Strike by pitmen spreads
Ford faces indefinite strike
Seamen stay out at Dover

Striking ferry crews ready to defy injunction

First strike by nurses at Barts

Thorn-EMI to issue £45,000 writs against shop stewards who backed health action

Ford walk-outs

Hospitals in South London look set to be hit by a series of strikes — with more disruption on the way.

Ford faces new strike threat
Land Rover workers start all-out strike

THE BRITISH DISEASE IS BACK — See Back Page
Throughout the country, Labour councils are implementing government cuts; sacking hundreds of workers, closing nurseries, cutting housing meetings, and all the other things that Thatcher's policies demand. Camden's council has gone one better than the rest of Thatcher's Labour lackeys, and started repatriating Irish and Bangledeshi homes. Workers' Machinia calls this an 'organised racism'.

What does SW advocate as the best way of dealing with the organised racism of Camden council? How is the vanguard party organising the fight back?

Tony Dykes is the leader of the council. SW supporters recently went to a Labour Party meeting in Kings Cross. "Once inside, a number of members of Kings Cross SW started talking and arguing with a number of Labour lefts about the need to challenge Tony Dykes on this position." (SK 12.87). Trying to get the left to challenge the racist leaders of Camden council is only part of the SWP's strategy for working class defence. The SWP supported a "viable lobby" of the Labour group meeting on 16 Nov 87. They have also organised a petition calling on Labour to reverse their position.

What a load of bullsh!*

Stanford Hill squatters have a different way of dealing with the Labour scum. The council is trying to evict them. The first thing they did when they heard about it was burn a few barricades and make it clear they wouldn't go quietly. Then they invaded a council meeting and "lobbied" the councillors, one of whom needed medical attention afterwards.

Deaf to Democracy

Lambeth engineers fought more flexible working introduced as part of the council's cuts strategy by going on strike, picketing the depot, turning back petrol lorries and trying to picket out the town hall workers. There have been loads more struggles in Lambeth and in Labour and Tory councils up and down the country. These have been regular, sustained, mass meetings, and strikes to stop councils sacking militants in libraries and mentally handicapped homes. Extending this struggle means breaking with any illusions in Labour. It also means breaking from the unions. Socialist Workers' one-day strike was organised on the day the council was due to vote for cuts. There was a picket outside the Town Hall. NALGO shop stewards were there trying to make the picket ineffective. Militants on the picket line succeeded in stopping some councillors from getting in the town hall. NALGO hacks asked for union cards. Then they said their position as picket organ-

Punch-up in the town hall

A COUNCILLOR was recently punched in the face by a group of squatters during a meeting of the Oxford Town Hall last night.

A group of around 150 squatters kicked off by Socialist Worker members after a speech by police fire officers tried to take the best available seats.

WE'VE GOT NOOSE FOR LABOUR

The next day, the engineers went on strike against a lockout. Militant council workers argued with all council workers to join the strike, since the cuts affect everyone. A leaflet was produced appealing for breaking down union divisions and going for a united strike. They called for links with hospital workers who were just beginning their fight against governments' cuts and low pay. What they failed to do in this leaflet was state loud and clear that the unions are against this unification every step of the way. NUPE officials did everything they could to persuade their members to cross the engineers' picket lines. Union hacks will do everything to make pickets ineffective. Delay strikes while a ballet is organised, hold back militant minorities on the grounds they're undemocratic; every trick in the book to hold back working class struggle. Revolutionaries and militants have to clearly point this out.

Some Fraternal Criticism....

LETTER FROM THE CCI

This is part of a letter from the Internationalist Communist Group criticising our article on the Labour Party in Midday 10, followed by our reply. The CCI can be contacted by writing as follows, WITHOUT WRITING THE NAME OF THE GROUP B.P. 34, BRUXELLES 31, 1060 BRUXELLES, BELGIUM.

The whole "perspective" of the article "Support the Labour Party..." does not define the Labour Party as an integral and necessary part of the capitalist State; on the contrary it rather reflects the point of view of someone who's trying to show, through concrete examples, that after all the Labour Party is not what most people think it was! The article remains locked up in the crudest of the ideas, "the conscious-ness", trying to convince those who might still have illusions in the Labour Party, how wrong they are! This should never be our starting point. Our starting point is not what such or such proletariat is thinking, nor what the different individuals or parties in bourgeois society say about themselves.

From our point of view, the Labour Party and social democracy in general does not cheat or betray the proletariat; its very existence - expressed through its programme - from the outset, in a pure negation of class. The Labour Party claims and defends the development of capitalist society, the reinforcement of the State (and if necessary, we can give the reader such or such example to prove this assertion! but this example would not replace the argument), the sacred defence of the Pound and the Union Jack! Well, what other practical evidence do we need?? After generations and generations of proletarians have paid with their blood and with the blood of their children..."
The Terrible Lessons That History Has Taught Us (On the Nature of Social-Democracy, on the Real Meaning of Civilization - Misery, War, ...) What Other Arguments Do We Need?

To know "the real Labour Party" we don't have to know it reacted to a speaker who tried to defend gays at a Labour Party meeting! The whole historical experience of our class testifies to the full bourgeois nature that determines British Labourism to - not only not to defend workers (site) or gays - but to exploit and oppress our class! And to call what they do "defend gay Labour Party Meetings"! The general impression one finally gets from reading the article (and in spite of such assertions as "the Labour Party will have to be destroyed to save the workers") is that the Labour Party is just an obstacle for the working class to achieve its goals (cfr. "it is debatable whether Labour is of any use to the ruling class. It is certainly of no use to the working class."). The article does not clearly define the Labour Party as an enemy of the proletariat. This is due to the fact that the arguments that are put forward in the article derive mainly from immediate reality and experience, and not from the general worldwide determinations of bourgeois society and class struggle.

South Africa

From the recent press coverage of events in South Africa the casual observer might be forgiven for thinking that even the liberal media had been taken over by Pretoria. News stories have, more or less, just repeated the official S. African government line on what has been going on. Almost all manifestations of class struggle in the townships has been described as political faction fighting. A recent article in the Independent-about the KIC squatter camp near Crompton, Cape Town, typical of the "South African governments devastating success in subdued the anti-apartheid resistance by the simple tactic of keeping its most competent and popular leaders locked up under the State of Emergency laws. Deprived of the organisers who in the past were most successful in achieving black unity, radical groups across the country are - perhaps unsurprisingly - displaying increasing signs of anarchy."

