

Kinnock wants votes WE WANT ACTION

AS PLANNED Jarrow 86 got a good deal of publicity for Kinnock and the Labour Party. But was Jarrow 86 all a waste of time for the unemployed? No. It highlighted the whole question of unemployment and it provided the ideal window of opportunity to launch the Unemployed Workers Charter. This has been shown by the flood of letters and phone calls from unemployed workers wanting to become UWC supporters.

Naturally because it stands for a real fightback against unemployment and the system that causes it the UWC had to challenge the politics of Jarrow 86 which were unashamedly electoral.

The Labour Party leadership knows Thatcher's record on unemployment is indefensible. Hence they have pinned their chances at the next general election on exploiting it. The Walworth Road whiz-kids are of course fully aware they were selling defective goods. Because of this they had to carefully coach Kinnock's ever so sincere patter on unemployment, get Hattersley to promise the punters one million jobs within two years and mimicking the Tories they even felt compelled to package it all in Satchi and Satchi style with *Investing in People*.

To help Kinnock in his progress to No.10 they cynically used the Jarrow 86 marchers and their hatred of Thatcher as a cheap source of PR. With the help of virtually all the left press, including the *Morning Star*, *Newsline*, *Militant*, *Workers Press* and *7 Days* the marchers were in fact turned into pawns in a marketing strategy to cultivate the image of "the party of jobs" for Labour.

Being committed to Kinnock it was hardly surprising the organisers of Jarrow 86 did not for one moment address themselves to the task of actually organising the unemployed. The "high profile" Jarrow 86 roadshow rolled into town and then rolled out, often unnoticed by the unemployed themselves, let alone the mass of ordinary people.

Unfortunately there was no attempt to bring together a determined nucleus of unemployed activists to help with the reception of the marchers. Jarrow 86 Ltd was not even interested in such groups mobilising for the November 2 demonstration in London let alone taking up the challenge of organising the unemployed. No, everything was in the hands of the

Walworth Road bureaucracy, respectable trade union officials and expense account Labour Party councillors.

Scepticism reigned

By the end of the march some of the marchers themselves were saying those behind Jarrow 86 were interested in one thing and one thing alone — votes for Kinnock's Labour Party at the next general election — not fighting unemployment. True most insisted that getting Kinnock in as Prime Minister is the only hope for the unemployed. But when asked what Kinnock would actually do for the unemployed if he was in No.10, as opposed to promising in order to get there, scepticism reigned.

Is this fair? Well, judging by Labour governments in the past, it certainly is. Let us leave aside the MacDonald government way back in the early 1930s which savagely cut unemployment benefit; look at the last one. It not only drove down the wages of the lowest paid but presided over the doubling of unemployment and even introduced the notorious YOPs (the forerunner of YTS).

It carried out this attack on the working class for exactly the same reason Kinnock will, if he gets his turn, attack the working class. Labour is out to manage, not fight, the system which causes unemployment. Of course if that system were booming he could afford to elevate full employment to a principle. But as we all know it is not.

In fact, despite all the hoo-ha about unemployment 'levelling off' from Thatcher's Employment Secretary, Lord Young, Britain is showing signs of entering into a new downturn. (Believe it or not establishment economists say the world economy is at the peak of its upturn and so the next few years will see it enter its cyclical downturn).

Bearing this in mind the *Economist* noted that "whoever wins the next election will lead the country into a crunching economic crisis in the early 1990s, perhaps sooner." Because of this it predicted British workers will suffer under Thatcher or Kinnock "an austerity harsher than anything imposed by Labour in 1976-79".

If all Kinnock can promise at the high point of the business cycle is three million still without jobs after two years in office, it takes little to

imagine what he will deliver if he were actually administering capitalism in the low point of the business cycle.

Readers of *The Leninist* will know we have shown that the present period is not one of capitalist general crisis but the run up to one. In the drift towards the abyss, capitalism desperately puts off the inevitable and keeps the mass of profits up by creating ever greater amounts of paper money (fictitious capital) which is not backed by production. Yet, as the last 15 or so years prove, despite the break-neck expansion of the credit system, capitalism's cyclical downturns steadily become deeper and last longer, its upturns weaker and more fleeting.

The credit system which has already been stretched to unparalleled proportions will sooner or later collapse — then it can truly be said that capitalism is gripped by a general crisis. The next general crisis of capitalism will undoubtedly dwarf the last one which spanned the years 1914-1948. This is because the depth and duration of capitalism's crisis are in reverse proportion to the preceding boom, and the long boom of the 1950s and '60s was the greatest boom in capitalism's history.

In other words we aint seen nothing yet.

If British capitalism has flung an estimated four million out of work before the general crisis, the mind boggles at just how many it will sacrifice, under Thatcher, Kinnock, or one of their successors, when it finally plunges into general crisis.

In the light of capitalism's seemingly intractable problems many rightly point to the elemental fact that only by organising production with socialist planning can unemployment be made a thing of the past. This being the case it should mean that as Labour under Kinnock makes no pretence of ushering in socialism or even far reaching reform, there can be no excuse for fostering hopes amongst the unemployed in the 'next Labour government'. Yet most of the left does little more than play the role of cheerleader for Labourism.

Ending unemployment

This tailism is closely related to fear of another basic truth — though this is one few today dare admit — socialism is only possible after the

working class has seized state power, established its own dictatorship and begun the task of building communism on the ruins of the capitalist social order.

What this truth tells us, is that the fight against unemployment must have an explicitly anti-capitalist and an implicitly anti-Kinnock edge. For only by ending capitalism itself can unemployment be made a thing of the past and therefore only by opposing Labourite attempts to manage capitalism can a serious fight against unemployment be launched.

Because of this we are forced to warn unemployed workers against the left Labourites. They provide a radical cover for the rightism of Kinnock and even more damningly look to the capitalist state itself as the medium of their 'socialist project'.

This reliance on the capitalist state is also why we say the Eurocommunist, CCG, NCP and Straight Leftist friends of the Labour Party are objectively little different from Kinnock's left Labourites. Their faith in the socialist potential of the capitalist state, its parliament, laws and democracy, ties them to the very system they claim to oppose and therefore to the continuation of one of its inevitable features — unemployment.

That is why only *The Leninist* — which stands for the smashing of the capitalist state — could sponsor a campaign like the UWC.

It fights to lay the foundations of a mighty national unemployed workers' movement which can, hand in hand with employed workers, take on the system and win. Of course, as part of this, the UWC supports the right of unemployed workers to be full members of their appropriate trade union but it recognises this can be no substitute for a national unemployed workers' movement.

After all, the official labour movement, which has gone along with slave labour schemes like the YTS, only pays lip service to the plight of the unemployed. So while a real fightback against unemployment necessitates taking into account the official movement, it also necessitates going beyond the confines of trade union officialdom and the Unemployed Centres, which are often nothing more than non-political tea and sympathy drop-ins run by appointees.

So instead of wanting to isolate unemployed workers from employed workers, like many trade union big wigs, the UWC will campaign to mobilise the unemployed alongside all workers in struggle. To facilitate this the UWC says unemployed workers' organisations must have representatives with full voting rights on local trade councils and a national unemployed workers' movement should have a seat on the TUC.

To do this the UWC knows it must break the shackles the official movement places on the unemployed. It therefore says the unemployed should take over and run the Unemployed Centres themselves: with the centre workers if possible, without them if needs be. And unlike the official movement it will not take into account what the system can afford: the UWC will use direct action to win for unemployed workers what they need for a full life.

Already the UWC petition has over 10,000 signatures and from the four corners of Britain unemployed workers are wanting to become UWC supporters. It is easy to see why.

The Department of Trade and Industry admits that despite the dragooning of 314,384 onto YTS schemes and 240,000 onto community programmes it expects unemployment will remain above three million till at least 1990. The Tories are therefore using Restart, SS snoopers, the new inquisitorial questionnaire and other forms of naked intimidation in order to get the numbers claiming benefit down. And where their manipulation of statistics 18 times failed we find proposals from Tebbit to reintroduce Victorian workhouse immorality and make the unemployed do menial work for their benefit.

To counter this offensive against the unemployed the UWC looks to action in the here and now. It does not want to hold back the anger of the unemployed, let alone offer the dubious prospect of 'the next Labour government'. That is why all unemployed workers should join the UWC and why it deserves the support of all trade unionists, all workers and all socialists. If you want to join the UWC or just use its petition and publicity material — phone Mark Fischer on 01-431 3135, or write to BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX.

Jack Conrad



HILLSBOROUGH BACKFIRES

THE Hillsborough Accord has been in force for a year. It has tidied up cross border security, strengthened extradition arrangements between London and Dublin and revived the flagging SDLP. But at the same time Hillsborough is exposing the Dublin government before all nationalists and the SDLP is becoming seen as simply pro-British. Worse the IRA remains undefeated, Sinn Fein retains a mass base and to cap it all the loyalists have run riot. Hillsborough has in other words backfired.

As we predicted far from resolving the revolutionary situation that has gripped the Six Counties since 1969 it has intensified it. In fact whatever solutions Britain has tried to impose only seems to get it deeper into the quagmire.

The sending of troops, the disbanding of the 'B' Specials, internment, power sharing, the abolition of Stormont, the promotion of the Peace People, 'Ulsterisation' all backfired just like Hillsborough.

With this track record of British 'solutions' in mind it is tragic to find comrade Jimmy Stewart, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Ireland, speaking alongside Tony Chater, demanding that the labour movement in Britain must act to get the British government to impose yet another British 'solution' on the Irish people. Surely the whole bloody history of British domination of Ireland proves there can be no British 'solution' to Ireland's problems simply because Britain's presence is the problem.

