

THE
COMMUNIST

6th

No 24

Evans, Hoffman
& Marxism

C.W.O.

"Leadership" and
Leadership

D. Laurie

Hampstead
reassesses
STALIN

M. Lynch



EVANS, Hoffman and

MARXISM.

Lenin's view was that 'without a revolutionary theory there cannot be a revolutionary movement. Up to the present, groups whose behaviour showed that they did not share this view, and that in fact they held the reverse view, have nevertheless felt obliged to repeat Lenin's statement as if they agreed with it. Now, for the first time, a 'Marxist-Leninist group, a 'Party' in fact, has emerged which openly rejects Lenin's view and states the contrary view. We refer of course to the 'CPB-(ML)', which in the editorial of No 1 of the Worker declares: "Without a revolutionary Party there cannot be a revolutionary theory." In the CPB view the organisation precedes its theoretical basis: theory is not the guide of practice; it is a mere by-product of practice, a mere moralising ideology which accompanies practice.

The 'Party' has now existed for a couple of years. What 'revolutionary theory' has it developed? Its major contribution is the notion that British society has entered the first stage of fascism. How, you might wonder, could anyone with any knowledge of fascism, and any knowledge of the condition of British society, maintain we are now living in a fascist society?

In Northern Ireland a fascist state existed for almost half a century. It is now in the process of being dismantled in favour of a democratic form of bourgeois dictatorship. The British state has been, during recent years, an active agent of bourgeois democratic political reform because it considered that the conditions which made fascism necessary no longer existed. Last summer the British army intervened for the first time against the fascists.

The CPB dare not explain the reality of what has happened in Ulster because this would explode its sham politics. It has therefore been led into publishing the most blatant deceptions in order to make the Ulster events fit into its sham politics. There have been shooting incidents between the British Army and other elements in Ulster. Struggles of the Irish people against imperialism, the CPB exclaims. In fact these have been struggles between the imperialist and fascist forces (the two having ceased to be identical). Last autumn there was a prolonged battle between the state and fascist forces who were trying to break into a Nationalist area to burn it up. Because the fascist elements were prevented from reaching their objective by the state forces this was a battle between imperialism and the people. If the people had won and had got into Unity Walk, or if the state had not tried to prevent them, then the "people" would have become the fascist forces of imperialism. But because

they were thwarted by the imperialist state, the fascists were transformed into the 'anti-imperialist people'. Without a revolutionary Party of the Birch/Ash/Bateson type there could never be such revolutionary theory.

The major theoretical work of the CPB is the article in which it demonstrates that British society has entered the first stage of fascism (The Worker, Feb 1969). In this brief article, there is a relatively lengthy quote from Sir Geesing Vosham, Principal of the Academy to exemplify the fascist attitude of the big bourgeoisie:

"We have now won through to such a time (a time of power). Remember that barely two decades ago our great Central Banking profession was almost totally paralysed by the world-wide addiction to cheap money and the other pernicious byproducts of the so-called Keynesian revolution.

The picture that presents itself to us today is a very different one. All over the world, bank rates are at levels that would have made the most ruthless of our forbears gasp.

To enlarge on the significance of these things for our great Central Banking masonry, we alone are in a position to control this great new force and that, naturally, places considerable power in our hands. No international Bankers can get far these days without the collaboration of Central Bankers, and, more often than not, it is they--rather than the politicians--who take the big decisions. Let no one imagine that our new-found sovereignty will be lightly given up."

This is all very fine except that Sir Geesing Vosham is a figment of the imagination of the writer of the Lombard column of the Financial Times. The statements of this satirical creation of the Financial Times columnist are quoted in earnest by the CPB theorists. We can understand their dilemma. No leading imperialist could be found who could be fitted into the CPB fantasies. And since the article was only intended for circulation in the working class movement it was felt that fiction could be substituted for fact.

It was inevitable that the illusion of practice should give rise to the illusion of theory. The former represents its inconceivably shallow activities as practice, stresses the primacy of this 'practice', and represents the empty sloganising which accompanies it as 'theory'. In opposition there has developed a 'theoretical' clique, totally divorced from the existing working class movement, making no attempt to analyse objective conditions with a view to developing the politics of that movement, which speculates on notions in abstraction from reality, and represents these subjectivist speculations as 'theory'.

We refer of course to the Evans/Hoffman/Kenna clique. Hoffman has recently created a new pamphlet entitled: The Irish Question: Connolly, the ICO and the Irish Bourgeoisie. The

main content of this pamphlet is the notion that existence of capitalist economic relations is the same thing as the bourgeois democratic political revolution, and that both parts of Ireland are therefore nationally independent. This stroke of genius will be dealt with in the Irish Communist (whose January issue includes an article on the Evans/Hoffman 'correction' of Engels' work on biology).