The press may whinge about how difficult journalists' jobs are becoming because of the State of Emergency but there is none of the "Fearless" investigative reporting that journalists become capable of when it suits the interests of the bourgeoisie. It should be remembered that S. Africa is to a lot less dangerous for foreign journalists than, say, El Salvador or the Lebanon. The war that is likely to happen to them is that they get run out of the country.

The reason for both taking this line is quite simple. The level of class struggle in S. Africa remains high by international standards despite the successes of the State and rightwing black vigilantes in ending the school boycotts, undermining the rent strikes, crushing resistance on the streets and locking up militants. At the same time the possibility of major liberal reforms on the part of the State, an option supported by the ruling class almost everywhere as a means of heading off the class struggle, is becoming less and less likely. The recent by-elections won by the conservative right Conservative Party are just one indication of how narrow the State's margin for manoeuvre is, given its continuing almost total reliance on white voters.

Last year saw more working days "lost" through strikes than any previous year. Almost all sectors of industry were involved. High points included:

- A national strike in OK Bakers at the beginning of the year which lasted ten weeks, the longest ever in the retail trade in SA.
- A 12-week rail strike involving 16-20,000 workers which ended on June 5 after the South African Transport Services had lost over R50m in earnings and damage to property.
- The under one in June turned into a strike involving a national strike involving 16-20,000 workers.

Wildcat's Reply

Thank you for your letter. We can read very briefly by saying that we accept most of your criticisms. The Labour Party article was derived from an earlier pamphlet produced by the old Manchester Wildcat. This basically argued that trying to use the Labour Party to fight for the working class was a waste of time. Of course, the last issue was an attempt to produce a more "hard hitting" version of the pamphlet. Let's say it was part of our historical baggage.

We still have differences with the CCI about how to approach issues like this. We believe in explaining things so people can understand what we're saying. Phrases like "general worldwide determinations" are just jargon, and we feel that many of your arguments are written in an obscure language which make communist ideas more difficult than they really are, because in reality, they are simply an expression of the needs of the working class. You are going to be convinced by your arguments by reading about "the historical arch which relates primitive communism to full communism."

You say "the example should not replace the argument", but arguments without examples are mere assertions. It's no good stating that social democracy is the negation of the proletariat, we have to show what the Labour Party is doing to fuck the workers over. That is one of the aims of Labour Scan on the previous page.
RETURN OF THE CRISIS

U.S. Trade Balance

1981 1984 1987

Shanghai 48 - Shk 82 - Shk 154

10 - 12

You don't need a yen for economics to see the disorienting state of the world economy. On Black Monday October 19th 1987, Wall Street suffered its greatest ever percentage drop. The crash reverberated around the world in minutes. The next day was even worse. Since then, there has been no recovery. What does it mean for us? The stock market reflects the real world economy. Companies are shown in industrial companies. If the value of a share in a given company plunges from $5 to $2 in a few minutes, this is because stockbrokers think the whole company is worth a lot less than they used to, or whether they suddenly buy or sell less? Because the world economy, on which their profits depend, is heading for a catastrophic recession.

The most obvious reason for this is the US economy. Reagan's economic growth, based on massive investment capital out of the rest of the world and spending it on non-productive sectors of the US economy, and US companies, as speculation is bad enough for the rest of the world. But the failure of this base, and the accompanying fall in Wall Street from the rest of the world, will be disastrous. The US consumer market is about $1 trillion, or almost half the total consumer market of the leading 7 industrial nations. World production is based on this market. When it goes down, world capitalism goes down with it.

In the immediate future, either the dollar falls, and the world's exports to America with it, or US interest rates rise to stabilize the dollar, in which case America will rapidly slide into full-scale recession, decimating the world's exporters with it. In such a no-win situation, it's not surprising that Reagan fiddles as Wall Street burns.

The economic gurus of the Reagan administration argued for massive tax cuts to spur productive investment by corporations. But an insatiable industrial force doesn't have to spend all its cuts on machinery, they spent them in the most profitable areas, not the productive ones. The Economist has reported on a New Orleans conference of private investors who concluded that gold hoarding was safer than equities. The sense of impotence is another sign of the lack of confidence in productive investment. US capacity is approximately $300 billion. p.a. Financial centres speculate this amount every 25 days, starving productive capacity. The accumulation of manufacturing capacity utilization in the USA indicates how much recovery has been weaker than its predecessor, and how depression has been worse.

Ceausescu admits to grim economic woes

By Michael Parenti

Pounded By the Crisis

What makes us confident that this coming recession is going to be the worst since world war II is the sheer scale of the problems used to generate the recovery of 1985-86. The most dramatic indicator of this is US debt. Although government debt was sometimes greater in the 1945-60 period than it is now, measured as a percentage of GDP, this was the result of economic boom. The growth of public debt from 1982-86, during which the US changed from the world's biggest creditor to its no. one debtor, was calculated to generate a boom. The greatest debt in history indicated a boom. The greatest debt in history needed to finance a depression that will last all of four years. A vast chunk of the world's productive resources has been sucked into a parasitic expansion in one country, which has now failed. The 10% of the national income that the Reagan years have been, and dependent on the other countries are on the USA. The news cutting about malnutrition in the USA brings home how Reaganism means to the working class. These statistics are the product of a few years boom.

Why did the governments of the West adopt right wing economic policies in the first place? Because the left wing solutions of the seventies failed, leaving high inflation and world stagnation in their wake. Now the right have failed too. Here are those in the EC who want to go back to the good old days of expansionism, as though printing money could restore capitalism's health. They want to per-

south Japan and Germany to expand their economies, and drag the rest of the world out of the mire. They would involve getting the US to correct its balance of trade problem with German policies, and persuading their populations to take the place of the Americans as import eaters. Ever tried selling manufactured goods to Japan?

It hardly needs pointing out that the remainder of the world's economies are in no fit state to act as locomotives for the world economy. From Bucharest to Buenos Aires, from Chisinau to Chiangmai, the passage of the latest news is of workers openly talking of economic collapse and contemplating default rather than face the proletarian response to austerity measures.

Dog Mattick

What causes capitalisms crises? One explanation can be found in a classic work of Marxist economics, "The Permanent Crisis" by Paul Mattick, a mast mathematician model which reduces all the problems of capitalism to one underlying law, the falling rate of Profit Tendency. It is true this one of the reasons for capital's flight from manufacturing into wasteful speculation is the falling rate of profit, which is caused by the growing disproportion of machinery to labour in in value terms. But it is not the only factor. The falling rate of Profit Tendency, and will not lead to the final collapse of capitalism as Mattick maintains. Only the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism by the working class will abolish it: this depends on subjective will as well as objective factors.

