

ECHANGES

For information about Echanges, subscriptions and also pamphlets, write to the following address, which is the only one dealing with centralizing correspondence.

ECHANGES ET MOUVEMENT, BM Box 91, London WC1 N3 XX United Kingdom

FRANCE

Théorie Communiste (C. Charrier, BP 2315, Marseille Cedex France - in french)

N° 7/July 1986. This issue, entitled 'The new cycle of struggle', attempts an original approach by the group Théorie Communiste (TC. in the text) to the current movement of the class struggle. In a brief letter calling for a meeting in Paris on November 1th 1986, TC. hinges its analysis of this movement upon three points: the end of one cycle of struggle, the restructuring of the relation between capital and the proletariat, and the emergence of a new cycle of struggle. This, roughly, is the theme of the text which makes up the content of this issue N° 7 of TC. This letter also outlines the theoretical approach of TC. In this 'transitional period' between the old and the new cycle of struggle, 'the characteristics of the latter must be defined in order to arrive at a perspective based on the valorization of such of its characteristics .. as will bring about the revolution'. This group's attempt to rediscover the movements progress towards revolution involves - according to TC - primarily the 'recognition' of the previous cycle, if the analysis is not to fail yet again into the 'stagnation of present theoretical production and of its perspectives'.

The language might create some difficulties for the reader who has not read previous issues of TC.; some ambiguities will have to be cleared (e.g. the meaning of 'valorization', of 'characteristics which bring about the revolution', or of 'prospects for theoretical production').

If we overcome these problems, we can perceive an opening, a call for each to pursue the path of their own research. This transitional period is a situation in which each is trying to discover the characteristics of a new cycle according to 'ones specific theoretical basis and history'. We can agree with this consideration, expressed more clearly in this sentence: 'The production of the new is still part of the old'; we understand that this

production as a result of 'everybody's work' is actually the production only of the real movement itself and that this analytical work is also a movement involved in a dynamic process linked to the dynamics of the movement itself. TC appears to acknowledge this in the impressive amount of detail from the movement of struggle which it describes and analyses in support of its theoretical analysis (one of the merits of the pamphlet). It is normal in such a work that previous theory helps in the selection of facts; the understanding of which and differences from the original theory which emerge allowing new steps to be taken towards new theory.

To try to sum up TC's theory and to convey the essence of these texts: 'The blockage in current present theoretical production originates in a refusal to consider the development of capital as a succession of cycle of struggles expressing various stages of the contradiction between the proletariat and capital, but to see this development only as an accumulation of conditions ..'. Hence the criticism of theories considering the movement of struggle as a process to be radicalized because it needs constantly to be overcome. 'A cycle of struggles exists .. only when it gives birth to its own overcoming through the specific situation and practice of the proletariat..'. Without reference to a 'cycle of struggle' we nonetheless agree with the concept that the 'overcoming' of a certain stage of struggle involving a balance of struggle:

- capital (with all the techniques of production and hence for domination) versus labour (with all the weight of concrete and ideological structure built up through the previous struggle)-can only be attained through 'the specific situation and practice of the proletariat'. TC comes to a 'practical criticism of the relation which could link, through a continual process, the class as such as is defined under capitalism and the revolution'; in order to embark upon our criticism of the theories of the 70's (auto-negation or the integration of the proletariat) and attempts an interpretation, we have to understand the reasons why these theories have disappeared. 'If we speak of the revolution as auto-negation of the proletariat we tend to create an internal contradiction between what the proletariat does contradictorily to capitalism but the focus within this contradiction, and what the class situation expresses as revolutionary potential capable of causing the situation of itself to shatter and disappear'.

For TC., the previous cycle of struggle was characterized by 'auto-organization', which TC. defines as 'the link between immediate struggles and the revolution' and considers not as an ongoing tendency, but as an historical therefore temporary form. Numerous examples of recent struggles (but only in Western Europe) are quoted to show the decline of this 'auto-organization'. This decline is characteristic of the end of the previous cycle of struggle and of the appearance of the new cycle.

Another series of examples is furnished to outline the 'critical axis of the new cycle of struggle' in immediate manifestations of class struggle. The

central characteristic of this new cycle is that the proletariat produces its entire being, its reality, its organization and its establishment as a class both inside capital and against it at the same time, and all within the practice of the class struggle.

In their conclusion TC. tries to establish some common ground to these immediate manifestations and therefore to build up a synthesis: 'In confronting capital, the proletariat builds up and confronts its own constitution as a class; there is no internal contradiction only confrontation with the other very real and autonomous expression of this relation: capital. It's in this sense that revolution and communism constitute the overcoming of this cycle of struggle'.

Grades of Echanges have arrived by different routes and with different formulations at certain conclusions which are close to those of TC and whose analysis of current struggles produces the following observations:

Workers don't undertake a battle out of consciousness of any revolutionary aim, but for concrete immediate aims applying to their present condition; if this struggle takes root even on a limited scale, it becomes a direct confrontation with capital. We do not however see this as a new situation, but as a basic characteristic of the class struggle, which can take various and mobile forms according to the dialectical dynamics of the balance of struggle between labour and capital.

The railway strike in France during the winter of '86-'87 can be seen as an attempt to build an autonomous strike organization, which failed for various reasons; it can also be seen as the product of its own limitations, if we consider the possibilities of such a strike succeeding in building this kind of autonomous organization. We would then have to consider certain other factors arising out of this strike: not those tending towards an organization with characteristics of past movements but those factors betokening different kinds of relations, also in evidence during the strike, but which got lost in the overall significance accorded to questions of formal aspects of organization.

Noir et Rouge (chez Félix, 65 rue Bichat - 75010 Paris - in French)

N° 6, September-October 1987: Barbie show; Decroly: a primary school not like others; Women: the social function - couple and modern society; Family: Jocast's children; Women in men's jobs; Women students; Kanaky: the other half of the sky; Student movement: from direct democracy to bureaucracy.

France goes off the Rails - The movement in France, November '86-January '87 (B.M. Blob, London WC 1 N3 XX or BM Combustion, London WC1 N3 XX-in English) This pamphlet studies and criticizes the student movement and the railway strike in France during the winter '86-'87. Some texts are translated from french analysis or from french leaflets. We will give a review of it in a special issue on the texts about these actions.