It would be a waste of effort to follow up all of Hoffman's little intellectual tricks in detail. To show how his trickery progresses we will follow up a number of items which have been dealt with in previous issues of the Communist.

In the Communist No. 22 we described as trivial pedantry Hoffman's statement that Marx, in Vol 1 of Capital, "allowed himself to be blinded by the splendour of Shakespeare's language" into believing that it was Shakespeare (before Ricardo, before Smith, even before Petty!) and not Marx himself, who first made a scientific analysis of money. (The passage quoted by Marx is from Timon of Athens: "Gold. Yellow glittering precious gold" etc.)

In his current pamphlet we read:

"Clifford dismisses as 'flimsy pedantry' my view that Marx allowed himself to be overpowered by Shakespeare's language...So anxious is Clifford to protect the field of literature from class analysis that he does not even bother to read the arguments properly. For Marx makes two references to Timon of Athens and it is convenient to differentiate them. In Capital Marx simply cites the passage as a colourful footnote exemplifying some of the phenomenal effects that money has on society. But this is not what Marx said in 1844...The young Marx declares that Shakespeare excellently depicts the real nature of money because at this stage of his thought he shared the view that it is Money and not Man which is responsible for his 'alienated state'".(p76-7)

So poor Hoffman has been wronged again. His 'criticism' of Marx referred, not to Capital or any other published work, but to some private writings done in 1844 and never published by him. And we (or 'Clifford') distorted his position so as to make it appear that he was referring to the footnote in Vol 1 of Capital. In fact he looked on that footnote as merely a colourful illustration "of the phenomenal effects that money has in society." How wicked we are.

But before we beat our breasts too hard, let us refer to what Hoffman actually wrote in his "Essays on Shakespeare". There we find Hoffman saying "astonishing as it may seem, this view was put forward by Marx himself" (p 40). Can a view be said to be "put forward" in a private manuscript only fragments of which remain? Hoffman then quotes this statement from the manuscripts: "Shakespeare excellently

depicts the real nature of money". Then he comments: "This was of course written when Marx was a young man. But he was not to change his mind." (our emphasis). Then he cites as proof that Marx did not change his mind, the statement in Vol 1 of Capital that "just as all the qualitative differences between commodities are effaced in money, so money, on its side a radical leveller, effaces all distinctions", and he refers to the footnote from Timon of Athens. Then, obviously referring to Capital, "Alas, Marx had allowed himself to be binded" etc.

In view of this definite statement that Marx "was not to change his mind" between the 1844 manuscripts and the writing of Vol 1 of Capital, what are we to make of Hoffman's statement in his next pamphlet that we distorted his "criticism" by taking it to refer to Capital? It is obvious that he realised that his 'criticism' of Capital was patently absurd, and that he decided to shift his ground and whine that the ICO had misrepresented him in the first place.

As to Hoffman's 'criticism' of the 1844 manuscripts: any Marx critic whose 'criticism' consists in applying the analysis made in Marx's subsequent writings to these manuscripts must indeed be desperate to be taken notice of. The manuscripts were written when Marx was in the process of establishing the dialectical materialist position. Their terminology is that of Hegel's dialectics and Feuerbach's materialism. The 'revolutionary' pedant could snatch at this terminology and show his cleverness by 'exposing' it with the theoretical position that was clearly established by Marx himself during the next couple of years. He could do this by criticising the mere terminology and ignoring the thought content of these articles. The terminology is Hegelian and Feuerbachian in the main: the thought content is dialectical materialist.

Marx never published these manuscripts. He went beyond them himself. All of the matters dealt with in these private writings were dealt with more clearly and more comprehensively in his subsequent published writings, and he was not bugged by the urge to publish the ambiguities of his process of development. Unlike Hoffman, who is already publishing his private correspondence for posterity, Marx left all of that to posterity.

That the Marx-critic, Hoffman, should take the 1844 manuscripts as a subject of criticism is a bad enough example of his pedantry. What is positively ridiculous is the ineptitude of his pedantry. Let us return to the conundrum: "Why did he (Marx) speak of Shakespeare excellently depicting the real nature of money: at the time of writing I had not fully resolved this puzzle and was content to assume that Marx had in fact allowed himself to be carried away. In fact subsequent reading has shown that the question goes deeper than that" (p 76). What was revealed to him by his profounder thought is that "the young Marx declares that Shakespeare excellently depicts the real nature of money

because at this stage of his thought he shared the view that it is Money and Man which responsible for his alienated state. It is not incidental that the revisionists have scoured every word of Marx's early writings seeking out passages like the one above which strictly speaking do not yet accord with the Marxist world outlook. For the fashionable term 'alienation' covers far more than exploitation: it implies an inevitable estrangement between man and society" (p 77, our emphasis)