Random Fluctuations

The right wing solutions to the downturn of 82 were not based on monetarism as commonly believed. Contrary to that view, they were based on a massive extension of credit to American capital backed by unprecedented borrowing from the rest of the world. Reagan and his fellow, Mr. Thunberg, in Britain, Germany and Japan have managed to disguise the fragility of their contrived recovery by pointing to the conquest of inflation. Part of this success has been the result of reducing public spending, i.e. attacking living standards. But another reason for it is the same reason that the right wing recovery has stoked the fires of crisis: the decline in productive investment. The sluggish growth of manufacturing has increased the price of materials looking for buyers, making low-prices. But this turn has led to capital moving out of peripheral areas. So far, Goodell, and concentrating investment in geographically and economically viable areas, has been successful. This has left no state untouched as evidenced by the growing armies of hungry Californians and homeless Londoners. Again we emphasize: this has been a boom.

Frank Speaking

Only the most blinkered and arrogant of bourgeois (Mrs. Thatcher) could avoid seeing the coming crisis. How fast will it happen? We can find clues in the OECD Outlook. The OECD now predicts that the weight of the OECD crisis has been surpassed, but it may well have weakened somewhat.

Apocalyptic stuff. But perhaps their caution is justified, and the recession will unfold slowly. The ruling class still has plenty of control over other sectors of the population to write off parts of Latin American debt show. We expect a slow descent, with mini-recovers. But any return to the pre-crash boom would cause the same problems as before, only more so. The fact that the bosses and all their economic advisers can't find policies to stop the crisis surely shows the inherently unstable nature of their system. If it were able to afford its slaves some security, they'd have found out how to do it by now.

The OECD believe that productivity, the real basis of economic growth, is about to rise. They say that more capital input should result in productivity growth, due to technological progress. But they admit that in reality, "...most of decades, productivity growth in most OECD countries has been slowing."
WAR AND PEACE

In the past, we have rather simplistically talked of the crisis driving the countries to war, a view derived from the falling rate of profit analysis referred to earlier. But the argument that the countries go to war to devalue capital, as FNsFers maintain, fails to explain most of the wars this century. The current crisis is actually leading to a relatively peaceful period in international relations. Gorbachev has conceded a missile treaty which allows Star Wars to go ahead, but which has certainly led to East-West detente.

In the Gulf, the fleet of Russian, American, Italian, Belgian, British, Dutch and French warships and minesweepers is part of an attempt to impose imperialist peace on a situation which was getting out of hand. (See the article on the Iran-Iraq war in Wildcat 105.) Every day Iran seems more isolated, and she could be forced to finally give in. The USA no longer needs the war to keep oil prices down - the recession will do. Russia is proposing formal cooperation between itself and the Western navies in the Gulf. The only major conflict between US-backed and Russian fighters in the world is Afghanistan, and the Russians went out. Central America is closer to peace than for years. Reagan has just cut defense spending.

The world’s rulers have enough problems already without preparing for major wars. Barring accidents, the peace process begun by Gorbachev will continue. Imperialist war is not on the immediate agenda.

Millions of homeless and jobless
suffer malnutrition epidemic

US doctors discover starvation on increase

From Christopher Reed
in New Mexico

A group of doctors in the US has produced a shocking report indicating that 20 million children, that is 6 per cent of the total US population, are suffering from malnutrition. The report, which is based on hospital records, has been widely publicized in the US press.

The doctors have estimated that the number of children suffering from malnutrition is increasing, and that the problem is likely to become worse in the future. The report has been widely cited as evidence of the failure of the US government to address the issue of child malnutrition.

In the midst of this crisis, the US government has responded by calling for increased funding for food aid programs. The move has been met with mixed reactions, with some politicians praising the government's efforts and others criticizing it for not doing enough.

Yugoslavia faces economic disaster over foreign debt

US recession inevitable.
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DEMOCRACY

The Constitution is paper, but bullets are steel -
Old Haitian Proverb

Introduction

Wildcat's original Basic Principles contained a commitment to common ownership and democratic control of the means of production, leading to a working class majority. Wildcat's position reflected the origins of our tendency in the social-democratic wing of the counter-revolutionary self-management group Solidarity. Party, as a result of discussion in the Intercom Journal in Britain, partly through contact with the CP, and as a result of involvement in the miners' strike, Wildcat abandoned workers' democracy. The last issue contained articles clearly stating this, which had been written by the members preceding publication. It has to be admitted that most of Wildcat's members had kittens when they realised the implications of what they'd agreed to, and dropped out.

Rejection of all forms of democracy is now a precondition for involvement in this journal. However it's not a simple issue which can be reduced to a two sentence Basic Principle, and discussion on democracy continues. The following was written by a comrade in London, and represents the clearest response so far to what we said in Wildcat 10. There is one contradiction in this article. In one place it says "no relations of force must exist between minorities and the mass of workers". In a footnote, it says that a minority could fight even a mass of workers in a situation where the masses were reactionary, e.g. Northern Ireland. But generally the comrade is right to say it is impossible for a minority to intimidate large nos. of workers in the right direction and win. Even in so-called 'democratic' societies you cannot intimidate people into building communism. For the benefit of our critics, let's make it clear once again: only the conscious activity of many millions of proletarians can create a classless society. 

V

WORKERS' DEMOCRACY AND MINORITY ACTION

1. Limits of Workers' Democracy

1. The notion that workers' councils are by definition revolutionary is clearly false; if workers have reactionary ideas, organised councils will reflect that. For instance the Ulster Workers' Council (1) which co-ordinated the 1974 Protestant workers' strike was formed by 'protesting' with Catholics in Northern Ireland, an action motivated not by a desire to develop organisations with genuine democracy but by a wish to suppress the Catholic majority continue.

2. Workers do not all become revolutionary simultaneously, and indeed in most episodes of the class war there tends to be a division (at least initially) between a militant minority and a more passive majority (2). If a revolution is to succeed such divisions need to be broken down, but in the meantime it's no use pretending they don't exist. Obviously in such situations workers' democracy, as a reflection of the ideas of a passive majority, would act as a dampener on the class struggle, and the minority would be quite correct to maintain its separate existence and to resist attempts to restrict its activity. For instance, if in the miners' strike a majority of miners had indicated that they opposed pit squids and violence against the police, it would have been right to argue that the militants should carry on regardless in their attempts to increase the effectiveness of the strike.

