

THE COMMUNIST

6^d

Class Struggle

No 27

in the Soviet Union... p.2

CPB (M-L)

p.5

Economism &

p.10

Communism

ICO LITERATURE LIST (continued)

Communist Workers Organisation

The Russian Revolution. 1s 6d.

The Palestine Question. 1s 6d.

Black Power. 2s 6d.

On the National Question in Britain. 2s.

Trades Unions and Productivity, a Communist Analysis by Les Cannon
(CWO introduction) published 1955, reprinted 1970. 1s 6d.

Miscellaneous

Neil Goold: The Twentieth Congress and After. 1s 6d.

The Connolly Association (a historical account of its
degeneration). 2s.

Ulster and Home Rule by an Irish Presbyterian. 1s 6d.

Magazines and newspapers

The Irish Communist--monthly theoretical journal of the ICO. 1s.

Communist Comment--fortnightly newspaper of the ICO. 6d.

The Communist--theoretical publication of the CWO. 6d.

(Subscriptions to the Irish Communist, 9s. for six months post
free. The Communist-- rates on request.)

All literature available by post from:

G. Golden,
28 Mercers Road,
London N.19.

L. Callender,
28 Surrey Street,
Belfast 9.

(note: include 6d per item for postage.)

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION LITERATURE LIST

Irish History

- The Working Class and the Irish National Revolution (1916-23). 2s.
Liam Mellowes: Jail Notes. (ICO introduction). 1s 6d.
The Irish Republican Congress (a history of the 26 Cos. 1931-6) 2s.
The Economics of Partition. 2s 6d.
John Leslie: The Present Position of the Irish Question. 1s
Wolfe Tone: An Address to the People of Ireland. 1s 6d.
Wolfe Tone: An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics in Ireland. 1s 6d.
C.D. Greaves: De Valera (ICO introduction). 1s 6d.

James Connolly

- Press Poisoners in Ireland and other Articles. 1s 6d.
Yellow Unions in Ireland and other Articles. 1s 6d.
The Connolly-Walker Controversy. 2s 6d.
Socialism and the Orange Worker. 6d.
The New Evangel (ICO introduction). 2s.
ICO: Connolly. 6d.
Workshop Talks. 2s.

Stalin

- Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR (1952). 2s 6d.
On an Article by Engels. 1s.
Concerning Marxism in Linguistics (ICO Introduction) 3s.
On the Personality Cult. 1s.
On Trotsky. 2s.
On Lenin. 1s 6d.
In Defence of Stalin (by a British worker). 2s 6d.

Economics

- Capital and Revisionism. 1s 6d.
The Economics of Revisionism. 1s.
In Defence of Leninism. 2s 6d.
On Stalin's Economic Problems Part I. 2s.
On Stalin's Economic Problems Part II (Marxism and Market Socialism). 5s.

Class Struggle in Soviet Union 1936-'56

part 1.

Sad Logic and Marxism:

William Ash, the most eminent intellectual in the CPB(LL) group, had a comment to make on the Stalin question in his article "Class Struggle In France": "It is over the issue of Stalin's role in the history of world revolution that most ideological confusion exists here, as in other western nations, and this has been a major stumbling block to pulling together in Marxist-Leninist Party unity, the young militant leaders. Bourgeois intellectuals and Moscow-line revisionists have joined together on this question to do a good job on behalf of political reaction. Of course, Stalin, notwit standing his dedication to Marxist-Leninist principles and his unwavering loyalty to the working class, made some serious mistakes, otherwise the revisionists could never have taken over so soon after his death to lead the Soviet Union back onto the capitalist road. However Marxist-Leninists can never accept unprincipled unity with those who completely negate Stalin..."

(New Zealand Communist Review, Feb. 1969. Previously published in Progressive Labour (U.S.A.) which Mr. Ash represents in Britain).

(Virtually the same statement was made by Mr. A. H. Evans in 1964 when he was editor of Vanguard - when Vanguard was the only periodical of a more or less united anti-revisionist movement. In a letter rejecting an item on Stalin Mr. Evans wrote: "The proof of the pudding is in the building, socialism in the Soviet Union is today standing on wobbly legs. Stalin must have something to do with that")

On Mr. Ash's own admission, the subject is an exceptionally important one. He says that confusion over the Stalin question is a "major stumbling block" to the development of a coherent Marxist-Leninist movement. (The I.C.O. and C.W.O. have insisted that since the mid-sixties, when Mr. Ash, along with Mr. Evans and others, was trying to sweep the question under the carpet in the interests of unity and of creative, forward-looking Marxism) The complex of questions which constitute the "Stalin question" are of supreme importance. But, though Mr. Ash now admits their importance in the abstract, in the concrete his manner of dealing with them is utterly flippant.

Mr. Ash's record on this matter is a long sad dismal one. Two highlights in it deserve notice. In late 1965 he appeared at a S.A.C.U. meeting in the Caxton Hall along with Eric Hobsbawm (C.P.G.B.) and Isaac Deutscher (trotskyist). Hobsbawm and Deutscher naturally denounced Stalin. I.C.O. members replied from the floor to the little extent that was permitted by the S.A.C.U. chairman. Mr. Ash made no attempt to deal with the matter, preferring to moralise abstractly on other matters. Again

in 1958 he appeared on a S.A.C.U. platform with John Lewis (C.P. U.S.). Lewis engaged on the customary revisionist denunciation of Stalin. He was challenged, despite obstruction by the supposedly anti-revisionist chairman, by C.W.O. members. Under their criticism he was reduced to a state of incoherent frenzy (which would be the normal condition of anti-Stalinist intellectuals if Communist criticism of their position was sustained). But Ash again a total silence on the main subject of controversy at that particular meeting, and in the Communist movement in general, and moralised in his usual irrelevant manner. The reason why he had to evade answering Deutscher and Lewis was that his position on the Stalin question did not differ from theirs in any essential respect.

Mr. Ash has had a number of novels published by the bourgeoisie and an academic work on philosophy published by the ultra-revisionist, American "Monthly Review". He is a professional writer. But his writings on the Stalin question amount to the paragraph quoted here. It is clear that Mr. Ash reserves his best literary efforts for the bourgeois literature market. Any slop is good enough to maintain his position in the anti-revisionist movement in its present state of confusion.

The statement that Stalin "made some serious mistakes, other-wise the revisionists could never have taken over so soon after his death", shows Mr. Ash's utter contempt for the anti-revisionist ^{MOVEMENT} (And the fact that he gets away with it shows that this contempt is justified). The statement is devoid of concrete content. And in terms of formal logic it is, as Mr. Ash knows well, simply an illogical statement. It is what is known as a "non-sequitor". The conclusion does not follow logically from the premise. "The revisionists took over soon after Stalin's death, therefore Stalin made serious mistakes". That is what the philosopher, Ash says: it is merely a grossly illogical application of formal logic, and will be seen as such by anyone whose reasoning faculty has not been destroyed by the irrationalism that is served up as dialectics by the opportunists.