These comrades say they want to see politics in the Six Counties return to 'normal'. This is not only utopian but downright reactionary, simply because the situation in the Six Counties is revolutionary.

Communists should not respond to this by ringing their hands at the violence but by fighting to take the lead in national liberation struggle. Certainly unless our Irish comrades do this they will be judged by history in the same light as the communists of Cuba, Algeria and Nicaragua who could only see a revolutionary situation after the revolution had taken place.

Ireland is full of possibilities. The heroic struggle of Sinn Fein (and the IRA) commands both our admiration and support. Yet with its petty bourgeois nationalist programme and illusions about a middle course between communism and capitalism who can doubt the need for a communist vanguard in the struggle to unite Ireland.

The CPI is not even looking to play this role. Instead of taking up the banner of Connolly and exploiting the failure of Hillsborough in a proletarian fashion by splitting the loyalist working class from reaction and taking the whole struggle onto a Thirty-two Counties basis it is promoting the Irish TUC's pathetic Stand Together campaign.

This latest 'campaign' by the trade union bureaucracy is anti-republican and pro-imperialist. It shamelessly equates the violence of the oppressed with the violence of the oppressors, ignores the question of the border altogether and pins its hopes on the reformability of the fundamentally irreformable sectarian Northern Ireland statelet.

That this Irish TUC nonsense is being peddled by Stewart and Chater speaks volumes about their surrender to bourgeois respectability. They feel safer in the company of trade union bureaucrats, establishment church leaders and anti-republican community groups than with the revolutionary Sinn Fein. Chater's *Morning Star* even boasts the campaign gained the sympathy of CBI director Alasdair MacLaughlin, whom, it reported "commended" the "initiative and said it deserved support right across the country." (October 27, 1986).

We say the Stand Together campaign deserves no support and we confidently predict it will sink without trace, just like the much vaunted Better Life For All Campaign of the 1970s, simply because it is irrelevant and objectively pro-imperialist.

The Editor

Six months subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £5; Europe £8; Rest of World £10 (airmail £17.50).

Annual subscription rates: Britain and Ireland £10, Institutions £20; Europe £16, Institutions £26; Rest of World £20 (airmail £35), Institutions £30 (airmail £45).

Back copies: Issues 1-6 (theoretical journal) £1 each plus 25p p&p. Issues of paper (from issue 7) 30p each plus 10p p&p.

All cheques payable to November Publications Ltd.

Correspondence to: The Editor, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX

Printed by: Morning Litho Printers Ltd. (1U), Unit 5 St. Marks Industrial Est., 439 North Woolwich Road, London E16 2BS.

Published by: November Publications, BCM Box 928, London WC1N 3XX © World copyright November 1986

LETTERS

English nationalism

Jack Conrad's reply to Al Donaldson typifies the arrogance of English nationalism and is more reminiscent of Trotsky's and Luxemburg's positions than Lenin's.

In *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination* (Thesis) Lenin states the principles which determine socialist's attitudes to nationalism. First of all, he makes it clear that "The proletariat (of the oppressing nation) must demand the right of secession for the colonies and for the nations that 'its own' nation oppresses." Lenin goes on to say that "The socialists of the oppressed nations, on the other hand, must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organisational) between the workers of the oppressed nation and the workers of the oppressing nation."

The question of support for specific national liberation struggles is not, however, such a matter of principle. Rather it is a question of deciding whether or not in a specific concrete conjuncture support for such a struggle will strengthen or weaken the class struggle. Lenin refers to Marx changing his mind about Ireland as circumstances changed and to the Polish Social Democrats changing their attitude to Polish independence.

We need to establish whether or not Scotland is a nation and, if it is, under what circumstances socialists should support Scottish independence.

According to the position adopted by the RSDLP in 1913, a nation needs to have territorial, economic, linguistic and psychological/cultural integrity. Scotland has always displayed these features despite English absorption. If Comrade Conrad could tear himself away from the trivia of South of England squabbles and venture north of Hatfield he might understand why the Scottish National Party enjoys more support than the LSD Alliance. In discussing Imperialism, Lenin always talks about 'England' not 'Britain'. 20th century Britain, like 19th century Russia, is a 'prison house of nations'. Of course, it is not in English comrades' interests to recognise this.

In Scotland today, Westminster dominance is the main barrier to socialist advance. The Tories have no significant support in Scotland and rule from afar through their poodles in the Scottish Office. At present, it is only through shaking off London's rule that the Scottish working class can break with the miasma of nationalism and fulfil their historic destiny (whoops, clumsy parody of Conrad's style...) as the vanguard of the British revolution.

Finally, Conrad's patronising jibe about "chuck(ing) out the English language the Scots people have so brilliantly used" confirms his unregenerate chauvinism. Have you never heard of 'Scots', comrade? Roch the wind!

Red Rackham
Edinburgh

Jack Conrad replies:

1. If comrade R Rackham were a common or garden left Scottish nationalist, his advocacy of separatism and opposition to our proletarian internationalism would at least be consistent. But 'Rackham' is, we think, our old friend WP Cockshott. Comrade Cockshott is, as our readers will know, a left Scottish nationalist of a most peculiar variety. Of his numerous letters published in *The Leninist*, two are worth mentioning in particular. July 1, 1986 — he attacked us for supporting Irish unification and for using the slogan 'Ireland will win.' This he said was to "adopt a purely nationalist slogan"

and perspective. August 29, 1986 — he again criticised our championing Irish liberation. Against this he called for the full integration of Northern Ireland into Britain, which his latest letter calls a prison house of nations. In July 1986 he admitted agreement with us that "Scotland is not an oppressed nation, far less a nation oppressed by imperialism"... "I also agree" he wrote "with your general hostility to nationalism and separatism." A few months later we apparently promote "English nationalism" — presumably in contrast to Irish nationalism. Have you decided to change your name every time you change your argument, comrade Cockshott...er Rackham...er?

2. Leaving aside puerile nonsense about south of Hatfield squabbles, let us again restate our position. There is a British nation formed through the union of English, Scots and Welsh nationalities. Nonetheless we support the right of all nationalities in Britain to self determination. This does not mean, nor should it, that we demand Scotland separates from England and Wales. Having a right is one thing, exercising it is another. This is fully in line with Lenin's thesis foolishly quoted against us.

3. Socialist advance is not held back by the absence of a customs barrier at Gretna Green. No, workers in Scotland (just as in England and Wales) are held back by the continued grip of reformism. United with their brothers and sisters in England and Wales, under the leadership of Leninists, they will indeed play a leading role in the British revolution. Separatism would prevent this — that is why communists in Scotland must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organisational) between the workers of England and Wales and the workers of Scotland.

4. Yes we have heard of Scots. It is a form of English developed in the Lowlands of Scotland — it is not a separate language. It was brilliantly used by Scottish poets like Burns and MacDiarmid (CM Grieve). If this view is "unregenerative chauvinism" we plead guilty.

UWC unity

Please send up 100 of the Unemployed Workers Charter brochures. I believe you have started the campaign well. It will be difficult. I intend to put my meagre resources into it. Our present disagreements will continue until I am satisfied with your position or we become broken by other ways or means. The main thing, however, is to get the petitions out. There is much work to be done and I thank you for providing the resources and such excellent material so cheaply.

Al Donaldson
Glasgow

UWC support

I am interested to find out more about the Unemployed Workers Charter. I see there's a possibility of becoming a supporter of the UWC — but what does that mean? Is it merely just saying I agree with it and nothing else, as I'd be interested in constructively helping rather than the rather dodgy term — supporter. As an ex-Greenham woman I find the term supporter very strange, having had lots of people constantly telling me they supported me — and then going home to their warm beds

and nuclear families if you see what I mean.

Yours
Betty Barker
Wigan

Anti-apartheid coal

On November 8, Hatfield Main NUM and Doncaster AAM are organising a protest against the importation of South African coal in solidarity with the South African miners. The march will be assembling at 11.30am at Guneff Corner, (beside the Jolly Sailor pub), Guneff, Scunthorpe. We will march past the Trent coal import wharves to a rally at 12.45pm, opposite the Flixborough wharf. I would be grateful if you could publicise this protest and any of your readers or supporters who can attend this important action would be very welcome.

Revolutionary greetings,
Dave Douglass.
Hatfield Main NUM

Last vote?

The Tory Party since it has been in power, has used law and order, and the police, as a counterrevolutionary force against the working class having any kind of progress. The Conservative Manifesto of 1983, and its "resolute approach" has brought us nearer to dictatorship and fascist rule. Britain has been sold out to America's world domination.

My advice is to vote Labour in the next general election. My advice to Labour; start changing to real socialism. Sack all the Tories in high positions in the TV and radio, replace them with real socialists. Above all, get rid of all US nuclear weapons and bases; this includes British nuclear weapons, because it is doubtful that you will get another chance.

Yours
Tom Hopkins
(retired miner)
Caerphilly

Punchy Trotskyism

We want to inform you that members and supporters of the Bolshevik Tendency were physically assaulted by Spartacist League goons at a SL public form on September 19, 1986, at University College, Berkeley. Four of our supporters were thrown to the floor and viciously beaten and kicked by SL thugs.

We have documented, in a protest letter to the Political Bureau of the SL, several other cases of international Spartacist tendency provocations against its former supporters.

The Spartacist League has been hurt by our criticisms of its bureaucratic practices and political revisionism. The SL today is an organisation in trouble. Its leadership desperately needs new recruits to replenish its shrinking dues base.

Gerald Smith
for the Bolshevik Tendency
Oakland, USA

Note: Letters have been shortened due to lack of space. For political security we have changed names and addresses, and certain details.

PHONE
01-431 3135

WRITE TO:
The Editor
BCM Box 928
LONDON
WC1N 3XX



Hungary: a US plot?