3. In a revolutionary situation there are many ways in which a minority might advance the cause of communism by such actions as initiating the free distribution of goods or the socialisation of housing (e.g. homeless people taking over houses from Finchley manor). The argument that such actions amount to 'substitutionism' (i.e. that such minority substituting themselves for the class) is based on the assumption that the working class either moves as a whole or not at all. Such a view completely ignores the reality of class struggle - the miners who went on strike in 1984 did not all spontaneously walk out at one and the same time. It was a small minority of miners, those at Cornwood colliery, who took the initiative without waiting for a ballot, after which the strike spread nationally. A minority can only be said to be acting in a substitutionist manner when it believes that it is sufficient in itself, independent of the action of others alone, it can bring about revolutionary change.

4. The revolutionary minority cannot be identified with any single political organisation or with any single category of workers fighting for the destruction of capitalism at any one time may be organised in a variety of ways - political groups, mass assemblies, strike committees, etc. For many such workers the question is not whether or not they constitute a majority hardly arises, they just get on with what needs to be done: "The workers themselves decide, not because such power is given to them in accepted rules, but because they actually decide by their actions." (Pannekoek, in Workers' Councils).

5. At the same time as the revolutionary minority does not seek approval for its actions by ballots or other democratic procedures, it also constantly works to expand its base and do away with the separation between minority and majority. We seek to persuade other workers to participate both by the force of its arguments and the argument of its actions: "It may happen that a group cannot convince other groups by arguments, but then by its action and example it carries them away." (Pannekoek, ibid.)

II. Limits of Minority Action

"All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interests of the immense majority." Marx and Engels, Communist Manifesto

1. The revolutionary critique of democracy must clearly distinguish itself from the Leninist view. Lenin held that a minority, organised in a particular way, might seize state power for itself 'on behalf' of the proletariat. (For example, in On Compromises he states: "Our Party, like any political party, is striving after political domination for itself."). His views were shared by the Italian Communist Left ("the rule of the class can only be by the party") - Bordiga, Party and Class Action - and are now articles of faith for a whole host of latter-day leftists.

2. A seizure of state power could be carried out without the active support of the majority of the working class: Trotsky estimated that only 30-50,000 people took part in the October 1917 insurrection. However unlike previous revolutions (which have just involved the transfer of state power from one group to another), the communist revolution cannot be carried out by a small minority, no matter how far-sighted, wielding the state machine. Communism cannot be implemented by decree, it is a social revolution which must transform social relations at all levels. That is why the emancipation of the working class can only be the task of the workers themselves.

3. It is not only the question of the practical tasks to be accomplished - the democratic revolution that requires the mass involvement of the majority, but is only through mass struggle that the consciousness of the necessity of these tasks, of the need for communism, arises: "Both for the production on a mass scale of this communist consciousness, and for the success of the cause itself, the alteration of men on a mass scale is necessary, an alteration which can only take place in a practical movement, in a revolution; this revolution is necessary, therefore, not only because the ruling class cannot be overthrown in any other way, but also because the class overthrowing it can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew." Marx, German Ideology.

4. Forms of organisation alone do not guarantee a revolutionary content; nevertheless some forms of organisation have more revolutionary potential than others. For instance if a group of strikers, under the control of their dispute from the unions and run things from regular mass assemblies this can be a significant and positive step in itself, both as a practical critique of unionism and in so far as it allows the collective action and confrontation of ideas from which revolutionary consciousness emerges. (Here form and content are not two completely separate categories - the change in form from a bureaucratically run 'stay at home' strike to a mass assembly itself implies a change in the workers' ideas, the content...
of the strike). Of course, when mass meetings make reactionary decisions such as voting to wage, we support the minorities who defy these decisions.

In a revolutionary situation practical questions of organisation will be urgent, and forms of organisation which facilitate mass involvement and the breaking down of hierarchy, specialisation and the separation between leaders and led will be essential. The existence of workers' councils does not by itself guarantee the same as long as workers have reactionary ideas (3), but clearly the dictatorship of the proletariat (4) (aiming at the suppression of commodity production and wage labour) can only be exercised through some system of mass mechanisms and revolutionary workers' councils (5), rather than through the dictatorship of the party. In so far as minorities take action outside this framework it must be on the strict basis—that no relations of force exist between them and the mass of workers (6)—"The communists have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole" Communist Manifesto. There are no short cuts to the mass self-activity of workers without which a genuine social revolution is unthinkable.

Notes

1. Although the UWC probably reflected the ideas of Protestant workers at the time I'm not sure that it was a genuine organ of workers' democracy compared to the WCTU for mass meetings. There are plenty of other examples however—in November 1956 for instance workers' councils demanded parliamentary elections at a time when it was the workers who held real power in Hungary.

2. The terms 'minority' and 'majority' have been used fairly uncritically here because they are of use in describing the relationship between smaller and larger groups of workers in certain times and situations. In many ways though it is impossible to say what constitutes a majority in the real world. Going back to the mines strike again we see that the Cottonwood strikers (the majority of the pit) were a minority of the miners as a whole later when the strike became national striking miners were in the majority but they were still a minority within the class, and so it goes on. In the majority the largest single group, or 51% or two thirds, and more to the point two thirds of what? In other words the very terms 'minority' and 'majority' are themselves part of the discourse of bourgeois formal democracy. What really counts in that if a group of workers large or small can advance the interests of the whole class through a certain action they should get on and do it.

3. The existence of workers' councils does not itself guarantee communism even if workers have revolutionary ideas; the point is to realise these ideas practically by putting them into action.

4. In the aftermath of Stalin and co. the phrase 'dictatorship of the proletariat' conjures up images of secret police, labour camps and state terror. In other words the dictatorship over the proletariat of a new ruling class. I use the phrase to mean the self-organisation of the mass of workers once they have achieved domination over society, to suppress the capitalist class and their attempts at counter revolution and to extend the revolution to all corners of the globe.

5. Obviously not every action in a revolutionary situation will be carried out in such a framework: workers won't need to wait for national and international delegate meetings to vote before starting to kick the bosses out of the factory and to attack police stations with the idea of closing them down. However some aspects of the revolution can't be left to the semi-spontaneous actions of the workers on the spot and will require coordinated planning on an international scale—this particularly applies to the reorganisation of production which will be of vital importance. Communism abolishes the separation between producers and the means of production that is a feature of all capitalist societies—instead a small minority deciding what is to be produced and how such decisions will be taken by the mass of producers themselves. Only an international system of workers' councils composed of representatives from revolutionary mass assemblies can ensure that it is the workers who are actually in complete control of production and distribution at least until the establishment of the world human community with the impossibility of returning to capitalism when questions of production will just be a simple matter of administration.

