What lies behind the poll tax?

IN APRIL THE fight against the Poll Tax - the Tories' self-proclaimed flagship - will enter its most crucial phase yet.

As registration for the tax begins in England and Wales, the first demands for payment will be being sent out in Scotland, and as the "can't pay, won't pay" campaign begins to bite north of the border, a similar strategy of working class community resistance backed up by industrial action by council workers will start to grow throughout the rest of the country.

Fight

The Tories are well aware that the struggle against high Poll Tax rates - centred on a non-payment campaign - will not last more than a couple of years.

Not because people will surrender the fight, but because within that time Poll Tax levels will begin to fall back to something approaching the current rates levels, and fewer people will find themselves unable to pay.

Why will the Poll Tax fall?

Because local councils levying high Poll Tax rates (to finance a reasonable level of service provision) will find themselves unbeatable. The people who rely most on council services (from meals-on-wheels, bus passes, libraries and refuse collection) will simply be unable to afford to vote in councils offering to provide these services. Which is, in essence what the flat rate Poll Tax is all about.

The Tories' objective in doing away with the rates system is far more sophisticated than simply wanting to rob the poor to give money to the rich.

The Poll Tax is thelynchpin in a strategy that is setting out to destroy the political and financial power of local councils, decimate local council services, axe tens of thousands of council jobs, break up and sell off council housing stocks, and - most importantly in Thatcher's eyes - eradicate the possibility of a return of "municipal socialism" of the likes of the GLC and the Metropolitan Councils.

One of the most important - and often ignored - elements of the Poll Tax legislation is the taking out of local authority control the power to levy rates on local businesses and commerce.

Burden

In the past, higher spending local councils have been able to raise much of their revenue through upping rates on local businesses and commerce. Cutting the burden of any increases away from domestic rate payers.

Now the Tories will be able to set a national business Poll Tax rate - and they will pitch it as low as possible, particularly in those areas least likely to be Tory controlled, supposedly to encourage the growth of local "enterprise".

Come the introduction of the Poll Tax and the drop in revenue generated through the business rate, rates levels will have to soar simply to maintain current levels of services provision. Come election time, all political parties in local government will be falling over each other in the rush to promise how they will cut back more services, privatise more work, sack more jobs, and thereby offer a lower Poll Tax than their opponents.

Power

And as the struggles against rate capping have shown, Labour councils - like that in the London borough of Brent - will be second to none in attacking the working class in the struggle to remain in power.

The Tories have armed themselves with a whole battery of legislation in their war on local councils: the compulsory "tendering" out of council services; the forced offering for sale of council houses; the black on using the money from these sales to build new houses; the selling off of whole council estates through the new Housing Bill; encouraging schools to opt out of local authority control - the list goes on and on.

Most recently, they have announced plans to force councils to fund housing benefit payments to council tenants, solely from rents paid by other, wage-earning, tenants. This particularly insidious move aims to sow seeds of division among tenants, and, as rents go up to cover the housing benefit costs, make a private landlord cheaper in the short term than staying with the council.

The move by Bradford Conservative Council, under its leader Eric Pickles, to slash the council workforce, sell off its assets and axe its services is not then some one-off by an over eager group of local Tories.

Pickles' £6 million package of cuts - fully endorsed by Tory Central Office - are designed, firstly, to test public reaction in the run up to the introduction of the Poll Tax, and, secondly, to see just how little resistance will be mounted by local government unions and Labour councillors to the changes.

The Tories have deliberately chosen a traditionally Labour controlled town in the North of England for this first experiment. As 1990 approaches, Bradford's experience will be repeated throughout the rest of England and Wales.

Fightback

We need have no faith in the notion of "safeguarding local democracy" to see that the Tories all out assault on local councils represents a major attack on our class. Our interest is not in watching the powers of top Labour bureaucrats in council offices. But the jobs, housing and services needed by working class people.

The battle against the Poll Tax will become the cutting edge in the fight to turn back the tide of attacks. We should recognise the wellestablished strategy that the Poll Tax is central to, and go all out to encourage an effective fight against it in the workplace and the community.

The time to organise is now.

GENTLEMEN! A NEW BROOM TO SWEEP THROUGH LOCAL GOVERNMENT!

Sometimes a guy needs a drink...

Formerly VIRUS

ORGANISE!

for class struggle anarchism

IRELAND

Twenty years on

THE MYTH OF LABOUR'S 'SOCIALISM'

PAKISTAN UNDER BHUTTO

THE POWER OF RANK AND FILE ACTION

POLL TAX FACTS

REVIEWS

Magazine of the Anarchist Communist Federation
Anarchist Communist Editions

ACF pamphlets are available from ACF, c/o 6th Whitechapel High Street, London E1 7QX.