From a given effect, the rapid seizure of power by revisionists immediately after Stalin's death, Ash infers as the necessary cause "serious mistakes" made by Stalin. He does not say what these mistakes are, and does not show concretely how the alleged but unspecified mistakes caused the rapid seizure of power by the revisionists after Stalin's death. It would be hard to imagine anything further removed that this from "the concrete analysis of concrete processes", which Lenin said was the essence of dialectics. The concrete process of the rise of revisionism could not possibly be dealt with more undialectically and illogically than Mr. Ash deals with it.

A setback for a movement does not necessarily imply mistakes in political leadership. The objective correlation of forces in the class struggle may be such that a setback occurs despite correct policies. There is no necessary connection between setbacks and mistakes in policy. A setback can be caused either by a mistaken policy, or by the objective correlation of forces which policy cannot determine. One does not even need to be a Marxist to see that.

4. But what Ash says is that a setback which occurred after Stalin's death necessarily implies serious mistakes on Stalin's part. Even if the setback had occurred before his death it would not necessarily imply mistakes. The existence of mistakes could still only be established through formal logical deduction. And in no circumstances could the existence of mistakes be scientifically established through formal logical deductions in which the actual concrete content of the mistakes remains unknown, as in Mr. Ash's metaphysics.

Mr. Ash's reasoning is typical of the trend to which he belongs. Another typical position is the view that now is not the time and Britain is not the place to investigate the actual history of Khrushchevite revisionism. The existence of Stalin's mistakes as a cause of Khrushchevism can be established through mere succession, while the content of the mistakes remains unknown; and it is none of our business to establish the actual content of the mistakes through historical analysis: it is our business to forge ahead and build a mass Communist movement: that is the opportunist view. In fact, the sound nucleus of a Communist movement cannot be established until the theoretical obstacles concentrated in the "Stalin question" are sorted out. We just stated that view in 1964, and were told that history would prove us wrong. The impotence, fragmentation, and intensifying subjectivism of the anti-revisionist movement six years later is the verdict of history.

Aspects of Stalin's actual role in the class struggle in the Soviet Union between the mid-thirties and his death have been described in previous issues of the Communist (especially the series on Yugoslavia) in the two parts of the I.C.O.'s "on Stalin's 'Economic Problems'" and "the Economics of Revisionism" and in "In Defence of Stalin", recently reprinted by the I.C.O. Other aspects of the question will be the subject of these articles.

The 1936 Constitution:

Stalin's speech on the 1936 Constitution has been repeatedly declared to be a major revisionist document in that it declares that classes and class struggle had ceased to exist in the U.S.S.R. This has been stated at numerous public meetings during the past few years. C.W.O. members have pointed out that Stalin said neither of these things in the 1936 speech. But the dogma that appears to explain everything (provided you don't think) has to be maintained at all costs. If historical fact doesn't tally with the dogma, so much the worse for historical fact. That may be all very well if you can't distinguish mental connotation from revolution. But people who operate in the actual class struggle and haven't the gift of mistaking their own volatile feelings for objective social reality, have a hang-up about historical fact.

Stalin said very clearly in his 1936 speech that Soviet society was composed of two classes, workers and peasants, plus the intelligentsia which, properly speaking was not a class. He never said that the class struggle had come to an end. Before and after this speech he stated his categorical disagreement with the view that the class struggle had died away. His view

was that the class struggle was intensifying. What he said in the 1936 speech was that the landlord and capitalist classes had been abolished from Soviet production relations, and that production was now carried on by two classes whose class interests were not antagonistic - workers and collective farm peasantry. That was a perfectly accurate description of the situation. There were contradictions in the production relations, but not antagonism. The evolution of Soviet society, assuming correct policies and effective leadership on the part of working class, could proceed in such a way as to diminish the contradictions. The collective farm peasantry could evolve into workers and become part of the working class.

"The landlord class... had already been eliminated as a result of the victorious conclusion of the Civil War. As for the other exploiting classes, they have shared the fate of the landlord class. The capitalist class in the sphere of industry has ceased to exist. The kulak class in the sphere of agriculture has ceased to exist. And the merchants and profiteers in the sphere of trade have ceased to exist. Thus all the exploiting classes have now been eliminated. There remains the working class. There remains the peasant class. There remains the intelligentsia."

(Leninism p.565 ,On the Draft Constitution of the U.S.S.R.)

Dealing with a proposal to change "peasantry" to "toilers of socialist agriculture", Stalin insisted that, despite the changes brought about in the peasantry by collectivisation, it would be wrong to maintain that the peasant class had ceased to exist.

"In the first place, besides the collective farmers, there are still over a million households of non-collective farmers among the peasantry... Secondly, the fact that the majority of the peasants have started collective farming does not mean that they no longer have their personal economy, their own households, etc.... Finally, have the working class and the peasant class already disappeared in our country? And if they have not disappeared, is it worth while deleting from our vocabulary the established names for them? Evidently, what the authors of the amendment have in mind is not present society, but future society, when classes will no longer exist and when workers and peasants will have been transformed into toilers of a homogeneous communist society. Consequently, they are obviously running ahead." (ibid. p.562-3)

So much for the story that Stalin declared classes to have been abolished in the U.S.S.R. in his 1936 speech.
(To be continued)

Brendan Clifford

CPB (M-L)

"anti-revisionist" "Party"

The Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Lenist), (the Birch-Asp group) emerged into public view for the first time in more than six months with a public meeting on May 1st. In spite of its being a public meeting, public discussion was manoeuvred out of the window. Though the impression was given by Birch that there would be a discussion, in the event it was confined to two unopposable resolutions, not to the platform speeches. This is a trick fit for (and used by) opportunist trade union officials, from whom Birch differentiates himself - at least in words.

The core of the platform speeches (i.e. the whole meeting) was combatting 'Labour Illusions' among the workers. Yet several times the fact that the workers 'won't lift a finger' to support the Labour Party was mentioned. The workers see through social democracy, yet social democracy survives. This miracle of the Labour Party's survival, then is explained away (but not explained) by Birch, saying, first that the workers have Labour illusions after all, and secondly, that the CPGB has been a counter-revolutionary organisation since its inception in 1920. This is simply not the case. You have just to look at its record between the wars. But this assertion flatters those who make it - History and the British worker it seems have been waiting for the appearance of Birch and the CPB for 50 years. And of course, to say the CPGB always was revisionist gives the CPB a good excuse for not dealing with modern Khrushchevite revisionism in the CPGB.

The real reason is, that Birch and the CPB, do not have - or do not want to have - the politics to deal with modern revisionism. And this from an anti-revisionist 'Party'.