The concept of alienation found in Marx's 1844 manuscripts certainly does not imply an 'inevitable estrangement between man and society'. Alienation is clearly shown to be a product of class exploitation. It is no vague concept referring to 'man' and 'society', as Hoffman alleges. Nor is there a trace of the view that "Money and not Man is responsible for his 'alienated state'"

In these writings Marx shows how, in capitalism, the product of the workers own labour "confronts him as another's property", and how this is the substance of his alienation. His "misery results...from the essence of present day labour itself." Capital is "private property in the products of other's labour." (p 37). "...we have to grasp the essential connection between private property, avarice, and the separation of labour, capital and landed property; between exchange and competition, value and the devaluation of men, monopoly and competition, etc: the connection between this whole estrangement and the money-system" (p 68). In this system "the object which labour produces--labour's product--confronts it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer" (p69). "...the worker is related to the product of his labour as to an alien object...the worker puts his life into the object: but now his life no longer belongs to him but to the object" (p 70). "If the product of labour is alienation, production itself must be active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation" (p 72). "In the real practical world self-estrangement can only become manifest through the real practical relationship to other men"(p 79).

In this there is no mystical derivation of the alienation of the worker from the product of his labour from the power of money. The reference to the 'money-system' is obviously a reference to the commodity system. On p 116 we read that money "reduces everything to its abstract form" (twenty years later he wrote that money is the most abstract form of bourgeois wealth). Also: "The need for money is...the true need produced by the modern economic system." He had previously explained the class relationships that form the basis of the modern economic system. There is a great difference between the statement that money and not man is the cause of the alienated condition of the worker, and the statement that the modern economic system produces the need for money and the alienation of the worker which expresses itself "through the real practical relationship to other men."

Now we come to the fragment on "The Power of Money in Bourgeois Society" in which Hoffman's 'criticism' is based. Marx, referring to bourgeois society, whose social base he had described earlier, says: "By possessing the property of buying everything of appropriating all objects, money is thus the object of eminent possession. The universality of its property is the omnipotence of its being. Money is the pimp between man's need and the object, between his life and his means of life" (p137). "Money is the alienated ability of mankind (p 139). "Since money, as the existing and active concept of value, confounds and exchanges all things, it is the general confounding and compounding of all things--the world upside-down--the confounding and compounding of all natural and human qualities" (p 141).

In the market system need which cannot express itself as effective monetary demand cannot be satisfied. "The difference between effective demand based on money and ineffective demand based on my need, my passion, my wish etc., is the difference between being and thinking..."(p 140) "Assume man to be man and his relationship to the world to be a human one: then you can exchange love only for love, trust for trust, etc. If you want to enjoy art, you must be an artistically cultivated person: if you want to exercise influence over other people, you must be a person with a stimulating and encouraging effect on other people. Every one of your relations to man and to nature must be a specific expression, corresponding to the object of your will, of your real individual life"(p141). But money changes all that. "That which is for me through the medium of money--that for which I can pay (i.e., which money can buy)--that am I, possessor of money. The extent of the power of money is the extent of my power. Money's properties are my properties and essential powers--the properties and essential powers of its possessor. Thus, what I am and am capable of is by no means determined by my individuality. I am ugly, but I can buy for myself the most beautiful of women. Therefore I am not ugly, for the effect of ugliness--its deterrent power--is nullified by money.....Does not my money therefore transform all my incapacities into their contrary?" (p138-9).

It is as clear as daylight that when Marx speaks here of the 'power of money' he is speaking of a social phenomenon: the power of money as 'the existing and active concept of value' (If we wanted to emulate the most pathetic of Marx-critics, Hoffman, we could declare Marx to be an idealist for using the word 'concept' instead of from here: in fact his 'criticism' doesn't ever reach that miserable level). Before writing the fragment on money, he had described the class relations on the basis of which money becomes the general form of wealth, and acquires its 'omnipotence'. There is not a shadow of doubt that Marx was perfectly aware that the power of money was the power capitalist production relations, and that the 'alienated state' was product of these production relations, and not of money considered as a thing in itself.

So it is clear that Hoffman is not only a pedant, but an inept and dishonest pedant, when he declares that "Marx was yet to make it clear that it is not Man who is alienated by Money but, but some men who are robbed of their labour power by others!" (If we were to be pedantic we could insist that Hoffman has distorted Marxism yet again even in the few words just quoted. In capitalism workers are "robbed of their labour power" only in rare cases. Slavery was made illegal some time ago. Labour power has now become a commodity which the workers sell more or less at its value. What they are robbed of is not their labour-power but the surplus value created by their labour. A "Marxist" like Hoffman who specialises in "correcting" Marx and Engels in theoretical matters really should learn to distinguish theoretically between slavery and capitalism).