ACE No 1 Basic Bakunin: The Ideas of Bakunin, one of the founders of class struggle anarchism. (30p inc p&p)

ACE No 2 The Poll Tax and How to Fight It: describes the effects of the Poll Tax, and the inevitable failure of the Labour Party and the unions in fighting, and shows how to build effective strategies for collective action that can scupper the Tory flagship. (50p inc p&p)

ACE No 3 The libertarian communist Manifesto: a translation from the French of the Fontenis document into the need for coherent class politics and a strong anarchist organisation to influence the revolutionary process. (60p inc p&p)

ACE No 4 (forthcoming) A pamphlet that explores the politics of race in a class struggle perspective. Also A.N.A.R.CH! as we see it: the original pamphlet outlining the theory, politics and direction of the ACF. (50p inc p&p)

SUBSCRIBE:

TO SUBSCRIBE TO ORGANISE! costs £1.80 per year (four issues) including post and packing. All contributions to the next issue of Organise! have members in the clear anarchist viewpoint on the national holiday. We do not agree with our A&Ps at the ACF Press Fund, and as long as they don’t conflict with our A&Ps at the ACF Press Fund, and as long as they don’t conflict with our

Plague

Brian Wilson, who suffered horrific injuries after he sat on the railway tracks to block a nuclear waste shipment, leaving the naval weapons base at Crown Point, San Francisco, recently voiced the need to build a movement of opposition. And Lawrence Feschington, the only soldier who has been influenced by anarchist ideas, says that he wants to—to-liberate the spirit of 1968—it’s needed today, especially in the United States. They and their allies—military political parties—have played an active role in the American radical movement in Britain and the Unions in fighting, and shows how to build effective strategies for collective action that can scupper the Tory flagship. (50p inc p&p)
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Press Fund

To ensure that the ACF's pamphlets are available at a stable footing we are launching a Press Fund. A successful fund will ensure a safeguard against printing costs, shop percentages, postage, distribution costs etc. It will also mean we can ensure that anarchist communist politics are getting across to more people.

In the near future we hope to produce a larger and more frequently published Organise! and as long as they don’t conflict with our A&Ps at all issues, including post and packing. All articles in the

Will Bush be uprooted?

The recent American election has highlighted the general disillusionment of many Americans with the electoral system. Almost fifty per cent did not bother to vote, seeing little difference between Bush and Dukakis.

There is a growing realisation that the struggle to transform society cannot be tied to the Democratic Party, even if it is speeded up by the "liberation" rhetoric of Jesse Jackson.

In New York last year a gathering in Tompkins Square protested against the gentrification-inspired closure of the park after midnight: a typical example of the general gentrification process, whereby neighbour- hood areas and communities—often with a high ethic population—have been broken up, their inhabitants "relocated", and the area then "recreated", making it too expensive for people to move back, thus removing the problem (as perceived by the authorities) of inner-city areas.

Pollution

We need look no further than the devastation of the world's forests by acid rain, the pollution of our seas by nuclear and chemical waste and the destruction of the ozone layer by CFCs to see how caring Capital is of our environment. The only use capital has for our forests is to exploit it for profit, and the Tories' so-called "green" policies are anything more than cynical lip-service to placate and divide those of us who are real concern for these issues.

The Water Industry provides us with a microcosm to examine the whole rationale.
Down the plughole?

Continued

of capitalist production. Once privatised as a profit enterprise, the water of Capitalist production will soar, hitting need and so environmental concerns will be neglected, for there is no profit to be made from sewage disposal and keeping our seas and waterways clean.

Private

Workers will be divided among themselves because of the fragmentation of the industry and basic union agreements on pay, hours and safety will gradually be eroded as they have been in many other privatised industries. As the Tories have working practices will slip into those that workers had to deal with in the nineteenth century. It is even possible that our drinking water may suffer contamination as standards slip before the onslaught of Capital, and even if public outrage were to demand better standards, we would be told that "it all costs money" and have to pay for it. Further price increases will be forced upon us.

Safe

Whatever our criticisms of rationalisation, we have a need for a clean and safe water supply and a non-poluted environment for our fair working conditions for those within the water industry. If we do not secure these it will be the working classes who have to live with the price increases, the pollution and the toxic chemicals, not the ruling class who inflict them upon us.

IN THE WAKE of outrageous hysteria created in the press about AIDS, a small group of far-right Christian Tories are responsible for the creation of Clause 28.

Clause 28 is an amendment (the Local Government Bill which prevents local councils from having any part in the promotion of homosexuality. Lesbians and gays, supported by many sympathetic heterosexuals, organised large amount of protest against the Clause. Whilst the Clause was passed in Parliament, the mass mobilisation of lesbians and gays was a great success, containing some of the most creative protest seen in Britain for years.

Section 28 is in itself an illegality, illegal, it being almost impossible to prove in court that anything promotes homosexuality. The danger lies in that it has given bigots the encouragement to abuse and attack lesbians and gays. The police have also seen the Section in this way, and have to deal with the harassment on Hampstead Heath that "they have had it easy".