It is all the more surprising when it is remembered that Reg Birch, for many years, sat on the National Executive of the CPGB. Who is in a better position to attempt to overcome the main obstacle to the development of communist politics in the UK. (i.e.

-/- *

(i.e. revisionism in the CPGB) ? Yet who has maintained a firmer silence on the subject? The problem confronting the British working class movement is the need to give a political opposition to revisionism, a political basis for the elements in the CPGB who oppose the leaders, the programme etc. The CPB (or or at least Birch) have the resources to do this, (to deal with revisionism) yet they refuse. What sort of approach is this?

The same thing occurs in relation to the centre of modern revisionism - USSR. The question is one of real political economy: not for nothing did Stalin write 'Economic Problems' as a move in the anti-revisionist(class) struggle in the USSR. To criticise the USSR for having management schools(Worker -CPB paper May 1970) is not enough -Lenin, in 1920, stressed the need for management expertise. The point is that the class nature of the USSR is the opposite now of what it was in 1920. A workers state is now a capitalist state - but this can only be proved by looking at the economic policies of the government. The 'capitalist road' must be shown to lead to capitalism. The I.C.O. has done this -see 'Marxism and Market Socialism'.

The CPB has never expressed interest - agreement or disagreement - in this pamphlet. Nor has it shown any intention of analysing in any depth the history of the international communist movement, surely another primary task. (Yet time is spent on 'Lightening Demonstrations' -50 people quickly and quietly walking from Downing St. to Parliament, handing out leaflets about Ireland. The question arises, if this is the CPB's "mass work", how do the masses get to know about it? Or does the CPB gamble on the off-chance that the dockers and busmen of the East End will have taken a morning off work and be promenading in Whitehall?

I will turn from the fact that the CPB is an 'anti-revisionist party' with no anti-revisionism to other issues:

1. Ireland: 'British Imperialism' and 'anti-imperialism' are the key catch-phrases here, for this are used time and again by the CPB. There was an 'uprising in N.Ireland last August' (Worker May '70) which 'nearly overthrew Stormont' (Fintan O' Shea -CPB speaker on

May 1st) but a last ditch stand by 10,000 soldiers saved the day for the bourgeoisie. Such is the CPB's version. The facts are, however, that Stormont was never in danger, and the 'uprising' was a Paisleyite pogrom - a rampage by loyalists (i.e. loyal, subjectively, to British imperialism). This seeming contradiction - imperialism shooting loyalists - has not been explained by the CPB, who only misrepresent and distort the facts (into line with their subjective desire to see anti-imperialism struggles). Analysis has been conducted by the I.C.O. and on the basis of this, events were explained and communist politics developed. "The Irish people, with workers to the fore, are forging closer unity against ... British imperialism" says May's Worker - these workers are largely I.C.O. members. The CPB has never published any disagreement with the I.C.O. analysis; it chooses, for safety, to ignore it.

Furthermore in relation to Ireland, the CPB continued its opportunism regarding party organisation. N. Bateson (formerly one of the Manchanda clique) told us of the need for national-level parties. Lenin and the Bolsheviks, on the contrary, had the policy of state-level parties, the organisationally united bourgeoisie must be opposed by the organisationally united workers at least on a state basis. The CPB has never attempted, or even stated the need to extend their organisation into Ulster, an integral part of the UK state. But even this, as the I.C.O. makes clear is not enough. For this would divide the Irish workers between the Southerners on the one hand and the Ulster workers and emigrants on the other. (As well, the two economies - UK and Eire - are moving closer, and political developments (e.g. federation) will surely follow. The correct communist organisational principle is a British and Irish Party). The full case for this has been presented in other back issues of the I. Communist and Communist, I will go no further. It is enough to say that the CPB has consistently ignored our argument and implemented an opportunist policy. Though speaking to this point - organisation - N. Bateson never touched on what it meant in practise, so the 'reasons for this piece of opportunism were never given, the CPB's de facto rejection of the proposals were neither explained nor defended

2. Theory:

"Know your enemy, and know your friends" Bateson told us on Friday. "Our contribution to this task (i.e. making revolution) is making scientific socialism, the revolutionary theory which applied to the concrete conditions of Britain will overthrow the rule of the exploiters and establish the dictatorship of the working class" says the May 'Worker'. This is, to be blunt, a lie. The CPB has never examined any of the "concrete conditions of Britain". This is precisely where the work must be done, to re-establish communism in the British Isles, and the CPB's record here -- well, it hasn't one.

3. Fascism: The nearest the CPB has to theory is the notion that the Corporate State is creeping up on us, and it will 'degenerate into fascism' as Mr. Roycroft told us. The first point is that, while Roycroft and the CPB may think fascism and the corporate state different things, the fascists don't. "The Corporate of Britain" by Mandeville Roe, is sub-titled 'the machinery of fascism explained' (This is a fascist programme of 1934). The CPB's evidence for creeping fascism is the anti-union law (which wasn't passed), the incomes policy etc. The cause is the bourgeoisie's growing inability to contain the economic struggle. The facts however are that the capitalist class can and is containing the economic struggle. For the world market is expanding, and this, coupled with a lack of ^{Communist} politics on the part of the working class movement means that the bourgeoisie can absorb the victories on the economic level. (One can give, also many examples where the bosses have won - the Ford/strike, for example). Fascism is simply not necessary at the present stage or even in the foreseeable future. The "evidence" for 'creeping fascism' has existed for a long time - Mondism in the 20's, the anti-Unionism of Baldwin, the 1945-50 'restraint' policies, the 'pay pause' of 1961 etc.. If the corporate is coming, it is certainly taking its time. Fascism is one form of capitalist rule. For this reason it would be un-Marxist for us to rule out the possibility of the British bourgeoisie ever adopting it to suppress the working class movement. What we are saying is that in the stable conditions existing in Britain to-day, there is no indication that the bourgeoisie are moving in that direction.

Even if capitalism were in a position of crisis that necessitated fascist rule, is it likely to be deflected from its course by marxists neglecting scientific marxism in favour of opportunist slogan shouting?

The question is really, why do the CPB invoke the spectre of fascism? It must be that the alarm gives them the excuse to conduct themselves as they do - to ignore theory, to indulge in meaningless practice (lightening demos 'indeed' !)

4. Race : The next point is that one of the bases of this fascism is the rising tide of racism created by the ruling class as Birch told us on May 1st. This is clearly not the case; no State interested in racist strife would pass the Race Relations Act etc. British imperialism is going through a stable phase of development at present, and is attempting to iron out minor contradictions like racism which might possibly upset things. But the CPB needs the alarmism - what do facts matter?