Hoffman claims that he was misquoted in The Communist No. 22 where we cited his view that "Marxism is qualitatively different from all class thought". He points out that there was a qualifying clause: i.e. "all class thought which has in every case been threaded together by the chains of the working people". When we read grand phrases like that we try to make sense of them. We compared "class thought", with "class thought which has ...been threaded together by the chains of the working people". We reasoned that if there was any substantial difference between the two it was that the latter possibly excluded sections of bourgeois thought. Working class thought is certainly "threaded together by the chains of the working people". The first element in working class thought is consciousness of oppression and exploitation. It is with this elementary consciousness of the workers of the fact that they sell their labour power to capitalists to be exploited, and of the oppressions which results from this, that the working class movement begins. And from start to finish the development of the working class movement in bourgeois society is "threaded together by the chains of the working people". Working class consciousness is consciousness of the chains, of the nature of the chains and of how the chains may be broken. If there is any class in society whose thought could, in any sense be said to be "threaded together" by something other than the chains of the working people, that class is not the exploited class but the exploiting class. The thought of the ruling class.

The thought of the ruling class is on the whole determined by the need to keep the exploited class in subjection. It makes the chains that binds the working people. It might be said that its thought is not "threaded together" by the chains which it makes for the exploited class. The handcuffs play a different part in the consciousness of the jailer than they do in that of the prisoner.

The ruling class must see to the chains of the subject class in order to maintain its own freedom and live its own life. When the chains are secure they can indulge in cultural activity which is only remotely connected with the class struggle, which appears unutterably trivial in the light of the class struggle, but which appears to give subjective satisfaction to the bourgeoisie. In that very limited sense it may be said

and the thought of the bourgeoisie is not rigorously threaded together by the chains of the working people", i.e. by the need to keep the chains secure.

But the thought of the working class is either rigorously threaded together by their chains, and the urge to break free of them, or it ceases in any meaningful political sense to be working class thought. We reasoned therefore that while Hoffman's qualification certainly did apply to working class thought, it possibly ruled out aspects of bourgeois thought, and that was why he mentioned bourgeois thought separately. And we did not think that we were pouncing on a casual slip of the tongue, or a genuine confusion. It made sense that Hoffman should say this. Since, along with Kenna and Evans, he declared that the British working class as a whole is a "bourgeois working class", whose class interest is not revolutionary but bourgeois; and yet he appeared to have the objective of developing the Marxist movement in Britain, there is no class basis in Britain on which his activities could bear fruit. It made sense therefore, that he should declare that Marxism was not working class thought but was "science", as the "Marxist" Kolakowski has done. While we were surprised at the rashness with which he made this statement (opportunists do not usually operate like that), we were not in the least surprised that he held that opinion.

But now Hoffman declares that he "obviously" meant, by his qualifying clause, the opposite of what he said. He says "it is perfectly obvious from the sentence above that I am contrasting Marxism with the thought of all exploiting classes... The point is so obvious that Clifford finds it necessary in the piece he selects to omit the sentence, "which has in every case been threaded together by the chains of the working people..." Has he reproduced the sentence faithfully and not resorted to the tactics of the gutter (perhaps Comrades can see why Clifford is so anxious to defend the work of Bertholt Brecht!), he would have seen that by class thought, I meant not all class thought but all thought of exploiting classes... Clifford's despicable action was worthy only of a neurotic, dishonest liberal"(pp.77/8), and so on .

That is all the explanation Hoffman gives. And even now that it has been explained to us, we still cannot see how the category of "class thought which has in every case been threaded together by the chains of the working people" could refer only to the thought of the exploiting classes, and ("obviously" or otherwise) exclude the thought of the working class. In view of Hoffman's subsequent statement we will take it that he did not mean what he said, and was merely phrasemongering after the manner of Trotsky.

(In the foregoing, Hoffman attributes a view on Brecht to B.Clifford, but gives no source. Clifford says that he has ever seen three or four plays by Brecht, and apart from being bored to death by them, formed no opinions whatsoever on Brecht and has no intention of doing so. Since Hoffman has been whining about alleged misquotation by Clifford, perhaps he will substantiate what he says on this matter - or in the event of his inability to do so, apply the words "neurotic dishonesty" to himself)

Bourgeois Working Class

Hoffman also complains that we have attributed to him the view that the class interest of the British working class is imperialist. He says "...this is simply a lie. Nowhere have Arthur Evans or I ever suggested that it was in the interests of the working class to support British imperialism" (p.74). From what follows we gather that Hoffman now maintains that when they used the phrase "bourgeois working class", they meant a working class which is very much under bourgeois political influence: a working class whose consciousness of its own objective interests is at a low level. If that is what they meant all along it is surprising that it is not what they said. Evans was asked on numerous occasions whether he meant this, or whether, like Kenna, he meant that the objective class interest of the British workers was bourgeois. He refused to answer, though on every conflict on the matter he supported Kenna. And never expressed any differences with Kenna's position.

