced to illegally. Trotsky summed up Leninist ideas vividly in 1924 when he said: "...the Party in the last analysis is always right, because the Party is the single historical instrument given to the proletariat for the solution of its basic problems... I know that one must not be right against the party. One can be right only with the Party, and through the Party, for history has no other road for being in the right." (9) Ironically it was Trotsky himself who, in 1904 had pointed out the danger of such ideas. Before he became a Leninist he in a polemic against Leninist views of the Party: "The organisation of the party substitutes itself for the party as a whole, when the central committee itself for the organisation, and finally the dictator substitutes himself for the central committee." (10)

This substitutionism in the party was reflected in the society the Bolsheviks created. The rule of the party (or rather, its Central Committee) was substituted for the rule of the proletariat. The workers' committees running industry were castrated in 1917-1918 (before the civil war, the devastating effects of which are the constant excuse for Trotskyist and Stalinist apologists) in preparation for one man management. By the summer of 1918 elections to the Soviets had become a farce. In 1918 the Red Army, originally a democratic militia, was transformed by Trotsky into a non-democratic army on the bourgeois model, with saluting, different living quarters for officers, the death penalty for desertion etc.. In 1920 Trotsky (supported at first by Lenin) called for the militarisation of labour - labour armies to be used as scabs - and the substitution of Party-controlled production unions for genuine Trade Unions. The nature of the Party after 1914 (when it was broadened by many who agreed with Lenin only on the need to turn the imperialist war into a civil war) meant that these proposals came under fire from a significant minority (and in the case of the militarisation of labour proposals a majority). But as we have seen this opposition, and even the right to organise opposition, was effectively ended with the 1921 Party Congress.

Thus the original paradox, that Leninism, a doctrine calling for revolutionary freedom destroyed that freedom, can be seen not to be a paradox at all. Lenin's talk of proletarian democracy, and freedom from authority in 'State and Revolution' remained just that - talk. By removing such notions to a vague future, Lenin banished them to the realm of abstraction. What remained was the immediate task of overthrowing capitalism and establishing a transitional regime. Bourgeois authority was not challenged by the authority of a revolutionary proletariat (which alone would have laid the real preconditions for the abolition of authoritarianism) but by the authority of a political party - self proclaimed 'vanguard of the proletariat'. Precisely because, as one prominent Left Communist proclaimed "socialism and socialist organisation will be set up by the proletariat itself, or they will not be set up at all", the transitional regime of 1917/18 remains with us today, more powerful than ever.

#### 5. THE TROTSKYIST ATTITUDE.

The Trotskyist never learned anything from failure of the Russian revolution. Trotsky himself was never to make more than a partial break with the USSR., and was led into the contradictory position of defining Russia as a degenerated workers' state. Leninist organisation with its hierarchies, its authoritarianism and its notions of leadership and subordination remained. "The leading cadre plays the same decisive role in relation to the party that the party plays in relation to the class" (11) writes Cannon, leader of the largest of the American Trotskyist groups, the Socialist Workers' party. There is the same intolerance to opposition: "Those who try to break up the historically created cadres of the Trotskyist parties are in reality aiming to break up the parties and to liquidate the Trotskyist movement. They will not succeed. The Trotskyist parties will liquidate the liquidators, and the SWP has the high historic privilege of setting the example". (12) These are the madmen that claim to be our leaders! The authoritarian structure of the parties is a reflection of the society they seek to create.

Another Trotskyist leader, Ernest Mandel, writes: "Anyone who believes that the mass of the imperialist countries are ready today to take over the running of the economy at once, without first passing through the school of workers' control, is deceiving himself and others with dangerous illusions." (13) More explicitly he writes: "The production relations are not changed so long as the private employer has merely been replaced by the employer state, embodied in some all power manager, technocrat or bureaucrat.... The classical solution is the succession of phases: workers' control (ie. supervision of the management by the workers), workers participation in the management; and workers self-management." (14). Like Lenin, the Trotskyists wish democracy and freedom away to a vague future 'when the workers are ready for it'. They also reduce it to an abstraction.

#### 6. LENINISM - THE I.S. VARIANT.

The one revolutionary group in Britain which seemed to many to have learned the lessons of the failure of the Russian revolution, and attempted to be both Leninist and libertarian, was the International Socialists. Their emphasis on democracy within the party is shown in a book by three of their most prominent members - *Party and Class*. Here Duncan Hallas writes that a revolutionary party cannot possibly be created except on a thoroughly democratic basis, that unless in its internal life vigorous tendencies and shades of opinion are represented, a socialist party cannot rise above the level of a sect. "Internal democracy is not an optional extra. It is fundamental to the relationship between party members and those amongst whom they work." (15) In the same book Tony Cliff writes: "because the working class is far from being monolithic, and because the path to socialism is uncharted, wide differences of strategy and tactics can and should exist in the revolutionary party. The alternative is the bureaucratised party or the sect with its leader... Scientific socialism must live and thrive on controversy" (16) It seems odd that such democratic sentiments should co-exist with a total support for the Bolshevik practice during the Russian revolution. Even those members of I.S. who, like Peter Sedgewick argued that the degeneration of the revolution had occurred by 1918, attribute the decay to the "military depredation and economic ruin which wrought havoc in an already enfeebled Russia." (17) No mention of the Leninist view of the Party. Libertarian socialism and Leninism are incompatible - and the I.S. group has remained Leninist, and we have recently begun to see the results.



The stress on democracy within the group has been exposed as hollow. As early as 1971, the I.S. leadership reversed a *national conference* decision that the group should take a principled abstentionist position on Britain's entry into the E.E.C. Instead, they adopted a position of opposition to entry. The way in which the opposition groups like Workers Fight and the "Right Opposition" were expelled is startling in view of the group's previous emphasis on faction rights. Tony Cliff has abandoned his earlier position in *"Party and Class"* that "wide differences in strategy and tactics can and should exist in the revolutionary party" (18), and now holds that "I.S. is a voluntary organisation of people who disagree or agree within narrow limits" (19).

The libertarian rhetoric of a society based on workers' councils remains, but it is nothing more than a rhetoric. Certain questions are never raised, let alone answered. Will the factories be under workers' self-management during the 'transitional period'? Will the Workers' State be a federation of workers' councils, under the direct control of the working class (a libertarian idea) or will it be a centralised bureaucracy co-existing with workers' councils on the Yugoslav model (a Leninist idea)? What happens if there is a conflict between the centralised authority and the workers' councils? (When such a conflict occurred in Russia in 1917/18 and in Spain 1936/37 it was the councils who lost out). Above all, what will be the relationships of the vanguard party to the State, the Workers' Councils, and the working class? How will it avoid substitutionism? Cliffs argument in *Party and Class* that substitutionism can be stopped by a diligent leadership is completely inadequate.

## 7 THE LIBERTARIAN POSITION.

Nobody denies that the condition for revolution in Britain will be different from those that prevailed in Russia. However, the idea of a vanguard party remains, as does the danger that the "transitional period" will prove far from transitional. The idea that the working class can be liberated by a party - no matter how correct its line - is an abstraction. All that would happen would be the creation of a new ruling class, as has been seen in Russia and other "socialist" countries. The working class must liberate itself, as called for by Marx, and in doing so it will create the preconditions for the liberation of all oppressed groups from authority.

Our relationship to Leninist theory must be made clear. Leninism has its strengths as well as its weaknesses. Its recognition that working class consciousness is fragmented and generally under the hold of bourgeois ideology is essentially correct. While he underestimates how quickly workers can free themselves from authoritarian ideology, Lenin did recognise the importance of leadership. Anarchists must overcome their fear of the idea of leadership, and recognise that in any situation where people are confused, an anarchist will provide leadership where he or she advocates libertarian solutions. The difference is that whereas anarchist leadership consists of persuasion and agitation, the Leninist vanguard party seeks to go beyond agitation to actual *political* leadership through its control of the state. For the purpose of agitation on a national scale some type of organisation is necessary, and here also Leninism should be looked at more carefully. Lenin saw that the organisation of the party

# Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists

# SUBSCRIBE

## TO LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE



**For Twelve issues**

I enclose a cheque/P.O. for £1 as a subscription to **LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE**.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

**LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE, 29 Cardigan Road, Leeds 6.**

make all cheques/P.O.s payable to **ORA General Fund.**



was determined by the authoritarian society in which it existed (though he did not see that the structure of a vanguard party determined the society which it created), and tried to solve the problem by adopting democratic centralism. Democratic centralism is suited for a vanguard party, but libertarianism must reject such a form of organisation which usually turns out to be more centralised than democratic. What is needed is an organisation with a high degree of theoretical clarity and a fully developed sense of responsibility towards other comrades, while at the same time maintaining a maximum of political discussion within the organisation. A central co-ordinating body is vital, though there must be complete and absolute control over it by the membership and its task should be minimal and clearly defined.