It needs to be emphasised here though that communism has got nothing to do with self-managed capitalism, with workers taking over firms and running them themselves, say, miners exchanging coal for food produced on a collective farm. Communism abolishes the principle of exchange altogether—things will be produced to directly satisfy human needs, not to be exchanged, bought and sold or bartered.

A minority with control over the means of production, dictating to workers what they should produce and how, would be on the way to forming a de facto ruling class, even if they called themselves communists. Having "correct" ideas doesn't alter the objective reality of social relations and it is quite possible for one-time revolutionaries to end up on the wrong side of the barricades. No doubt there were genuine revolutionaries in the Bolshevik party in 1917 who later took part in the suppression of the Kronstadt uprising in 1921.

6. This is not to say that revolutionary workers, even if in a minority, should never use violence against any workers in any circumstances. Workers (and not just individual scabs but masses of workers) are just as capable of being reactionary as anybody else. If a mob of loyalist workers were rampaging through a Catholic housing estate in Ulster only an idiot would say "no mass of workers in action, they must be right"; our first response would be to fight with whatever weapons were at hand. When in 1960 1800 London dockers and marched in support of Enoch Powell, it would have been quite justifiable to have used violence against them. The question of whether to use force in such a case is a tactical and not a moral one—in this instance violence might not have been effective and might have driven the dockers further into the arms of the racist right. A small minority cannot advance the struggle towards communism by using violence against the class as a whole however—workers cannot be driven into making a revolution like so many cattle.
TUFFIN NEEDS A DUFFIN'

A contribution from comrades in the POST Office.

The past year has seen an unprecedented attack on the conditions of postal workers. The annual pay rise coupled with cuts in overtime and the increased casualisation of the workforce. Having set the management didn't expect was the extent of the lunchtime, wildcat strikes have been breaking out throughout the country especially in London. On average out of every six strikes in the country one is a postal strike.

The Union of Communication Workers (UCW) has attempted to sabotage the struggle at all levels, from General Secretaries down. Branch secretaries, in May workers were told to cross picket lines and handle mail work by 'Marxist' branch secretary Ted Lewis. The only Marxist magistrate in London, (UCW District Organiser for London) told workers at West Central to get back to work - they told him to 'f**k off' as did workers in other offices he tried to dissuade from coming out in solidarity. Examples like this are numerous but we feel that two quotes from General Secretary Alan Tuffin and one from a Grimsby postman sum up the unions' attitude.

"Management attacks to provoke you, you must not react but await instructions from your union."

"The second is from an article in the UCW paper praising the union and moaning about the management being mean... at Christmas!"

"Our branch officials were run ragged at Xmas trying to avert confrontation... the branch officials were more concerned about the Xmas mail than the management."

Whilst this was going on the UCW was going through its usual motions of talking about a shorter working week. Most postal workers work six days, 43 hours week and this issue was brought up by the workers in the summer. The UCW then launched a campaign to get control of the workers mounting a campaign around a three hour reduction which nobody was interested in and back into the official channels. They know that most postal workers don't want to be drawn into another battle of postal strikes. They want their strike won and the management do not want to be left with the responsibility of having a strike on, around Christmas. They also know that a lot of people depended on the extra money from Christmas and recent presents for their kids and next year's holiday.

The strikes continued and the ballot approached. The ballot was won and the union 'held the nation to ransom' to quote the bourgeois press, while in reality they cooperatively tried to avert the strike.

"The strikes..." was the answer. Why the UCW was in the middle of negotiating an 'amicable agreement' to end the strike, the press, MPs, the management, the union and every other f**ker were talking about the tragedy of losing the Christmas mail. The mood on the floor was f**k the Christmas mail. On the 4th December branches in London, South and Southend were ordered out on a 24 hour strike. A couple of hours later Tuffin had made up with the management and was on the TV telling them to go back to work - they didn't. AT 10 pm, SEDO came out, next day everyone at work was talking about it.

The ballot was won by a majority of 55%. The UCW went into negotiation. In the offices we were told nothing by the union, the papers and the Telly said there was going to be a deal, they were dead wrong the days of negotiation were over - the pressure in the phones, the MPs, the management, the union and every other f**ker were talking about the tragedy of losing the Christmas mail. The mood on the floor was f**k the Christmas mail.

The 4th December branches in London, South and Southend were ordered out on a 24 hour strike. A couple of hours later Tuffin had made up with the management and was on the TV telling them to go back to work - they didn't! AT 10 pm, SEDO came out, next day everyone at work was talking about it, Edinburgh, Cardiff, Penzance, London CCS and Luton were out and Tuffin was still saying go back to work. The raging phone of reporting offices going on strike aged 4, 5, 6000, 7000, 8000, 9000.

For those who didn't know what was going on behind the scenes, including virtually all postmen and women, it must have seemed that the union was out of control. However a different picture has since emerged. After walking out of the negotiations, the union decided in the lift to go and see Brian Nicholson, new PD Chairman. At this stage action had already begun. While in Nicholson's office Tuffin locked on the Buckingham window and later reported to the London District Council that "I felt inspired by this, and I decided then that I would not let my members and their families suffer at Christmas.

Although union bosses have to be pragmatic due to the amount of pressure they have to carry on with the action to put pressure on the PD regardless of what he said on TV. There were seven offices out on this 'official wildcat'. Other offices were out over local issues, e.g. Luton, and possibly others just walked out in solidarity though we can't confirm this.

When Tuffin got the deal and the strikers went back to work, postal workers were incensed. At the time nobody knew the full details of the deal, but that didn't matter 12 hours wasn't enough. The UCW branch sec said "I don't want to walk out on the Floor and have half my membership trying to lynch me".

LETTER WORKERS SPEAK

Wildcats (real ones this time) broke out against the union. Brent Cross came out for 24 hours and held a demonstration outside UCW headquarters in Clapham. A brick was thrown through a window of the union premises and the postman said to the press "the union is willing to talk to any numbers about the deal but in a proper disciplined manner, not in the street with three hundred angry people". That night Bristol had 400 out. The day it was Birmingham. At present the union is balloting on the offer and trying to scare people into voting yes by saying if they don't accept the deal there'll be a strike and we'll get stuffed like the miners did.