HUNGARY 1956

THE October 1956 uprising in Hungary profoundly influenced the development of the world communist movement. Coming in the wake of the CPSU's 20th Congress and its revelations about Stalin it opened a new chapter in our history which is full of contradictions which have not yet been resolved. Naturally the bourgeoisie still uses the events in 1956 to the maximum as part of its campaign to show that capitalism is superior and more democratic than socialism.

There can be no doubt that in the short term the world communist movement suffered a trauma in the wake of October 1956. In Britain it led to a rightward shift in the Party as a whole and a massive haemorrhaging of membership, particularly intellectuals.

Nonetheless, historically, these events helped to open the eyes of communists to the reality of living socialism and greatly weakened the hold of 'official optimism' over their minds. In this light the events in Hungary thirty years ago objectively acted to the benefit of Leninism and thus to the detriment of the bourgeoisie.

What happened in Hungary? Despite the *Morning Star's* emphasis on "lynchings and book burnings" (October 25 1986) one thing is clear. A large section of the Hungarian people revolted against the Communist Party leadership and were only quelled after bitter fighting with Soviet armed forces.

This is the essence of the matter. Of course Radio Free Europe and local reactionaries like Cardinal Mindszenty and Arrow-Cross fascists exploited the situation to the full. But this, nor the sacking of the Party's HQ and the killing of communists, cannot hide the fact that it was the working class in Czepele and Dunapentele, proletarian areas of Budapest, and industrial cities like Miskolc — often

under the leadership of disaffected communists — which constituted the main centres of the uprising.

Why?

Why did the uprising take place? In the final analysis the answer to this question lies in the continued domination of the world economy by imperialism, the way socialism was established in Hungary and how it was forced to evolve in the Soviet Union.

In regard to the evolution of socialism in the Soviet Union, we must remember Marx and Engels envisaged socialism would be established on the basis of the most advanced productive forces. In practice, as we know, it was established in backward Russia — a country estimated to have had in 1913 the productive level of Cromwellian England.

Should the Bolsheviks have declared that it was therefore impossible to build socialism in Russia? Those, who completely fail to understand what is decisive in Marxism, namely its revolutionary dialectics, like Frank Furedi and Tony Cliff (the leading theoreticians of the RCP and SWP respectively) certainly imply as much.

Lenin, thank goodness, suffered from no such failing. He openly declared that, yes, the objective and cultural premises for socialism had not sufficiently developed, but a working class led revolution had taken place and by relying on the world revolution coming to their rescue and the energy of the masses these objective and cultural premises could be created. No genuine revolutionary party could turn its back to such a perspective.

The Bolsheviks therefore rejected textbook 'Marxism' and built socialism in Russia and in doing so made an immeasurable contribution to humanity.

However, as R. Yürükoğlu points

out in his *Socialism Will Win*, the socialism that was established in the Soviet Union, as in every example of practice, embraced two distinct characteristics. Firstly, he says the universal characteristics which must appear wherever socialism is established and fully reflect theory. And secondly, the temporary characteristics rooted in the specifics of the development of Soviet society itself. The characteristics need not be found in any other socialism for they are determined by the realities of that particular society alone.

Comrade R. Yürükoğlu rightly says all the characteristics rooted in the specifics of Soviet society "boiled down to something which Lenin strove to rectify till the end of his life: the lagging behind of the democratic aspect of democratic centralism." (p.27) One manifestation of this is the widespread bureaucracy against which Lenin fought. Another is the single party system which Lenin never regarded as a principle. A further manifestation is the restrictions gradually imposed on discussion in society and in the Party, especially under Stalin.

None of these characteristics derived from the theory of socialism. They are characteristics of building socialism in an isolated backward country.

To return to Hungary, it is clear that the revolution was carried out from above. The old state machine was destroyed by the victories of the Red Army not the insurgent working class under the leadership of their Communist Party. Because of subjective mistakes, not least a completely uncritical attitude towards socialism in the Soviet Union, the door was opened to a situation where the model of socialism applied by 'Hungary's Stalin', Matyas Rakosi, did not reflect Hungary's national traditions or needs.

In fact the Rakosi leadership

imposed many of the Soviet Union's worst bureaucratic deformations. Between 1949 and 1953 thousands of honest communists were charged on crudely manufactured evidence of being "Trotsky, Tito fascists". Amongst them were Janos Kadar, who was imprisoned, and Laszlo Rajk, the popular 'hard line' communist head of the national police force, who was executed.

Again basing himself on the Soviet model Rakosi attempted to industrialise the country not only through expropriating the surplus from a forceably collectivised agricultural sector but by squeezing working class living standards. Thus while between 1949 and 1952 national income rose by 50%, real wages actually went down by 16%.

Finally a Soviet style one party system was created through the one-sided merger with the Social Democratic Party in 1948 and the use of the so-called 'salami' tactic on those making up the People's Front. This meant all legal parties were reduced to adjuncts or transmission belts of the Communist Party (after 1948 called the Hungarian Working People's Party and after 1956 the Hungarian Socialist Worker's Party). This was of course all justified with reference to Soviet practice and a cliché-ridden 'Marxism' which is still 'official' today.

Explosion

Such an approach produced the raw materials for an explosion. Mass student demonstrations on October 23 1956 set in motion an insurrectionary vortex which drew in people from virtually all sectors of Hungarian society.

Rakosi went to be replaced by Imre Nagy. He quickly degenerated from a 'liberalising' communist into a renegade who opened up the government to reactionary elements like Zoltan Tildy, an advocate of capitalist restoration. Nagy's government attempted to quench the masses' thirst for democracy by promoting nationalism and westernism — a process capped on November 2 1956 when it announced the withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact and the country's neutrality.

Under such an opportunist leadership it was hardly surprising that the Party and institutions of the socialist state disintegrated. Such was the bankruptcy of the 'artificially' transplanted model of socialism that the only way to save the situation for socialism in Hungary was a presidential decree sacking Nagy and his government, the reorganisation of the Party and a call by the new government, led by Kadar, for Soviet intervention. This

heavy handed and bloody solution cost the name of communism in Hungary and the world at large dear. Nonetheless it was clearly a failure not of genuine Marxism-Leninism but centrist 'official' communism.

Unfortunately conditions in Hungary had not produced a Leninist communist cadre which could lead the working class, organised in workers' councils, in battle to consolidate socialism under the banner of Marxism-Leninism and socialist democracy.

Without this conscious element the legitimate grievances of the masses and their spontaneous rebellion, was despite their subjective intentions, doomed to drift Kronstadt-like in a counterrevolutionary direction. Those, like the Trotskyites, who think this is not the case have to dismiss the threat imperialism constantly poses to socialism and the lessons taught by Lenin in his *What is to be Done?* about the necessity of the working class being led by a vanguard party.

What of today? Truth forces us to say the democratic aspect of world socialism still lags behind what is demanded by the objective conditions in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union itself. Leninists can only but be heartened to hear similar statements from Gorbachev himself. Yet we know necessity demands far more sweeping measures than have so far been proposed by Party leaders in the Gorbachev school.

There is no room for complacency. Every decade socialism has existed in Eastern Europe we have seen large sections of the working class rebel against their Communist Party. Today in 'stable' Hungary consent of the masses has been brought with Japanese, French, American and Federal German consumer goods and a relatively tolerant political regime. This 'westernism' has gone hand in hand with allowing small scale private capitalism to thrive and integrating trade into the imperialist dominated world economy. Has Kadar's experience of combining the Soviet political model with 'market socialism' an Achilles heel?

We think it has. Because of the slide of world capitalism into a new general crisis this has severely affected peripheral countries like Hungary. In order to remain competitive in the world market real wages have, as in the early 1950s, had to fall and unemployment, not seen since the 1940s, threatens to return. Surely both ominous signs for Hungary's much vaunted political stability. So no communist should say another October 1956 is impossible.

David Sherriff

Double our money

Thanks to Thatcher selling-off the TSB her well-heeled friends in the shires instantly doubled their money as soon as their shares hit the stock exchange floor. We can't rely on Thatcher doing us similar favours. We rely on the sacrifices of hard pressed workers to finance our work. And many of our supporters are at the sharp end of Thatcher's offensive against the working class, its living standards and rights. Because of this we never find ourselves awash with money. In fact being serious communists we always push our finances to breaking point. Carrying out serious communist work always necessitates beginning with what is needed, not what we can afford. Today the situation demands the organisation of the unemployed — we have launched the Unemployed Workers Charter. Today the situation demands workers' sanctions against apartheid — we are in the forefront of the fight for this. Today the working class requires a reformed Communist Party — we are steadily recruiting workers to it directly through *The Leninist* as well as through our other activities. Today with £291.65 in so far to our £600 monthly fighting fund necessity demands you double our money quickly.



CCG R

ON SEPTEMBER 1 the Communist Campaign Group launched its quarterly *Communist Campaign Review*. Originally planned as a monthly to start as long ago as last April, the scaling down to quarterly is a testimony to the weakness of the CCG and the failure of its leaders to gain the allegiance of the bulk of oppositionists in the CPGB.

Proclaiming its aim of a "marriage between Marxism and the labour movement" (Engels), the editors, Ron Bellamy and Ray Colvin, claim allegiance to "the principles of Marxism-Leninism", without which "a Communist Party is communist in name only." They attack the "Revisionist clique around *Marxism Today*" which has "lost faith in the working class" and "denied the significance of class struggle," and they invite contributions to the "fightback against Eurocommunism."

Ominously, the editors include an article by that well known communist, Tony Benn, and threaten to "make known new developments in Marxist analysis in every sphere". Not surprisingly therefore far from thrashing out theoretical problems in order to reforge the CPGB on the rock of Marxist-Leninist truth, what the *Review* dishes up is the tired old reformism of the *British Road to Socialism* and the Alternative Economic Strategy — the rotten opportunist politics which itself gave birth to Eurocommunist liquidationism.