Let us get clear what the I.C.O. has maintained from the start (since 1964). It maintained that, due to Britain's particular history, to the imperialist position of British capitalism, and to the exceptionally high political development of the British *ruling class,* **working class* was at a very low level. In 1964 when Evans was maintaining that Britain was on the brink of revolution (periods like a year and six months were mentioned regularly at Vanguard public meetings by Evans) - and that there was therefore no time and no need for extensive theoretical work - the comrades who later formed the I.C.O. dismissed this as fantasy, pointing to the economic stability of the system and the overwhelming dominance of bourgeois politics in the working class movement.

When Kenna published his pamphlet in 1966, maintaining that there was no proletariat in Britain, and that the whole society had an imperialist interest, we published a detailed refutation of this pamphlet (after making sure through extensive conversations with Kenna that he meant exactly what he said). By bourgeois working class, Kenna meant a working class whose objective interest is imperialist. Kenna has never retracted this view. He has continuously stated it at public meetings down to the present.

There could hardly be a matter of greater importance for those who are attempting to develop a Communist movement in Britain than the question of whether there is a proletariat in British society. If Kenna's statements on the British working class are correct there is no class basis for a Communist movement in Britain. But if the bourgeois political influence in the working class movement in Britain is not an expression of the real class interest of the British workers; if in fact it is not in the class interest of the British working class to support the bourg-

** the development of the British political*

bourgeoisie, then there is a class basis for the development of a Communist movement in Britain. (Whether this will be easy or difficult, whether it will proceed rapidly or slowly, is a different question. Because of the extent of bourgeois influence, the exceptional development of the ruling class, the activities of a relatively large labour aristocracy, and the stability of the economy, it is not to be expected that the development of a Communist movement could proceed rapidly in the present situation.

If Evans has been in fundamental disagreement with Kenna on this fundamental issue, it is surprising, in view of his close association with Kenna over a period of years when this was a basic issue in the anti-revisionist movement, that he never expressed any disagreement with Kenna, and that at numerous public and private meetings he either supported Kenna in ambiguous terms, or said nothing. But of course we're forgetting Evans' assertion that the principle front of struggle is the literary front (p.71). Lines of demarcation must be drawn over assessments of Shakespeare and Gorki and Brecht. Over trivial matters, like whether the class interest of the British workers is bourgeois, we can agree to differ: or better still we can ignore these differences entirely, since to go into them would be to disrupt the mutual admiration society.

With regard to Hoffman's attribution of the "bourgeois working class" position to Mao, Hoffman now admits that this was false, but pleads that he was misled on the matter by "our most gifted Marxist" A.H.Evans himself.

On p.77 Hoffman refers to B.Clifford as an "admirer of Christopher Caudwell". No source is given for the reason that there is none. Clifford has published nothing about Caudwell. The only possible source of this remark is a private meeting between Hoffman and a couple of I.C.O. members. Hoffman and Evans spent much time attacking Caudwell. Clifford remarked that all he had ever read of Caudwell's was some articles from "Studies In A Dying Culture". He had read these a number of years earlier and thought they were useful. He asked Hoffman what was wrong with them. Hoffman replied that he had never read that particular book. No more was said on the matter. Now Clifford becomes "an admirer of Caudwell". "Studies In A Dying Culture" was Caudwell's main published work. It is not mentioned in the Evans-Hoffman critique. "Illusion and Reality" which is the focus of their criticism, was apparently never published by Caudwell. Clifford, whose artistic ignorance is beyond dispute, has written nothing on the matter and merely wanted to be told by Hoffman why his impression of the "Studies" was mistaken. Hoffman who has published very definite views of Caudwell, had neglected to read the "Studies". This fact tells us a lot about Hoffman's approach. That he should now, in a theoretical work, refer in the way he does to a mere private conversation of a year ago, is an indication of the degree to which sheer spleen comes into his "theorising". It is clear that like many opportunists he cannot distinguish between Marxist theory and gossip. And Lenin often had occasion to remark on the method of referring to private conversations on these matters e.g. "Trotsky could produce no proof except 'private conversations' (i.e. simply gossip, on which Trotsky always subsists)". Hoffman concludes his pamphlet with a selection from

his correspondence. He publishes some letters privately exchanged between himself and B.Clifford in 1969. The letters are carefully edited in order to exclude certain awkward information about "our most gifted Marxist", A.H.Evans. and to maintain the "theoretical" image of Evans and Hoffman. Since the inception of the anti-revisionist movement Evans has been among those most determinedly opposed to doing the necessary theoretical work facing the movement. It should now be clear that their fake polemics (resembling "the brilliance with which Trotsky used to impress the schoolboys": Lenin) has nothing in common with Marxist theory.