The day after the union promised that the Christmas mail was safe at least 24 offices were taking unofficial action. As the Guardian reported, "Most office chiefs are meeting union leaders in a fresh attempt to curb the rising number of wildcat strikes which have disrupted postal services in the past year." Postal workers are prepared to fight, the task of the milindists to prevent the struggle from falling into official channels which always lead to defeat. Workers from Brent Cross demonstrating outside the UCW house were still within those official channels. The unions are not a political organisation and they belong to the bosses. There is no point in trying to change the rule book, make it more democratic etc. The rule book must be ripped up! Instead of demonstrating outside and fighting the struggle whichever way the ballot went. Since then strikers in Bristol, Leicester, Edinburgh (in support of health workers), High Wycombe, all over London and various other places in the provinces have shown that postal workers are not defeated.

POST SCRIPT

The offer was accepted in the ballot, after the union let the issue drop for about 2 months, to us it was a disgraceful issue by UCW. We had lost. We are still fighting this struggle whenever way the ballot went. Since then strikers in Bristol, Leicester, Edinburgh (in support of health workers), High Wycombe, all over London and various other places in the provinces have shown that postal workers are not defeated.
CLASS WAR - THE PAPER THAT SUPPORTS OUR BOYS.

Class War is the media's favourite group. Sensationalist articles in the press and on TV have promoted these anarchists' self image as uncompromising extremists dedicated to the destruction of the rich hold dear. In reality, Class War defends all kinds of reactionary ideas. The clearest example was in Class War 25: "My dad fought in the war and I was proud of him. Remember the working class won that war...".

Class War believe that the second world war was fought in defence of the working class by the working class. It's not often today that left wing groups defend such views with the clarity and simplicity of Class War. But during the war itself, left wing groups were among the most active supporters of the war effort, urging the imprisonment of strikers as agents of Hitler. Today the email of this letter of support is organized in Anti Fascist Action, a popular front of left schoolteachers and students, who now organise demos against the remnants of the National Front, etc.

We're all in favour of fighting fascists. But fighting racists means fighting Labour and the Tories as well. Camden's Labour Council are actually implementing the racist policies the NF merely talk about. Unlike Anti Fascist Action, we do not march to the Cenotaph to commemorate the victims of fascism, but not those of British imperialism.

World war two was not won by the working class. It was won by an imperialist war. Britain went to war because Germany threatened her economic interests. During the war Nazi atrocities were matched by Allied ones. The bombing of Germany and Japan was every bit as barbaric as Auschwitz. In February 1945 the British and Americans massacred the population of Dresden in Germany. This town had no economic or military value. However it was largely made of wood so it burnt well. It was packed with refugees fleeing the tender mercies of the Russian Army. So bombing Dresden caused maximum civilian casualties. It was a straightforward act of racist mass murder.

HEROES OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION. No.1: NIKOLAI BUKHARIN

Nikolai Bukharin has just been rehabilitated in the Soviet Union 50 years after his execution by Stalin in the Moscow Trials. He is back in favour because his support for the New Economic Policy, which gave Russian peasants freedom to produce for the market, vaguely resembles the New Right wing economic policies which are taking Russia towards liberal capitalism.

Prior to NEP, Bukharin was the main theoretician of the Bolshevik Left. In 1915-16 he opposed Lenin's support for national liberation movements, arguing that the development of modern imperialism meant that national liberation was a myth. Imperialism was a world system from which no nation could break free. Here Bukharin misses the point: whether or not a nation state can free itself from the imperialist system makes no difference to the irreconcilable antagonism between capital and labour in that country. The Bolsheviks' failure to see this led to the promotion of alliances between classes in the colonies against the common enemy, imperialism. The result was the massacre of workers in the colonies by the Bolsheviks' bourgeois allies.

Bukharin opposed the treaty of Brest-Litovsk of 1918, where the Bolshevik government signed a peace treaty with German imperialism. Practically, he said it would prolong the war, and hold back the revolution in the West. More importantly, he said the Brest-Litovsk Left opposed the deal in principle: revolutionary governments do not sit around a table with the butchers of the working class, trading areas of land and their inhabitants in return for peace. Bukharin's allies among the working class were not the opponents of the treaty in other parties like the Left Social Democrats, but Bukharin stayed within Bolshevik discipline and the democratic decision of the Soviets to ratify the treaty.

The Civil War led to another major error on Bukharin's part. The militarisation of every aspect of economic life, the collapse of the currency, together with the introduction of rationing, led him to describe the economy as "War Communism". It was nothing of the sort. The law of value still operated through the black market, the currency was replaced by barter, and tentative socialist projects in the Ukraine were crushed by the Red Army in the interests of the emerging capitalist state.

The end of the Civil War and the absurdity of War Communism led to Bukharin's dramatic lunch to the right in 1921 when he supported NEP. By this time the Bolshevik Party was unapologetically capitalist, and the debates which took place at the 10th Party Congress, at the same time as the suppression of the Kronstadt uprising, were debates about how to run capitalism.

It made no difference to the working class which Old Bolsheviks presided over their exploitation. We do not mourn Bukharin, but try to learn from his fatal pro-capitalist errors.

Today, the ideology of anti-fascism, the idea that democracy must be defended against fascism, is wearing a bit thin. But during the Falklands war, one argument was that it was a war against the fascist government of Argentina. Class War was thrown out of Anti Fascist Action. But the quote from issue 29 above shows that it defends their ideas. It is no reactionary as any other leftist group.

My dad fought in the war and I was proud of him.

Piles of bodies after the bombing of Dresden.

DON'T HANG AROUND - BUY A SHARE IN WILDCAT!

The issue of ORDINARY SHARES at £10 each. These entitle the shareholder to a DISTRIBUTION FRANCHISE. A bundle of Wildcat journals will be sent for distribution to bookshops, factories and other proletarian concentrations in your locality.

Visit page 5 for our address.
WHY THE THIRD WORLD DOESN’T EXIST

The idea of dividing the world into a 1st and 2nd world on the one hand and a 3rd world on the other has its origins in 19th century ideas of inevitable and rightful "progress". These beliefs reflected both the rapid accumulation of capital in Europe and North America and the need for competing capitals to expand into pre-capitalist areas of the world. This need was crudely justified by the ruling class in the rhetoric of "civilisation vs barbarism". This view was taken at face value by most of the "Socialist" movement. It was generally believed that each part of the world had to become fully capitalist before it was possible to struggle for socialism in that area. This is a nationalist approach.