The editorial is written around photos of Marx and Lenin, torn in two — intended to illustrate the revisionism of the Euros, but more appropriate to the CCG itself.

Lenin's pamphlet *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism* is mentioned, pointing to the "two trends" which have split the British working class movement for over a century, and correctly identifying the "reformist trend," but failing to identify its opposite. Unable to formulate the words *revolutionary trend* the editors defend the "class standpoint of the principled socialist left". This sorry phrase lumps together all those who talk of class struggle (but not revolution) for the purpose of achieving "the aim of socialism" in the nicest possible way, through a post-imperialist phase of better capitalism (the AES), to be

inaugurated by a Labour government through parliament.

For Lenin, imperialism is the highest and last phase of capitalism, the Labour Party is a "bourgeois workers party" which serves to retain the working class under bourgeois hegemony, and parliament is a part of the bourgeois state which must be smashed in revolution by organs of workers struggle which then become organs of workers' state power.

The so-called "principled socialist left", especially the Campaign Group of Labour MPs, whom Bellamy and Colvin single out for special praise, are in fact left reformists. They belong to the reformist trend, not the revolutionary trend.

In discussing the "advance to socialism" neither the revolution nor the question of a revolutionary situation are so much as mentioned simply because the AES and the *BRS* are opportunist fairy tales about boom-time "transition to socialism" without a revolutionary situation and without revolutionary struggle. Obviously this reformist *BRS* strategy does not require a revolutionary party, and it has speeded up the CPGB's organisational decay and shrinkage, and Eurocommunist dominance of the EC. In fact the CCG cannot defeat Eurocommunism because its *BRS* politics continue to give birth to it.

RUSSIAN PARABLE

The CCG leaders consider themselves fortunate indeed to be able to wheel out their own veteran "Bolshevik" to tell us what's what. Eighty-eight year old Andrew Rothstein, son of Russian political emigrants, founder member of the CPGB, Press Officer for the Russian Trade Delegation (1921-24), chief correspondent for TASS News Agency in London (1924-26 and 1932-34) etc, etc, is presented as a trump card.

Rothstein rightly says we are witnessing the "weakening of the whole party" by its own leadership, brought about by "organised revisionism, Eurocommunism" which, through *Marxism Today*, has for years been peddling "a

hostile attitude to the Socialist countries" and has "gradually abandoned all the fundamental ideas of Marxism-Leninism." But there follows a list of fundamentals which includes no mention of such concepts as revolution, the necessity of smashing the bourgeois state (including parliament), the necessity of the dictatorship of the proletariat (the touchstone of Marxism, according to Lenin), nor the indispensable vanguard role of a revolutionary Communist Party.

Rothstein quotes Lenin (p.7) "...without freedom of discussion and criticism the proletariat does not recognise unity in action". The CCG leaders are, of course, aggrieved at their exclusion from the columns of *Marxism Today*, which has long since been the Euro's factional rag, but what do they themselves understand by "freedom of discussion and criticism"? The editorial invites "contributions to the fightback against Eurocommunism". The National Committee of the CCG recently pointed to "an urgent need for the widest possible dialogue ... between Communists and all on the left ... aiming at reestablishing a united Communist Party ... based on Marxism-Leninism" (Ray Colvin, CCG National Organiser, *Morning Star* September 24, 1986). But do they mean it?

"An urgent need" for dialogue means the CCG can wait from summer 1985 until autumn 1986 before launching its so-called discussion journal. "All on the left" means respectable left reformists in the Labour and trade union bureaucracy, and does not even extend to other tendencies in the CPGB, least of all the so-called ultra-left *The Leninist*. If you want to write a piece on how to reforge the CPGB by ditching the reformist *BRS* and AES, and returning to the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, don't be surprised if the *Communist Campaign Review* editors decide it is not "constructive".

PEACEFUL IMPERIALISM

Tom Durkin's contribution on the International Year of Peace correctly assesses the purpose of the US Star Wars plan as "to attain military superiority with the aim of dictating their terms to the countries of working class power and socialism", and to "force the Soviet Union ... to divert enormous resources from other areas of industrial and social expenditure ... creating social discontent and the destabilisation of the socialist system" and ultimately "to eliminate socialism from the world".

Durkin links war to class society, pointing out that wars are fought "mainly for the acquisition of wealth and territory by dominant, minority, ruling classes". The first and second world wars are correctly ascribed to the antagonism between imperialist powers "in their struggles for raw materials, markets and plunder".

However, instead of drawing the lesson that the elimination of capitalism (through the completion of the world revolution in the most advanced and powerful centres of imperialism) is the only way to safeguard world peace, Durkin teaches that "social change" depends on persuading imperialism to change its spots and behave peacefully.

In typical centrist fashion, his foray into theory, quoting Marx, Engels and Lenin, is for decorative purposes only, and is confounded by a poisonous mix of pacifism, anti-American chauvinism and anti-Tory Labourite rhetoric.

The export of capital and the consequent weakening of "British industries" is treated as a bad Tory policy, even after quoting Lenin to establish it as a feature of imperialism since last century. Durkin ignores his own theory in order to pretend Labour is not imperialist.

"The right wing leaders of the Labour

Government in 1945 collaborated with the US imperialists ..." and "Once again a Labour Government sided with imperialism" — pretending that imperialism is not British, but foreign, and if we must acknowledge British imperialism, then it is Tory and not Labour. "The US and its principle ally, the Tory government ..." — But was not every post World War II Labour government also the principle ally of the US? "Tory Britain, too, is a front runner" (as an arms exporter) ... "The colossal expenditure of the Tory Government..." Such self deception! Not only did every previous Labour government excel in both military expenditure and arms exports, but Durkin himself, in this very same article, whines that the Labour Party's plan for its next period in office "evades the vital issue of military expenditure which drains the economy".

The problem for comrade Durkin is that unless British imperialism ceases to be warlike and expansionist and ceases to export capital (both essential features of imperialism) then the resources cannot be found for the utopian AES, that Kautskyste plan for improved imperialism which is supposed to open the gateway to socialism.

Unfortunately, imperialism is not just a bad policy. Its warlike nature cannot be overcome by the election of an enlightened government, even if backed by "mass extra-parliamentary working class action to keep it on course", but only when the working class smashes imperialism by socialist revolution in the advanced capitalist countries, to complete the world proletarian revolution begun by the Bolsheviks.

BOURGEOIS 'MARXISM'

Ron Bellamy, having promised to "make known new developments in Marxist analysis in every sphere" kicks off his article on *Modern Revisionism* with a few paragraphs on ... "Marxism feminism"!

As *The Leninist* has repeatedly argued, Marxism and feminism simply do not mix. "For Leninists, the word "feminism" is not synonymous with women's freedom, but is a reactionary, divisive ideology. Feminism has everything in common with other sectionalist ideologies such as Black Power and Zionism. It will never liberate women because, although it is a reaction to chauvinism, it itself becomes a type of inverted chauvinism, isolating women from the working class movement." (*The Leninist*, No.4, August 1983).

We think comrade Bellamy would be better employed rediscovering the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism before he makes bold to tell us about "new developments".

Some five years ago another of the present day CCG leaders, Mary Davis, wrote in *World Marxist Review* about the "idealistic, bourgeois nature of feminism" and attacked "socialist feminism" in particular. Now, in the same *CCG Review* in which Bellamy creatively indicates "the scientific objectivity which must distinguish a Marxist feminism" comrade Davis writes on *Women and the Class Struggle* referring to "feminism" or "feminists" at least a dozen times, never in order to accommodate it into Marxism like Bellamy, but always to counter it.

She writes of "Eurocommunist feminists" and "the classless feminist approach", but retreats from her position of five years ago by failing to openly attack either socialist feminism, or even feminism in general, this time.

"Eurocommunist feminists" are wrong, not because they are feminist, but because they are Eurocommunist, and favour the "new politics of the oppressed". Similarly the "classless feminist approach" is mistaken, not because it is feminist, but because it is a classless approach which "fits very nicely into the logic of ... classless reformism".

REVISIONISM

Whether Mary intended these worst possible interpretations of her words is not really important. Bourgeois ideology flows freely through the holes in the colander of centrist "analysis", despite the best of intentions.

In any case, in dealing with the "so called 'feminist critique' used by those who wish to jettison the AES" she becomes explicit in criticising only some feminists, instead of feminism as such. "... some feminists ... have consistently attacked the concept of free collective bargaining" and "some feminists have mistakenly identified working class men as the enemy."

To show just how reactionary feminism can get, comrade Davis points to Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst and their "encouragement of women's participation in the 1914-18 war effort as well as doing all they could to oppose Bolshevism".

The real benefit of Marxist-Leninist analysis, however rather than showing some errors which some feminists happen to make, is to demonstrate that feminism, as a form of bourgeois ideology, necessarily gives rise to anti-working class ideas and practice.

"Socialist feminism", or Bellamy's "Marxist feminism", must be understood as the bourgeois ideology of feminism dressed up in socialist or Marxist form. Clara Zetkin, a founder member of the German Communist Party and a renowned Comintern leader, warned against "socialist outcroppings in the bourgeois women's movement, which turn up only so long as the bourgeois women feel themselves to be oppressed."

In Tsarist Russia, the Mensheviks argued for cooperation between working class women and the feminists, while the Bolsheviks stood for working class political and ideological independence from the bourgeoisie. This meant building a working class women's movement free from "feminism — the attempt of bourgeois women to stand together and pit their common strength against the enemy, against men." (*The Social Foundations of the Woman Question* by Alexandra Kollontai, the only woman member of the Bolshevik Central Committee in 1917).