Some anarchists have criticised Lenin for his ruthlessness, but I believe that such a criticism should be rejected. Any successful revolution will be faced with the possibility of civil war and tremendous economic difficulties which it will be forced to meet ruthlessly if the revolution is to survive. In doing this it may be necessary to do some horrifying things such as killing ordinary workers who are fighting for the counter-revolution. But there will be qualitative differences between the libertarian and the Leninist attitudes. We are fighting for different aims, and so must reject policies like creating a secret police, prison camps and "red terror". Such policies would destroy revolutionary freedom. We must be prepared to accept defeat rather than engage in such actions.

Finally, we must recognise with Lenin that authority can only be defeated by authority. Lenin recognised that the State is an instrument of coercion by one class against another, and pointed out that a Workers' State will be necessary in the turmoil of revolution in order to coerce the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless, we must differentiate ourselves from Lenin's view of the State. To Lenin the state was a centralised republic co-existing with workers' councils, with the vanguard party controlling the centre. To libertarians, it is a decentralised federation of workers' councils under the direct and absolute control of the working class.

Such a state is one that begins to cease being a state almost immediately. It is not the institutionalisation of class oppression like the Leninist state, but the foundations of liberation. Since the concept of a workers' state is now fully associated with Leninism, and it is thereby simplified to become *merely* class oppression rather than being simultaneously the institutions of liberation which necessitates the dissolution of the State, anarchists reject the revolutionary society will have a state in its initial phase.

One thing we must reject clearly is the notion of a centralised vanguard party. The division of labour between those who rule and those who are ruled has lasted too long, and can only be ended by the *self*-emancipation of the working class. It is absolutely necessary that anarchists clarify their relationship to this self-emancipation, and the debate on organisation within the libertarian movement must develop in a clear and realistic direction.

## Notes

- (1) *Chris Harmon - Party and Class.*
- (2) *Engels - On Authority.*
- (3) *Lenin - What is to be done?*
- (4) *Lenin - Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.*
- (5) *Lenin - The Re-organization of the Party.*
- (6) *Lenin - The State and Revolution.*
- (7) *Ibid.*
- (8) *Osinsky - On the building of Socialism in Kommunist*
- (9) *Trotsky - Thirteenth Party Congress.*
- (10) *Trotsky - Our Political Tasks.*
- (11) *James Cannon - Factional Struggle and Party Leadership, in S.W.P. pamphlet In defence of the Revolutionary Party.*
- (12) *Ibid.*
- (13) *Mandel - Workers Control and Workers Councils.*
- (14) *Mandel - Marxist Economic Theory. Vol. 2.*
- (15) *Duncan Hallas - Towards a Revolutionary Socialist Party in Party and Class.*
- (16) *Tony Cliff - Trotsky on Substitutionism in Party and Class.*
- (17) *Peter Sedgwick - Victor Serge on Party and Class. in International Socialism 50.*
- (18) *Tony Cliff - Party and Class.*
- (19) *Cliff and Nagliatti - Main features of the programme we need in I.S. Internal Bulletin Jan 1973.*



# SECTARIANISM: WHY IT'S NECESSARY

BY STEVE KIBBLE

Recent issues of Libertarian Struggle have devoted some space to analysing and attacking the role of I.S. in Teachers Rank and File. This kind of analysis is obviously necessary, yet many people who consider themselves vaguely left feel very uneasy when they read articles by one group attacking another. It's considered somehow distasteful, but above all it's *sectarian*, implying that the group has placed their own importance above that of the working class. There is some truth in this. Sections of the Maoist movement, differing on minor questions, label the others "conscious agents of imperialism", "fronts for the CIA", etc. All very good stuff for the sect collector but of very little use to anyone else, least of all the working class. There would appear to be two different types of sectarianism. The latter variety isn't sectarianism in the classic sense of the word, but then the definitions have spread a little.

The first definition i.e. sectarian proper is that which occurs between different groups vying for that much sought after position - "the leadership of the working class."

Since a study of all the set books can entitle one to this position, the situation rapidly becomes confusing. At the moment two particular groups have by their own vehemence at least attained this. One being the Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the other the Socialist Labour League. Since they hold this position, then clearly everyone else must not only be wrong, but consciously wrong, and thus "objectively being on the side of the ruling class." The patent absurdity of this position is obvious, but it continues to dominate the politics of these two groups. Among other less paranoid vyers for the leadership of the working class, the usual litmus paper test is who has the most members. At least this bears some relationship to reality and shows that their ideas do have credibility amongst the most advanced sections of the working class. But still the argument is couched in terms laid down by Lenin. There can only be one leadership which has defeated the others to create the monolithic highly-centralised body that will lead them to the revolution. Then, since it represents the most advanced sections, it will rule in the transitional period between capitalism and full communism until the class is ready for full power itself.

The other kind of sectarianism and one that I would argue is totally necessary is attempting to differentiate between groups that appear to say the same thing and want the same objective, but whose practice, theory and methods of action are entirely different. Here one has to state quite specifically, using historical experience and present day analysis to show that there is a difference, and it can not only be seen to be a paper difference but one that has a direct bearing on the eventual emergence of a working class capable and willing to organise itself to overthrow capitalism and replace it with workers' power. Since there is a strong link between the way a group is internally structured, its method of operation (tactics), and its supposed aim, then everything is up for attack.

Libertarians have to be very aware of this. We are probably the smallest grouping active in the working class and thus the least effective. At this present time it is fairly easy to be an effective Leninist group with the working class, or at least the most class conscious elements in it, only recently being weaned away from the myth that social democracy truly "represents" the working class and can bring about social justice and equality. Our ideas are different from "follow us and see a new society created", and we have to show this very clearly in our ideas and in the kind of organisations that we wish to help to create in the working class. We believe that the working class should control society. This means what it says; not that the party, representing the most advanced sections, should control society. We believe in independent working class activity; not just independent of every group but us. We believe in rank and file movements in the unions; not in groups set up by group cadres with ready-made policies and papers laid down by a leadership that knows all the answers. We believe in learning from the class as much as trying to teach and initiate; not in making a token bow to participation. In all these our tactics should relate to our eventual aims. Likewise our organisation and its structure should relate to our tactics and aims. As we believe in free speech in the working class, so we believe in free speech in the organisation. We believe that minorities have the right to put their position, both internally and publicly, as long as it is clear that it is a minority viewpoint. We believe that no one group



of people should keep their knowledge to themselves, but instead that knowledge and experience should be shared and that those with less than others be encouraged to contribute as much as possible. We believe that no group should have the power of certain positions to dominate others. And so all positions are either mandated on a recallable basis or the necessary functions are rotated, both to avoid power positions and to spread experience..

All this helps to create an organisation that should be efficient and libertarian. There is a direct link between this and organising to create a society built the same way. Not that we seek to become the revolutionary microcosm of the working class - which is some kind of crypto-Leninist position. What is needed is a clear understanding and analysis of why actions are undertaken and why certain ideas are better than others. And why the essential differences between us and others need to be made clear.