By the 1960’s and 50’s when capitalism had spread almost everywhere and the colonial system was crumbling, bourgeois ideology had become slightly more sophisticated with the notion of underdevelopment. This category was supported by the emerging national anti-colonial ruling classes as much as by the leading imperialist bourgeoisie. The latter saw it in terms of some countries being unfortunately backward, while the former saw it in terms of unfair terms of trade, dependency etc. They thought that the "advanced" countries were deliberately preventing the 3rd world from "developing". This is wrong: it is the logic of capitalist exchange itself which leads to a widening gap between capitals of different organic composition, not an imperialist conspiracy.

Capital punishment

I’ll briefly explain this point before going on to contrast development ideology with the real world.

The organic composition of a productive unit or commodity is the ratio of dead to living labour in it. In other words, a highly automated production process has a higher organic composition than a less automated one. In order for a capital of lower organic composition to catch up with one of higher composition, it would need to achieve a higher rate of profit. But the rate of profit (which is not the same as the rate of surplus value, the difference between what workers produce and the cost of their maintenance) tends to equalise throughout the different branches of capital. Assuming an identical rate of surplus value, this means that in an exchange between a commodity produced with a high organic composition, c/v, and one with a lower composition, the commodities will not exchange at their values. The one with the higher composition will exchange at more than its value, and the lower will exchange at less than its. Accordingly, there will be a constant drain of value from capitals of low organic composition to those of high. Geoff Kay explains this more lucidly on p108 of Development and Underdevelopment, MacMillan 1975.

This can be summed up more simply. The capitalist state works on "onto him that hath shall be given". It is therefore difficult for a poorer capital to break into the world market unless it uses some drastic method of primitive accumulation to get started, or unless it can become a valuable investment area for foreign capital.

To return to the imperialist and the national bourgeoisie, both categories of vemail clearly identified development with industrial capitalism and the reproduction in the "underdeveloped" countries of the kind of affluence experienced in the "developed" world.

The truth is that development does occur but capitalism develops a proletariat and commodity production, and not necessarily a Western standard of living for the former.

Development ideology is often uncritically reproduced in the attitudes of so-called communists. This could take the form of the crude Eurocentrism of some of the left communists, who take the view that class struggle is only of significance in Europe and America. The rest of the world is known as capitalism's "periphery". Sometimes they assume that there was no significant revolutionary struggle outside the "heartlands" of capital, nor communist tradition. The ICC are a welcome exception: their publication Communist No. 6 contains an article on the revolutionary struggle in Patagonia. I have heard of a revolutionary tradition in Iraq, and it's likely that there's other examples that we've yet to uncover.

Some think there's little class struggle outside the Northern Hemisphere, just endless bourgeois faction fights. Where class struggle is partially recuperated it is assumed that the movement for democracy completely dominates events. This approach led the Parisian cafe intellectuals of La Bonjouir to state that there is no class struggle in South Africa, only a struggle against apartheid!

CENTRES OF ACCUMULATION

It is not denied that some parts of the world are richer than others. Capital tends to have definite centres of accumulation. These are the different centres at different times: for example the decline of Spain and Portugal from the 16th to the 18th century and the early emergence of the Pacific region. Neither am I denying that the prospects for class struggle are different in various regions of the globe, or that the class struggle takes different forms. However, dividing the world into developed vs underdeveloped regions is no good as a starting point for understanding the world-wide disposition of class forces.

WORLDS APART

The term "3rd world" is not used entirely consistently but it is usually taken to mean: the whole of Central and South America, the whole of Africa, the whole of Asia apart from Soviet bit of it, usually China, the Caribbean, most of the Pacific islands and most of the Middle East. This vast conglomeration of nations supposedly have a whole series of things in common which set them apart from the "developed" countries of the Western and Eastern blocks. The most obvious thing they are supposed to have in common is poverty. If you look at a published league table of income per capita you tend to find 1st and 2nd world countries near the top and 3rd near the bottom. On the other hand, Libya has a higher standard of living than Britain, and Argentina, Uruguay and Iran all have higher standards of living than Portugal, Hungary and Poland. Venezuela has a standard of living comparable with Spain and Ireland, though the latter are both in the ICC. The economist's concept of poverty is a very misleading since it ignores the role of subsistence production which significantly contributes to the livelihood of a very large proportion of the population.
Political instability is another stereotypical feature of the 3rd world nations. This is another dodgy concept because it fails to distinguish between the ability of a state to rule effectively over faction fights within the bourgeoisie, including unresolved national questions and so forth, and ability to control the class struggle. The bourgeoisie media try to present these two sources of political instability as the same: there is unrest because they don't know how to create a popular government. In terms of the first type, bourgeois instability, it is true that the poorest countries, particularly those in Africa, are often paralysed governments when it is usually a sign of weakness on the part of the state. But the concept of the 3rd world also includes states which are very stable such as Mexico. Zimbabwe how appears to have achieved a fair degree of stability. The old Rhodesian state was more or less taken over wholesale by the current regime, with the explicit assistance of British imperialism.

Bourgeoisie instability is not infrequently faked as a way of dealing with proletarian instability, the class struggle. Witness the endless government crises in Italy, or the supposedly world-shattering deposing of Marcos in the Philippines, which basically consisted of one bourgeoisie family leaving the country.

Revolutionary Travel Guide

The most interesting parts of the world might be expected to be those where both kinds of instability coexist. In other words, those where is a lot of class struggle but the local bourgeoisie can't get there set together to deal with it. An example might be Argentina, or Yugoslavia. The danger in this sort of speculation is that one can lose sight of the need for class struggle to internationalise, but it is fair to ask about the prospects for class struggle in different parts of the world.

At first sight it might appear that in the very poorest countries such as Ethiopia class struggle is almost impossible because the power structure by street battle. In reality it is the other way round. The working class is starved because of lack of struggle. Even in dirt poor countries like Zimbabawe and places like Khonisia and Morocco the working class has been able to resist austerity. Even in Ethiopia there were large-scale workers' struggles in Addis Ababa in 1974.

Obviously a strike in Chicago has more implications than one in Chumalaya, however industrial concentration isn't the only important factor; the mass strike in Poland was important because of Poland's strategic value. In more industrialised countries the proletariat may be "physically" stronger and have a history of struggle, but the bosses are also stronger. This is almost true by definition since if the bosses have accumulated more they have to "non the class war" for longer. The working class in these areas may be more sectional because effects by sections have been able to win concessions.