Arrests

Since Section 28 became law, police have stepped up their harassment of gay men. Hundreds of arrests and convictions have been made of gay men having sex in public toilets (which is known as 'c�gging'), and instead of using the usual 'sexual offences' legislation, many police have used local by-laws and the Public Order Act (a section of the Town Police Act legislation in which just about everything the police can't like is illegal).

Court

This prevents gay men an access to legal aid and a jury trial. Police have also used agent provocateurs: policemen who induce gay men in public places and then arrest them - a number of convictions have been secured in this manner for many gay men will fight their cases in court.

One such case, involving an agent provocateur at Dartford Heath was dropped by the Director of Public Prosecutions when it was discovered what the police had been doing.

In Hove, Sussex, a 72 year old man collapsed when questioned in favour of a public toilet. He died the next day without attempt being made by police to resuscitate him. A man in York was conned into becoming a agent provocateur and was subsequently sacked from the Terry's chocolate factory where he worked.

He was a member of the GMH, but his shop steward voted in favour of the sacking at the appeal, although the majority of Terry's workers were against it.

The lesbian and gay community in York, along with students, are organising around the issue, and this case demonstrates that lesbian and gay workers need to organise to bypass the union in such cases.

The press have cooperated fully with the authorities in attacking gay men for cottaging. They have printed the names of men arrested - the effect of which can completely destroy a man's life, alienating him from friends and relatives, losing him his job, and setting him up as a target for verbal and physical attack.

Media

Classic that cottaging could spread AIDS are disgraceful, but typical of the media. Gay men are in the forefront or promoting safe sex, and put this into practice when cottaging as elsewhere.

The heterosexual media media has done almost nothing to promote safe sex, despite the evidence that AIDS is spreading rapidly amongst the heterosexual community, and the knowledge that only safe sex can halt this.
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Reformist

The Zion regime with its alliance with the United States (protectors, Israeli fundamentalists) and the Muslim League have pushed for the Islamisation of the country. This has involved the establishment of Shariah courts (where people are tried according to narrow Islamic rules). This led to the introduction of the Hudood and Zina Ordinances: changes in family law and drinking.

This means a life of total oppression for women, thousands imprisoned (detained, tortured) no force of equality before the law at all. It is virtually impossible for women to defend themselves against rape, acquire a divorce, or give evidence in a court.

The survival of the dictatorship depends upon a number of things. Initially good harvests gave the regime their first two things - most of Pakistan's exports are agricultural.

Secondly, the Gulf states have given the regime huge loans and grants, and they also employ a large number of workers who work abroad, and who send back around $2 billion annually.

Thirdly, the US has pushed through loans and grant for its own reasons.

Like her father, Bhutto, Benazir is bourgeois, educated and commercially rich. Throughout the present election she has made compromises with the rich, the PPP has ignored such of its peasant and working class supporters in favour of the landowners, industrialists and religious leaders.

The PPP has already affirmed that she will not endanger the interests of the US or big business. Her statement that she will not significantly lessen 'socialism' than her father's.

Economic

It is to be remembered that economic life is still largely controlled by two social groups. There are the 22 big businesses that control the majority of industrial and commercial activity. Also the landowners who still operate in a semi-feudal manner, although accepting some aspects of modernisation and capitalist practices.

The question is this - which power bloc will acquire some say in the political process? Shall it be the urban and industrial workers and the fragmented and insolvent Mujahideen and the religious leaders? The power of the army and the rich and the rich will undoubtedly have a big voice.

They are the workers and peasants of Pakistan shake off the leadership of the feudal aristocracy, the theological courts and the merchants, that they will be able to get rid of the dictatorship, and then perhaps make Pakistan their own way.
Re-introduction of British troops into Northern Ireland. This year sees the 20th anniversary of August 12th 1969 saw the start of Protestant police reserve force units for the sectarianism and loyalist gangs.

The Orange (Loyalist) marches of 1989, the 20th anniversary of the 1969 battle of the Bogside. The Orange State still in no way dominated by the IRA, who see it as the first step towards Dublin/Rome rule, and failing to undermine popular support.

So here we are in 1989, with troops still on the streets, Ulster the training ground for Britain's counter-insurgency techniques, the sectarian Orange State still in tact. Twenty years of an undeclared war against the community of opposition. Twenty years of armed struggle by the Republican Movement, and twenty years of defeat for the proletariat.

The traditional form of workers' organisation in Ireland is the union. Unions evolved in order to defend workers' interests in the here and now. All unions aspire to legality, to recognition, because this makes their day-to-day job possible. Unions die if they are not accepted to a certain extent by the bosses and the State. If they don't disappear they tend to turn into petty bourgeois political organisations. Recognition is accepted by the bosses when the workforce becomes too unmanageable without it. However, the argument for recognition in a larger sense (outside of the membership's workplace) is as true for Ireland as for anywhere else.