Third camp internationalists in France during World War II (in English-copy at Echanges: f1)

The author is French and has been living in France during and after World War II; he was involved in these small groups activities. The text brings very valuable information on what is usually completely hidden behind the heavy propaganda of states or parties. Presently the 'revisionists' pretending to fight this dominant ideology are bringing even more confusion and help to the opposed ideology (old or neo-fascism). This short story of the difficult and obscure fight of the 'Third camp internationalist' nuclei can help us a lot on the way to internationalism.

UNITED KINGDOM

1987. Emeute au Carnaval de Notting Hill

Small pamphlet in French, no address (copy at Echanges)

Review from a friend: The article is very good. I particularly welcomed the analysis of the 'role' of black leaders and carnival organizers, which is usually overlooked.

Some remarks:

1. It's quite inaccurate to say that 1987 was an 'advance' in lack of interracial confrontations on previous years. There has never been a history of such (Pickpockets versus tourists not relevant). Even in the great '76 riot there were very few accidents of blacks v. whites, not even versus Asian shopkeepers (shops were attacked, but indiscriminately of race; according to some witnesses there were some incidents of black aggro versus whites, not much though and not general).

2. Anthony Lemard was a well loved and respectable neighborhood personality, community activist/welfare worker, who did indeed die in police custody. But he was not killed by police violence. It's sadly but readily acknowledged by his family and friends that he died from a self-administered drug overdose. It wasn't necessary for the police to arrest him, as he'd been called down before they arrived, but it had been neighbors who called them - Anthony had been very violent with a knife.

The significant fact is that, so bitter is the past and present experience by blacks at Notting Hill Police Station of being beaten up and killed (in the previous months a young black man had been gratuitously killed by police at Notting Hill Station) that the immediate rational assumption was that policemen were responsible; spontaneous demonstrations outside the police station began instantly. They were only called off when people were satisfied (a week or so later) by community discussions (police statements weren't believed) that policemen were not to blame.

Miners' strike: 'To the bitter end' - Grève des mineurs en Grande Bretagne (Mars 1984-Mars 1985) H. Simon, Edition Acratie - in French. This book is a complete analysis of the strike - available at Echanges: £ 5. A review will follow in a further issue.

Rank and file movement Some letters and articles showing how the workers' movement can be manipulated by some leftist bureaucrats. Copy at Echanges. (after the miners' strike)

Counter Information (Box 81, c/o 43 Candlemakers Row, (Pigeonhole 81) Edinburgh, Scotland, United Kingdom)

N° 17/Nov-Dec '87: Prison revolts; Strikes at Moat House Hotel (Liverpool), Sari fabrics (London), nurses (Royal Edinburgh Hospital), miners (Yorkshire); Occupation for 42 hours at Salford Plastic (Manchester) to stop removal of machinery.

Penny Summerfield - Women workers in the second World War Photocopy of the conclusion of this book - in English. A valuable contribution to the reappraisal of the role of women at this time and of the political and economical pressure to bring women to work not only for the war effort but permanently. We can compare this situation with what Tim Mason described for the German women in 'Les femmes en Allemagne 1925-1940' (in French) and in 'Labour in the Third Reich 1933-'39' (Past & Present n° 33). Copies at Echanges.

Solidarity (A Journal of Libertarian Socialism - c/o 123 Lathom Road, London E 6)

N° 16/Spring '88. Trotskyism: The revolution betrayed. This issue publishes an extract of 'The Interim Report of the International Committee Commission of the fourth International on the corruption of the Workers' Revolutionary Party' (leader Gerry Healy). The key pages are preceded by a very relevant commentary ending with this right conclusion:

'We cannot accept the attitude which says that if it is necessary to support, or to keep silent about, the torture and execution of dissidents in order to augment party funds, so be it; or that ordinary people are simply there to be lied to, manipulated, exploited and sacrificed to the interest of the party - often embodied in its leader - are relevant. The symptoms presented by the WRP express in an extreme form the basic attitude of a wide section of the authoritarian 'left', and this is true both here and now and in the societies they have brought or might bring into existence'.

It is true as well that this amorality stems 'from leninist ideology' and involves the 'denial of any relationship between means and ends'. The analysis should go deeper in the roots of capitalist society: leninism was the ideology for the building on a variety of a bourgeois society and a bourgeois state. No surprise to find among all the supporters of this ideology

the same amorality for the protection of elitism, i.e. class society, of domination of 'ordinary people', i.e. exploitation, we can see everywhere in the present society (full ICFI-report available at Solidarity for £ 5).
 Review of books: Winning the battle but losing the war (Barbara Ehrenreich, Elisabeth Itess and Gloria Jacobs); Remaking love, the feminization of sex (Fontana); Polish apparat's double think (Theresa Toranska); 'Oni', Stalin's Polish Puppets (Collius Harvill - see previous Exchanges).

Paper boys - Accounts of picketing at Wapping (no author, no address - copy at Exchanges)

For those not having the opportunity to read regularly 'Picket' during the one-year Wapping fight (see Exchanges nrs. 47, 48, 49, 50) this booklet will give them an accurate inside view of what was this long struggle and what was at stake for all those people involved in this difficult attempt to break the iron frame of government and bosses, police and unions. We can see how organization of small fighting gangs rose from the fight itself and how rich were the spontaneous answers to the repressive forces themselves. Even though the very plain language brings us the very life of the daily - or rather two times a week - struggles, we can't prevent us to see behind these simple words some hidden political tendency. We could have expected from the preface some analysis of the rising of autonomous characters as they appear from the story itself. Instead we have some hidden-meaning words like 'good activists', 'real proletariat', 'heroism in the battles', 'we will become the most powerful group in the country'.

Real proletariat or hidden vanguardism? The answer will come from other struggles, but it could be very different even if it answers the ambiguous question asked in the preface: 'What kind of organization is needed.' For whom?

A letter from Wildcat (c/o Raven Press, 75 Picadilly, Manchester, M1 2 BU)

'We are writing, rather belatedly, to comment on the review of our pamphlet, 'Capitalism and its Revolutionary Destruction', which you published in Exchanges no. 51.

It is evident from the review that several important differences do exist between Exchanges' outlook and our own: for example, over the proletarian or bourgeois nature of the 1917 revolution in Russia; the role - if any - of organised political groups of communists in the class struggle; the differences - again, if any - between capitalist development in the 19th century and today, which influences our historical view of national liberation struggles and trade unionism; and so on.