"Leadership" and Leadership

Even though the British working class are being subjected to many pressures by the capitalist system, they are not the type of pressures which bring about a desire to end the system of capitalism. However, while this is generally true of the British working class as a whole, there is an abundance of thinking workers ripe for the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Anyone who is part of the working class movement and putting ideas over will know this to be true. It may only be 1 out of 30 on the job or in the neighbourhood but this should be a sufficient incentive for the anti-revisionist movement to 'get sorted out'.

A lot of thinking workers have rejected the Communist Party and trotskyist organisations and a lot of 'individual communists'. There is a lot of reasons for this, and some comrades in the Marxist-Leninist movement have shown some of the reasons. One major reason which has been largely ignored is the question of leadership.

Many advanced workers, potential communists have rejected the CPGB and will continue to reject the CPGB and indeed the Marxist-Leninist movement if this 'leadership complex' continues to flourish.

When a communist or an organisation calling itself communist has confronted itself with the working class it has done so as though there was a great divide between the two, that of leader and follower. These organisations many of them great 'forms' of Mao's method in China have failed to learn or even attempt to apply this communist method in Britain. Many workers can see this, and they place these communists in the same category as all the other 'politicians' or 'leaders' who have dropped from the blue as saviours, and have no intention of relinquishing their power

should the workers request it. They are leaders over the workers not leaders of the workers. Workers quite correctly resent this attitude among communist organisations and can see it no matter how much these organisations try to hide it.

In learning from the experience in China we should apply it ourselves. The main argument that we can offer to advanced workers is to ask them how much say they have in determining their future under capitalism. They know that they have no say in the matter. From there the answer becomes simple: an organisation must be developed by the workers in order that a system where the workers themselves determine their future can be achieved.

If the anti-revisionist movement hopes to play a part in the development of such an organisation they must begin to apply Mao's communist method.

All we should aim to do as individuals or groups of individuals is to expose and explain the system of capitalism wherever we can, in accordance with the struggles and problems of the workers we are involved with. Their struggles and their problems not our problems, or problems we think they should have, because it is the workers own problems that they obviously want to talk about and find the answers to.

The degree to which this method will be successful is determined, in the main, by two factors. Firstly in exposing the system, i.e., in trying to bring workers to a better understanding of their pressures, we will be successful insofar as what we say corresponds to reality, i.e., to the experiences of the working class.

Secondly, we can only be equipped with the knowledge to do this by studying in great detail the actual set-up in Britain, armed with Marxism-Leninism, and publishing, discussing, re-assessing our findings.

It is no longer good enough, and indeed it never was good enough to say to workers: look I'm a communist and my party is going to lead you to freedom. The communist or Maoist method is to say that I am a communist, and a group of us have something to say about the problems you have raised. If they correspond with your experiences all well and good, if they don't, then we will go from there and develop our discussion. All a communist is doing (or a group of communists) in the latter approach is admitting to the working class what he really is. He is merely a worker with ideas, particular ideas that he develops with other communists, workers etc. and is willing to use them to develop further the understanding of the working class. The working class will at different points of time accept or reject these ideas for various reasons.

In applying this method groups of communists find that they are only talking to a small percentage of the working class, but if this method is continuously applied they will find themselves talking to hundreds or thousands of workers. The communists will be

Hampstead Reassesses Stalin

On Dec. 5th. last, the Adelaide (Hampstead) branch of the C.P.G.B. held a public meeting entitled "A re-assessment of Stalin". The main speaker at this meeting was a Mr. Carritt who is apparently a member of the "new leadership" of the C.P.G.B. No Marxist assessment of Stalin or his political activities was attempted by Carritt. In fact he dealt with the Stalin period in the superficial way to be expected from the representative of a bourgeois-liberal party (which is of course what the C.P.G.B. has now become).

In essence, Carritt produced what amounted to a semi-Trotskyist theory of the class relations in the Soviet Union from the 1920's on. He held that the C.P.S.U. represented, not the working class, but the peasantry and the "new working class developing from the peasantry". This statement would seem to mean that it was the Russian peasantry i.e. the petty bourgeoisie which as represented by the C.P.S.U. was the main social force in the development of socialism in the Soviet Union. This is an amazing 'creative development of "Marxism" which even Trotsky at his best rarely equalled. Carritt, if he stuck to the logic of his position, would have to reject the whole of Marxist-Leninist theory on classes and the class struggle since neither Marx nor Lenin ever envisaged the petty bourgeoisie as being the main force in building socialism. However, Carritt is unlikely to do this publicly, at least not just yet.