The unions' only purpose on a day-to-day basis (apart from legal aid, insurance etc.) is as negationists of the struggle against the logic of capitalism. Unions have never tended to go for the other way - reformism then, and turns the unions, or the resulting new unions, into vehicles for revolutionary change. But they always go for the other way - incorporation into the State. This goes for all unions, even anarchist-syndicalist ones. Unions become part of the array of ideological forces used by the State against workers. Unions in any circumstances would rather see struggles lost than for them to get beyond the control of the union. For these reasons unions can never support the destruction of capitalism.

Libertarian Communists have never seen the point of the union. A lot more needs to be said on the question of anarchist activity amongst the rank and file, this is only the start.

The traditional form of workers' organisation in Ireland is the union. Unions evolved in order to defend workers' interests in the here and now. All unions aspire to legality, to recognition, because this makes their day-to-day job possible.

Unions die if they are not accepted to a certain extent by the bosses and the State. If they don't disappear they tend to turn into petty bourgeois political organisations. Recognition is accepted by the bosses when the workforce becomes too unmanageable without it. However, the argument for recognition in a larger sense (outside of the membership's workplace) is as true for Ireland as for anywhere else.

The union must fulfill a management role by its very nature at all levels. The unions will only negotiate with a union if they are pretty sure the membership will follow the union. That is, the union has the ability to control the membership in order to make deals with management. Having accepted the "legality" of capitalism (in return for recognition in a larger sense the legal status of the union) the unions largely help keep workers in line and basically argues for a "better" management of the workers and the types of challenge which rank and file action can pose. The basic role of the libertarians is to oppose unionism, to oppose workers' organisations and to oppose the unions. It was one of the aims of the covert campaign in 1969 as an effort to create a new internal debate within the RUC and the rank and file workers themselves.

The organisation was not there to defend the Catholic population. However, as the repression increased, the call went out for arms - and who had these? The trick was to use this opportunity, stepped in, as best they could, as defenders of the Catholic working class. Their credibility and popularity regained, they have never looked back.

Topple this - indeed graffiti on the flats on the Bogside was used by the State against workers. The state of the workers' struggle in Ireland is as bad as it is because of state action. The unions' only purpose on a day-to-day basis (apart from legal aid, insurance etc.) is as negationists of the struggle against the logic of capitalism. Unions have never tended to go for the other way - reformism then, and turns the unions, or the resulting new unions, into vehicles for revolutionary change.

So what do we as Libertarian Communists see as the solution? The troops must go and the Orange State be smashed. However, only through mass, conscious struggle outside of the solution of the sectarian Orange State, and this is true for Ireland as for anywhere else.

What is the potential of rank and file action? These are a few notes on the nature of unionism and the types of challenge which rank and file action can pose. The basic role of the libertarians is to oppose unionism, to oppose workers' organisations and to oppose the unions. It was one of the aims of the covert campaign in 1969 as an effort to create a new internal debate within the RUC and the rank and file workers themselves. These are a few notes on the nature of unionism and the types of challenge which rank and file action can pose. The basic role of the libertarians is to oppose unionism, to oppose workers' organisations and to oppose the unions. It was one of the aims of the covert campaign in 1969 as an effort to create a new internal debate within the RUC and the rank and file workers themselves.
Communist Party-sponsored National Minority Movement (NMM) of the mid-1920s-’50s; and the Socialist Workers Party’s (SWP) rank and file organizing efforts in the 1970s. Of these three movements, the work of the South Wales miners’ UNC is the most important. The Committee emerged during the Cambrian Combine dispute of 1910-11 and consisted of the leaders of the strike, who were not union bureaucrats and who constantly fought the conciliation tactics of the South Wales Miners Federation leadership. The Miners’ Next Step was, as a matter of principles, a revolutionary syndicalist or industrial unionist document and it contributed such to the already growing syndicalist tendency in the working class at the time.

Militancy

It was this tendency, and the growing militancy of the British working class, that led to the Shop Stewards Movement during and after World War One. Apart from anything else, people’s energies would have probably been used up by then and the moment would never come. Also, what if I was pushed into a union post – it would make no sense not to accept, so I’d end up being a low-level union bureaucrat that believed the union stands in the way of our struggle. It would be as stupid and deceitful as a revolutionary becoming an MP while believing that Parliament needs to be smashed by the mass action of the working class.

The approach is actually Marxist. It is the kind of politics that plays with peoples’ lives, and it’s not for anarchists.

The United Front

Tied up with the transitional demands, the idea of the united front is to unite reformist and revolutionary workers around the transitional demands. The united front can never work for revolutionary and radical workers and revolutionary workers are always going to outlive revolutionary workers, it is easy to see who is going to dominate any such unified front organisation.

Contradiction

In practice if Communication Worker Group went in for a united front approach we would probably be taken over by the Broad Left (they already stole our logo during the mid/late 70s, eventually they would be out there and file workers. The formula outlined above lay behind these movements too. But before we move onto these initiatives I want to look, in abstract, at a couple of tactics that are still favoured by those particular groups to set up their own rank and file bodies.