Having acknowledged the real differences such as these, however, we must point out that a large part of what is written in the review is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of our view of the relationship between class struggle and class consciousness. This misunderstanding is summed up in the

statement that Wildcat 'regards the struggle of the working class as the result of its consciousness'. Frankly, we are more than a little puzzled as to how your reviewer arrived at this assessment, since it is just the opposite of what we believe!

While the question of the emergence of class consciousness is not one which we have dealt with in any great detail in our publication, the whole direction of our interventions and activity over the past few years has been based on the view that if widespread class consciousness is to emerge it will be as a result of working class people participating actively in collective class struggle, and that the progress of the working class movement in a revolutionary direction will be made largely in response to overcoming the immediate practical problems which crop up in pursuing and extending class struggle. Moreover, we base ourselves on this materialist position in our frequent opposition to idealist tendencies in the working class movement here such as the Socialist Party of Great Britain (SPGB), who see class consciousness as the product of passive reflection on the evils of capitalism, and who argue that the working class must somehow become conscious before engaging in any revolutionary activity.

In other words, with regard to this issue at least, our approach is basically the same one which is defended against our supposed view in your article!

We hope you will publish this clarification of our views as a contribution towards clearing the way for a fruitful debate on the issues which do separate us, rather than wasting time and space on issues where we are more or less in agreement'.

A review of a Wildcat article on the book 'Poland 1980-'82' (H. Simon) at the end of this issue brings more arguments in this discussion.

News from Everywhere (Box 14, 136 Kingsland High St - London E 8 - in English). From the paper itself:

'This is a chronological list of events which we consider as relevant contributions to the class struggle. Our criteria for inclusion are those events that show some potential towards autonomous proletarian activity, not so much always in their present form, which in the case of strikes over here for example, rarely break away from union domination, but more in the nature of their demands and reactions to the imposition of austerity measures. We deliberately do not include terrorist or nationalist activities because they are not expressions of the class struggle. In quite a few of the struggles listed, which although reformist/limited in appearance, there has been a conflict between the most combative elements of the class and those who exist to strengthen their role as leaders or protect their petty privileges within this society (cf. Madrid 14/2/87) and for this reason we think they are worth including.

Some of the things we've reported take the form of demands for democratic reforms in 'Third World' countries ruled by one party systems. Those leading these struggles for democracy are generally bourgeois elements resentful of the economic domination of a small elite. This situation seeks to encourage class alliances in the 'national interest'. The reason that we have reported them is that there are workers and other proletarians who use these situations as a convenient opportunity to attack the State and express their grievances. Specifically, successful student struggles can act as an encouragement and catalyst for workers to express their own struggles (as in France in '68 and '86 for example). Although the press has portrayed the South Korean events as a student/bourgeois opposition movement, workers have participated to some extent. The nature of their participation is more or less unknown, but it is undoubtedly influenced by the severe repression they experienced in the 1980 civilian uprising. It is also known that students accused of anti-government activity are often thrown out of university and have no choice but to go and work in the factories'.

Modern Times (BM CRL, London WC 1 N3 XX or Box 14, 136 Kingsland High St., London E 8)

Exchange & Mart; Time Out ('Freedom's just another word for be good or we'll lock you up'); Cosmopolitan: all the world's a market; Everyone will live in their own penthouse; Sunday People; News of the World; New Scientist (on automation and new technology); The Times (on strike action); Today.

This new magazine presents itself as: '..one attempt to analyze the complexity of this society, to find a common basis for our oppression and exploitation, so as to find a unitary basis for our struggles against it. But unity can only come from action, not from mere theoretical agreement, nor from setting up a party that seeks to integrate all struggles into its own enclosed space, time and understanding, for the purpose achieving separate power. In producing this magazine we have posed for ourselves more questions than we have answered, and we are continuing our analysis, our discussions on the practice of what we have learnt, together with (we hope) the development of our real practice.

If our language seems at times rather abstract and obscure, this is partly because this world is not as it portrays itself, so it is necessary to deal abstractly to find its tendencies that explain its concrete acts and existence (the basis of society is value, an abstraction from our concrete production), partly because we have not yet made our theory totally concrete in our practice (which is possibly impossible outside a revolutionary situation). Also as words change their meaning through use, it is sometimes easier to define things clearly with words that are least used, and so have retained a clearer meaning.'

Movement for Workers' Councils

In Echanges n° 52 we published a brief report of a conference organised in London on the 12th of September by an 'Institute for the practice and theory of the proletarian communist revolution'. We have received a 'communication' signed by the four members of the 'Preparatory Committee' of this conference and we are asked to publish it in a forthcoming issue of Echanges. This 'communication' is so full of misunderstandings and misinterpretations that we have decided not to publish it and not to answer it. We have decided as well not to give, as we promised, the more extended report of this meeting and the criticism of the text joined to the conference convocation. Those decisions were taken to avoid further misunderstandings, lengthy and useless discussions on misinterpretations.

Echanges will send copies of the documents issued by these 'Movement', 'Institute', 'Forum', and 'Committee' including the two above mentioned texts to anybody asking for them. We will continue to distribute the pamphlets already mentioned in Echanges n° 49-50 (or new ones eventually). They are available from 'Movement for Workers' Councils; secretariat: 21 East Lake Rd, London SE5, United Kingdom, where you can get as well more details on the point of view and on the present activities of this group.

USA

Reflections on American Radicalism, Past and future - Paul Buhle (Against the Current, Sept-Oct. '87)

Paul Buhle, the author, has just published a book 'Marxism in the US' (Verso Press, London) and is co-editing an Encyclopedia of the American Left (Garland Publishers). The book (complete title: 'Marxism in the United States - from 1870 to the present day, remapping the history of the american left') is vehemently criticised in a review published in News & Letters (n° 14/November 1987): 'Paul Buhle buries Marx's American roots' (Fred T. Shelley). In the same issue of Against the Current, Paul Buhle's article is followed by two responses: 'Limits of religious rebellion' (Allen Hunter) and 'Roots of American Radicalism: Afro-Anabaptist-Indian Fusion' (Loren Goldner). All these articles actually are more a discussion between intellectuals looking for ideas pulling workers out of their daily life to fight their exploitation and to find their way towards a new society. What they all say about social democracy, leninism, stalinism, trotskyism, etc can be somewhat relevant, but is indeed very superficial. Loren Goldner is right when he develops the idea that the 'success' of all these different forms of 'state capitalism' (wrongly identified by Paul Buhle to 'socialism' and 'marxism') in Western Europe was linked to the existence of primitive forms of agriculture: the 'left' was there to perform industrial bourgeois revolution; its 'modernism' borrowed a lot to jacobinism and played a central role towards the complete domination of capital.