If comrade Davis is increasingly slipping into fighting the symptoms instead of the disease of feminism — a most ineffective method, of course — this is merely a reflection of her acceptance of the reformist BRS and AES, which do the same thing in relation to capitalism, attacking its effects, like the war drive, mass unemployment, poverty, racism, women's oppression, curtailment of democracy and so on, but fudging the questions of revolution and the state, without which capitalism cannot be ended. The question of the state has always been the Achilles heel of British reformism, and still is.

Despite having a few stabs at "reformism", Mary only mentions its opposite "revolution" once, and that in the kind of jibe customary from the lips of Eurocommunists and other rightwingers who have "given up socialism". She speaks of "ultra-leftist nonsense about solving everything after the revolution".

What does she mean? This caricature of revolutionaries as people who don't fight for immediate gains in the day to day class struggle serves as an attack on the very idea of revolution, not on any so called ultra-leftism. And this is especially so in a journal which aims to rally the non-revolutionary (i.e. reformist) "principled socialist left" trade union bureaucrats against "right wing reformism" (editorial).

How does comrade Davis herself see the way forward? She attacks the new economic strategy and its feminist incomes policy as "attempting to apply a palliative to capitalism rather than cure the malady." So we must end capitalism! Good! Now for revolutionary strategy!

The end of capitalism is to be achieved by "placing demands which, whilst they can be partially met under capitalism, put such brakes on its power that it finds it increasingly difficult to carry on in the old way and that our strength will determine the new way."

So, you see, it will be possible to fight for demands which will gradually weaken the capitalist class and strengthen the working class until eventually, by the accumulation of reforms, capitalism will have become socialism — not through silly old "ultra leftist" revolution, but good old British "principled socialist left" reformism!

What you don't need for this "strategy", of course, is a Communist Party. The *Morning Star* can voice the aspirations of the principled socialist left reformists very well on its own, thank you.

WORKING CLASS TEACHERS

Another interesting difference between the authors in this first *CC Review* is over the definition of the working class. Mary Davis quite correctly lets slip that the vast majority of women are part of the working class "since most of us have been, at some time or another, forced to sell our labour power".

Max Adereth, on the other hand, is given extensive space for an article on *The Role of the Working Class Today* specifically rejecting "a broad definition of the working class which includes all those who sell their labour power in order to earn a living" — in other words, are forced by circumstance to sell their labour power. No room for doubt here, Mary: he means your definition!

Is this another of the "new developments in Marxist analysis" which you promised us, comrade Bellamy? Have you no regard for the feelings of the patient activists of the CCG who have scraped together their pennies and pounds over the months so that the liberating truth of Marxist-Leninist ideas could (eventually) be unleashed into the labour movement through your journal, only to find sophisticated confusion pouring from the pages, just like *Marxism Today*?

Max Adereth defines the working class as "those who create the wealth of modern society and whose labour produces surplus value for the capitalists." Instead of giving several examples of whom his "narrow" working class includes or excludes, he rather stupidly restricts himself to one only, and that the only one he is actually concerned about. Teachers working for a local authority, we are told, are not working class because "one cannot say that his" (sic) "work contributes to the production of surplus value."

Why did Max choose teachers for his example? Was it because this helps to clarify the meaning of his definition, and acts as a guide to classifying other sections as working class or not working class? It doesn't, does it? No, it is nothing more than the age old opportunist cowardice of ideological capitulation! Max is only concerned to accommodate the reactionary snobbery of many teachers who do not wish to be regarded as working class. Max, telling working class snobs that they are not middle class is a normal part of everyday life for real communists.

Why not consider a few other local authority employees? How about school dinner ladies, town hall typists or NHS nurses? What surplus value is directly created for capitalists by council dustmen or park gardeners? Do any of these fit comrade Adereth's definition of the working class? But since they are not hankering for permission to be excused from the class, comrade Adereth is not called upon to release them.

REVISIONISM

After his poor start with "Marxist feminism",

Ron Bellamy continues his analysis of "Modern Revisionism" by indulging in a curious game of Aunt Sallies, telling us all about the faults of "Left Revisionism" and "Right Revisionism" without a single quotation from either camp, and never actually telling us whom he means. This, of course, makes it impossible to check whether his shots are accurate. Nevertheless, his exposition serves quite adequately to expose his own revisionist views, particularly on the vital questions of the state and revolution.

"Revolution is a process of development marked by sharp qualitative turns" and embracing "quantitative evolutionary" periods, says Bellamy. This description corresponds better to the process of development of human society as a whole than it does to revolution, which is after all nothing if it is not a sharp qualitative turn resulting from the accumulation of quantitative changes during a relatively stable evolutionary period. Any discussion about the process of revolution is only legitimate after revolution itself is recognised as a sharp turning point, otherwise it is bound to slide down the gradualist slope to reformism, as comrade Bellamy in fact does. When Bellamy ridicules unnamed "Left Revisionists" for allegedly believing in a "single revolutionary moment", what he in fact ridicules, like comrade Davis, is the concept of revolution itself.

Besides reducing the smashing of the bourgeois state to a mere change of personnel, Ron sows utter confusion by mixing up government and state. (How on earth did you choose this editor, CCG comrades, for your "theoretical" journal?)

According to Bellamy, when a "progressive government" of "principled socialist left" reformists is elected, that is a "revolution". But it must be sure not to move too fast in making "progressive" changes or changes in the leading personnel of the state machine, and then only if the measures taken are backed by mass movements, otherwise it will be faced with "counterrevolution" by the capitalist state machine, which was never destroyed or replaced and never even had its top personnel changed in the "revolution".

Perhaps CCGers will resent this portrayal of the confused ideas of their editor, but they should realise that this is the sort of nonsense which logically follows once you set out to end capitalism using as your main weapon parliament, itself a part of the bourgeois state machine.

Working class rule will not be achieved by gradual improvements in the bourgeois state, its democratisation or changing its personnel. What really happens is that the working class organs of struggle, developed in the course of sharpening class struggle, become alternative organs of state power in a revolutionary situation, and the class struggle then reaches its sharpest point, revolution itself, in the life and death struggle between the old bourgeois state machine and the new working class state machine.

Bellamy's revisionist view of the bourgeois state, especially parliament, as a weapon for the working class to use against the capitalist class, is reinforced in comrade John Bray's article on *The Labour Movement and the AES*. He criticises the "realigned left" for having "dodged the issue of state power and its use on behalf of the people".

Unfortunately, we must draw the reader's attention to the fact that he is talking about capitalist and not workers' state power. This is clarified when he reaffirms that the implementation of the AES will take place within capitalism: "While we should not create any illusions that permanent full employment can be achieved under capitalism," (good point, John) "there are nonetheless great possibilities in the fight to implement the sort of AES we advocate" (ie within capitalism) "the balance of

power can be shifted to enable us to take a sizeable step on the road to socialism." Once again we are offered a "road to socialism", but instead of sniping at the concept of revolution, like Bellamy and Davis, comrade Bray merely omits it!

"OUR ISKRA"

With the contradictions that riddle the CCG's *Review* in mind CCG supporters would do well to ponder the nature and role of the *Morning Star* and whether their tireless efforts (well, a few of them, perhaps) to maintain it will be reciprocated in support for their aim of "winning back" the Communist Party as a Marxist-Leninist Party.

The CCG is currently undertaking its second 'great' campaign, this time on peace. The first, in case you did not notice, was in defence of the reformist AES, around guru Photis Lysandrou's pamphlet *Which Way for Labour? Peace, we are told, is a much more important issue, in fact the most important, and the CCG will mount an even bigger campaign(!) around its forthcoming pamphlet on peace than it did around WWFL?*

However, when the CCG rallied in London's Conway Hall on October 7, to launch its magnificent peace campaign, the *Morning Star* did not even bother to report it!

This is certainly not because the editor, Tony Chater, does not care about peace. It is probably his favourite issue. What he does not care about is the CCG. Having put two fingers up to the Party and declared UDI, throwing the *Morning Star* onto the mercy of the trade union bureaucracy for financial maintenance, CCGers are indeed foolish to believe Chater will ever again subordinate his paper to the control of the Communist Party, let alone to a NCP Mark II.

Ken Gill, one of the CCGers' greatest heroes because of his top bureaucrat status in the TUC, and chair of the PPS management committee, is known to be anxious to distance the *Star* from the CCG, and is noticeable by his absence from its rallies. So is Mick Costello, the *Star*'s industrial correspondent, one-time industrial organiser of the CPGB.

Signs of conflict in the CCG/*Morning Star* camp, usually kept well hidden from view, surfaced in the *Star* letters column on October 6, when Roy Myers attacked Mick Costello's overoptimistic assessment of this year's TUC, in contrast to that of Lysandrou, for whom "negative aspects ... were of greater concern."

Costello had praised the "fighting mood" of Congress as "the best guarantor for the future", overlooking the fact (heinous crime, indeed!) that "the AES" (Lysandrou's hobby horse, and a foundation stone of the crumbling CCG) "was never referred to at the TUC".

Photis, having foolishly staked his personal reputation on the AES in a lunge for captaincy of the sinking CCG ship, must be quite hurt when not just Costello, but through him the *Morning Star* itself, which Photis thought was the CCG's own paper, absent-mindedly forgot about the AES. But then it is easily forgotten, isn't it, Photis? The sooner the better, in our view!

But Photis needs the AES, comrades. Having voted against the BRS in 1977, and having watched capitalism get into difficulties which made the BRS blueprint so unrealistic that the very Euros who drafted it now want to ditch it, Photis (and the CCG) now makes his stand on the marshy ground of the BRS, to provide an (imaginary) crisis-free post-imperialist capitalism which can be democratised into socialism. Imperialism doesn't need an AES, and nor does the working class. Only Photis and his fading CCG British Roaders need it to pad out their illusions as they go marching on to vote for Kinnock.