These are the ideas of the ‘transitional demand’ and the united front approach. The tactics of the NMM and the SWP were the tactics of the NWM and the SPM.

The Transitional Demand

A rank and file movement may try to exert pressure on the union (eg making demands for reductions in hours, or wage rises, etc) in order to show the rest of the membership that the current structure of the union and the current leadership need to be replaced with something more militant and responsive.

Extended

This tactic can be extended, however, into a challenge to the union as such. The demands on the union to take up struggles made from below could be used to prove to workers that something other than a union is needed, something revolutionary and all-embracing socially.

This tactic of ‘enlightenment’ would therefore involve encouraging workers to believe the union can be changed and letting them keep pushing it until they learn from their own experience that the union cannot radically change society in the interests of the working class.

This is dishonest and manipulative. Even as an occasional tactic it is dodgy. It would lead to confusion, people wouldn’t know if we were trying to reform the union or go beyond it. Militant union members, who still had faith in the unions’ ability to change, would soon become tired of our seeming prevarication. It is our duty to try to draw people away from a full time union ‘mentalitY’ – to do this we have to be consistent. Also, one demand on the union bureaucracy would lead another, eventually there would be constant demands (eg, over hours, wages, and “decentralisation” of struggles). It is the same thing as a full time lobbyist (on the union leadership) as it is such a time-consuming occupation, and also if you’re keen on a bit of fame. This is what happened to the NWM, who started out with set demands.

Personally, I’m not going to tell people to pursue such a path, and I don’t think we should ever come to it, and then when it falls turn round and say now is the time to start doing something else; something I knew we’d have to all along anyway.

Apart from anything else, people’s energies would have probably been used up by then and the moment would never come. Also, what if I was pushed into a union post – it would make no sense not to accept, so I’d end up being a low-level union bureaucrat that believed the union stands in the way of our struggle. It would be as stupid and deceitful as a revolutionary becoming an MP while believing that Parliament needs to be smashed by the mass action of the working class.

The United Front

Tied up with the transitional demands, the idea of the united front is to unite reformist and revolutionary workers around the transitional demands. The united front can never work for revolutionary and radical workers and revolutionary workers are always going to outlive revolutionary workers, it is easy to see who is going to dominate any such unified front organisation.

Contradiction

In practice if Communication Worker Group went in for a united front approach we would probably be taken over by the Broad Left (they already stole our logo during the recent national strike)

The Shop Stewards Movement

Now I want to look briefly at rank and file initiatives that have emerged during struggle and the contradictions they have come up against.

The background of the first shop steward movement lies in...
THE LABOUR PARTY has carried off one of the greatest illusions in history, namely that it in some way represents the interests of the working class.

As we shall see, this fundamental lie is easily exposed, and it is becoming increasingly obvious to working class voters themselves, who, if they are going to trust a bourgeois party, might as well vote for the Tories or the Democrats.

The purpose of this article is to show that, for a variety of reasons, the Labour Party is in terminal and irreversible decline. Not least of its problems is the contradiction between its main support - the working class - and the anti-working class ideology that espouses.

System

The Labour Party has never been a socialist party. It was largely created by unions to gain trade union representation "within" the system, through parliament. Indeed the history of the Labour Party is that of hounding, isolating and, if necessary, expelling socialists from its ranks. The purging of the Militant Tendency is just the latest phase of a long and shameful tradition. The doctrine of the Labour Party is best described as "Labourism". In its essentials, Labourism involves nationalising a few sharp edges off capitalism, while preserving it.

First and foremost, the Labour Party is wedded to the traditional British methods of the rule of law, constitutionalism, parliament and gradualism. These four features effectively lie down the Labour Party and prevent it from carrying out truly radical measures. By sticking to the rule of law, for example, the Labour Party cannot engage in radical extra-parliamentary action. Thus, on the issue of the poll tax, it has been outmanoeuvred by the Scottish Nationalists who do claim the right to illegal protest.

While Labourism is supposed to reflect the interests of the trade unions and the existing economic system (capitalism), there are often difficulties associated with this, as the two are at a great extent, contradictory. Thus Labour has on occasion proposed anti-union legislation, eg. Harold Wilson's "In Place of Strife" proposals. In reality Labour is not consulted at all to ordinary working people, but to the trade unions as bureaucracies which it will defend if it can. The Labour Party does not take a class approach, but, like the Tories, aims to appeal to all classes. The absurdity of "socialist" millionaires like Lord Steel and Maxwell引起s no problem whatsoever for Labour.

This non-class approach is a natural consequence of Labour's commitment to capitalism and its anti-socialism. Clause 4 of the party's constitution is often invoked as evidence of Labour's socialism. In reality "socialism" for Labour is simply that Labour governments do whilst in office.

Welfarism

Labourism can be confused by the unvarying socialism which it sometimes involves nationalisation and the maintenance of welfare. The reality is that Labour has virtually exhausted its state ownership measures in its "greatest period", ie 1945-51. Many of the nationalisations carried out then were emergency measures to revive inefficient capitalist enterprises like the railways. Nationalisation reproduced, under state ownership, many of the capitalist management practices. State industries, as a result, have had their fair share of strikes. Indeed, the most spectacular strikes in our history have taken place in the nationalised sector.