5. Parliament. Another point is that we were told that Parliament is a game, there is no difference between the parties, no meaning in the speeches of bourgeois politicians. The capitalists only strategy (apart from creeping fascism) is an economic one, i.e. productivity deals. This is all wrong - the Labour Party will win the election because its policies are more appropriate than those of the Tories in the present stage of development of British capitalism. That is, the parties are judged by the bourgeoisie on the basis of their programme and policies - the bourgeoisie must see their state pursuing the right policies; Now it is important to "know your enemy" i.e. to see what the imperialists are up to - this will not be achieved by writing off Parliament as a game.

The last point was the joke of the evening. Bateson tells us, "our party has no sectarian interest... but has the supreme ambition of being recognised by the working class as a whole". This, coming from a group of organisation would (politics apart) be acceptable - but from a self-styled "party"! !

A party is a party when it is the advanced detachment of the working class, and recognised as such. To call yourself a party and then call for recognition is to ^{put} the cart several yards in front of the horse. Also, it implies that the working class must change, not the CPB(M-L). We think it the other way about.

Finally the CWO is (still)willing to have a public debate with the CPB(ML) at any mutually acceptable time and place.

Rick Stead

Note:The second part of the Czechoslovakia series will appear in next month's issue.



Economism &

Communism :

"The economic struggle is the collective struggle of the workers against their employers for better terms in the sale of their labour power, for the better conditions of life and labour. This struggle is necessarily an industrial struggle, because conditions of labour differ very much in different trades, and consequently the fight to improve their conditions can only be conducted in respect to each trade (trade unions in the Western countries, temporary trade associations and leaflets in Russia, etc.). Lending 'the economic struggle itself a political character' means, therefore, striving to secure satisfaction of these trade demands, the improvement of conditions of labour in each separate trade by means of 'legislative and administrative measures'...This is exactly what all workers' trade unions

do and always have done. Read the works of the thoroughly scientific (and 'thoroughly' opportunist) Mr and Mrs Webb and you will see that the British trade unions long ago recognised, and have long been carrying out, the task of 'lending the economic struggle itself a political character'; they have long been fighting for the right to strike, for the removal of all legal hindrances to the co-operative and trade union movements, for laws protecting women and children, for the improvement of labour conditions by means of health and factory legislation etc" (Lenin, What Is To Be Done, Collected Works, 1961, Vol 5, p 404).

"But the crux of the matter is, how is one to understand the statement that the mass working-class movement will "determine the tasks"? It may interpreted in one of two ways. Either it means bowing to the spontaneity of this movement, i.e., reducing the role of Social-Democracy to mere subservience to the working class movement as such (the interpretation of... Economists) or it means that the mass movement places before us new theoretical, political, and organisational tasks far more complicated than those that might have satisfied us in the period before the rise of the mass movement." (What Is To Be Done, p389-90).

It is necessary to begin with these two Lenin quotes because the 'Left' today in Britain does not take up a Communist position toward the economic struggle and trade union politics. Lenin states quite clearly the situation for Communists: the working class wage economic struggle against the capitalist class; the working class spontaneously make their own organisation and politics (trade union organisation and politics) to wage this struggle; trade unionism can only succeed in getting limited concessions from the bourgeoisie; in order to advance the economic struggle, communist politics and organisation must replace trade unionism. Lenin decisively rejects the 'stage theory' which states that the evolution of the economic struggle will prepare the way for communist politics: the working class will learn from its trade unionist leaders and organisation the correctness of communism.

Only when there is Communist leadership of the economic struggle can the working class advance in economic struggle to challenge the bourgeois state*. A good example is the General Strike where the working class showed a solid determination to stay out and yet when the TUC called for a return to work, there was no other alternative for the working class. The situation which generated the General Strike was a fierce economic struggle by the working class in which the opportunist trade union leaders were always

* In most cases communist leadership must fight two political battles: (1) the battle against political opportunism, (2) the battle against spontaneous trade unionism. The first battle is against a more difficult because more conscious opponent.

at the 'head' and organising a retreat. In order to advance and win the economic struggle Communist leadership would have been necessary to organise a challenge to the state. Neither trade union nor opportunist politics and leaders will advance the economic struggle when this means challenging the state.

The working class can only advance in political consciousness by the political experience of challenging the state (this can be a political strike--for economic demands which the bourgeoisie will not grant without political struggle) Lenin stated that the Russian working class were prepared for the successful overthrow of the bourgeois state in 1917 by the political strikes of 1905. There was Communist leadership in 1905 which advanced the economic struggle and from this advance the working class learned its first concerning political struggle against the state. Lenin said that without the experience and lessons of 1905 the Russian working class could not have won in 1917.

'LEFT' POLITICS = OPPORTUNISM.

The 'Left's' part in the economic struggle in Britain today is that it will not advance the economic struggle because to do so would mean the working class challenging the state. This is something that none of the 'Left' groups want because in that situation they would be exposed as having no strategy to win, because they have no strategy as to how to defeat the state. Yet the 'Left' hold a position of leadership in the economic struggle. Though it is obviously true that not every shop steward or union official is in the CPGB, IS, CPB etc, it is also true that 'Left' politics direct the economic struggle. Those shop stewards and officials who are not 'political' and who represent the working class's spontaneous trade-unionism cannot defeat the 'Left' at a political level. Why? (1) The 'Left' has a network of organised and unofficial contacts, e.g., the CPGB advisories, which plan and direct the economic struggle. This gives their position an organisational predominance. (2) trade unionism has no politics of its own. (see Lenin where he says trade unionism is sometimes directed into bourgeois politics. What Is To Be Done, p. 387)

The 'Left' has a coherent politics: it knows where it stands in relation to the bourgeoisie: it is against seriously challenging them even at the economic level. Even when the working class is ready to wage an intensified economic struggle and its spontaneous leaders put forward this demand, the 'Left' will win out because their politics of opportunism are at a higher level than spontaneous trade unionism. Only Communist politics can defeat this opportunist position.

From this position the 'left' are able to hold back the economic struggle: they occupy an opportunist position of channelling the force of the working class in economic struggle into compromise and defeat. The recent 'wages explosion' is far from being the victory which the 'Left' papers trumpet. This article will examine

some of the recent disputes which the 'Left' have led and will show that the working class lost. It must be acknowledged that the 'Left' won though; for there was no challenge to its leadership from Communist politics. In the absence of this challenge the working class has no choice but to continue settling for what opportunist politics delivers.

It is important before starting to examine the present to explain the reason for the predominance of the CPGB in the ranks of the shop stewards and trade union officials. (Jack Jones, Les Cannon, Reg Birch and Hugh Scanlon received their political training from the CPGB to name a few.) The CPGB from its inception in 1920 until the victory of revisionism in the party advanced the economic struggle and did lead the working class in economic struggle to challenge the state. (Future articles in the Communist will deal with the history of the CPGB.) The opportunist CPGB inherited the leadership position of the Leninist CPGB in the economic struggle. And in the absence of Leninist politics, the opportunist CPGB has been able to more or less preserve its organisational dominance and through this give opportunist direction to the struggle. Now that the CPGB is opportunist it is wooing unity everywhere on the Left--IS, Tribune, Institute of Workers Control. Thus it is correct to refer to the 'Left' as one opportunist bloc though each group within it has varying degrees of organisational and political control over the working class.