I must reiterate that in the long run no section of the working class can win on its own. You can no more have communism in Britain than communism in Tibet. Even if the proletariat seized power throughout North America the priority would have to be economic recovery before the Polish mass strike had not immediately been prevented from going further by respect for nationalism and Catholicism the struggle would inevitably have reverted to some form of nationalism and proved impossible to generalise the struggle across national frontiers.

A brief look at the recent history of mass strikes in Europe shows what a powerful barrier to revolution nationalism is. This looks particularly disheartening when you consider how small Europe is. I would expect that a struggle that opened across national frontiers would have an electrifying effect on the class struggle. But I would speculate that this is not likely to happen because the development of strong links of solidarity across national frontiers before major struggles break out. We can expect these links to be made between proletarians who have an interest in the need of others. What they have to do is to break out from the confines of nationalism and build movement who are conscious of how and fight for communism. Here latter must always use their knowledge of the history of the class struggle to point out the crucial necessity of internationalising the struggle and find concrete ways of doing it.

NAILING RELIGION: THE POPE AND DEMOCRACY

A leaflet produced by the communist group Workers' Emancipation during the Pope's visit to Argentina.

"Welcome to your spiritual home" said a poster which showed John-Paul II in a con of deodorant (we don't understand this bit either). "The Pope has come to bless genocide" said another. But it's a government, even put up with this for long. While the crowd was still growing (people were just beginning to come out of work) it gave the order to charge. Some fired rapidly, but most stayed, shouting slogans against the police, against the church, against the Pope. There were sit-downs, there was tear gas, there was brutality meted out to strikers and people cut off from the crowd, with their young age, health or sex. Result: more than 100 arrested, 30 injured. Today those arrested are free, but their cases are pending - in the face of a conspiracy of silence by all those who profit from dictatorship.

But this is not the only result. IT SHOWN THAT WE CAN'T BE INDIFFERENT, IT SHOWN THAT OUTSIDE THE POLITICAL PARTIES - left and right - all ultimately defenders of the rule of capitalism - THERE EXISTS AN MINIMUM THE CAPABILITY TO ORGANISE OURSELVES. And MOST IMPORTANT: MONOLITHIC, the whole world doesn't love you, nor everyone prepared to follow your lead in the repression and exploitation. In the messenger of peaceful exploitation, to the representative of the millennial church in the service of power and money we may go HOME - knowing that in Italy also there are those who say, GET THEE FROM ROME AND THE WORLD OF LABOUR. Amen.
THE BRITISH DISEASE IS BACK – LET'S MAKE IT FATAL.

No sooner had Thatcher announced that the British disease had been cured than the biggest wave of industrial discontent since the miners' strike began.

The importance of these strikes is not just that many different sections of workers have been involved, but also the genuine possibility of them linking up in a united struggle. Car workers, seamen, postal workers, council workers, civil servants, miners, nurses and many others have struck in defence of their interests. But the most exciting development is the number of strikes of workers in defence of other workers. The most important of these has been a series of strikes against cuts in the National Health Service. Miners at Frickley, Vauxhall workers, Thorn EMI, postal workers and many others have come out on one-day strikes to support nurses. Nurses have joined the picket lines at Forth with banners saying 'Health Workers Support You'. A few coachloads of nurses could bring out millions of workers, close down the country and force Thatcher to her knees.

ALL OUT

The reason for this is not the sentimental idea that nurses deserve a better deal, but the obvious fact that cuts in the NHS are an attack on the whole working class. When capitalism is forced to make all-out attacks on us all, the danger of an all-out working class response is obvious. This is what happened in Poland in 1980 when the government announced food price rises. The current strikes in Britain clearly point the way to a similar development here.

UNION SABOTAGE

Any attempt to link up the current strikes into a mass strike will be opposed by the unions. The NAMU told Ford workers to accept a 'historic deal' from the company including flexible working. The workers wouldn't have it, and after a week of a strike which halted production in Spain and Belgium as well as Britain, got a better deal out of Ford. The NUS took control of the ferry strike and then ordered the men back when told to by a judge. They got most of the ferry workers back, leaving the PO (aka Townsend Thoresen) workers at Dover isolated. However, those workers have been organising links with other workers, and disputes around the ports continue. The NUM called off its overtime ban just as the current strike wave started, and just as the pit deputies struck. Dividing workers into small sections and defeating them is what trade unions are all about.

The unions' interest is in the continued maintenance of stable capitalist production. Our interest is exactly the opposite. The Tory government is launching an all-out attack on our working conditions, our health and safety, and our living standards. The only way to stop them is a massive wave of strikes outside union control.

That's only the beginning. After the strike wave of 1974, they brought in the Labour Party to attack our class. All governments are our enemy. Only the destruction of all states by a worldwide revolution can solve our problems once and for all. In the meantime, strikes should be taken as far as possible. Workers should form united strike committees with demands based on the needs of the working class. They should refuse to return to work until all other workers demands are met.

MORE MONEY FOR THE NHS. A LARGE FLAT RATE PAY RISE FOR ALL NHS WORKERS – PORTERS, CLEANERS, NURSES, THEATRE STAFF, ETC. No new disciplinary codes (such as the ones for nurses and miners). Inmate strikes in support of any workers dismissed, suspended or employed to a job they don't normally do. NO TO UNION DIVISIONS! NO TO MODERATION! Spread the strikes!

BASIC PRINCIPLES

1. We are for the abolition of capitalism by communist revolution on a world scale. We are for the destruction of the money/market/wages system which exists in every country in the world, and its replacement by a classless society, in which goods are distributed according to needs and desires. We will abolish the division between work and leisure. The role of revolutionaries is to actively participate in escalating the class war toward this end.

2. We are against all forms of capitalism: private, state and self-managed.

3. We are actively opposed to all ideologies which divide the working class, such as religion.

4. We are actively opposed to all divisions in the working class whereby one section oppresses another, such as sexism and racism.

5. We are against all expressions of nationalism, including national liberation movements such as the IRA.

6. The working class (wage labourers, the unemployed, housewives, etc.), is the revolutionary class; only its struggle can liberate humanity from scarcity, war and economic crisis. We support independent working class struggle, in all areas of life under capitalism, outside the control of the trade unions and all political parties.

7. We are against trade unions because they are part of the capitalist system, selling our labour power to the bosses, and sabotaging our struggles.

8. We totally oppose all capitalist parties, including the Labour Party and other organisations of the capitalist left. We are against participation in fronts with these organisations.

9. We are against participation in parliamentary elections; we are for the smashing of the capitalist state by the working class and the establishment of organisations of working class power.

10. We are against sectarianism, and support principled cooperation among revolutionaries.