The "welfare state", what is left of it, is not particularly socialist either, being based upon the Liberal ideas of Lord Beveridge. The universal and free welfare benefits have been gradually eroded since they were first introduced by the 1945-51 Labour government, by both subsequent Tory and Labour governments. The British National Health Service was, to a great extent, created to maintain the interests of the medical profession. Whilst we should defend the welfare state, we should also be aware of its defects and understand that it is a myth which helps to sustain capitalism in Britain.

The so-called left-wing of the Labour Party is carefully controlled by the party leadership, and "Bennism" has been rendered impotent. It seemed a few years ago that Benn might mount a challenge to the leadership and possibly move the Labour Party towards his brand of "socialism". It should be realised that Benn only differs in terms of degree with the leadership. Like Kinnock, Benn's "socialism" is a mixture of Christianity and welfarism. Unlike Kinnock, Benn views the 1945-51 Labour government as a model to be emulated. The Party leader sees this as a recipe for electoral disaster (ha!). Benn is an elitist. Benn is a parliamentarian and reformist, Benn sees "socialism" as something which is given to the poor, for whom his heart bleeds.

"Support the working class in struggle! that's a good one Roy!"

Imperialist

Finally, Labourism involves the patriotic defence of British capitalism and "British interests" abroad. Since it was founded, the Labour Party has, with very few exceptions, supported British wars and adventures overseas. The Falklands/Malvinas war was only the latest episode of Labour's backing for imperialist interests. Labour has been consistent in its support for the "anti-communist alliance" NATO, has helped put down colonial revolutions and has gone along with racist immigration measures here in Britain.

Whilst many features of Labour's doctrine do enjoy popular lines of that hatred against Wilson's government in 1975.

The greatest nail in the Labour Party's coffin is Thatcherism. The radical post-war consensus that Labour had so prized was torn Britain, the Party can no longer even pretend to be able to deliver the goods. The Labour Party has lost its way, hence the tailing of Thatcherism on, say, defence, council house sales, and the family council house sales, and the family...
stewards do not emerge on their own, but they come out of a militant and much as possible. This certainly than neglecting the union allegiance. On the State as it has a mass membership.

stewarding that they were doing. The workforce. A shopfloor will only want a steward who they think can negotiate for. Or they and lose the ability to do a good job as a steward.

A steward who is a revolutionary cannot last - either they will be drawn into the union apparatus through the day-to-day accommodation with management that they have to negotiate for. Or they will "go too far" for the members and lose the ability to do a good job as a steward.

For revolutionaries the real problem with all these movements is in their critique of the union. Whether they aim for the creation of new unionism (syndicalism) or whether they try to reform the existing unions and give the power to the base, they do not break from the necessary "logic" of the union, which, ultimately, is to preserve capitalism.

All the rank and file movements in Britain have been alternative union movements, they have never gone beyond trying to make better unions. The problem of this is the basic belief that the idea of the union can work for us in a revolutionary sense if it is modified, "de-politicised," or the unions become one big syndicalist union.

In the beginning it would seem that such changes make unions potentially revolutionary, but as the union becomes a mass organisation and its delegates, or representatives, enter the management offices, the practicalities of the day-to-day organisation of the union take over. The initial slogans become meaningless as the union becomes the negotiator for a fairer form of exploitation. This is the sole purpose of a union, and it has no time or inclination to overthrow the State we it has a mass membership to look after and an economy to keep an eye on. (This is certainly

**Negotiators**

Shop stewards are negotiators, and despite their best instincts have to play a similar role, albeit on a much lower key, as shop stewards.

A steward that goes wild in the manager's office, threatening to all the bosses throat everything and act unfairly is no use to the people who are representing it on the shopfloor. Management will only listen to a steward if they respect his/her opinions and knows the steward can rely on the back-up of the workforce. A shopfloor steward will only want a steward who they think can defend them in everyday injustices.

A steward who is a revolutionary cannot last - either they will be drawn into the union apparatus through the day-to-day accommodation with management that they have to negotiate for. Or they will "go too far" for the members and lose the ability to do a good job as a steward.

For revolutionaries the real problem with all these movements is in their critique of the union. Whether they aim for the creation of new unionism (syndicalism) or whether they try to reform the existing unions and give the power to the base, they do not break from the necessary "logic" of the union, which, ultimately, is to preserve capitalism.

All the rank and file movements in Britain have been alternative union movements, they have never gone beyond trying to make better unions. The problem of this is the basic belief that the idea of the union can work for us in a revolutionary sense if it is modified, "de-politicised," or the unions become one big syndicalist union.