In the USA, these theories brought there by all kinds of immigrants were not relevant because agriculture (and the middle classes linked to it) were capitalist from the very beginning. Paul Buhle does not see that what he calls their 'failure' in Europe is only the fact that the same total domination of capitalism is now performed - partly owing to the 'left' parties and unions - a success, not a failure. The attempt to look for the roots of american radicalism in other directions than 'socialist' imported ideas is distorted from the very beginning for two reasons:

- ideas and structures are seen as bringing consciousness and not at all as the product of struggles in the society

- marxism identified as a political system and even more with the various forms of 'state capitalism' can be considered as completely irrelevant to embody the resistance to exploitation.

It is interesting to follow the author wandering through american history to find all the roots of the innumerable forms of struggles against domination. The various religious sects, the various forms of 'marxism', the previous forms of cultural expression among black Indians, were among a lot of other forms, a way to maintain strong solidarity and identity in a very aggressive and destructive capitalism. They were only the temporary tools for a fight, a class struggle of which the article says nothing only dealing with the structural temporary forms. Loren Goldner's criticism more or less follows the same way, but tries to go beyond: he underlines that marxism 'is about the suppression of the capitalist antagonism of work and leisure in a new kind of activity which takes up within itself activities dispersed in those separate spheres'. We can agree, but for Loren Goldner it is only a kind of bridge to join Paul Buhle's ideas about the 'fusion of Radical Reformation, Indian & African' in a brand new American radicalism. Actually both are looking for a 'revolutionary working class strategy surpassing the problematic .. which underlay even our best revolutionary strategy'; they say the 'new ideas' are the only adequate strategy to 'combat the capitalist restructuring now underway'.

The other criticisms of Buhle's article are either academic or political one's, i.e. again about ideas, structures, but not at all about class struggle in the present capitalist society. Allen Hunter starts in that way: '(Buhle) does not acknowledge the extent to which people have chosen reformist rather than revolutionary politics, e.g. workers calculating that the benefits of reform were preferable to the ambiguities of attempts at seizing power'. Hunter puts only the finger on a fundamental point, missing as well the essential of it. Workers are not 'choosing' between reform or revolution. When they fight, individually, collectively (in small or larger and larger units) it is not a choice and they don't choose their way, the extent, the limits. They are going according to their interest, in a dialectical process, using the existing structural forms at their hand if they are relevant, up to the point where they consider what's their interest at

that moment. As for that, political or sociological analysts can write a lot but generally they miss what was the actual worker struggle. It is precisely what all the quoted authors did in their inquiries about American Radicalism (copies of all mentioned articles at Echanges).

Discussion Bulletin (PO Box 1564, Grand Rapids, MI 49501)

DB contains articles, letters and discussion contributions from among other persons sympathising with or being members of marxist, DeLeonist, industrial unionist, left/council communist, syndicalist and anarchist groups.

N° 26/Nov. '87. Debate on labour time vouchers and transition to socialism (Tim Holzinger, Adam Buick); The Jehovah's witnesses and the 'old' Socialist Labor Party; The question of organization; The conflict between Workers Solidarity Alliance and Libertarian Labor Review; Adam Buick: answer to the I.C.C.; Debate on the now finished article series 'The Socialist Labor Party Revisited'.

N° 27/Jan. '88. A page from labor history: The Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance; The differences between IWW, WSA and Libertarian Labor Review; F. Girard (BD editorial board): answer to I.C.C.; Debate on labor time vouchers (Interrogations, F. Girard); Socialist Party of Great Britain, Guildford Branch: The road to socialism.

Synthesis (A newsletter & journal for social ecology, deep ecology, bio-regionalism, ecofeminism and the green movement, PO Box 1858, San Pedro CA 90733 - 1858 USA - in English)

N° 25/July '87. National Alternative Politics Conference; Review of books: The Green Alternative - Creating an Ecological Future (Brian Tokar); Eco-feminist Conference at USC; Little Rock meeting of COC Interregional Committee; The N-American conference of Christianity and Ecology; Japan Green Federation.

N° 26/Dec. '87. Report of Kansas City Committees of Correspondence August meeting; some reflections on the christian entry into ecological movement; Mid-Atlantic green program; Review of the Book 'Dissent and critical thought in the German Democratic Republic (Bruce Allen); Social Ecology vs. Deep Ecology.

Processed World (55 Sutter Street, Apt 1829, San Francisco, Ca. 94104, USA
N° 19/Spring 1987. Talking Head; Letters; Work's diminishing connections; A teaching temp talks back; Kaiser don't care (Rank and file activists talk about the Kaiser Hospital strike); Small is not beautiful (Life at the Bay Guardian); Book review: Culture in Contention - The whale and the reactor: a search for limits in an age of High Technology.

The new Freud in the Work place is Pay as You Grow. More employers are linking wages to performance (The Washington Post National Weekly Edition, 8-6-87. Copy at Echanges)

Companies in the USA search for solutions to cut costs and improve productivity, some are persuading employers to put more of their salaries at risk in return for more of a say in how the company is managed. Actually all the programs that are changing the contour of the American paycheck (gain sharing, small group incentives, individual incentives, pay for knowledge, etc.) aim at increasing the intensity of work in dividing wages into a low basic rate and an important 'share' of company profits determined according to individual behaviour to work. This new system of piece work is presented as 'an antidote to American economic ill', i.e. as a means to stop the decline of the rate of profit in industry, in average getting more products for less wages. According to the author there is no dispute on the fundamental impact that this is having in the work place.

Axis point of American Industrialism (John Zerzan)

A reprint from International Review of Social History (review in another Echanges).

What is a sit-down Strike? (A Workers' Democracy pamphlet - WD Press, PO Box 24115, St. Louis, MO 63130 USA)

Throughout the year 1937 sit-down strikes ripped across the US. In March '37 there were 60 sit-down strikes in Chicago only. How did the sit-downs begin? Why did they spread so fast? Why did sit-downs work? Why did they come to a halt? Who were the Wobblies? Can there ever be sit-downs again? All these questions are the titles of chapters in which they are answered. The conclusion advocates for sit-downs to create a new society.

In These Times (Institute for Public Affairs - 1300 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60657 - USA.)