Ian Farrell



In his memoir of the miners' Great Strike, *The Enemies Within*, Ian MacGregor not surprisingly praises union leaders like John Boyd who, at his suggestion, became a director of British Steel. "There were a number of trade union leaders" he says "with whom I could communicate and talk frankly". These included Gavin Laird, Alan Tuffin and Frank Chapple. MacGregor also lets slip that even Ray Buckton, the leader of Aslef and member of Straight Left's Advisory Panel, was at the same party as him in New York. This says everything about the social nature of the trade union bureaucracy and the political nature of those so-called 'hard line' CPGB members who align themselves with it.

Was Nicholas Daniloff a spy and not the innocent pawn Reagan claimed? The Los Angeles Times noted that his old US embassy contact in Moscow was expelled from the Soviet Union for spying in 1985. It also pointed out that the US had gone to "unusual" lengths to prevent Daniloff's case going to trial because of fears he would have been shown to have been guilty of espionage. Adding fuel to the fire is his claim that possession of secret maps of Soviet army concentrations in Afghanistan was part of a legitimate journalists effort for his paper — it has not published them.

The British press is keeping rather quiet about developments in the case of the South Korean KAL 007 Boeing 747 shot down over Soviet territory in 1983. Then it used the families of the 269 people killed to up the tempo of anti-Sovietism. Claims that the plane was being cynically used by the US to spy on very sensitive military installations were frenziedly howled down. Now a group of bereaved relatives have written an appeal in the International Herald Tribune demanding to know why the US airforce destroyed vital radar tapes of the incident. Why indeed?

Iranian woman arrested for 'improper veiling' are now only being released on condition their families pay 50,000 rials (\$640) to the authorities. In fact, the regime's parliament is soon to turn its liberated attention to a plan which will set up "labour camps for badly-veiled women" where all expenses will be met by their husbands or families. Remember the days when leading Straight Leftists used to assure us that Ayatollah Khomeini was in fact a 'socialist'?

TEACHERS

TEACHERS are showing no enthusiasm for the government's 'final' package, let alone the deal agreed during this summer's negotiations in Coventry between the Labour Party dominated local government employers and the majority of the teaching unions. In essence the Coventry deal, like government's package, offers teachers money in return for conditions. So not surprisingly after accepting the Coventry deal the leadership of the National Union of Teachers finds areas like Devon, Hinkley, Torridge and Bury, areas not noted for their leftism, voting against the deal.

It is such rank and file pressure which has forced the NUT Executive to concede demands for a Special Salaries Conference and then a national ballot (likely to be completed in early December).

Even the UDM-like 'moderate' National Union of Schoolmaster/Union of Women Teachers has rejected the deal and staged a highly publicised series of half day strikes in order to win a higher cash offer. Of course the NAS/UWT is pursuing a right wing sectional strategy.

It represents in the main 'professional' teachers, teachers with an eye on becoming department heads and the like. It has no desire to speak for teachers as a whole let alone fight for them.

After breaking the teacher's united front in the first place and forcing the NUT into the negotiations which ended in the Coventry deal, it is trying to embarrass its arch rival. Having lost members to the NUT because of its early willingness to sell conditions for pay it now hopes to make up some of its lost ground by securing a bigger pay differential for better paid teachers.

The NUT has attacked the NAS/UWT action as "premature", its leadership prefers to rely on the 'final' negotiations over November 9-10. At these talks it will attempt to get a little more on pay as a sweetener to keep its members from defecting and quell the rebellion stirring in the ranks.

Nonetheless with many of its members taking unofficial action by still refusing to cover for absent colleagues, the NAS/UWT spanner in the works, and the fact that the employers have made it clear the government might not provide extra finance to cover what is already on the table, the NUT leadership finds itself in a tight corner.

It looks like it will attempt to get out of this simply by refusing to offer anything in the way of a lead. Then in the ensuing confusion, with, it hopes, a marginally improved offer on pay, it will try to swing a majority of the delegates at the forthcoming special conference, and finally at the right moment bluntly ask the rank and file to vote on a take it or leave it offer.

Maining Coventry

If this happens the leadership will have betrayed its own members. The Coventry deal, even with a few improvements, can only but pave the way for longer hours and more work for classroom teachers. Of course, in return for selling conditions, there is no guarantee real pay levels will be maintained in the future. And conditions are, as any trade unionist will tell you, far harder to change for the better than pay. No wonder there is so much discontent with what is on offer.

Like the NAS/UWT, the leaders of the Educational Institute of Scotland, boast that they would not accept a Coventry-type deal. Yet the Main Report, covering teachers in Scotland, is in many ways even worse.



Rank and file rebel

CLASSROOM CLASS STRUGGLE

Scottish teachers are being offered a 16.5% rise, lasting until April 1988. Although this is a slightly larger rise than that on offer south of the border, it still leaves teachers poorer in real terms than in 1974. (To get back to the real pay levels of that year would require a 30% increase). In fact despite the EIS threatening strike action against the governments package it was modelled on Main — which the EIS leadership accepted.

In return for only slightly better pay the EIS is prepared to sell more conditions than the NUT. To facilitate this, to engender fatalism amongst the rank and file, the president of the EIS mystically declares the Main offer "not acceptable but not rejectable".

We say teachers in England, Wales and Scotland should vote against selling conditions at their respective conferences. They should organise militant joint union rank and file bodies which can, unlike the NUT, NAS/UWT and EIS misleaders, fight for action to win back at least 1974 pay levels. They should also fight tooth and nail against government proposals to introduce legislation tying conditions and wages to binding contracts.

Left lessons

The left's response to the leadership's misleadership has been disgraceful. Some leading CPGB activists in the NUT argued for negotiations along the lines of the Coventry deal. Now as the membership expresses its dislike of the deal these worshippers of 'broad alliances' find themselves deservedly isolated.

In London June Fisher, an NUT Executive member, faces growing calls for her to resign after her own branch overwhelmingly voted against the Coventry deal. Another example of the wages of realignment is Jim Ferguson. He is also an NUT Executive member, but he has tried

to give the Coventry sellout a left face. Yet despite this the result was the same: his own branch (Liverpool) voted against Coventry.

While in some areas Leninist CPGB members have taken a lead in calling for rejection and unofficial action, in most areas opportunists in our Party still dominate, and have done their best to block any criticism of the Executive being placed in front of the membership.

Far from this un-communist behaviour being confined to the 'soggy' supporters of *Marxism Today* and communists who say they are trade unionists first and communists second, all opportunist factions have proved themselves cowardly and tailist.

The *Morning Star*, after showering praise on the NUT Executive for ages, decided to go silent in October, not doubt an 11th hour effort to salvage some vestige of left credibility. So much for class politics and the *Morning Star* being different from the Eurocommunists.

As to the Straight Leftists, despite having a number of teachers at the top of their factional pyramid, their 'broad labour movement' paper has (at least up to the time these lines were written) avoided getting its hands dirty over Main and Coventry. Unfortunately, this abdication of even pretending to offer leadership has only encouraged most Straight Leftist teachers to noisily and enthusiastically back the NUT Executive.

Ultra phobia

Centrist sects like the New Communist Party and the ex-Maoist Communist Party of Britain (ML) have, believe it or not, proved even more craven in their support of the union bureaucracy.

The ex-Maoists, having given up being revolutionary long ago, have become national chauvinists instead: "Save Britain from Thatcher" they patriotically

whimper. And they tell teachers this can best be done by voting for the deal with the pro-British, anti-Thatcher, Labour Party led, local authority employers.

Martin Brown, writing in the NCP's paper the *New Worker* thinks along similar lines but wanted to go even further down the road of opportunism.

In true centrist fashion he therefore tried to sell Coventry because it "is in the best interests of the education service, teachers, working class parents and above all, children" (sic). Another argument from this NCP hack in favour of Coventry is that the "ultra-left" oppose it! Naturally with such stupid logic the NCP lines up with Kinnock's purge of *Militant* and as a principle wants to see the liquidation of its own organisation into the mire of Labourism.

As to the so called 'ultra-left', feared by the Trotophobic NCP, it is not particularly 'ultra' nor 'left'. The Socialist Teachers Alliance (supported by the Socialist League) has tried to become the good old fashioned, and therefore conservative, broad left of the NUT.

This has meant being a dead weight when it comes to real resistance to the sellout leadership. For instance the Local Association Pay Action Conference in late September saw a proposal by Leicester NUT to organise national unofficial action on October 30 narrowly defeated by STA and SWP votes.

Despite this the LAPAC agreed to launch a number of worthwhile actions. Tragically such initiatives have been hamstrung by the STA's desire for Labour Party respectability and plagued with SWP "technical hiccups" and "down turn" blues.

Clearly teachers, like the rest of the working class, are in need of real communist leadership.

Tony Coughlin

POLEMIC

Laboured pacifism

Ben Lowe, *Peace Through Non-Alignment: The Case for British Withdrawal from Nato*, Verso Press, pp.47, £1.50.

THE CENTRAL argument of this pamphlet appears to be that there is a lack of coherence between the Labour Party's professed unilateralist policy and its commitment to further membership of Nato.

The discrepancy is apparently explained by the desire of some in Labour's ranks to uphold Britain's vestigial imperialist role in the world, by "the ambition to maintain a 'Great Power' posture" (p.12) now that the day of Britain's imperial splendour has passed away.