The opportunism of the 'Left' bloc in the economic struggle arises from the only priority for the 'Left' shop stewards and trade union officials being to maintain their leadership over the working class. It is their only priority because for the 'Left's' professional theorists advancing the class struggle and gaining the maximum from the bourgeoisie for the working class are non-existent questions. Thus the 'Left' must lead the economic struggle to maintain its role, but not too far. If the struggle went too far, it would become a political strike and the 'Left' leadership would be exposed as no longer able to advance against the state but only urge a hasty though honourable retreat. That situation is dangerous because political questions are raised: by the working class and the rank-and-file 'Lefts'.

To defend its right to a revolutionary label and at the same time justify retreat, the 'Left' leaders are forced into revisionist contortions about saving the working class from white terror and eschewing left deviation. This works, but only so long as there is no Communist politics. To avoid this dangerous situation the 'Left' are careful always to put the maintenance of their own leadership as the answer to the question: How can we the shop stewards and trade union officials further Marxism-Leninism in the economic struggle. The 'Lefts' answer: support us (insert here CPGB, IS, SLL, CPB etc) the only group working within the working class. And so, for the 'Left', the shop stewards who pull the working class back after an initial advance are following

the correct revolutionary road, i.e., they are preserving the 'Left's' leadership.

ECONOMIC STRUGGLE: THE STATE OF PLAY

It is idealist to state that Communist politics will arise inevitably out of economic struggle. As Lenin pointed out, the logical extension of trade union activity is fighting for economic concessions from the bourgeois state. And it is a fact that the bourgeois state has granted and will continue to grant concessions. These concessions may be subjectively worthless to the revolutionary who desires the end of capitalism, but objectively to the working class, they are 'better terms in the sale of their labour power'. It is important to state that these concessions have not been granted without an advance in the economic struggle by the working class. These advances have been led not by trade unionist politics but by Communist politics (In Britain, examples are the development of the shop stewards power to lead the working class forward against the state and opportunist trade union leaders and the Unemployed Workers Union in its organisation of the unemployed and the employed against the state and opportunist trade unionist leaders.)

As long as the ruling class can rely on opportunist trade unionists to lead the working class, they can quite safely allow the economic struggle 'free rein'. In this situation the ruling class can always turn the economic struggle to their advantage so it becomes of positive use to them. It is in this light that the Labour Party's handling of industrial relations becomes intelligible. The current wave of unofficial strikes is evidence that the opportunist (remember this includes shop stewards not just officials) trade unionists have been caught out. These unofficial strikes have been costly for the bourgeoisie in lost production and make orderly intensification of exploitation like productivity agreements difficult to implement. By pretending to be serious about the penal clauses last year the Labour Party gave the trade union leadership a chance to consolidate and renew its hold over the working class.*

The trade union leaders (and this includes the unofficial leadership) by standing up to the Labour Party on behalf of the working class: we will not stand for state control; gathered a legitimate claim to lead the working class; they had been proved in the fire of battle. By this tactic the Labour Party hoped that the trade union leadership would be able to lead the working class into accepting 'orderly' industrial relations, i.e., which were weighted in the bourgeoisie's favour. The tactic had limited success--the TUC and trade union leaders now are shouldering their responsibility to lead the working class for the ruling class more conscientiously. However the wave of strikes is still

* I use pretended advisedly--the Donovan Commission on Trade Unions warned the Govt against legislation on unofficial strikes. It stated this would have little or even negative effect.

rolling in. The Labour Party at present is hoping to extend the use of the tactic of state intervention--this time by using the carrot and not the stick. The present Industrial Relations Bill which contains 'concessions' has been introduced at this time so that it will not become law before the next election. The 'concessions' are concessions for the trade union leaders--not the working class. They make trade union membership and recognition for negotiating purposes enforceable by the bourgeois state. They also give the trade unions the right to open certain company books--to facilitate reasoned and realistic wage claims. After all when a company is about to go broke, like UCS or Cammell Laird, it is in the workers interest to know this, so that they can facilitate their greater exploitation and the survival of their jobs. The trade union leaders extend their power while the bourgeoisie gain conscious allies among the hitherto unorganised. If the trade union leaders deliver the trade union contributions (£) to the Labour Party, loyal and vocal support and the Labour Party is returned to power, this carrot will be forthcoming.

Without an advance of the economic struggle, it is unnecessary for the Labour Party to concede anything for the working class, and they have no intention of doing so. The most significant measure 'considered' by Castle was the legalising of blacking. This of course was rejected as aiding the working class in the economic struggle (See injunctions on T and G in Hull trawler strike and AEF at Johnson Matthey Chemicals, Enfield, restraining unions from enforcing blacking for how necessary a weapon blacking is for the working class.) The reasons given were that the legal position would be far too complex for legislation.

At present the bourgeoisie is under pressure in the economic struggle from the working class. Neither the trade union leaders nor social democratic state are holding back the tide efficiently enough for the capitalist class. (See Lord Stokes' speech where he reminds the social democrats and opportunists of the 30's when the working class was moving toward communist politics. It was however a good-natured reminder that a stitch in time saves nine: consolidate your position while there are no communist politics to challenge you.) Thus, the bourgeoisie are forced into making cash offers big enough for the trade union leaders to present to the working class as a victory. These wage increases will just keep pace with inflation.

It must be said that the said that the opportunist trade union leaders are not failing to lead the working class for lack of trying. In fact if you look at the recent vicissitudes of the economic struggle, there are instances where shop stewards and even trade union officials have appeared more militant than their members--the GEC-AEI redundancies of Sept '69 and the Ford dispute of Dec '69-Feb '70.

GEC-AEI REDUNDANCIES

It is plainly insufficient to say that the workiers were not behind the shop stewards' demands for occupation because they did not understand the deep political significance of an occupation

as well as the militant shop stewards.

The occupation of the factories was stated by the shop stewards Action Committee to be a 'symbolic protest'. They admitted they had no plans about what to do once they had occupied the factories apart from running them. They consulted the Institute of Workers Control on how you ran an occupied factory and the Institute in turn began recruiting disaffected petty-bourgeois anxious to render a symbolic protest for the jobs of accounting etc. The shop stewards never consulted their members about these plans until 1 to 2 days before the occupation was planned. Then at the mass meetings, the workers overwhelmingly rejected plans for occupation.