N° 35/Sept '87. The black mayors; The auto industry's job security; Coal miners' slaughter (about Matewan, a new film by John Sayles which dramatized West Virginia's Matewan Massacre in 1920).

Workers Vanguard (of the Spartacist League-Box 1377 GPO New York, NY 10116) N° 429/29-5-'87. Barbie Trial; Freedom for Vanunu; Yugoslavia in turmoil; Mexico atop the Volcano.

N° 436/18-9-'87. Victory to Salinas; Modest Cannery strike; Victory to Chicago Teachers strike.

Fifth Estate (PO Box 02548, Detroit, Mich. 48201)

Summer '87. Anarchy in Minneapolis; Race, class, and crime in the US; the Goetz case; Did US cause aids?; Detroit Trask Incinerator; The metaphysics

of dancing tribes; Stefano Della Chiaie: portrait of a fascist; Against utilism technic.

Fall '87. How deep is deep ecology; A challenge to radical environmentalism. This issue is only on this subject. Review in a next Echanges issue.

Labor Notes (7435 Michigan Avenue, Detroit, Mich. 48210 - USA)

June '87. Meat packers discuss how to rebuild a fighting union; Go-it-alone mentality hurts airline union in Era of Deregulation; Could plant closing have been stopped; Aerospace workers mount in: plant strategy against Mac Donnell Douglas.

N° 104/Nov. '87. Eight-month strike: lockout brings solidarity to paper workers (in four states against the International Paper Company); Canadian Government passes back-to-work law as postal workers fight privatization scheme; Why the GM/Ford contracts won't provide the job security (with details on the contracts); Observations on the football strike.

N° 106/Jan. '88. Paper workers hire Ray Rogers to escalate campaign against Int. Paper (on a nine-month strike/lock-out of 3400 paper workers on wages and job-classification); The worker's right to refuse unsafe work; Book: 'Workers, Managers and technological changes', a study of how technology has affected the balance of power between workers and employers (Plenn Publishing Corp, Customer Serv., 233 Spring St, New York, NY 10013 - \$ 37.50); Why stock market crash may lead to austerity.

News and Letters (59 East Van Buren, room 707, Chicago, Ill. 60605)

N° 5. Why Hegel's Phenomenology, why now (Raya Dunayewskaja); Militarized science in a state capitalist society.

Immigrant workers' strike (Barrett Fooda)

N° 10. Korea's new revolutionaries; Delta pride workers pride with union.

N° 14. South Africa: new stage of repression; new stage of trade union struggle.

GERMANY

The German working class 1888-1933

Richard Evans. Review from Head and Hand.
N° 12/Winter '87-'88 (copy at Echanges)

The book appears to have some interesting articles. One about communists activity among street gangs in Berlin. The second about petty crime on the Hamburg docks as an expression of class conflict.

Who is afraid of the Security State? (Th. Sander - copy at Echanges)

This text shows how West Germany has become one of the most highly developed

police states in the world and the level of resistance among the population. Taking the last census as the most recent example, T.S. brings to the conclusion that 'while the organized boycott of the fervent admirers of democracy went down in total defeat .. the unorganized boycott can be seen as a massive demonstration of the refusal of the state'.

Wildcat (Sisina, Postfach 360.527 - 1000 Berlin 36 - in German)
N° 42/Autumn '87. Editorial; Militant research has to become militant; Squatters struggle and urban politics; Berlin: 1th of May riots for Reagan's visit - and repression; Hunger strike in Berlin prison (Die Plötze); Restructuring and strikes at Reinosa (Spain) against redundancies; South Korea; Workers struggles and international capitalism; Revolutionary discussions among men groups in towns on patriarchy, men behaviour, etc.
N° 43/Jan. '88. Editorial; Revolt in the steel industry against redundancies; Militant research: in the big industry; Strike at Mercedes (Victoria-Basque country) against new methods to measure work time; Who is frightened of the Cob(r)as? Interview with a Collegamenti comrade actively involved in school cobas; New ideas on the railway strike in France; Sth-Corea; Working class, sit-ins, banditism in Brazil; USA: struggle against wages cuts (Kaiser Hospital, San Francisco-translated from Processed World 12/86); Strike wave in Turkey.

CANADA

Resistance (Friends of Durruti, PO Box 790, Station A Vancouver, BC Canada VG C2 N6)

N° 11. Documents and analyses of the illegal front. RARA attacks Dutch multi-national; Census aims to quell resistance (West Germany); Campaign against gene technology; Siemens chairman assassinated; Technological restructuring resisted; ETA prisoners.

SOUTH AFRICA

South Africa 1985, the organisation of power in black and white (S. Thomsen and N. Abraham)

BM Combustion, London WC1 N3 XX, U.K. - in English. This text was produced in August '85 in the USA. This version contains a few additions to the original text. Review in another issue.

IRAN

REPORT - newsletter of the communist party of Iran (BM Box 3004, London WC1 N3 XX UK; 015 Box 50040 10405 Stockholm Sweden; Kamingar-M-BP2 - 95102 Argenteuil Cedex France)

N° 29/March-June '87. This is not the Moscow oriented C.P., but a leftist

(end page 23)

Poland 1981 - Graveyard of workers' democracy. In Wildcat N° 10 (Box W180, Mansfield Road, Nottingham; Box W75, Picadilly, Manchester, M1 2 BU)
This long text (issue nr. 10) claims to be a review of H. Simon's book 'Poland 1980-82 - Class struggle and the crisis of capital' (published in french by Spartacus and in English by Black and Red - both editions available at Echanges). Actually this article is not only a review but an opportunity for Wildcat members to develop their positions on their 'revolutionary' activities, the role of a 'communist minority' whose central function (among others we suppose) will be to work for the emergence of 'a truly revolutionary consciousness' (quotations from Wildcat text).

We may even ask ourselves if these 'ruthless' self-qualified revolutionarily conscious members of this communist minority (self qualified as 'the communist party') have ever really read the book. As usual in this kind of political polemics between tiny groups, when a suspect has to be hanged, parts of sentences are taken out of their context, other phrases are distorted from their original meaning, some quotations are considered as the author's opinions though cited only to show the gap between rank and file activity and a minority of 'self imposed' leaders. Some of these quotations are so evidently flimsy, sounding so obviously like jokes, that one wonders if these 'revolutionaries' have not completely lost the english sense of humour.