Thus sectarianism is clearly necessary. And it is most necessary against those who appear to be close to us, but in fact are not. It is an easy matter to distinguish ourselves from reformism and its ageing stablemate, Stalinism. The difference between ourselves and the most authoritarian Trotskyist and Maoist groups are again fairly obvious. Where sectarianism is most needed is against groups like I.S. who have become adept at taking away selected portions of libertarian clothing in order to cover up the more unattractive parts of Lenin's body. Their cynical manipulation of so-called rank and file groups has to be attacked and attacked until there is a general realisation that rank and file does mean groups of autonomous workers organising in their own defence and putting forward their own ideas. And that the role of revolutionary organisation is to help this, not to use them to build up blocs in the unions to challenge the leadership and recruit en masse. In attacking I.S.'s political tactics it is quite valid to call in to question the structure of I.S. and how it has become far more centralised and how the National Committee would like to make it more so. Faction and tendency rights have been eroded away. There are proposals to regional committees from federal and delegate bodies into groups of the best cadres in the area as chosen by the National Committee. There are proposals to limit branches to only one resolution at conference and that based on the perspectives document drawn up by the National Committee. Note should also be taken of the physical intimidation of other left groups that I.S. seems to be indulging in - the beating up of a Red Weekly seller and others in Liverpool, the threatened doing-over of Big Flame. All this relates to the kind of politics that I.S. is currently pursuing in their hope to take up the place in the shade recently vacated by the Communist Party.

In short, we need to use sectarianism as a weapon to destroy any hold that groups dominated by theories of Leninism and reformism have over sections of the working class. That is what we are aiming to do, even if it is not usually phrased like that. If we believe in workers' power then those ideas stand in the way of the fulfilment of that belief. Not that we should fight them in the way that I.S. appears to be fighting its opponents i.e. literally, but fighting them by our argument and organisation and our willingness to learn.

## Publications

**Organisational Platform of the Libertarian Communists.** (ORA pamphlet) advance orders to D. Young, 91, Burghhead Drive, Linthouse, Glasgow.

**Mole Express** Manchester voice of revolutionary struggle. News/reviews/exposes/graphics/features. 10p monthly from 7, Summer Terrace, Manchester 14 SWD.

**The Tyranny of Structurelessness** by Jo Freeman. Obtainable from Leeds Womens ORA, 29, Cardigan Rd., Leeds 6. 5p plus 3p post. *'Libertarians in all movements should study this pamphlet because it contains the core of the argument that ORGANISED libertarians have stated.'* Review in April Libertarian Struggle.

**Front Liberaire** fortnightly paper of O.R.A. France. Sample copy from North London group, subscription details from 33, rue des Vignoles, 75020 Paris, France.

**Michael Tobin**, who was jailed for two years being in possession of leaflets calling on British Army soldiers to desert, has been released. He wishes to be contacted by fellow ex-prisoners, or prisoners, to organise a campaign against the British penal system. Contact Michael Tobin, P.O. Box 10638, Amsterdam, Holland.

**De Vrije Socialist** paper of the Dutch Libertarian Socialist Federation. For copies write to, Jan Bervoets, Willem de Zwijgerlaan 104, Den Haag, Netherlands.

**Inside Story** the radical magazine which specialises in the stories Fleet St. won't print. For sample copy send 25p to Dept. AP 20, 3, Belmont Road, London S.W. 4

**Solidarity**, a paper for militants in industry and elsewhere. 6p. plus post from 123, Latham Road, London, E.6



# Behind the economic crisis

by Al McNeillie

In Britain the world trends of slowing down in economic growth (apart from 1973) and a relative decline in productivity in the advanced industrial countries, a fall in profit margins, a decline in investment in important sectors of the economy, and the consequent galloping inflation as increased costs are passed on as higher prices, are intensified by a lack of competitiveness. This lack of competitiveness is a central feature of 20th century British and economic history. Britain's dominance of 1870 when her exports equalled a third of the world's total was gradually eroded mainly by the development of the U.S. and Germany as major industrial powers. By 1913 Britain's share had dropped to 13% - a decline which necessitated the imperialist war of 1914-1918 and the savage attacks on the working class in the immediate post-war years. This period culminated in the massive working class defeat of 1926 and the adoption of a depressed economy in the inter-war years. The main reason why there was no fascist solution to the problems of British capitalism was not because of the democratic and undogmatic nature of the British as is frequently asserted, but because the ruling-class had already defeated the workers in the General Strike and because the Wall Street crash had a minimal impact on Britain. The British economy was already depressed. The fact that standards of living have increased greatly since 1945 as a result of capitalist expansion in the West tended to disguise the reality of the situation. The truth of the matter was that Britain's position *vis a vis* her rivals continued to decline so that Britain now produces less than 4% of the world's output.

The slackening of the post-war expansion in the mid-1960's revealed Britain's weakness - a weakness which has been expressed in countless balance of payments crises, devaluations, and "stop-go" policies. If British capitalism is to be made competitive there are three imperatives: the raising of profit margins, the stimulation of investment, and, most importantly, a major attack on working-class standards of living and workers' organisations. These imperatives mutually reinforce each other. To take an example: one of the reasons for the lack of investment in British industry has been that British capitalists have often

preferred to invest in countries where there is a disciplined, low-paid labour force (as in South Africa) where profit levels are higher and there is little danger of the workers becoming "bloody minded." This the ruling-class and successive Labour and Tory governments have clearly realised. In recent years we have seen numerous aspects of this three-pronged strategy in operation - from productivity deals to attacks on the welfare state and council housing; from tax concessions to the rich "In Place of Strife" and the Industrial Relations Act; and finally, Heath's "Prices and Incomes Policy." The fact that the Tory government accepted the potentially crippling costs of Britain's entry into the EEC is an indication of how desperate is the position of British capitalism.

However, it has gradually emerged that the key factor in the equation

higher profits + greater investment + attack on working-class  
= expansion = restoration of British competitiveness

is the attitude of the working class. The industrial and political strength of a strong, confident labour movement (I don't want to underestimate the limitations of the British working class movement but they will be discussed later) has repeatedly frustrated ruling class strategy. The unions sank Barbara Castle's "In Place of Strife"; the miners smashed the norm -1% strategy; rank and file initiative freed the London dockers - the first purely *political* strike since the General Strike - and has rendered the Industrial Relations Act innocuous (at least up till now). In short, the necessity to make British capitalism competitive requires the ruling the ruling class to wage ever more naked class war on the workers, and the working-class is not taking this lying down. Strikes are increasing in duration and in the numbers involved (see table below). Militancy has brought with it novel forms of struggle - the occupations, flying pickets etc., and tentative moves from rank and file trades unionists to break down the sectional differences that bedevil the trade union movement eg. the strike of the Birmingham engineers and their support of the miners which forced the closing of the Saltley coal depot. The most recent manifestation of this war of attrition in which both sides are slowly but clearly increasing the stakes, is Heath's Wage Freeze.



	Number of workers involved (000's)	Average number of days per worker on strike	Number of working days lost (000's)
1953-64 (average)	1,081	3.3	3,712
1965	876	3.3	2,925
1966	544	4.4	2,398
1967	734	4.0	2,787
1968	2,258	2.1	4,680
1969	1,665	4.1	6,876
1970	1,801	6.1	10,980
1971	1,171	12.1	13,551
Jan-Oct 1972	1,353	17.1	22,202

### THE FREEZE AND PROSPECTS FOR PHASE THREE

Phases One and Two have been largely successful for the Tories. Most trades unionists have sullenly accepted wage restraint, and those workers who have fought against it - civil servants, London teachers, gas and hospital workers - have been defeated. Profit levels are increasing (indeed so high that the Financial Times has called them "embarrassing"). There is evidence of increased investment in industry, and the Sunday Times reports that *(British industry is planning a massive surge of investment in new factories and new plant)* (1). The latest statistics show a productivity boom which seems to be in excess of 5% per annum. Nevertheless, the euphoria of the Tory press should not blind us to the fact that there are three very nasty storm clouds ahead for the government - world trends, balance of payments problems, and the inevitable breakdown of the Government - TUC talks with the resulting explosion of working-class anger this autumn and winter.

The I.S. group's economists are absolutely correct in stressing the re-emergence of the international trade cycle as a major factor in the world economic situation. The fact that the British economic revival is not unique must be recognised. The comment of "The Economist" they use to illustrate this deserves repeating: *"All major countries experienced record growth in the first quarter (of 1973) ..... Japan notched up a 15% rate, the United States the largest in any quarter since the Korean War, and Germany and France also raced ahead despite shortages of capacity and labour ..... orders everywhere are rising. Germany's overseas orders for heavy engineering were up by a third on a year ago. (But at the same time) inflation forecasts were less optimistic and growth everywhere will slow down next year ..... Now we all march in step national trends reinforce each other. So the 1974 slowdown could lead to a 1975 recession"* (2). A further recession seems almost inevitable in the next two or three years.