It was when he came to deal with Stalin's "crimes" that Carritt's petty-bourgeois emotions completely overwhelmed him. He has actually ascertained that Stalin murdered Kirov, (although this is a traditional Trotskyite accusation against Stalin, the orthodox bourgeoisie are a bit doubtful about it, they have not reached Carritt's level of certainty in this matter). He was also very indignant about Stalin's "better known atrocities" such as the Moscow Trials, the liquidation of the kulaks, Trotskyism etc.. He accused Stalin of killing 10 million--no less. He even, in a fit of petty bourgeois moralism said that Stalin was "an evil man". (Of course, in the eyes of the petty bourgeoisie, Stalin could never have been anything else but evil, since much of his political activities were directed towards eradicating their influence from the working class movement).

When he was asked to name the sources for his various accusations, Mr. Carritt became rather vague. After some questioning he was finally persuaded to give ONE source--Mr. Robert Conquest, the well known anti-Stalinist humanitarian who is such a staunch supporter of the American efforts to eradicate Vietnamese Stalinism. Other than this anti-communist, Mr. Carritt failed to produce any other source for his information. Carritt's diatribe against Stalin is merely the same drivel which has

been peddled for 30 or 40 years by the trotskyists. Not once have these individuals been able to put forward any FACTS as a basis for their statements. Nor can Carritt. It is an indication of the level of political bankruptcy to the C.P.G.B. under its present revisionist leadership has sunk that these long discredited Trotskyist arguments are being put forward by its vanguard theorists.

During the course of his speech Carritt made one significant statement. He said that the attitude to Stalin was now the determining factor in deciding whether one was a revolutionary or not. This is correct though not in the sense that Carritt probably meant. At a time when every species of political opportunism--revisionist, trotskyist, 'maoist' etc-- are jumping on the anti-Stalin bandwagon, it becomes clearer than ever before that a full Marxist assessment is required. This will never come from the opportunist groupings who have consistently confused this issue by phrasemongering, and whose interests require the furthering of this confusion.

Mr. Carritt's anti-Stalin diatribe was not enough for one middle class woman claiming to be a member of the CP who felt that he (Stalin that is) was responsible for the rise of Nazism in Germany. Mr. Carritt did not fully agree with this but he accepted that Trotsky had made a much more accurate analysis of German fascism than Stalin. The same bourgeois woman said that the Russian working class was a 'terrorised slave class'. She did not explain how this terrorised slave class had managed to defeat the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union.

The CPGB leadership as a whole would probably not accept Carritt's full position at present. His views are important in that like those of his colleague Monty Johnstone, they represent the vanguard of British revisionism. Carritt, Johnstone and their kind see clearly that in order to complete the destruction of the Communist movement it is not enough merely to slander Stalin. Lenin must also be ideologically and politically castrated. While doing this, of course, they will take great care to present themselves as 'the rescuers of Leninism from Stalinist dogmatism'.

One of the main conclusions which anti-revisionists must draw from the present position from Carritt, Johnstone, etc is that revisionism and trotskyism are essentially similar. Both interact with each other. There can be no possibility of a serious communist movement developing in Britain until trotskyism has been dealt with theoretically. There are few signs that the British so-called anti-revisionist movement is in any way committed to making an analysis of trotskyism and its role in the working class movement today. On the contrary, it is clear that sections of it are quite prepared to collaborate with trotskyism. A glaring example of this is Mr. R. Birch 'leader' of the CPBML. This individual a couple of years ago wrote the introduction to a

pamphlet written by T Cliff, a prominent anti-communist (or trotskyist). This introduction, since Birch was well known as a leading militant in the trade union movement helped to give this pamphlet a wider circulation than it would otherwise have got. As far as we know Birch has never either publicly defended or repudiated his connection with Cliff.

At the time, Cliff made every possible effort to draw attention to the fact that Birch had written this introduction. Even at this late date a statement from Birch might be of value. We doubt, however, if such a statement will be forthcoming. As regards the other 'Maoist' groups, none of them has made any attempt to deal with trotskyism; they simply hurl the word 'trotskyite' about as an indiscriminate term of abuse. In the meantime the influence of trotskyism in the British working class shows no signs of diminishing. Nor will it as long as it is confronted by mere phrasemongering. With the publication of the pamphlet 'In Defence of Leninism' the ICG began the exposure of trotskyism, and attempted to show its relationship to present day revisionism. The completion of this analysis remains one of the most urgent tasks confronting the developing Communist movement in Britain.