Paradoxically therefore, Lowe argues, this silly, outmoded desire on the part of some has led to Britain adopting a "degree of servility to the United States which is quite remarkable..." (*Ibid*). In a word, therefore, the pamphlet is nonsense and if its arguments were not the dominant consensus on the British Labour left and even amongst those who have the audacity to dub their views as Marxist, it would hardly be worth reviewing at all.

At one point Lowe actually quotes from the prestigious US magazine *Business Week*, but seems incapable of understanding the implications of what he has just faithfully copied out:

"...the US deliberately constructed out of the ruins of the war an international monetary order based on the dollar... With its nuclear umbrella and armed forces, the US stood ready to guarantee this open economic system against threats from the Soviet Union on the outside and enemies that might close off certain markets and needed resources such as oil on the inside. As both banker and cop, the US was the guarantor of the postwar global economy." (cited on p.5)

Lowe interprets this as a "self appointed role" as if it were a matter of the US policy makers simply deciding it might be 'nice' to play at Big Daddy for the next four decades. Imperialism, US or otherwise, unfortunately does not operate quite like that, Mr. Lowe ...

In fact, the US post-World War II new order represented the temporary resolution of the contradiction between the imperialist 'haves' and the imperialist 'have-nots' which characterised capitalist world politics throughout the 20th century.

In World War I the more dynamic capital of Germany had tried to smash stodgy old Britain's domination of the world market, a dominance won through the fact of simply being the first to industrialise and the first to become imperialist. It failed, but under the aggressively revisionist regime of Hitler, it made another bid to establish a world order that reflected more 'fairly' the dynamism of the various national capitalisms, ie. it attempted to smash in particular Britain's exclusivist imperialist hold over large parts of the world and open these areas to the exploitation of its more dynamic capital.

Again it failed, but at the end of the war, with the economies of Western Europe either shattered or

heavily in hock to the US, the more equitable redistribution that Germany had sort by force of arms was carried out by the all-powerful US.

The US became a sort of super-imperialist power in the post-war world and the second rank imperialisms of Britain, France and now Federal Germany, were happy to play the role of junior partners as there was plenty of gravy for everybody to dip their bread into. Such a restructuring of the world capitalist political order was not the result of subjective policy decisions on the part of German imperialism, or the US administration: it was the consequence of the uneven development of capitalism and in turn the revisionist and warlike tendencies of imperialism itself as a system.

So there you have a potted military/economic history of this century, so far. British imperialism did not fade away like a frail and tired old Chelsea pensioner, but instead was content to operate under the hegemony of the United States, which could guarantee the imperialist world order and ensure everybody got a slice of imperialist plunder.

The problems start to arise, of course, with the onset of recession and the drift towards a new general crisis. Then the contradictions between the various imperialist powers become ever sharper and more antagonistic.

Lowe half sees the way the crisis has split the united front of imperialism both externally in the form of inner-Nato conflicts and internally in the sphere of each nation's domestic political front:

"A short time ago, there was a flurry of articles in the press about moves to strengthen Western Europe's position in Nato in relation to the United States. The Western European Union — a moribund defence alliance — was rejuvenated; European arms cooperation became more extensive; an agenda was set for European high-tech cooperation through the French-inspired Eureka programme; and the EEC was to start taking on greater responsibilities for foreign and domestic policy ... While Star Wars has revealed official America to be more dominant in Nato than before, and also more manic and unaccountable, the European establishment is increasingly riven with divisions that run through countries and parties as well as between nation states." (p18)

Lowe notes that the Labour Party has been a staunch supporter of Nato from the very beginning of that anti-Soviet counterrevolutionary alliance; yet he is unable to offer a reason as to why that relationship is now being questioned and why European politics is becoming split precisely along the lines of the attitude to be adopted to that organisation.

With the onset of the economic crisis, inter-imperialist rivalries have emerged between the those making up the Nato 'team'. Consequently power blocs, or at least the delineation of the aggressive power blocs of the future, begin to take shape and bourgeois political life in general becomes more schismatic and fraught. The imperialist countries are in other words lining up for war.

Lowe and his co-thinkers in the Campaign Group of Labour MPs, or even the Communist Campaign Group, down play Britain's imperialist role in the world today for the sake of cheap anti-American rhetoric.

They thus, consciously or not, fall in behind that wing of establishment opinion in Britain that wishes to down play the link with the US and to aggressively prepare to defend Britain's own imperialist interests.

Chris Hunter



Enver Hoxha: a battling Albanian

Enver Hoxha, *The Artful Albanian: the memoirs of Enver Hoxha*, (edited and introduction by Jon Halliday), Chatto and Windus, London 1986, pp.394, £5.95.

THERE are sincere centrists who having seen first Stalin and then Mao reduced from the status of demi-god to devil turned to Enver Hoxha and his Albania as a haven of their 'ideological orthodoxy'.

Although for most centrists little Albania is a poor substitute for the mighty Soviet Union, or even China with its thousand million population, the Enverist ideology is undoubtedly leftist and revolutionary compared with the usual centrist fare. That is what makes Enverism attractive to the left centrist. Nonetheless it is thoroughly idealist.

It not only holds the view that Albania is the only socialist state in the world but the sects it finances are the world communist movement. Using the same method Enverism makes Albania's xenophobic isolation and crippling lack of integration into the world economy a virtue.

Naturally this can only be done with reference to the works of Enver Hoxha, not Marx, Engels, Lenin and scientific truth.

This view of the world necessitates selective blindness and self deception, not least a refusal to admit Albania's extreme economic backwardness compared with the advanced capitalist countries, its lack of state and party democracy and its distrust of things foreign.

Soviet authors used to brand the leadership of the communist movement in Albania as Maoist. This is clearly untrue. Enverism was a product of the centrist origins of communism in Albania and that country's national struggle, although it was taken up by many communists, in countries like Turkey, after the collapse of mainstream Maoist groups into the arms of reaction.

In Albania, obtaining socialism was comparatively easy. The Italian and then German occupation swept aside the old order and the Soviet Army's historic victories in 1944 and 1945 left the field wide open for communists in Yugoslavia and Albania well before Soviet troops arrived. Nonetheless, actually constructing socialism has been done in the most unfavourable conditions. And it must be said these difficulties have in many ways been made greater by the politics Hoxha wanted or has been forced to pursue.

Socialism has been described as beginning as monopoly capitalism with the dictatorship of the proletariat. Yet Albania had a very backward capitalist sector in a sea of peasant agriculture all under the brutal dictatorship of a feudal monarch. So it is hardly surprising socialism in that country and direct working class rule is more formal

than genuine. Socialism in Albania therefore shows all the birth marks of the backward social conditions from which it emerged. This was unavoidable but what was not was its portrayal as a socialist paradise approaching the threshold of communism.

In this selection from Hoxha's six volumes of memoirs, described by Halliday as a "flood of memory, suspicion, invective and self-righteousness", we are given Hoxha's utopian account of socialist Albania and at the same time a gritty description of its struggle for independence. In fact, to retain the independence won so heroically against Italian and German imperialism, tiny Albania has been forced into conflict with larger socialist countries, first Yugoslavia, then the USSR and finally China.

Hoxha's determination to fend off big nation chauvinism was commendable: but it cost Albania dear. In terms of its economic development and internal liberties Albania is still far from being an advanced socialist country.

Unfortunately Hoxha refused to admit Albania's backwardness or the fact that the survival of socialism in his country was only possible in the context of the world military balance between socialism led by the Soviet Union and imperialism led by the USA. He even glorified its isolation proclaiming it either as a result of a deliberate plan to prevent Albania becoming indebted and victim to the fluctuations of the world economy or alternatively as a result of its defence of the Marxism-Leninism personified by JV Stalin.

Given that Stalin was hardly immune from big nation chauvinism, this peculiar defence of Stalin and his centrism can only be explained by deliberate refusal to look at certain truths about his attitude towards small nations. It was also no doubt due to Albania not being on the receiving end of the Soviet leadership's big power bullying until Khrushchev and the fact that the communist movement in Albania was born centrist and thus regarded Stalin's ideology as 'Marxism-Leninism'.

Despite containing almost no reference to the lives of ordinary Albanians, Hoxha's memoirs paint a fascinating picture of the relationships between the socialist states and their leaders. Although seen through a distorting centrist prism, Hoxha provides valuable insights for all who dare look beyond the diplomatic communique and turgid official history.

Hoxha describes the debauched and self indulgent lifestyles of many general secretaries and government functionaries in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He recalls conversations with the likes of Mao and Tito, their boasting, their double dealing and contempt for a small nation like Albania. Against these 'friends' turned 'revisionists' Hoxha finds it natural to contrast Stalin as an example of straightforwardness and kindness.

Of course, although Hoxha declares himself Stalin's humble disciple, gives himself only the purest of motives and the highest of principles, there can be no doubt that he was a wily operator and not averse to use the most brutal methods to crush internal dissent. The list of his former comrades suddenly found to have been agents for the CIA, MI5 and KGB after decades of having worked with Hoxha is as chilling as the charges were unbelievable. Nonetheless the memoirs of this now departed 'artful Albanian' are certainly remarkable and honest, at least when compared with the dull, ghosted, lying, diplomatic tones we have come to expect from leaders of socialist countries.