More immediately, Britain is going to face a massive balance of payments problem by the end of the year. British capitalism seems to be so structurally uncompetitive that it cannot even take advantage of successive devaluations of the pound and it is certain that in British conditions expansion, together with the frailty of the pound in the international money markets, precipitates a balance of payments deficit. The fact that since entering the Common Market the trade deficit with other member countries is increasing is an ominous trend. Already The Times has labelled the current expansion as "the boom which must go bust", and on this year's performance it is likely that by the end of 1973 Britain will be £1000m. in the red. The floating pound gives a certain amount of elbow room to the Heath government, but whether it will be enough to avoid a major balance of payments crisis is extremely doubtful. A major crisis, of course, would necessitate a deflationary budget and an end to expansion - politically disastrous for the Tories.

Thirdly, and most importantly, the Tory government faces the probability of large scale industrial unrest this winter. The list of unions with wage claims pending is enough to frighten any government, let alone the present one whose position is so vulnerable. Miners, engineers, electricians, railwaymen and public service employees have put in for claims which the government cannot possibly concede, while Hull dockers are already mounting one-day strikes every week in pursuit of an £8 per week increase. The fear of such an explosion of working-class resentment has led the bosses' paper par excellence and defender of the principles of free trade - The Economist - to argue for food subsidies not because it may alleviate hardship but simply because it may take a little steam out of the battles to come this winter. The reasoning is this:

*"To suggest these schemes does not mean that any sort of government subsidy for either food or mortgages is desirable. The purpose has simply been to argue which variant of subsidy scheme would be least bad. In conditions of considerable external difficulty, the Heath Government does seem to be about to sponsor a reasonably sensible general economic policy ..... The worst outcome for the country this winter will be if that policy, and hopes for the cohesion of British society are destroyed by illegal strikes that enjoy too much tacit public support. The best outcome will be if the policy is effectively accepted and enforced by the public ..... In order to escape from the worst outcome towards the best it could be worth introducing some cosmetic illogicalities, if they would make what is said to be a harridan of a policy look more attractive and cheer people up."* (3)

However, clutching at straws like food subsidies and the remote possibility of agreement between the government and the TUC is useless. Partial concessions, threshold agreements, selective subsidies, amendments of the I.R. Act etc. may indeed win over some to supporting Phase 3, but it is hardly likely that anything short of a freeze on prices (which is impossible) will appease workers and postpone the inevitable confrontation for a few more months. The freeze was supposed to be part of an anti-inflation policy but the experience is that while their wages have been frozen, prices have continued to soar. Inflation, rising at nearly 10% per annum with food prices rising at nearly 20% is sure to continue at unacceptable levels. The choice for workers is a stark one: accept Phase 3 and what is effectively a wage cut - or fight back. Most workers are going to fight. A long and bitter confrontation over the next few months is a certainty.

### CONFRONTATION AND ORGANIZATION

The coming confrontation raises a whole series of questions about the nature of the British Labour movement and its ability to win the next battle in this war of attrition - not that victory or defeat for either workers or government is likely to



be decisive in the long term. It is interesting to recall the comments of Willie Gallagher and J.R. Campbell. Both were active in a remarkably similar situation to the present one - a crumbling economy, inflation, a period of heightened class war. They argued that the different levels of struggle demanded different forms of organization:

*"It was never so necessary as it is now for the workers' movement to submit itself to the most ruthless self-criticism. Old tactics and old methods of organization have to be overhauled and brought up to date to enable us to meet and overcome the latest developments of organization from the employers' side. Delay spells disaster. Everywhere the organization of the employers and its catspaw government is being improved to meet all eventualities. If we do not counter these developments with improved organization, then the existing organizations will be no more able to deflect the employers from imposing industrial serfdom on us than a matchbox in the path of a steamroller could deflect it from its path."* (4)

Gallagher and Campbell here highlight a problem which is relevant to the present working class, particularly to industrial militants. In a period when strikes are national, involve increasing confrontation with the forces of the state, the forms of struggle developed during the 50's and the 60's - strong local shop-floor organization - are seen to be becoming inadequate. Trades union officials will become more prone to selling out their members, not because they are right-wing, nor because they are inherently treacherous, but because the objective social position of trades union officials, right and left alike, as a bureaucratic caste vacillating between bosses and workers, means that in a period of naked class war their social base is threatened. The problem facing militants is not so much a crisis in leadership (an idea which reformulates the problem but does not answer it) but rather an institutional and organisational crisis.

What is absolutely necessary is the development of organisational forms which correspond to the imperatives of the levels of struggle in the immediate future. What is needed is a form of organisation which can overcome the sectionalism and fragmentation of the British labour movement and the not infrequent isolation of individual militants, so that events like the intervention of the Birmingham engineers at Saltley becomes the rule rather than the exception. The possibility for such progress lies in rank and file groups. The patchy but encouraging growth of rank and file groups in various unions and combines organised around papers like *"The Collier"*, *"Carworker"*, *"Dockworker"*, *"Building Workers' Charter"* etc. provides a key to the solution of the immediate needs of militants.

Up and till now these rank and file groups, though they have begun to break down the problems of fragmentation and isolation of militants, have done little to face the problems faced by sectionalism. Nevertheless, it seems that the I.S. are going to make an attempt to weld them together into a national structure - the ambition being to bring together the already significant minority of militants in the working class into a new National Minority Movement. The Social Worker industrial conference at Manchester in the Autumn is expected to raise such perspectives. We must give critical support to the I.S. on this position as well as pressing for local committees of struggle which will generalise local struggles and facilitate victory in local situations.

Of course, there are real dangers in supporting the I.S. in this venture. Firstly, the attempt to form a new National Minority Movement may be doomed to failure because of the industrial strength of the C.P. and the continuing dominance of left reformist ideas among industrial militants. (There is evidence that the C.P.'s continuing accommodation to the twists and turns of left T.U. bureaucrats, particularly Scanlon and Jones, is increasingly coming into opposition with the needs of its industrial militants. For example, a number of C.P. militants

were bewildered by the policy of the Party in the building workers' strike where the leadership swung behind the UCATT bureaucracy, refusing to publish *"Building Workers' Charter"* and, as a finale, sending down a couple of hatchet men from King Street to silence C.P. members in Birmingham who were leading a campaign against the actual settlement! This is not to suggest that militants will leave the Party in droves but rather that there is a contradiction between the Party line and the needs of its militants, a contradiction that has to be exploited.)

Secondly, there is the danger that I.S. may dominate and bureaucratisate a national rank and file organisation as they have done in the Teachers' Rank and File where libertarians have had to form an opposition to fight bureaucracy and lack of democracy in the organisation so that Rank and File can fight bureaucracy and lack of democracy in the NUT. Thirdly, the whole thing may degenerate into an I.S. recruiting campaign. Finally, it is quite conceivable that a national rank and file organisation may itself become obsolete as an organisation of struggle, and that to lay too much emphasis on building such an organisation opens the way to an emphasis on means of struggle rather than on the ends of struggle.

However, they are problems which have to be faced on a theoretical and practical level sooner or later. The revolutionary left has to take on the C.P. on a political level in industry some time. One of the positive contributions libertarians can make in a rank and file movement at the moment is precisely the argument for democracy within the movement and pointing out the dangers of bureaucratisation. To confuse organisations of struggle against capitalism with institutions which can bring about socialism is a disastrous political position. We have to continually stress that a national organisation of rank and file militants is an organisational form corresponding to a particular level of struggle - no more, no less, and is certainly not a shadow federation of workers' councils.

The real question for libertarians is whether we want to become a credible part, however small, of the British labour movement. If we do, we have to participate in the establishment of a Minority Movement, whatever our reservations about the intentions of I.S. and the danger of creeping economism. To delay to postpone our decision, to adopt a wait and see approach, could well be a disaster. If we miss the boat this time, libertarian politics in Britain will consist of sterile sectarian wrangling, self-indulging carping criticism of other groups, continuing isolation from the working class, and, at most, the formulation of formally correct positions without the ability or the influence to fight for our politics in the working class. The opportunities for the revolutionary left have never been greater - we can't afford to waste them.