Two examples of this type of criticism will suffice. W. writes: 'However, the MKS was not revolutionary, it was as Simon points out 'a meeting of reformists'. This qualification is drawn from a passage of the book (page 28 english edition) attempting to analyze the balance of struggle between the widespread strike and the attempts of negotiations to end the strike. The passage explained: '.. this is the more important aspect, the negotiations in Gdansk were not discussions between strikers and the authorities, but a meeting of reformists, some of them Party members, the others connected with the political opposition or with the working class rank and file - all of those serving as experts ..'. Clearly, the 'meeting of reformists was not the MKS but the meeting at the negotiating table of representatives of the polish government and of the MKS; the remainder of the paragraph leaves no possible doubt about this, except for W. In another chapter of the review (Class consciousness and the Party) W. writes: 'Simon shows how nationalist was working class resistance after the coup. A rank and file document ..'. This document quoted in full (pages 74 and 75 - english edition) was, it is specially emphasized, circulated 'under the auspices of Solidarity local' and was supposed to give advice to the workers on what should be their daily practice; so the local underground Solidarity officials had entitled it 'Rank and File rules for passive resistance'. In the book (page 75) this document was followed by a discussion of the pretence of Solidarity bureaucracy to instruct the workers what to do when they had already done a lot spontaneously, especially in Silesia. The nationalist stance of the document

was the position of Solidarity local apparatus: the text was without ambiguity on that point; but W. read into it a demonstration of how 'nationalist was working class resistance' and 'the absence of class consciousness'. The W. review swarms with such examples.

Going through this 'ruthless criticism of weakness of workers' struggles' (to quote W. moralists) and consequently the weakness of the book 'a worship of the working class' (another W. quote), we have at first to consider the deforming glasses, the instrument W. uses to look at events and which yardstick W. manipulates to measure what it calls a 'revolutionary potential'.

Doing so, we will push aside some 'ruthless' and peremptory condemnations without answering them (in Lenin or Stalin times they would have carried bullets) such as 'This reactionary social-democratic ideas are common followers of Rosa Luxemburg and councillists like H.S.' or 'He (H.S.) is dangerously wrong when his worship of the working class leads him to quote counterrevolutionary ideas approvingly' or 'the bourgeois rubbish that he (H.S.) uncritically quotes about rights, participation, democracy and worse?', or that H.S. is 'blind to the cause of the failure - the absence of class consciousness'. All these are quotes from W. review: we can't help thinking of the famous Lenin statement that workers can't go beyond a trade union consciousness, and so they need beloved political guides.

When we read such definitive judgments we may ask ourselves what is the precise meaning of appreciations such as, that W. 'shares with H.S. an analysis of Poland as a capitalist country' and that 'to his credit, H.S. recognized that action necessarily precedes consciousness whilst the bourgeoisie still dominates the working class'. Are they not pure cosmetic? (transportation to Siberia rather than the firing squad?). W. don't even see that this final approval of the position of H.S. is totally in contradiction with their own positions as summed up in the conclusion of the review that 'a truly revolutionary consciousness can only emerge from ruthless criticism of the weakness of workers' struggles ..' (only underlined by us). Who will deliver the criticism and how?

*

* *

Let us come back to the instrument and yardstick of this ruthless criticism. W. does not say expressly who they are and what they stand for in this review but when reading it we find certain definite statements, we soon reach the conclusion that W. members consider themselves as part of these militant minorities defined as 'communists'.

Who is a communist? 'Whichever side .. tending to move towards communism',

writes W. So we get in a quote from Barrot's 'What is communism?'. We agree with the idea that communism 'can only be achieved through the destruction of 'value' and that 'it is neither democratic nor dictatorial' and that 'of course it is 'democratic' if this word means that everyone will be in charge of all social activities' (We can't discuss here the influence of leninism and bordigism on Barrot's ideas but it would explain the meaning of this 'of course'). If W. quotes this Barrot extract, we think it is to support their opinion: why then does W. fail to understand the word 'democracy' with the meaning of 'bourgeois democracy' and not at all with this meaning of 'being in charge of all social activities' at first of workers' activity in class struggle? Have we to draw the conclusion that W. did not understand at all the central argument of the book, that in Poland, as in most of the workers' struggles, the conflict was (and still is) between this 'communist workers' democracy and the bourgeois democracy, though never expressed as clearly as in these words? This contradiction in W. position can be seen in another form when W., after having recognized that 'action precedes consciousness', can write that 'mass strike .. is the result of preparation by minorities' or that 'the minority will take the lead in doing what needs to be done' (Who will decide 'what needs to be done'?).

This last point needs more development because it is the Ariadne thread of W. analysis and certainly of their general positions. We have to consider the reason of this contradiction: on one side the definition of democracy as a situation where everyone will be in charge of all social activities', on the other side this importance given to the communist minority that 'tends to emerge during massive struggles' but 'will remain a minority until well into the revolutionary period' and defined as 'the communist party'. Should we understand that this communist democracy defined as such is for the future, not for now? The only expectation is that for W. it will exist only when everybody is conscious. For the time being it is evident for W. that the majority of workers in their daily life and in their always limited actions can only be characterized by 'the absence of class consciousness'. We should understand as well that the struggles in Poland were only for W. an example of what happens in most struggles. W. writes: 'There is no need to go outside an analysis of the Polish working class' Achilles heel - its reactionary ideas - to explain why the ruling class was successful'. This we don't understand very well.

For W. (and we agree) 'being precedes consciousness': if the polish workers were so dominated by 'reactionary ideas' why did they challenge in such a way the capitalist polish ruling class and a whole system of exploitation? We are moving in a kind of vicious circle: of course only a 'communist minority' can break it.

W. as well thought of the polish workers' (and any other workers') action as the vanguardist action of a minority and was very disappointed that the workers made no attempt to spread the struggle outside Poland ..; only this

sentence reveals even more: big differences on class struggle.

W. ideas about it are more closely expressed in this sentence: 'In the class struggle .. frequently, the actions of combative proletarians go ahead of their ideas. Democracy .. results in holding back necessary actions'. To go ahead with their own ideas, W. gives its own - and wrong - description of the events of July and August 1980 in Poland. 'The mass strike does not start from all the workers. It is the result of preparation by minorities'. Who were then the minorities in Poland? Or have we to understand that the lack of consciousness of polish workers' was so because they have not been prepared by a minority and neither had they had this 'communist minority' able to tell them what they needed? W. writes about 'H.S. complaints about elitist conceptions among the leaders of the MKS'. What W. for their own purpose calls 'complaints', is nothing more about the MKS than the facts. W. needs to remove these facts with a contemptuous judgement, killing two birds with one stone. W. in rejecting the dialectical process between the polish workers' democracy of their own interest, and the bourgeois democracy of the 'elite' of the MKS, can thereby develop its own formula of the reactionary ideas of the polish workers' democracy assimilated to bourgeois democracy, and so introduce its own conceptions of the role of minorities (a good elite opposed to a bad one).