Two points should be made: (1) The redundancies were in an area of high unemployment with a relatively lower proportion of engineering jobs than the national average. It was obviously going to be difficult for 3000 engineering workers to find jobs elsewhere on Merseyside, if not impossible. Given this fact, it seems obvious that if the shop stewards' action committee had had a plan of economic struggle which made sense to the workers they would have accepted it. (2) One of the points in the moral protest of the shop stewards Action Committee was that they had very short notice of the redundancies. Any worker in engineering will know that redundancy is a possibility given technological change and rationalisation. If he has not experienced it, then he knows someone who has. When GEC, EE and AEI merged, it should have been obvious that rationalisation like this would bring redundancy. And yet the 'most conscious', 'most militant' and 'Left' shop stewards were caught with their knickers down. I think it more likely that they refused to see the redundancy question until too late because to deal with it would have required a more thorough organisation of the working class even at the trade union level than they were prepared to undertake. Redundancy is not something that can be fought by an unofficial or official strike in one or three factories for however long or however solid. The shop stewards know this as do their fellow workers. It requires that the whole industry be prepared to come out on strike and that the rest of the working class is mobilised in support (not moral or token support, but serious support.) For the working class to fight redundancy would mean advancing the economic struggle and preparing for political strikes. Another words Communist leadership.

Neither the shop stewards nor the trade union leaders are prepared to undertake this kind of organisation. Not only do the redundancies occur, but the working class is never 'consulted' about whether it will support the only realistic course of opposition. Far from the 'Left' putting a vanguard position, it occupies a position in the rear of the working class, believing that redundancy can be 'effectively opposed' by petty-bourgeois fantasy in practice. The workers in GEC-AEI were correct to reject the occupation from a working class point of view, because it would have made no difference to their jobs. The 'Left' shop stewards were advocating petty-bourgeois wish fulfillment

in the hope that the working class would adopt 'Left petty bourgeois' politics and take a lesson from the students in how to express your opposition in a creative ^{way}. The working class instead agreed with its 'Right' stewards that creative protest would do nothing to stop the bourgeoisie.

A Communist leads the working class in the economic struggle by advocating an advance in that struggle. This obviously requires an advance in trade union organisation from the status quo and an increasing involvement of the mass of workers in the class struggle. The 'Left' today claims to advance the economic struggle by on the one hand mouthing slogans about corrupt trade union officials and the impending crises of capitalism and on the other hand leading the working class back from economic struggle on any issue which might lead to a political strike. In political meetings of politically conscious workers, the 'Left' leaders (Ramelson, Cliff, Birch etc) shout their belief in the revolution while pointing out soberly that the working class is not ready yet to follow them, the revolutionaries to revolution. However, just because the working class is not ready for revolution, the revolutionaries must not forsake it, but instead lead it for those small but important victories in the economic struggle. This stand is necessary for the 'Left' to maintain its control over its working class cadres. The politically conscious workers learn their Marxist-Leninist politics here: Marxist-Leninist politics is not for the masses. Armed with this revolutionary dictum the working class cadres go out and lead the masses as they have been taught--back away from economic struggle which could prove dangerous--for the 'Left' leaders and the bourgeoisie. When the working class do not follow the 'Left' in economic struggle--as at GEC-AEI, the 'Left' leaders counsel the shopstewards not to be disheartened, it is only that the 'Left' were too far out in front of the working class this time. There is no need to reason further. After the occupation's failure, none of the 'Left' groups had any substantive criticism of the shop stewards to make!! They confined themselves to regret that this revolutionary tactic was not adopted!!

The 'Left' working class cadres do not occupy positions of leadership today because of their present heroic role. They are there because of the working class struggles which were led working class men in the vanguard of their class during and just after World War I. The CPSU(B) and the Communist International recognised this when they invited these leaders of the new shop stewards movement to the 2nd Congress of the Communist International (1920). These men had advanced the economic struggle by organising the working class at the shop floor, at the industrial level and at the national level into a force which the bourgeoisie had to reckon with and make significant concessions to. They made shop stewards the effective leadership of the working class movement. (By effective leadership I mean this: given Communist leadership by the shop stewards, the working class could struggle against the opportunist trade union leaders and the bourgeoisie and build the foundations for a

political strike. Obviously any such organisational weapon can be turned against the working class if opportunism replaces Communist leadership) These men were not Leninists but they were anti-capitalists and were the vanguard of the working class, and because of this Lenin stated that they were the most important force in Britain from the standpoint of the international proletarian movement. It is true to say that the power of the present shop stewards movement is the direct result of the working class struggles led by these men. At present, the 'Left' shop stewards movement is eroding the organisation which the working class built by giving opportunist political leadership.

STANDARD TRIUMPH-INTERNATIONAL

From Sept--Nov '69, 1150 workers at Standard Triumph-International (ST-I) in Liverpool were on strike for an increase in bonus pay and the provision of £25 per week when laid off through no fault of their own. ST-I earnings had fallen behind earnings at Ford and Vauxhall plants in the area, while the Financial Times reported that lay-offs had been "a running sore, according to some strikers, since at least Christmas 1968, when some of the body painting was transferred from Woodend Ave to the nearby new plant.

The demand for £25 per week when laid off through no fault of their own is a demand that the employers are unwilling to concede in the motor industry (and will not concede without an advance in the economic struggle). It is obviously a frequent strikes at present in the motor industry (Vauxhall and Fords have had major disputes around this.) Ford management successfully linked lay-off pay with (1) disputes outside the company: if the body shop comes out, you do not get lay-off pay. (2) with the proviso of no unofficial strikes. The Ford strike last year ameliorated these clauses, it did not change them. The first example of lay-off pay actually being paid, at Rootes, was for 1 week only--because of a strike outside the company--after that nothing. The ST-I demand represents a real change in terms of sale of labour power; it is different from the above schemes because it is from the working class point of view.

It is important to note the conduct of the trade union officials. The T and G, the AEF and the EPTU were involved. At no time did Cannon (EPTU) make a statement about the strike which the Financial Times described as "blatantly unconstitutional". Jones and Scanlon at the Labour Party Conference urged a return to work in order to save Castle-Wilson's face. At no time did Jones and Scanlon use their authority to pressure for a negotiated settlement; in fact the AEF decided to boycott the DEP Inquiry which finished taking evidence just as the moves to return to work were taken. (The AEF stated that these days taking part in an Inquiry was tantamount to agreeing to its recommendations. This is the most progressive and political statement from the point of view of the working class about

the exact function of Inquiries by the state that I have seen. It came not from unofficial leaders but from officers.) The officials' conduct could not be described as hindering the ST-I struggle, though they did not advance it. In fact, moves were under way to advance the struggle just as it was called off. The driving force in the first moves to advance and the first moves to call off was the same: the Leyland joint shop stewards committee. (ST-I is part of the British Leyland group.)