Mary Goodwin

BOOKS

İşçinin Sesi Publications English Series

TURKEY — WEAK LINK OF IMPERIALISM

R. Yürükoğlu
Paperback — 178 pages.
Price:£2.50

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

R. Yürükoğlu
Paperback — 68 pages.
Price:£1.00

PARTY DISCIPLINE

Cemil Silahtar
Paperback — 64 pages.
Price:£1.00

OPEN LETTER

Veli Dursun
Paperback — 95 pages.
Price:£1.00

THE THIRD PROGRAMME AND OUR TASKS

R. Yürükoğlu
Paperback — 95 pages.
Price:£1.50

CONFERENCE OF THE LENINISTS

OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY

Paperback — 62 pages.
Price:£1.00

SOCIALISM WILL WIN

R. Yürükoğlu

40 pages. Price:£1.00

SECOND CONFERENCE OF THE LENINISTS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY

Paperback — 116 pages.
Price:£1.50

THE 12TH SEPTEMBER FASCIST COUP

Paperback — 30 pages.
Price:£1.00

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE FUTURE

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 64 pages.
Price:£1.50

REFLECTIONS ON THE CANCELLED CONFERENCE

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 39 pages.
Price:£1.00

SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 39 pages.
Price:£1.00

LIVING SOCIALISM

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 169 pages.
Price:£2.00

THE REVOLUTION IN AFGHANISTAN

Emine Engin

Paperback — 174 pages.
Price:£2.00

THE SITUATION AND OUR TASKS

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 95 pages.
Price:£1.50

DISCUSSIONS IN THE CPT 1981-1982—DOCUMENTS

H. Erdal

Paperback — 90 pages.
Price:£1.00

THE DISINTEGRATION OF FASCISM

R. Yürükoğlu

Paperback — 153 pages.
Price:£2.50

COMMUNIST PARTY OF TURKEY — WORKER'S VOICE, PROGRAMME AND RULES

Paperback — 107 pages.
Price:£1.50

Orderst to: Books BCM Box 928

London WC1N 3XX

Add 20% for post and packing.

Make cheque or PO payable to

November Publications.

MSC Sheffield

At the Manpower Services Commission headquarters in Sheffield, all South African contacts have been blocked, preventing three planned official visits. We spoke to John Houghton, branch secretary of the CPSA and he impressed upon us the spontaneous nature of the protest: It's best to describe it as an 'unprompted reaction' from our members. Members were unhappy about being asked to receive a South African visitor. The group of workers concerned actually refused to have any dealings with South African visitors.

After that, there was a proposal from the management to bring in another South African — a black — yet another group of workers rejected such cooperation. Finally, a proposed visit by the equivalent of the MSC in South Africa nearly happened when a third group of workers protested and the whole thing had to be called off.

It's the natural reaction of people to being asked to deal with the South African regime. I find it very rewarding as a branch secretary that members are willing to take such measures without being prompted by the union. It's been something they've done off their own backs.

We were trying to get publicity for this incident at the time and people like the *Morning Star* didn't want to know. They didn't think it was worth any copy. We were disappointed with the *Star's* response.

British Library

The British Library's Document Centre in Boston Spar might seem an unlikely place to find workers' sanctions being implemented, but when we spoke to Chris Radford, Treasurer of the Civil and Public Services Association branch in the Lending Division, he informed us otherwise. In fact, Chris reports that the motion to black all South African requests to the library was won through the general meeting this year with something like 3 to 1 majority. So what was the response of the management, we asked Chris:

Management have played it fairly coolly. They actually had the issue on the agenda of one of their management meetings down in London. We had reports of what went on at that meeting. On the one hand, some were saying that it was going to be a matter of conscience and the Library wouldn't make a fuss about it; but our local management have had a slightly heavier response, although even then they've been quite keen to keep it all very quiet.

The initiative came from people in the branch rather than the national AAM, but we did organise a meeting with the local rep of the Leeds AAM preceding the general meeting. We haven't had any links with the AAM trade union organiser as far as I'm aware.

Our action is a fairly tokenistic one. Few books would go out every week to South Africa anyway but people feel they are doing something. I think that you are right to point out that all these localised actions — and there are a lot of them — need far more coordination and organisation.

Civil Service

Charles Cochrane, assistant secretary of the Council of Civil Service Unions, is the man who so far has orchestrated much of the anti-apartheid action that civil servants

like the Boston Spar British Library workers and Sheffield MSC members interviewed on this page have been taking. We asked him if he was surprised about the flurry of activity from this section of workers:

On one level I have not been surprised by the level of activity of members. I believe that there is a much greater knowledge of what is going on in South Africa than the media credits the British people with. On another level, I have been surprised and it is gratifying to see that people are prepared to take their own initiatives and get on with it. The MSC action was very much out of the blue. It was an immediate membership response to management provocation.

Once we have all the information about the British government's links with South Africa together, I think then we will be looking at those areas where we as a trade union can do something effective. And effective means where we can get the immediate membership support and where we can support them if they are victimised.

I feel the trade union movement must keep up strong steady continuous pressure on the government. We want to look for areas where we can really put the screws on over a period of time and ensure also that we can back up our members who do that over a period of time. I think there is a big potential if we can do the work properly.

Brent, London.

Stan Keable of Brent Nalgo tells about the successful motion on South Africa he put to the branch's AGM, a key component of which was the call for a protest general strike to force the government to impose sanctions: Brent Nalgo has three and a half thousand members, including many black members, and has a strong anti-racist policy and has been affiliated to the AAM for some years. With the branch AGM coming up I asked the branch executive meeting in September to back a motion to go to the AGM calling for effective solidarity action with the South African workers in their struggle to smash apartheid.

The executive accepted the idea of a conference on workers' sanctions and an SWP amendment (which I agreed with), for adopting detainees. But then they accepted another SWP amendment to delete the protest general strike call. So I moved a general strike motion myself at the AGM. There were about 500 members present and it was voted through overwhelmingly and will now go to Nalgo conference in June 1987, where I am a delegate.

It seems the members did not have the same qualms as the left stewards and branch officers. No one spoke against the motion in the AGM itself. Yet in the Executive Committee the SWP had ridiculed it as unrealistic: 'Why not call for a revolution' and 'I didn't know you had joined the WRP', all those type of inane comments were being thrown about.

But other arguments were put to me privately. Some said that the next Labour government will impose sanctions, others that the general strike call persuades people not to bother with other activities such as the consumer boycott or demonstrations. But I think this is hogwash!

The key thing is to develop workers' sanctions to hit South African links directly and to build up pressure like the Hands Off Russia Campaign in 1920 for protest general strike action which can

*While the TUC
limits its 'solidarity'
with the black masses
in South Africa
to the production of
a soft sell film
urging a consumer
boycott,
and advising
big business
that apartheid is
a 'bad risk',
workers around
the country
continue
to take action
of their own.*



"Clearly Mrs Thatcher is not interested in imposing sanctions, but they can be imposed by mass popular action." (O.R. Tambo, November 1985)

ORGANISE FOR A WORKERS BLOCKADE

involve all sections of workers.

We must build up pressure for general strike action and the way to do that is partly by motions going to the TUC, but also by actual workers' sanctions being implemented in the here and now.

Workers' sanctions could lead to victimisation, like the Dunnes strikers. To avoid this we must make sure the bosses are too scared to victimise anyone in the first place. The Dunnes strikers have been left too long with only donations, rhetoric and smiles: its time we followed their splendid example and brought workers in Britain out on strike for the cause they have done so much for.

Dublin Dunnes Store.

The Dunnes Store strikers are still out and need more support as winter draws in. Not only are they having to put up with the hardships of being on strike, but one of their number has recently suffered the type of harassment that all Irish republicans are subjected to when they enter Britain — detention and questioning under the notorious PTA. Brendan Barron was coming over from Dublin to speak to AAM meetings in Birmingham, Derby and the Midlands when he was held at Birmingham airport under the PTA. When we phoned the Irish Distributive and Administrative Trade Union, Brendan's union in Dublin, a spokesman there said that Brendan was amused rather than intimidated by the whole episode:

They confiscated his speech: it must have been very revolutionary stuff. They also took a little booklet that

was printed by the Irish AAM about the Dunnes Store strike. They displayed a great interest in a number of batteries that Brendan had in his case — he's almost completely deaf, this lad, and he has a hearing aid that requires batteries. But they were very interested in the batteries and what they were for, etc.

They released him after a while and the last thing they said to him when they let him go was 'It's a free country, you can go now! I don't think Brendan said anything in reply...

Messages of solidarity and donations to the Dunnes strikers should be sent to Dunnes Store Strike Fund, c/o IDATU, 9 Cavendish Row, Dublin 1.

Simon Sapper, AAM

Simon Sapper is the Trade Union Organiser of the Anti-Apartheid Movement. When we spoke to him, he hadn't yet heard about the victory for the protest general strike motion at the Brent Nalgo AGM, and when told about it, Simon was not too enthusiastic about this type of approach:

I would say the TUC telling its affiliates to organise industrial action is inappropriate and unworkable in the current industrial relations climate.

What has to happen is for a greater degree of understanding to spread within affiliated unions, and for groups of workers at the branch level to be encouraged by their regional and national structures, including the TUC, to explore all the possibilities for breaking the

connections that Britain has with apartheid.

I'm talking about good educational material, the inclusion of anti-apartheid workshops in trade union schools and also the promotion of anti-apartheid events and speaking tours, particularly by ANC, SWAPO and Sactu speakers. In our experience there is no substitute for talking to someone who has come directly from the 'front line' of the struggle.

With that approach you don't antagonise trade union officials who are obviously concerned about various pieces of Tory legislation, which is understandable.

We don't want our activity to be counter-productive. It would be wrong of us to dictate to union branches what they should do. But I would agree with you entirely that the rhetoric of leaders can become a substitute for activity, although that is in no way meant as a criticism of people like Ron Todd whose sincerity is absolutely undoubted as far as myself and the movement are concerned.

There is clearly the need for better coordination and the development of an approach whereby the solidarity action with those involved in disputes can be spread.

We have liaised with many trade unions with regard to both the development and implementation of their policies. For example, there is the work we have done with the GMB with their disinvestment campaign.

Such disinvestment action could be just as effective in isolating South Africa as the more 'spectacular' and 'flashy' types of industrial action.