#### FOOTNOTES.

(1) The Sunday Times. 29 July 1973.

(2) International Socialism 59.

(3) The Economist. 18 August 1973.

(4) Direct Action - An Outline of Workshop and Social Organization. Gallagher and Campbell.



## POSTSCRIPT

Heath's Phase 3 proposals were greeted in the bourgeois press with headlines like "It's more all round" and "Ted gives us some cheer", but careful examination shows that the Phase 3 restrictions are nothing but a disguised wage cut. For workers, the £2.25 ceiling is hopelessly inadequate given the rise in the cost of living. The productivity "bonus" will only come into effect three months after the increase, while the miserable 40p safety-net will only be given when the cost of living rises by 7%. Of course, the bosses have something to cheer about: co controls on prices and profits - such as they were - have been relaxed.

The fact that Heath's only major concession in the Phase 3 package was the "flexibility" clause is indicative of the frailty of British capitalism and the vulnerability of the Tory government. Heath was unable to give selective food subsidies which could have provided the basis for a deal with the Trade Union leaders, but he did offer the "anti-social hours" clause as an attempt to buy off the miners. The Tories are being pulled in two different directions at the same time: on the one hand, they are terrified of the prospect of a major confrontation, particularly one led by the miners, while on the other hand, they are unable to provide the sort of measures (food subsidies etc.) which could prevent one.

More importantly, Heath had depended for the success of Phase 3 on the slowing down of inflation and the continuation of expansion. The energy crisis has rendered this impossible. The balance of payments problem (two record deficits in October and November), coupled with the energy crisis, has precipitated the capitalist crisis which would have occurred anyway in early 1975. The only solution for the Tories is a massive cutback in productivity and cutdown in consumer spending so that resources can be directed towards exports. Hence the three-day week and Barber's mini-budget.

As the crisis of British capitalism is intensified by the "competitive recession" of other capitalist nations the working-class is facing a slump whose effects could be worse than that of the 1930's. Consequently, political and organizational questions of the working-class movement are becoming increasingly more urgent. The coming struggle is likely to be decisive - a major defeat for the working-class will put back the movement years. The key political and organizational demands must be ones which unite the mass of the working-class on the basis of a combined onslaught on the Tory government. Revolutionaries must work for the immediate formation of local Councils of Action, composed initially of socialists and militants, whose immediate tasks would be to gain mass support through its intervention in and co-ordination of local struggles, and to prepare for a General Strike. We have to recognize that 1974 will be the year when the question of power will be the central issue. In these conditions the alternatives for the working-class and the revolutionary left are stark and brutal: lose and suffer a defeat potentially more disastrous than that of 1926, or start organizing for a General Strike and the establishment of institutions of proletarian power.

## Organisation of Revolutionary Anarchists

FOR INFORMATION ON ORA WRITE TO

**24 Moss St., York.**

ARTICLES, SUBS, ORDERS FOR  
LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE TO

**29 Cardigan Rd.,  
Leeds 6**



# THE TWO OCTOBERS

BY PIOTR ARCHINOV

Translated by  
North London ORA

The victorious revolution of the workers and peasants in 1917 was legally established in the Bolshevik calendar as the October Revolution. There is some truth in this, but it is not entirely exact. In October 1917 the workers and peasants of Russia surmounted a colossal obstacle to the development of their Revolution. They abolished the nominal power of the capitalist class, but even before that they achieved something of equal revolutionary importance and perhaps even more fundamental. By taking the economic power from the capitalist class, and the land from the large owners in the countryside, they achieved the right to free and uncontrolled work in the towns, if not the total control of the factories. Consequently, it was well before October that the revolutionary workers destroyed the base of capitalism. All that was left was the superstructure. If there had not been this general expropriation of the capitalists by the workers, the destruction of the bourgeois state machine - the political revolution - would not have succeeded in any way. The resistance of the owners would have been much stronger. On the other hand, the objectives of the social revolution in October were not limited to the overthrow of capitalist power. A long period of practical development in social self-management was before the workers, but it was to fail in the following years.

Therefore, in considering the evolution of the Russian socialist Revolution as a whole, October appears only as a stage - a powerful and decisive stage, it is true. That is why October does not by itself represent the whole social revolution. In thinking of the victorious October days, one must consider that historical circumstance as determined by the Russian social revolution.



Another no less important peculiarity is that October has two meanings - that which the working masses who participated in the social revolution gave it, and with them the Anarchist-Communists, and that which was given it by the political party that captured power from this aspiration to social revolution, and which betrayed and stifled all further development. An enormous gulf exists between these two interpretations of October. The October of the workers and peasants is the suppression of the power of the parasite classes in the name of equality and self-management. The Bolshevik October is the conquest of power by the party of the revolutionary intelligentsia, the installation of its 'State Socialism' and of its 'socialist' methods of governing the masses.

## The workers' October

The February Revolution caught the different revolutionary parties in complete disarray and without any doubt they were considerably surprised by the profound social character of the dawning revolution. At first, no one except the Anarchists wanted to believe it. The Bolshevik Party, which made out it always expressed the most radical aspirations of the working-class, could not go beyond the limits of the bourgeois revolution in its aims. It was only at the April conference that they asked themselves what was really happening in Russia. Was it only the overthrow of Tsarism, or was the revolution going further - as far as the overthrow of capitalism? This last eventually posed to the Bolsheviks the question of what tactics to employ. Lenin became conscious before the other Bolsheviks of the social character of the revolution, and emphasized the necessity of seizing power. He saw a decisive advance in the workers' and peasants' movement which was undermining the industrial and rural bourgeois foundations more and more. A unanimous agreement on these questions could not be reached even up to the October days. The Party manoeuvred all this time between the social slogans of the masses and the conception of a social-democratic revolution, from where they were created and developed. Not opposing the slogan of petit- and grand-bourgeoisie for a Constituent Assembly, the Party did its best to control the masses, striving to keep up with their ever-increasing pace.

During this time, the workers marched impetuously forward, relentlessly running their enemies of left and right into the ground. The big rural landowners began everywhere to evacuate the countryside, fleeing from the insurgent peasantry and seeking protection for their possessions and their persons in

the towns. Meanwhile, the peasantry proceeded to a direct re-distribution of land, and did not want to hear of peaceful co-existence with the landlords. In the towns as well a sudden change took place between the workers and the owners of enterprises. Thanks to the efforts of the collective genius of the masses, workers' committees sprang up in every industry, intervening directly in production, putting aside the admonishments of the owners and concentrating on eliminating them from production. Thus in different parts of the country, the workers got down to the socialization of industry.

Simultaneously, all of revolutionary Russia was covered with a vast network of workers' and peasants' soviets, which began to function as organs of self-management. They developed, prolonged, and defended the Revolution. Capitalist rule and order still existed nominally in the country, but a vast system of social and economic workers' self-management was being created alongside it. This regime of soviets and factory committees, by the very fact of its appearance, menaced the state system with death. It must be made clear that the birth and development of the soviets and factory committees had nothing to do with authoritarian principles. On the contrary, they were in the full sense of the term organs of social and economic self-management of the masses, and in no case the organs of State power. They were opposed to the State machine which sought to direct the masses, and they prepared for a decisive battle against it. 'The factories to the workers, the land to the peasants' - these were the slogans by which the revolutionary masses of town and country participated in the defeat of the State machine of the possessing classes in the name of a new social system which was founded on the basic cells of the factory committees and the economic and social soviets. These catch-words circulated from one end of workers' Russia to the other, deeply affecting the direct action against the socialist-bourgeois coalition government.

As was explained above, the workers and peasants had already worked towards the entire reconstruction of the industrial and agrarian system of Russia before October 1917. The agrarian question was virtually solved by the poor peasants as early as June-September 1917. The urban workers, for their part, put into operation organs of social and economic self-management, having seized from the State and the owners the organizational functions of production. The October Revolution of the workers overthrew the last and the greatest obstacle to their revolution - the state power of the owning classes, already defeated and disorganized. This last evolution opened a vast horizon for the achievement of the social revolution,



putting it onto the creative road of socialist reconstruction of society, already pointed at by the workers in the preceding months. That is the October of the workers and the peasants. It meant a powerful attempt by the exploited manual workers to destroy totally the foundations of capitalist society, and to build a workers' society based on the principles of equality, independence, and self-management by the proletariat of the towns and the countryside. This October did not reach its natural conclusion. It was violently interrupted by the October of the Bolsheviks, who progressively extended their dictatorship throughout the country.