This is only an apparent contradiction: to hold on to their leadership of the working class the shop stewards must take up the economic struggle. They cannot be quietists. And furthermore they must be seen to be trying to win. But opportunists shop stewards must also try at the earliest possible moment to show the working class that the struggle has achieved all that it can and should be called off. This is because if the struggle advances it will become a political strike which opportunism can only lead to defeat (which would be dangerous as far as maintaining leadership for the 'Left'. Not because Communism would spontaneously come from the working class to expose the 'Lefts', but because the bourgeoisie are likely to sack and isolate the 'Lefts' for going outside the rules of their game.)

The B-L joint shop stewards committee had organised a one-day sympathy strike: the Financial reported that 8500 workers in B-L's five truck factories in Lancashire were to stop work and also some others. This was the first step to making the fight for the demands firm-wide. The shop stewards then postponed the one-day strike and instead travelled to London at Lord Stokes's invitation to hear his maiden speech in the House of Lords (Stokes is head of B-L). The Financial Times states "Lord Stokes... is believed to have indicated to the stewards that the two sides could come to an agreement on the pay increase claimed and on any productivity strings that might be attached." The shop stewards then travelled up to Liverpool and passed Lord Stokes' message on.

The position up to this point was that B-L had refused to name a figure for pay increase while the men were still out--rightly from their viewpoint as employer as a strike which is solid places the initiative with the workers. It is not hard to deduce that Lord Stokes must have given an indication of pay-rise and also warned the B-L shop stewards of what would happen if the sympathy strike took place and the demand for lay-off pay was adopted by more than ST-I workers. (Even had the shop stewards intended only a 1-day sympathy strike, it is certain that the workers taking part would have considered the logic of the ST-I demand for lay-off pay and might have led their shop stewards into further action in support. At present ST-I in Coventry have been out for some 2 weeks for the demand of lay-off pay.) It was the possibility of a wider strike for a working class demand that Lord Stokes would have had to be very worried about. While it may be possible to 'reason' with a shop stewards committee, it is far more difficult to reason with a spreading strike, i.e. the reasoning at that point must involve some concession.

Because the shop stewards committee was not prepared to advance the economic struggle by organising B-L workers to win this demand (though they had evidence that the workers were prepared to do so), they used their 'good offices' to settle the strike. And indeed the ST-I workers were correct to vote to go back when confronted by their fellow-workers (shop stewards) on the side of B-L. They plainly had no hope of winning--even when their own ranks at ST-I were solid. In this case no guilt can be placed at the feet of the trade union leaders. Lord Stokes chose to go to where the effective leadership was--the shop stewards committee--and convince them that B-L would win if it came to a wider and more serious strike.

FORD

The Ford strike at Swansea and Halewood in Feb '70 was over the issue of parity of pay with the Midlands car factories. From the four week strike at Ford in March '69 the trade union officials had learned a great deal. That strike was started after a leak to Dagenham stewards of the new agreement about to be signed unanimously by the trade union leaders on the National Joint Negotiating Committee. The Dagenham stewards duplicated the agreement and put it at the disposal of other Ford plants' shop stewards. A strike resulted that was so solid (a plant that had no history of economic struggle, Basildon, was one of the most militant) that the AEF and T and G were forced to declare it official. After this experience of having their position as leaders undermined by the working class in economic struggle, the progressive trade union leadership showed that it understood what to do to maintain its authority.

The T and G set up an automotive national committee representing its 100,000 motor industry members, chaired by the national officer for the industry, but having no constitutional status--i.e., neither the national officer nor the Executive were bound by this committee's decisions. The value of the committee (for the officials) was that T and G officials were convening the effective leadership--the shop stewards--giving them a chance to talk and take decisions without binding anyone to any action and without making any provision for any advance in effective organisation, e.g., at the shop floor or between plants or between firms, e.g., Vauxhall and B-L supporting Ford.

The Ford stewards agreed on the demand of parity inside the new committee and spent more planning action on parity at this level than they did at the shop floor or between plants. The only material action which the shop stewards took were some mass meetings (at Dagenham in Nov '69, the mass meeting was addressed by 7 full time union officials and a Labour MP only.), some posters and badges. It is hardly surprising that after Ford made its offer of £4 per week the shop stewards first decided to call for postponement of the strike for two weeks (except at Swansea where they came out 'prematurely', when the Ford stewards committee

had originally threatened and had to be called back into line.) while parity was further discussed. And at the end of this fortnight, the strike call was rejected by all plants except Swansea. (Some sections at Halewood later came out in support of Swansea.)

It is necessary to state that Ford management had also learned from the March '69 strike. They learned that the workers were determined enough to warrant a large cash offer. This they made³.

The 1500 workers at Swansea stayed out for 1 week. The Swansea shop stewards during this week provided no leadership--either in terms of advancing the strike or calling it off. They waited until the trade union officer produced a face-saving formula for return to work (Labour Relations director Ramsay promising that parity could be a continuing discussion topic for the next year though under the terms of the new agreement there were to be no serious pay negotiations for 1 year.) The Swansea shop stewards had little choice. The shop stewards in the other Ford plants had not shown the workers that parity was a demand that could be won by economic struggle. Thus any chance of Swansea winning this demand alone was out! Yet the workers at Swansea had accepted the logic of the parity demand and the need to strike for it. The Financial Times quotes a "fairly typical conversation":

"What do you think of the offer?"

'I don't think anyone could disagree that it is a very good offer.'

'So you are in favour of returning to work?'

'No. It might sound alright but what Ford is trying to do is to buy off the idea of parity.'"

The votes in favour of parity at mass meetings at other Ford plants prior to the negotiations (Dagenham, Halewood) show that the workers there also understood this. But they could see that the shop stewards had made no provision for an effective strike, that they were not serious beyond serious sloganising. The only plans were support from trade union officials the meaning of which in terms of action was never made clear. This kind of lead from trade union officials can only be token support and was seen as such by the working class. The officials were not committing themselves to more.

Given that the shop stewards were unprepared to lead, the workers at Ford were correct in voting not to strike. They had no evidence that a strike would bring them more than £4 a week because the shop stewards' strike call never went further than rhetoric.

When the Swansea plant came out, Reg Birch, AEF Ford negotiator, Ford unions Secretary, and General Secretary of the CPB (ML), supported the strike and asked the AEF Executive to make it official. From the point of view of the 'Left', he took a principled position. From the point of view of the working class and the economic struggle, Birch's action meant nothing. When the effective leadership, the shop stewards joint committee, had

made no serious plans to organise a strike, Birch could register moral support, only. For Birch to have gone further would have involved putting a vanguard position to the shop stewards: stating that a tightening of and more thorough organisation was necessary to win the parity demand; that it was dishonest to the working class to advocate parity without clearly being able to lead the workers in an effective strike and clearly stating to the workers what was involved in an effective strike (e.g., real support from workers in other car companies, firm control over trade union officials); that if the shop stewards believed a strike of this kind was impossible they should not have advocated parity. It is worth stating that this is the only position in the economic struggle which stands for the working class interests and is the only position a Communist can take. Any other position exposes the taker as being for the working class interests in talk and against them in practice.