In the beginning it would seem that such changes make unions potentially revolutionary, but as the union becomes a mass organisation and its delegates, or representatives, enter the management offices, the practicalities of the day-to-day organisation of the union take over. The initial slogans become meaningless as the union becomes the negotiator for a fairer form of exploitation. This is the sole purpose of a union, and it has no time or inclination to overthrow the State we it has a mass membership to look after and an economy to keep an eye on. (This is certainly

**Anarchists**

Anarchists and rank and file initiative

So where do we rank and file go from here? We have recognised the principles that underpin all union organisation, and we deal with the question of rank and file movements.

As class struggle anarchists we must operate, and eventually organise, in all areas of life, and this includes the workplace. What form of organisation should we aim for here? What follows is the perspective and methods that I feel anyone with as bit of common sense realises that only the workers have lost.

Normally this is called a "sell-out" by the workers, but it's not.

A "sell out" can only be the action of someone who is on our side and then betrays us. They may can us (like management do), they may, for example, organise the workers and try to make it look as if a particular

**Anarchists**

Anarchists are, who believe that our class must control its own struggles and not abdicate its responsibilities to leaders, who ultimately always have different interests to our own. It's no good in one article to say that the union is always going to do something and then in another article to demand that the union takes the lead in a struggle.

This is the kind of confused propaganda leftfists might come up with but we should know better.

It is a fact that most strikes begin unofficially, also that if a union goes for industrial action it is against a background of unofficial actions and deep resentment among the workforce. In the case the union tails behind the feelings of the workforce and gets in on the act to control the struggle and lead the workers to accept that suits the union and the management.

**Sell-out**

**Behind the sell-out**

The class struggle has very serious implications both for workers and for those in the rest of the society. The sell-out has been mass movement and its delegates, or representatives, enter the management offices, the practicalities of the day-to-day organisation of the union take over. The initial slogans become meaningless as the union becomes the negotiator for a fairer form of exploitation. This is the sole purpose of a union, and it has no time or inclination to overthrow the State we it has a mass membership to look after and an economy to keep an eye on. (This is certainly

Anarchists should naturally be involved in rank and file activity and anarchists should form anarchist groups in their place of work, or across an industry, but this should not be a substitute for organising together politically on a much larger scale.

The revolution is about destroying the bosses and the State and seizing everything, not just taking over our workplaces. It will be
WHAT IS CHANGING IN THE WORKPLACE?

The closure of the North-East shipbuilding yards and other heavy industries last year will lead to the loss of hundreds of jobs, both inside the docks and outside. The inevitable result of redundancies is that the present system of mass membership and recognition by organised labour will be severely tested.

The rise in temporary, casual, and other precarious work is a direct result of the growing power of the employers. New management practices have been introduced in place of the old 'family-company' mentality at work. All of this is designed to atomize the workforce and put workers in the same factories and workshops, breaking down any sense of collective direction.

The workplace is becoming the decisive battleground for the working class. The fight against redundancies, and the need for workers to organise society on the basis of their own spontaneously emerging needs, is the key issue. The failure of any single fight will mean the end of the resistance of a region of a hundred and fifty miles in diameter, and the only bridge to power for those who genuinely desire to fight back against the bosses.

Set up another union organisation. This is the ultimate aim of British anarchist-socialism. Ordinary members aren't going to leave their old union to join a revolutionary group in non-revolutionary times - they will only do so to join an organisation that will be more effective than all unions. Its original revolutionary intent will disappear. The best it would be able to do would be to take control of the economy through a revolution that ended in State Capitalism, which is what several anarchists believed was happening to the CNV in Spain in 1936-7.

We should not take on any permanent low-level union posts; it makes our politics ambiguous. We should not become shop stewards because of the difficult position they occupy, which has been outlined above. However, we should favour the forming of unofficial strike committees, which help coordinate actions but which do not try and take on any negotiating role. We should favour the forming of action groups which try to extend the struggle, by example, eg flying picketing or sabotage.

Russian lessons

History of the Makhnovist Movement

Peter Arshinov, Freedom Press £2.00

This paper is the first British printing of Arshinov's work on the revolution in the Ukraine, and far cheaper than the original American printing and first English translation. Though the book has now been out for a while, it is still well worth republishing.

Arshinov himself was a metal worker in Kerestanov, who educated himself through anarchist literature. He joined the revolutionary movement in 1904 when he was seventeen, becoming a member of the Bolshevik Party. In 1906 he became an Anarchist because of the minimalism of the Bolsheviks, which did not respond to the real aspirations of the workers and peasants, with the minimum of revolutionary parties, to the defeat of the 1905 Revolution.

In the revolution after 1905, mass political activity was impossible, and Arshinov turned to the creation of a large pool of dispersed and often unorganised labour. He formed a group of unemployed workers who constituted a constant threat to the local authorities. He spent some years in exile in France, and was arrested in 1910 on the Austrian-Hungarian border.

Geographically, they covered a region of a hundred and fifty miles in diameter holding two million people. Whenever they held sway, the land was collectivised voluntarily and shared out among the agricultural workers.