Developing its idea on this 'communist minority' that 'will remain a minority until well into the revolutionary period', W. dances on a tight rope. 'There is no question of this minority 'injecting class consciousness' but the idea 'that it has to limit itself to 'accelerating' the class struggle for fear of substituting itself for the class is as reactionary as substitutionalism itself, because it leads this minority to abandon its avant garde role in favour of following the existing class struggle and the non-communist majority'. We have heard that a lot of time in the past. W. adds only more nets to prevent itself from falling into the leninist marshes.

Everywhere the 'communist party' is part of the working class, everywhere the communist minority (sometimes a very tiny one, no matter) takes the lead in doing 'what needs to be done', everywhere this minority is not 'injecting' but 'accelerating' and everywhere another reality is just 'reactionary'.

None of this has come about by mere chance. Like a lot of vanguardist groups for the past twenty years, W. has had to follow this narrow path and to cover their real thinking behind words, so bringing about a lot of confusion. If we consider class struggle in western capitalism we can see that workers are rejecting more and more leninist and generally vanguardist ideas and are trying to go their own way. The so called 'militant' often has to dress up old ideas in new clothes. Though advocating a democracy in which 'everyone will be in charge of all social activities' W. rejects as bourgeois and reactionary 'the right (for the polish workers) to intervene directly in any decision made over their heads'. W. pushes their point of

view even further ahead. 'It is not true that the majority of the working class have to actively support the initial insurrection. All that is required is that they do not actively oppose'. We are very far from 'everyone being in charge..'

So, in any struggle, some people (which minority) will decide of the moment, of the activity, of anything as far as the 'majority' stays passive. Again the old argument is that if 'mass meetings vote for scabs .. we support minorities who defy these democratic decisions'. As if it is possible to put any situation in such schematic lines out of its very context: workers could be against the strike because they consider it is their interest at that moment. Situations in class struggle are neither revolutionary or reactionary they are; and when a big majority of workers are against something they have certainly a common reason for it. It is not a matter of approval or rejection, but a matter of understanding.

We have underlined the word 'insurrection' because it is significant of W.'s position, and in the review it is the link between social and political struggles. Actually W. language of criticism always is a political one though it is more often dissimulated behind a social and class vocabulary. To develop their argument about 'insurrection' leading to the 'proletarian revolution' W. again represents the book as a defense of 'democratic bodies', 'delegates democratically elected', and so on. They should read more carefully. What they are looking for is not social struggle and social revolution, but political insurrection divorced from social struggle. So at least we have the yardstick with which W. measures which is 'the more revolutionary'. Insurrection is the key word: 'The last few years of riots in Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Latin America, Zambia, Britain, Japan and West-Germany and above all the struggles in South Africa have had more revolutionary potential than the polish mass strike, although none of them have involved a majority of workers'. All the struggles quoted raise very different problems from the question of democracy: their social content was so different that it is a total mystification to put them in the same basket of political insurrection. A strike without any political content can have very deep political consequences and a riot with an evident ^{political} content could have no political consequences. What can riots in Morocco or Tunisia, very backward and non-industrialized countries have in common with riots in England? What do the so-called riots in West Germany have in common with the Tottenham riots in Britain? W. can decide some struggles have 'a revolutionary potential' because they are labelled political strikes; W. does not even suggest that this revolutionary potential could come from the consequence of such struggles on the rate of profit and the accumulation of capital (they will have to come back to the polish struggles). 'Those who have born the brunt of police repression hardly need councillism to tell them it takes a lot of people to beat the state'. Who said that workers 'need councillism': only W., obsessed by the idea that workers 'need' some-

thing 'to be done' or 'to be said'. So the problem for W. is 'to beat the state', not the destruction of value or anything else, as if the state was not only the repressive frame of capitalism and as if its 'destruction' removes automatically all the relations of capitalist domination.

W. apparently fails to see that a class society is defined by the relations of production; we can see also the meaning of this 'minority taking the lead in doing what needs to be done .. well into the revolutionary period' (quote from W.); will this minority take some functions of the state to define and impose eventually on the majority 'what needs to be done'? We have to say that our opinion is exactly the opposite of W. For us, the essential problem is not to beat the state by an insurrection but to suppress capitalism by practicing communist relationships of production (destruction of value) and at the same time by destroying the state (and not beating it). Of this suppression will involve violence, not a direct violence against, but the violence needed to answer the attempts to suppress the organization of society where 'everyone will take in charge his social activities'. The organization of the struggle will be the organization of society, not at all a separate activity against one aspect or other of capitalist society.

All the quoted struggles have to be considered in that context, not according to their limited and contingent characteristics. In that respect, because they were an attempt to answer all the problems of a society, the polish mass strikes were without doubt more 'revolutionary' than all the quoted riots. We have on this point exactly the opposite position to W.'s. Poland in '70-'71 provided a good example: the fights in the streets were badly repressed and brought the workers back into the factories where occupations got them, socially and politically far more than had their struggles in the streets.

We don't want this last statement to be misunderstood because, as we have said before, nothing is so simply drawn in black and white. What the book Poland sought to do was not at all what W. seeks to discover in it: some revolutionary project or tendency on which to stick their system of ideas on communism and revolution. We tried to analyze a very complex succession of events and to show what this struggle could have in common with past struggles and what could be new in them. We know that these struggles moved within a lot of contradictions. We think it useful to give a short summary of what was the central part of the book. Polish workers went spontaneously on strike for economical reasons, purely materialistic ones; in most of the factories on strike all the workers were involved and not at all a minority; it was not at all a question of democracy because the action itself was democratic. The widespread and long-lasting strike became a threat to the country's economy, then to the government, and, in the background, to Russia. It was also a threat to capitalism as a whole. As ever, in such situations, new forms of domination rise from the struggle itself to try to maintain the domination of capital. The presidium of the MKS, then Solidari-