In looking at the shop stewards' role in the March '69 strike and in the Dec '69-Feb '70 negotiations we are faced with the same apparent contradiction as at ST-I: the shop stewards at first leading the working class forward in the economic struggle and then pulling them back. The same explanation as in ST-I holds: the shop stewards cannot maintain their leadership without fighting the economic struggle. But if the economic struggle advances, the shop stewards will also not hold the working class. If the opportunist shop stewards are too far behind, the working class will spontaneously strike without them, if they lead the working class too far forward, the politics of their position will be exposed.

WHY COMMUNIST THEORY IS NECESSARY

It is important to finish on a lesson which the employers are now learning if they did not already know it: the capitalist system will continue to generate 'spontaneous' economic struggle in the working class whatever the behaviour of shop stewards and trade union leaders. The Leeds clothing and the Pilkingtons strikes show this very clearly. Leeds where there had not been a serious dispute since 1936 and then not a city-wide dispute (and a Leeds-wide dispute means most and the most productively advanced part of the tailoring industry). Pilkingtons where there had not been a serious dispute since the General Strike. In these cases the working class carries the opportunist shop stewards at its tail or leaves them completely behind. (In the case of the GMW in Pilkington, the Tailor's and Garment Workers in Leeds, and the National Union of Blastfurnacemen at Port Talbot, the trade union officials were completely left behind and their usefulness for the bourgeoisie thereby diminished. The usefulness of the 'Left' for the bourgeoisie is proved here: the 'Left' may be left behind at first, but it soon will regain its leadership position in the absence of Communism. The 'Left' is not afraid to lead the economic a little, because it is skilled in then bringing it two steps back. However, as in the other strikes analysed above, the economic struggle at Leeds and Pilkington has a chance of being a victory for the working class

out of which the working class will learn Communist politics only if Communist politics exists. The fact that no economic struggle recently has ended in victory for the working class is a sure sign that 'Left' shop stewards and officials are following opportunist and not Communist politics.

The majority of the shop stewards and many ^{of the} trade union officials who give opportunist political leadership to the working class are not conscious opportunists. What does this mean? That these working class leaders do not intend to lead the working class back from economic struggle because they wish to be the bourgeoisie's most trusted lieutenants; they do it because those at the head of the 'Left' are conscious opportunists. The 'Left' leaders are petty-bourgeois--not necessarily by class origin, but always by conscious decision. They live off the backs of the working class and produce the pseudo-Marxist theory which guides the working class away from Communism. And while there is no Communist politics, the politically conscious workers are forced to adopt the politics of the 'Left' opportunists. Here again we find the apparent contradiction of the shop stewards who first lead the workers forward and then back.

In the first stages of the economic struggle, when there are no signs of development into a political strike, the 'Left' shop stewards can lead the working class without any advice from the Cliffs or Ramelsons. At this stage trade unionist politics are sufficient to advance the struggle and indeed these trade unionist politics do not immediately betray the working class.

However, when the economic struggle has advanced to a point where politics is unavoidable (and in any advancing economic struggle this is the case.) the shop stewards look to those whose job is politics--and they are only too ready to oblige. This situation where the 'Left' works by capitalist division of labour (some working by brain and the rest being unable to challenge the brain-workers) exists because the 'Left' leaders refuse to provide political education for the working class, 'Slogans are all they understand'. And the working class will not be able to take up a Communist position until the 'Left' petty-bourgeois leaders have been defeated politically by Communism.

Communist politics must theoretically defeat the 'Left' before they can defeat it in practice. This is the meaning of the Lenin 'Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary practice.' This article has shown how the working class cannot smash opportunism with its spontaneous trade union force. To seek to lead the working class before having a Communist position is therefore objectively opportunist--and nonsubjective hatred of capitalism can alter this fact. The main enemy of the working class and Communism at this time is not opportunist practice but the opportunist theory of the petty-bourgeois 'Left' leaders.

FOOTNOTES

¹ High wages do not necessarily go with a low degree of exploitation. For the degree of exploitation is the relationship between what you produce for the boss and what the boss pays you. This may or may not correspond to wage levels. Take Burtons and a back-street taylor with three seamstresses. Burtons will pay $\pounds 15$ a week, while each worker because of the greater quantity of machinery, turns out say $\pounds 300$'s worth of suits a week. Now allowing for $\pounds 250$ for machinery, raw materials, etc., each worker has added $\pounds 50$'s worth to the goods. He sees only $\pounds 15$ of this--the rate of exploitation is $23\frac{1}{3}\%$. The back-street taylor may pay his workers only $\pounds 10$ a week, yet because he lacks machinery etc, and is competing with Burtons who don't, his worker's output sells for only $\pounds 20$ a week. Allowing $\pounds 6$ for machinery and raw material, each seamstress has added $\pounds 14$. Of this she gets $\pounds 10$ --a rate of exploitation of only 40%.

Only a moral ('Only $\pounds 10$ a week!') not a Marxist approach equates low pay and high exploitation. Inducing more firms to pay higher wages (with greater capital intensity, i.e., quite probably a high rate of exploitation)--the 'high wage economy' of some trade union leaders, would solve nothing, for the workers would be worse off relative to the bosses.

Only a general rise in wages will, of itself decrease exploitation. That is an increase in real wages, for when prices can be easily raised, even a general wage-rise can be wiped out (e.g., France after May 1968). This is just what 'inflation' allows--the bosses to get back what they lose, by raising prices.

²The GMW demonstrated its inability to lead--the GMW branch went over to the T and G en masse. (See Pilkington and similar threats by the workers.) The important difference between the T and G and the GMW is not between right and left but between a leadership which will act as trade union leaders for trade union aims like the T and G and one which is secure enough to be able to be a thoroughly anti trade union union. The T and G is undoubtedly more useful to the bourgeoisie at this point than the GMW.

³Ford could well afford to offer this increase. Ford has the highest amount of capital per worker and thus the greatest amount of value added per worker in the British motor industry. The Financial Times reported that because of higher social security payments in the EEC, British car workers are paid comparatively less than those in Europe. Thus the attraction of investment in Britain even though the EEC provides the company with a greater actual and potential market.

Appearing in the next issue of the Communist:

Articles on: Part 2. of Class Struggle in the Soviet Union.

Pilkington's Strike

The SLL.....an exposure

Part 2 of the Czechoslovakia series

Just published by the I.C.O.:

The Housing Crisis and the Working Class	1/-
Workshop Talks by James Connolly ...	1/-
Stalin on Lenin...	1/6