They were a force for new thinking in the countryside, and this allowed them to consolidate their rapidly growing bureaucracy, finally acting against the Makhnovists.

The book should be read by everyone who wants an in-depth insight into the real nature of the Russian revolution, the role of the Bolsheviks, and the case for organisation of anarchists.
Win a copy of The Third Way on our stand at the National Anarchist Conference. The book explores the developing revolution in the United States, and its implications for the world. It is the product of a group of radical intellectuals who are determined to build a new society based on freedom, equality, and solidarity. The book is a must-read for anyone who wants to know more about the growing movement of radical change.

To enter the competition, simply first in the box below and then provide your name and address. The competition closes on 31st March 1989.

121 WGBH
95 Maple Street
Boston MA 02115

The winner will be announced in the next issue of Organise Magazine.

The Third Way
by John Zerzan and Daniel DeLeon

In the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of communism, many people are left wondering what the future holds for the world. The Third Way offers a radical alternative, one that is based on the principles of freedom, equality, and solidarity. It is a way forward that is open to all who are dissatisfied with the current system and want to create a better world. The Third Way is not just a theory, it is a movement, one that is growing stronger every day. Join the Third Way and help build a world that is free, equal, and just.

In this issue of Organise Magazine, we feature an interview with John Zerzan, one of the leading figures in the Third Way movement. Mr. Zerzan discusses the origins of the movement, its goals, and its future. He also talks about his own experiences as a radical activist and how they have shaped his views. This is a must-read for anyone who is interested in the Third Way and wants to know more about its history and ideas.

In other news, we have an article on the growing movement of workers and students in Europe. This is a period of great change, one that is marked by growing militancy and a determination to fight for a better world. The workers and students are demanding more rights and a say in the running of their lives, and they are not afraid to use force if necessary. This is a movement that is growing stronger every day, and it is one that we should all be doing our bit to support.

Finally, we have an article on the growing movement of anarchists in the United States. This is a period of great change, one that is marked by growing militancy and a determination to fight for a better world. The anarchists are demanding more rights and a say in the running of their lives, and they are not afraid to use force if necessary. This is a movement that is growing stronger every day, and it is one that we should all be doing our bit to support.

In short, this is a period of great change, one that is marked by growing militancy and a determination to fight for a better world. The workers and students are demanding more rights and a say in the running of their lives, and they are not afraid to use force if necessary. This is a movement that is growing stronger every day, and it is one that we should all be doing our bit to support.

In the meantime, we hope you enjoy this issue of Organise Magazine and that it helps you to understand the world we live in and the changes that are taking place. We welcome your feedback and suggestions, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Organise Magazine

160 George Street
London W1N 4NA

Tel: 01-224 6899
Fax: 01-224 6898
E-mail: organise@organise.org.uk

Organise is a non-profit-making organisation, and all proceeds go towards maintaining the magazine. We are a political organisation, and we do not accept advertisements from political parties or organisations that we consider to be oppressive. We are committed to using our platform to promote a world that is free, equal, and just.

We welcome contributions from all who are interested in the Third Way and its ideas. If you would like to contribute to Organise Magazine, please get in touch with us at the address above. We look forward to hearing from you.
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In the Balfour declaration of 1917, the British government promised the establishment of a "Jewish national home" in Palestine. This was a reaction to the desire of the Zionists to create a Jewish state in the region. Herzl saw expansion of Jewish settlements in the region as a way to gain acceptance in Europe and to counter the antisemitism that he perceived in Europe. He believed that by building Jewish settlements in the region, the Jews would be able to show that they were capable of functioning as a normal, productive people and that they did not need to be feared or persecuted.

In these quotes the author equates racism, Zionism, fascism and militarism. In the first quote, antisemitism is seen as a mixture of racism and militarism. In the second quote, Zionism is seen as a form of militarism. In the third quote, racism is compared to militarism.

Zionism and the Israeli state. In the third quote, the author suggests that Zionism is equated with racism. The author argues that Zionism is not anti-semitic, but instead is a form of self-assertion. The author also argues that the Israeli state is not a form of globalization.

In the fourth quote, the author discusses the role of the Jewish State in the context of World War II. The author argues that the Jewish State was able to resist the Holocaust because it was able to control the borders of the state and prevent the extermination of the Jewish people.

Aims and Principles

1. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.

2. Capitalism is based on the exploitation of the working class by the ruling class. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

3. The rejection of all forms of domination is a central principle of anarchism. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

4. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.

5. The rejection of all forms of domination is a central principle of anarchism. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

6. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.

7. The rejection of all forms of domination is a central principle of anarchism. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

8. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.

9. The rejection of all forms of domination is a central principle of anarchism. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

10. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.

11. The rejection of all forms of domination is a central principle of anarchism. The working class has no country and national boundaries are irrelevant. The working class can only be organised on an international basis.

12. The Anarchist Communist Federation (ACF) is an international organisation of revolutionary socialist activists.