## The Bolshevik October

All the statist parties, including the Bolsheviks, limited the boundaries of the Russian Revolution to the installation of a social-democratic regime. It was only when the workers and peasants of all Russia began to shake the agraro-bourgeois order, when the social revolution was proved to be an irreversible historical fact, that the Bolsheviks began discussing the social character of the Revolution, and the consequent necessity of modifying its tactics. There was no unanimity in the Party on questions of the character and orientation of the events which had taken place, even up to October. Furthermore, the October Revolution as well as the events which followed developed while the Central Committee of the Party was divided into two tendencies. Whilst a part of the Central Committee, Lenin at its head, foresaw the inevitable social revolution and proposed preparation for the seizure of power, the other tendency, led by Zinoviev and Kamenev, denounced as adventurist the attempt at social revolution, and went no further than calling for a Constituent Assembly in which the Bolsheviks occupied the seats furthest to the Left. Lenin's point of view prevailed, and the Party began to mobilize its forces in case of a decisive struggle by the masses against the Provisional Government.

The party threw itself into infiltrating the factory committees and the soviets of workers' deputies, doing its best to obtain in these organs of self-management the most mandates possible in order to control their actions. Nevertheless, the Bolshevik conception of, and approach to, the soviets and the factory committees was fundamentally different from that of the masses. While the mass of workers considered them to be the organs of social and economic self-management, the Bolshevik Party looked on them as a means by which it was possible to snatch the power of the sinking bourgeoisie, and afterwards to use this power to serve the interests of the Party. Thus an enormous difference was revealed between the revolutionary masses and the Bolshevik Party in their conceptions and perspectives of October. In the first case, it was the question of the defeat of power with the view of reinforcing and enlarging the already constituted

organs of workers and peasants self-management. In the second case, it was the question of leaning on these organs in order to seize power and to subordinate all the revolutionary forces to the Party. This divergence played a fatal role in determining the future course of the Russian Revolution.

The success of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution - that is to say, the fact that they found themselves in power and from there subordinated the whole Revolution to their Party - is explained by their ability to substitute the idea of a Soviet power for the social revolution and the social emancipation of the masses. A priori, these two ideas appear as non-contradictory for it was possible to understand Soviet power as the power of the soviets, and this facilitated the substitution of the idea of Soviet power for that of the Revolution. Nevertheless, in their realization and consequences these ideas were in violent contradiction to each other. The conception of Soviet power incarnated in the Bolshevik state, was transformed into an entirely traditional bourgeois power concentrated in a handful of individuals who subjected to their authority all that was fundamental and most powerful in the life of the people - in this particular case, the social revolution. Therefore, with the help of the 'power of the soviets' - in which the Bolsheviks monopolized most of the posts - they effectively attained a total power and could proclaim their dictatorship throughout the revolutionary territory.

This furnished them with the possibility of strangling all the revolutionary currents of the workers in disagreement with their doctrine of altering the whole course of the Russian Revolution and of making it adopt a multitude of measures contrary to its essence. One of these measures was the militarisation of labour during the years of War Communism - militarisation of the workers so that millions of swindlers and parasites could live in peace, luxury and idleness. Another measure was the war between town and country, provoked by the policy of the Party in considering peasants as elements unreliable and foreign to the Revolution. There was, finally, the strangling of libertarian thought and of the Anarchist movement, whose social ideas and catchwords were the force of the Russian Revolution and orientated towards a social revolution. Other measures consisted of the proscription of the independent workers movement, the smothering of the freedom of speech of workers in general. All was reduced to a single centre, from where all instructions emanated concerning the way of life, of thought, of action of the working masses.

That is the October of the Bolsheviks. In it was incarnated the ideal followed by decades by the revolutionary intelligentsia, finally realised now by the wholesale dictatorship of the All-Russian Communist Party. This ideal satisfies the ruling intelligentsia, despite the catastrophic consequences for the workers; now they can celebrate with pomp the anniversary of ten years of power.



## The Anarchists

Revolutionary Anarchism was the only politico-social current to extol the idea of a social revolution by the workers and peasants, as much during the 1905 Revolution as from the first days of the October Revolution. In fact, the role they could have played would have been colossal, and so could have been the means of struggle employed by the masses themselves. Likewise, no politico-social theory could have blended so harmoniously with the spirit and orientation of the Revolution. The interventions of the Anarchist orators in 1917 were listened to with a rare trust and attention by the workers. One could have said that the revolutionary potential of the workers and peasants, together with the ideological and tactical power of Anarchism could have represented a force to which nothing could be opposed. Unhappily, this fusion did not take place. Some isolated Anarchists occasionally led intense revolutionary activity among the workers, but there was not an Anarchist organization of great size to lead more continuous and co-ordinated actions, (outside of the Nabat Confederation and the Makhnovchyna in the Ukraine). Only such an organisation could have united the Anarchists and the millions of workers. During such an important and advantageous revolutionary period, the Anarchists limited themselves to the restricted activities of small groups instead of orientating themselves to mass political action. They preferred to drown themselves in the sea of their internal quarrels, not attempting to pose the problem of a common policy and tactic of Anarchism. By this deficiency, they condemned themselves to inaction and sterility during the most important moments of the Revolution.

The causes of this catastrophic state of the Anarchist movement resided in the dispersion, the disorganisation and the absence of a collective tactic—things which have nearly always been raised as principles among Anarchists, preventing them making a single organisational step so that they could orientate the social revolution in a decisive fashion. There is no actual advantage in denouncing those who, by their demogogy, their thoughtlessness, and their irresponsibility, contributed to create this situation. But the tragic experience which led the working masses to defeat, and Anarchism to the edge of the abyss, should be assimilated as from now. We must combat and pitilessly stigmatise those

who, in one way or another, continue to perpetuate the chaos and confusion in Anarchism, all those who obstruct its re-establishment or organisation. In other words, those whose actions go against those efforts of the movement for the emancipation of labour and the realisation of the Anarchist-Communist society. The working masses appreciate and are instinctively attracted by Anarchism, but will not work with the Anarchist movement until they are convinced of its theoretical and organisational coherence. It is necessary for everyone of us to try to the maximum to attain this coherence.

## Conclusions and

## Perspectives

The Bolshevik practice of the last ten years shows clearly the counter-revolutionary of their dictatorship of the Party. Every year it restrains a little more the social and political rights of the workers, and takes their revolutionary conquests away. There is no doubt that the 'historic mission' of the Bolshevik Party is emptied of all meaning and that it will attempt to bring the Russian Revolution to its final objective: State Capitalism of the enslaving salariat, that is to say, of the reinforced power of the exploiters and at the increasing misery of the exploited. In speaking of the Bolshevik Party as part of the socialist intelligentsia, exercising its power over the working masses of town and country, we have in view its central directing nucleus which, by its origins, its formation, and its life-style has nothing in common with the working-class, and despite that, rules all the details of life of the Party and of the people. That nucleus will attempt to stay above the proletariat, who have nothing to expect from it. The possibilities for rank and file Party militants, including the Communist youth, appear different. This mass has passively participated in the negative and counter-revolutionary policies of the Party, but having come from the working-class, it is capable of becoming aware of the authentic October of the workers and peasants and of coming towards it. We do not doubt that from this mass will come many fighters for the workers' October. Let us hope that they rapidly assimilate the Anarchist character of this October, and that they come to its aid. On our side, let us indicate this character as much as possible, and help the masses to reconquer and conserve the great revolutionary achievements.



# NOTES ON RUSSIAN STATE CAPITALISM

by Peter Newell

THE RULERS of Russia, and their paid hacks, have recently been celebrating "fifty years of the USSR", and extolling the virtues and advantages of "socialism" in that country. Mankind has been fed, and has believed, many myths; but the one that has proclaimed "socialism" in Russia is probably one of the greatest and most pernicious ever perpetrated. Such lies have been exposed by libertarian socialists and many anarchists, not merely since the formation of the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics fifty years ago, but within weeks of the Bolsheviks assuming power. As myths die hard, it will not come amiss if we remind ourselves of what has been said.