M. Lynch.

'Leadership' and Leadership continued from page 12.

conducting the same type of activity but conditions will have changed.

This is the real communist leadership role and the Marxist-Leninist movement must be this type of leadership or they will also be rejected as false imposing 'leaders' by the advanced workers and eventually the entire working class.

Dave Laurie.

No 13(March 1968)

Statement of Aims

On "Stalins Errors" (Open Letter to London Workers Committee)
Yugoslavia (Part 3):Revisionism in Economics--Angela Clifford

No 14(April 1968)

Marxists and the working class movement--G. Golden
The National Question In Britain--B. Clifford
The "Bourgeois" Working Class--D. Laurie

No 15(May 1968)

Economic Theory and the Class Struggle--B. Clifford
Yugoslavia (Part 4)--A. Clifford
"Say Uncle"(review)--D. Laurie
The YCL (letter)--R. Finlayson
Unity Theatre--A Unity member

No 16(June 1968)

Black Power (Part 1)

No 17(July 1968)

Imperialism and the Working Class--G. Golden
Yugoslavia (Part 5)--A. Clifford
France--D. Laurie

No 18(August 1968)

Lenin On National Parties (an exposure of distortions by the WPP)
Automation--A. Clifford
More Social-Fascist Trickery (re Finsbury Communist Association)

No 19(November 1968)

Black Power (Part 2)

No 20(February 1969)

Black Power (Part 3)

On "Stalin's Errors" Once Again (exposure of A. Manchandra's
distortions)

No 21(May 1969)

Czechoslovakia

Comment on Programme of "CPB (ML)"

No 22(July 1969)

"Maoism":Marxist or Populist?

Social-Fascism (re "bourgeois working class" line)

A Literary Critic (re JA Hoffman)

No 23(October 196)

Northern Ireland (exposure of "CPB (ML)" opportunism)

Once Again on Intellectual Revolutionism (re JA Hoffman and AH

Ulster--R. Stead

Evans

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION LITERATURE LIST

Pamphlet No.

- 3 The Irish Republican Congress (A history of the 26 Cos, 1931-6). 2s.
 4 The Working Class in the Irish National Revolution 1916-23) 2s.
 5 Connolly 6d.
 6 Liam Mellows (including Jail Notes and ICO introduction) 1/6d.
 9 Capital and Revisionism (exposure of revisionist attacks on Capital) 1/6
 10 The Connolly Association (historical review of its degeneration) 2s.
 11 On Stalin's 'Economic Problems' Part 1 (an investigation of
 revisionist economic theory and Stalin's refutation of it) 2s.
 16 Marxism and Market Socialism (Stalin's 'Economic Problems' Part 2) 1/-
 14 The Marxism of James Connolly (second edition in preparation) 1/6d.
 12 Marxachas Lenineachas le Padraic O Conaire (Agus scribhneoiri eile)
 13 The Economics of Revisionism (formerly Revisionism and Imperialism)
 15 In Defence of Leninism (an exposure of trotskyist and modern
 revisionist theories) 2/6d.
 The Economics of Partition (second edition) 2/6d.
 In Defence of Stalin (by a British Worker, first published 1964,
 published by ICO with ICO introduction, 1970) 2/6d.

James Connolly: Press Poisoners in Ireland 1/6d; The New Evangel 2s.
 (all with : Yellow Unions in Ireland 1/6d; Connolly/Walker
 ICO intro.) : Controversy 2/6d; Socialism and the Orange Worker 6d.

John Leslie: The Present Position of the Irish Question 1s.

C.D. Greaves: De Valera 1s.

Stalin: Concerning Marxism in Linguistics 3s.

On Trotsky 2s.

On an Article by Engels 1s.

On the Personality Cult 1s.

Trotsky: Our Political Tasks (first published 1904, first English
 edition with ICO introduction) 3s.

Wolfe Tone: An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics of Ireland 1/6d.

An Address to the People of Ireland 1/6d.

Neil Goold: Twentieth Congress and After and October Events in Hungary
 (first published 1956) 1/6d.

An Irish Presbyterian: Ulster and Home Rule 1/6d.

Palestine Question, 1s.; Russian Revolution 1/-; Black Power, 2/6d.

Subscriptions to the Irish Communist (monthly) 9s. for six months
 post free. Other magazines: The Communist (rates on request)

All pamphlets available by post from: G. Golden,
 28 Mercers Rd., London N.19.

L. Callender,
 28 Surrey St.,
 Belfast 9.

D. Laurie,
 14 Gladstone St., Hebburn, Co.
 Durham.

NOTE: Include 6d. per item for postage.