ty, were part of this attempt. It was a double dialectical process, with the rank and file workers on one side, with the ruling class on the other side. When Solidarity tried to be recognized by this ruling class as a valuable structure in the system, it also needed to be recognized as such by the workers. This was not the case at all. The so-called 'reactionary' workers tried to impose their own view of work and society. No matter what it was, it was their own view and the fact that they were opposed in doing so by both Solidarity and the ruling class was enough for the ruling class to consider it as a real danger and to consider Solidarity useless. So the ruling class had to come back to a more direct form of domination by a coup d'etat. For W. the polish workers, in spite of 'some gains' from the strike, never got a 'truly revolutionary consciousness'. They never moved away from reformism, nationalism and trade unionism. For W. 'it was when S. had done as much as he could to derail the movement and the workers had failed to consciously go beyond Solidarity, that the ruling class was able to restore order'. Actually, we don't understand: if S. succeeded in 'derailing the movement', where was the need for a coup d'etat? On the other hand, if the 'leader (Walesa) truly expressed the consciousness of the mass of the workers', then why this constant opposition between the rank and file and Solidarity officials all throughout these months of struggle? Because, contrary to what is said, W. thinks that consciousness has to come before action. This is clear where W. reflects upon 'the cause of the failure: the absence of consciousness' and when W. regrets that polish workers on strike 'made no attempt to spread the struggle outside Poland'.

Attempts by workers on strike to spread the strike have to be considered in the general context of the balance of the struggle. They could be successful or not, and such spreading depends not at all on such attempts

or on some kind of consciousness that the strike has to be extended. In the most important strikes, the extension of the strike has in practice been a spontaneous phenomenon, left to the decision of the workers involved in this extension (it was democracy and not minority action).

*

* *

We wish to speak more of 'democracy' in order to clear W.'s ideas, not only about Poland but about any struggle. There would be much to say about W.'s affirmation that 'the most significant struggles which have taken place in the world since 1981 have been notably undemocratic'. We won't discuss this point because given the examples quoted by W. it would need a distinctly long discussion. We wish only to underline that this choice is not by chance but is deliberate: those examples serve to illustrate the W. conception

about mass strikes as the 'result of preparation by minorities'. W. does not mind being found to be in contradiction with Barrot's ideas of democracy they quote (everyone in charge of all social activities); for to W. political activities are favoured and social activities ignored.

We will concentrate our argument on social activities because we consider them to condition political activities. Apparently W. thinks the contrary; which we can understand: W. minorities must have before all else political activity, in order 'to take the lead in doing what needs to be done'. This minority should have to define the 'needs', the actions and the moment. They will only ask the majority 'not to actively oppose' them, will defy 'democratic decisions' of the majority, at best they 'will call on the majority to participate'.

What a good definition for political activity, or coming back to Poland, what else did Solidarity and the 'political vanguard' involved in it, do with the polish workers? W. would say, of course, they were reformists and we are revolutionaries (as if violence was the guarantee for revolutionary communist activity).

Considering social struggles, the most important point of W.'s review is when they ask the question 'how to resolve disagreement among workers' and proclaim their 'call on revolutionary minorities to ignore' democratic decisions because as communists they support 'whichever side is tending to move towards communism', or in simpler words, W. accords to itself and its members the label of good quality communists able to decide for the workers. Actually, the problem is as old as capitalism itself. Precisely the same discussion took place in 1954 in a correspondence between Chaulieu (Castoriadis) and Pannekoek, on the activity of the group Socialisme ou Barbarie. Chaulieu (Castoriadis) could write to Pannekoek:

'(In a revolutionary period) .. the working class .. will not be a class different from the class we know today; it will have gone forwards an enormous step, but to quote a famous sentence, it will still bear on its side the stigma of the previous situation. It will be superficially dominated by deeply hostile influences against which at first a vague revolutionary will and a revolutionary vanguard will oppose. This vanguard will have through all kinds of means allowed by the fundamental idea about working class autonomy to enlarge and deepen its influence inside the Councils, to gain the majority for its programme. This vanguard will have perhaps even to act beforehand; what should it do if having 45% majority in the councils, it comes to it that a neo-stalinist party is going to take power for tomorrow? Should not have to go ahead to conquer the power immediately?'

In his answer, Pannekoek completely rejects this idea of the vanguardist action:

'You (Castoriadis) ask the question in a completely practical way: what the party should do if, having behind him 45% of the council members, it was informed of a coup from another party trying to conquer the power? Your answer

is: we have to go first in doing what it is going to do. What will be the result of such an action .. Would the struggle of such a party be able to save the proletarian revolution? I (Pannekoek -) think it would be a step towards a new oppression .. Workers can only prevent an oppression coming from a communist party through developing and reinforcing their own class power: that means their unanimous will to have the means of production under their control and their management.. If the working class .. is not able to take the production in its own hands, the unavoidable result will be that a new ruling class will become the master of the production..'

W. writes very similarly to Castoriadis, in slightly different words:

'No doubt mass strikes will play an important role in the revolution. But revolutionaries and militant minorities will need to be prepared to defy any organs which arise to represent the opinion of the majority of the workers. It will often be necessary to set up organs of workers' power to take the initiative in leading the struggle forward independent of the mass assemblies which represent the majority'.

We have nothing to add to the Pannekoek answer: it is still perfectly relevant though W. stays in the dark about the vanguardist element defined as 'revolutionaries and militant minorities' (including W. itself), as well what they call 'the communist party, the communist part of the working class'. We don't know what the actual form of this party is in W.'s ideas, but we know very precisely from W.'s position that this 'party' should behave exactly as any leninist party. Of course, as W. is 'revolutionary', present workers' democracy is a bourgeois democracy despised by these self-proclaimed 'truly conscious revolutionary', H.S. developed 'reactionary social-democratic ideas' and the polish workers never went beyond reformism, nationalism and trade unionism' and would have better gone to bed rather than fight their exploitation. In the decomposition of the left vanguardist organizations, W. tries desperately and caricaturally to appear as the searchlight for all the disbanded vanguardist troops. This is a currently very common activity among militants in Western Europe. But class struggle is elsewhere even though W. and Co try constantly to cling to some of its manifestations, and with obsolete machinery.

• IRAN (end)

group which, to some extent has broken with the stalinist/maoist tradition. This newsletter gives detailed information about strikes, actions and social conditions in Iran and fortunately there is little of the ideological stuff of this group. A short review will follow in another Echanges.

Exchange s et Mouvement
BM Box 91
LONDON WC1N 3XX
U.K.

PERIODICAL

TO