Even before the coming to power of the Bolsheviks in Russia, Peter Kropotkin exposed the arguments of the "State Socialists" and Social Democrats, including the supporters of Lenin, that they could - by their methods and policies - bring about genuine socialism or communism. In his MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM he writes: *'We see in the organisation of the posts and telegraphs, in the State railways, and the like - which are represented as illustrations of a society without capitalists - nothing but a new, perhaps improved, but still undesirable form of the wages system. We even think that such a solution of the social problem would so much run against the present libertarian tendencies of civilised mankind, that it simply would be unrealisable. We maintain that State organisation, having been the force to which minorities resorted for establishing and organising their power over the masses, cannot be the force which will serve to destroy these privileges.'*

Kropotkin called such an arrangement STATE CAPITALISM.

\*\*\*

As early as April, 1918, Lenin admitted that the Bolsheviks had jettisoned "the principles of the Paris Commune", and claimed in his LEFT-WING COMMUNISM - AN INFANTILE DISORDER that *'State Capitalism would be a step forward with the present state of affairs in our Soviet Republic.'*

Furthermore, the charge that the Bolsheviks (now calling themselves Communists) had introduced "State Capitalism" rather than "proletarian socialism" soon became a major and recurrent theme among anarchists and, to some extent, Social Revolutionaries and a few Menshevik Internationalists such as J. Martov. The Briansk Federation of Anarchists, in their journal,

al, VESTNIK ANARKHII (July 14 1918) were about the earliest critics of Lenin's State Capitalism. They were soon followed by "M.Sergven" (generally assumed to be a nom-de-plume of Grigorii Maksimov) in the September 16 issue of the journal, VOL'NYI GOLOS TRUDA, in a long article entitled "Paths of Revolution". The article was a severe indictment of the Bolsheviks' so-called dictatorship of the proletariat, which had in fact merely resulted in the substitution of State Capitalism for private capitalism. The workers and peasants, he claimed, now found themselves under the heel of a new class of administrators and bosses. What had taken place in Russia, the article went on, resembled, and was similar to, the earlier bourgeois revolutions in Western Europe; *'No sooner had the oppressed farmers and craftsmen of England and France removed the landed aristocracy from power than the ambitious middle-class stepped into the breach and erected a new class structure with itself at the top; in a similar manner, the privileges and authority once shared by the Russian nobility and bourgeoisie has passed into the hands of a new ruling class composed of Communist Party officials, government bureaucrats and technical specialists.'*

Under the centralised rule of Lenin and his Party, concluded "Sergven", Russia entered a period of State Capitalism rather than socialism. "State Capitalism was the new dam before the waves of our social revolution". The writer of the article, then lamented that the anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists were too poorly organised to keep the revolution from being diverted into non-socialist and non-libertarian channels. The Russian people had begun the revolution spontaneously, but lacked the libertarian organisation to carry it further, or to stop the Bolsheviks and State "socialists" from getting power and taking control. The expression "State Capitalism" was used by the anarchists to designate the concentration of political power, together with State ownership of the means of production. The State had become the exploiter in place of a multiplicity of private capitalist concerns. The workers remained slaves - wage slaves of the State.

\*\*\*

This was brought out sharply during the Kronstadt revolt in March, 1921. An article in the Kronstadt IZVESTIYA VREMENNOGO REVOLIUTIONNOGO KOMITETA of March 8 clearly analyses the situation in Russia at that time. The writer (who was probably Petrichenko) says;



*"After carrying out the October Revolution, the working class hoped to achieve its emancipation. But the result was an even greater enslavement of the human personality. The power of the police and gendarme Monarchy passed into the hands of the Communist usurpers, who, instead of giving the people freedom, instilled in them the constant fear of falling into the torture chambers of the CHEKA....."*

*"But most infamous and criminal of all is the moral servitude which the Communists have inaugurated; they have laid their hands also on the inner world of the toilers, forcing them to think in a Communist way. With the help of the bureaucratised Trade Unions, they have fastened the workers to their benches, so that labour has become not a joy but a new form of slavery"*

Hopefully, the writer concludes;

*"The workers and peasants steadfastly march forward, leaving behind them the Constituent Assembly, with its bourgeois regime, and the dictatorship of the Communist Party, with its CHEKA and its State Capitalism, whose hangman's noose encircles their necks and threatens to strangle them to death. The present overturn at last gives the toilers the opportunity to have their freely elected Soviets, operating without the slightest force of Party pressure, and to remake the bureaucratised Trade Unions into free associations of workers, peasants and the labouring intelligentsia. At last the policeman's club of the Communist autocracy has been broken"*

Unfortunately, it was not yet to be.

IN 1926, Archinov, Malmo and Ida Mett returned to the subject in their "Organisational Platform". They rightly pointed out that the seizing of power, through a so-called Socialist Party, and the organising of a so-called "Proletarian State", cannot serve the cause of emancipation. *"The State, immediately and supposedly constructed for defence of the Revolution, invariably ends up distorted by needs and characteristics peculiar to itself; itself becoming the goal, produces specific, privileged castes on which it depends ....."* It subsequently re-establishes the basis of a new Capitalist Authority and State, with the usual enslavement and exploitation of the masses.

Also in exile, Maximov on a number of occasions condemns the Communist rulers of Russia for imposing, and developing, a bureaucratic State Capitalist regime. And in his EUROPEAN IDEOLOGIES: A SURVEY OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY POLITICAL IDEAS, Rudolf Rockers observes;

*"In Russia, where the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat has ripened into reality, the aspirations of a particular Party for power have prevented any truly socialistic reorganisation of economic life, and have forced the country into the slavery of a grinding State Capitalism"*

At this point, however, it is fair to mention that not all anarchists have categorised the Soviet Union as State Capitalist. In the main, "professional" anarchists, such as Alexander Berkman, Emma Goldman and Voline were never able to analyse the form of society that emerged and developed in Russia.\* Voline generally referred to it as "State Socialism", and Berkman, as late as 1929, when he was writing his ABC OF ANARCHISM, still imagined that the Bolsheviks wanted communism, but that unlike anarchists, they hoped to impose it on the workers. The so-called professional revolutionaries, like Goldman and Berkman, took a long time in becoming really disillusioned with Bolshevik "communism". They never really appreciated that, with its State ownership of the land and means of production, its highly differentiated wages system and its primitive accumulation of (State) capital, Russia was merely developing - in a bureaucratic State form - what the West had developed years before - capitalism!

And it is this - State Capitalism - that the rulers of the so-called USSR have been celebrating; not socialism or genuine communism. The revolution for free or libertarian communism is yet to be. That will be the Third Revolution advocated by the Russian anarchists since 1918.

\* In Britain, long-standing anarchists and contributors to FREEDOM are still just as much at "sixes and sevens" regarding the nature of the Soviet system. More than one writer thinks it is communism!

# subscribe!

## LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST REVIEW

### £1 for four issues

Send to L.C.R., 277 Kingsway Park, Davyhulme, Manchester.



# Reviews

## THE TYRANNY OF STRUCTURELESSNESS

by Jo Freeman, published by Leeds Women's ORA, price 5p

"In the Women's Liberation Movement a great emphasis has been placed on what are called leader-less structureless groups as the main organisational form of the movement. The idea of 'structurelessness' however has become a goddess in its own right. Contrary to what we would like to believe, there is no such thing as a structureless group, because the idea of "structurelessness" does not prevent the formation of informal structures, but only formal ones. Unstructured groups may be very effective in getting women to talk about their lives; they aren't very good for getting things done."

The point is a good one, well worth making, but by itself it is not worth 5p, nor the effort put into producing this pamphlet, in which the basic theme is repeated, restated, reiterated, and elaborated for eleven pages. It concludes with some useful steps towards structuring groups democratically, but one is still not sure why Leeds Women's ORA found it worth so much of their time and attention.

My main criticism is the same as theirs, as stated in their excellent introduction. The pamphlet deals purely with organisation, and, as the Leeds women say, "The mutual intersection between theory, practice and organisational form is so strong that you cannot discuss any one in isolation." Obviously it is possible to give the main emphasis to one of these, but the author of 'The Tyranny of Structurelessness' nowhere allows her own social or political ideas even to be implicit, and consequently has little to say about practice. Her analysis of informal group structures has some interesting insights, but in general it so lacks any point of reference to reality as to be of little practical value. Establishing a form of organisation without a basic theory is like writing a poem (however lyrically), without a meaning. Both, alas, are only too common.

The Leeds sisters' other criticism of this pamphlet is that it lacks a criticism of traditional, hierarchical forms of organisation (as examples they give "Leninist groups, present Trade Unions, local councils) and how they work. This leads on logically from the first objection. Authoritarian organisations reflect an authoritarian view of society. If we reject one we must reject the other. This is something that needs to be worked out in detail so that the implications can be clearly understood. If the Leeds sisters do so, as they intend to, they will be filling in a considerable gap in our understanding.

The Leeds introduction and the brief notes on the British Women's Liberation movement ('The Tyranny of Structurelessness' is by a member of the American movement) seem more likely to provide points for consideration by those interested in the attempt to develop a genuinely non-authoritarian organisation, than the main body of the pamphlet ever will. It is to be regretted that the Leeds women have spent their time in reissuing a vague, verbose paper of such limited relevance, when they could be producing something of their own of real value, not just for Women's Liberation, but for the whole libertarian left.

Jill Walker (Manchester Women's  
Liberation)

## THE POLITICS OF HOMOSEXUALITY

By DON MILLIGAN

(Pluto Press 23p)

As an introduction to the politics of homosexuality this pamphlet is not a success. The issues are raised, but not detailed, and there is throughout a defensive attitude towards the 'gay consciousness.'

The key is found (p. 15) in an apologetic sentence that, "...the gay movement can make little practical contribution to the labour movement. We can't strike or organize tenants' associations ...." It would seem that the pamphlet, produced by Cde. Milligan as a statement in defence of his position, is mainly directed at his IS comrades, who have criticised him for daring to 'come out' while remaining an IS member.

The Gay movement, as with other movements against specific areas of capitalist oppression outside the narrow industrial struggle (blacks, women, claimants etc.) has developed in isolation from the political left, the left having had nothing to say to it. Such acceptance as the black and women's movements have achieved among the cadres of the vanguards (who remain overwhelmingly white, male and assumed heterosexual) has been through their own efforts, their own strength, forcing reluctant recognition. This has seen the end of overt racism and male chauvinism in the left press, and a willingness to regard blacks, women - and now claimants - as valuable recruiting fodder provided they can be pigeonholed as "black workers", "women workers", "unemployed workers". That is, acceptance of the movements but not their ideological questioning of bourgeois values.

And yet gays have not yet, in Britain, reached even this level. Left groups such as IS and (especially) SLL can still be violently anti-gay, they are dismissed - as women and claimants were before them - as unimportant, "petty-bourgeois" deviations from the class struggle.

Perhaps the left may soon recognise the problems of "gay workers" but it is unlikely that they will yet face up to the role of sexuality - including gay sexuality - in social revolutions. But rejection of the 'gay' consciousness by revolutionaries will inevitably lead to what could be called "gayism" - an analysis which while maintaining a revolutionary position, exaggerates the importance of gayness to "the struggle".

Such tendencies already exist in the women's (Rad. Femmes) and claimants' ("Claimantism" - eg Keith Paton) movements, and both are masked by a specific rejection of the traditional worker-orientated left.

Cde. Milligan makes a valid point when he says that "Homosexual liberation .....is not guaranteed under socialism". (p. 14).

Revolutionaries must examine all their thinking to destroy traces of bourgeois ideology, a point largely ignored hitherto. Any revolution which retains bourgeois prejudices and "morality" (including sexual attitudes) carries the seeds of its own self-destruction.

M.D. & J.W.



## "THE MULTINATIONALS"

(Pelican 50p) by Christopher Tugendhat.

Apart from an introduction for the Pelican edition this is Tugendhat's 1971 book, but it has certainly appeared in paper back at the appropriate moment when the public is becoming very aware of the power of multinational companies. It deserves a wide readership, although the author as a former Conservative M.P. and leader writer for the "Financial Times", is definitely one of the enemy, he has gathered together in readable form some enlightening information.

Multinationals are very large companies which produce and sell their goods in different usually far-flung countries. Examples are Ford, IBM and Shell. They have the striking characteristic of being under strict central direction with the subsidiaries all working within a framework established by an overall group plan drawn up at headquarters. Central direction with such huge organisations depends for its effectiveness on rapid and reliable air travel, an efficient telephone, telegraph and telex system, and computers capable of handling a mass of information. Multinationals have an important place in the industrial and economic life of most powerful nations and occupy leading positions in key manufacturing industries. They have increased in importance rapidly over the last twenty-five years: between 1946 and 1969 the book value of American foreign direct investments rose from 7,200 million dollars to 70,763 million dollars. As a result, U.S. companies now account for an estimated 60 to 65 per cent of all foreign direct investment. By 1980 it is estimated that foreign-owned internationals will account for about half of total exports of many Western European countries, and locally-owned internationals for much of the rest. Prof. Perlmutter believes that by 1985 world industry will be dominated by 200 or 300 very large international companies responsible for the greater part of industrial output.

This poses several problems for governments. The most dramatic is speculation. Money flows "like giant waves from one country to another," remarks an EEC official, and these waves are beyond the control of governments - the pace and direction of the money movements within each multinational group is directed by the central headquarters of the group. During two days prior to German revaluation in 1971 two thousand million dollars were exchanged into German marks. Ford's has an economist, according to Tugendhat, who has been right with 69 of his 75 forecasts of when devaluations will occur! More

vital in the longer term is the multinationals' power to decide on investment. This when a company can select whichever country offers the best industrial, economic sales and political prospects for its new plants and facilities. A government very anxious to secure a large investment running into several hundreds of millions of pounds can alter certain rules of the game to attract the investment. Companies which have the power to allocate markets, have freedom of choice **where to invest and** make it known that strict tax controls are not an attractive feature of a country's organisation, are unlikely to be treated favourably.

On tax, multinational companies tend to employ one set of experts to discover what the tax rules are and another set to advise on how to get round them. Additional investment is not encouraged in countries where pressure from tax officials is over zealous.

Trade unionists have become very alarmed at the power of multinational companies over the work force. Ford's workers were reminded during their month long strike in 1969 that production and new investment could be switched to plants abroad. The other side of this coin is that the strike at Fords of Britain had within a week led to the laying off of 2,000 men in the Belgian Ford plant. Whilst 89 million dollars worth of production was lost in Britain, 26.4 million dollars worth was lost in Belgium and Germany. Another factor in this area is that companies fear large profits will provoke large wage claims from trade unions so by book-keeping they keep the level of subsidiaries' profits in certain countries at a modest level. The companies have a huge advantage over trade unions in that they have access to all the companies' international figures whilst the trade union has to make do with national subsidiaries' figures only.

Tugendhat mainly excludes the relation of multinational companies to the Third World, concentrating on the developed, industrialised countries. This helps to make his book compact but the missing area is so vital in the source of raw materials that it strikes this writer that if Counter-Information Services could supply a comprehensive world survey of multinationals they would be doing an essential, if onerous, job. Another mind-boggling factor Tugendhat misses is the coming energy crunch. At one stage he muses on what would happen if IBM went bankrupt, governments suddenly being faced with many thousands of unemployed men, but imagine the results of the bankruptcy of the oil companies and the motor car manufacturers, both leading multinationals extremely vulnerable to the world scarcity of oil, and see where it leads you!

JERRY WESTALL

# THE PRESS FUND.

So far income and expenditure have just kept pace with rising donations and sales **LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE** needs a new composer, better quality newsprint to cope with a regular increase in the number of pages. Libertarian ideas have to become widespread in the class struggle which is reaching greater intensity. **LIBERTARIAN STRUGGLE** must be able to increase its effectiveness in this fight.

DONATIONS TO 29, CARDIGAN ROAD, LEEDS 6. MAKE OUT P.O.S & CHEQUES TO THE O.R.A. GENERAL FUND.