

---

# Marxist Studies

---

Vol. 2 No. 3

Autumn 1970

M A R X I S T   S T U D I E S

Managing Editor: John Walters.  
Business Manager: R. Carter  
16A Holmdale Road, London N.W. 6.

---

Vol 2. No. 3.

Contents

Autumn 1970

<u>Page</u>	1. Two Kinds of Marxism - A Review Article - Chris Arthur	
	12. Turkey's Peterloo?	Spartacus
	19. Women's Liberation in Perspective	Carol Day
	22. The Political Economy of Women's Liberation.	Margaret Benston
	Book Reviews	
	31. Europe Versus America? - Contradictions of Imperialism	reviewed by Ken Tarbuck
	32. Unless Peace Comes - A Scientific Forecast of New Weapons	" " Tim Shallice
	34. The Bolsheviks & Workers Control 1917 to 1921.	" " Kevin Whitston

---

Published by BMS Publications.

All Communications to the above address.

**Signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editor.**

## TWO KINDS OF MARXISM - A Review Article

by Chris Arthur

The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx by Shlomo Avineri; Cambridge 1968. (Paperback edition 1970, 15/-)

In the history of Marxism's intellectual productions two trends are discernible. Marx himself left an extraordinarily complex legacy, in the study of which it was only too easy to fall back on one-sided simplifications. On the one hand we have had those who, taking Marx's stress on science to be the main point, interpreted him from a positivistic standpoint; and, on the other, those who took seriously his acknowledged debt to Hegel.

Undoubtedly the dominant trend has been the former, expounded ad nauseam by all the bone-headed orthodox of the second and third Internationals. The best Marxists, however, have always known better than this. Indeed it was Lenin himself who realised how far off the track Marxism had gone when he recorded in his notebooks: "It is impossible completely to understand Marx's Capital, and especially its first chapter, without having thoroughly studied and understood the whole of Hegel's Logic. Consequently half a century later none of the Marxists understood Marx!!" (1)

At that time, as also when Lukacs produced the neo-Hegelian Marxism of History and Class-Consciousness, Marx's early works and manuscripts, which confirm this judgment, were not generally available. The merit of Dr. Avineri's recent work is that it takes fully into account for the first time in English such early manuscripts as the 1843 Critique of Hegel.

Avineri's book has been attacked in New Left Review by a reviewer working from the positivistic, scientistic, standpoint. (2). Doubtless the over-enthusiasm of some neo-Hegelian interpretations of Marxism need correction - but not by going back to the theoretical poverty characteristic of positivism, albeit in Althusserian dress. Perhaps we may digress on this theme before discussing Avineri's work.

The NLR review starts by describing the difference between the two views as follows. On the one hand Marxism "was understood as a science of society (historical materialism), whose object was the socio-economic formation". On the other, the neo-Hegelians make the basis of Marxism "the concepts of praxis, alienation, proletariat as universal class and historical subject, class-consciousness, etc."

We have no particular quarrel with this account but draw different conclusions. The NLR reviewer charges, without evidence, that the neo-Hegelian interpretation can "relapse into spontaneism." (3). This is simply the converse of the charge launched, with much justice, by Lukacs and Marcuse against the positivist version, of fatalism and quietism. This latter charge can be substantiated a priori by pointing out that positivism removes man-as-subject from the arena and shifts responsibility for establishing socialism from the party and class to disembodied 'historical forces'. Gramsci perceptively explains this "fatalist aroma" by the subordinate character of the social strata whose consciousness it is, and allows it may be valuable psychologically as long as there is

present at the same time a real activity, but denounces it when made into a reflexive philosophy by intellectuals.

It is thus quite baffling to find the statement that "the work of the Marxist cadre in mobilising the masses and wielding political power to effect social transformation, is compatible only with 'scientistic' Marxism." (4). The exact opposite is true. However often these two things co-exist in practice they are theoretically inconsistent. If Marxism is just a sub-division of natural science there is no place, not only for the cadre but for any self-conscious activity at all, since the revolution will surely dawn at the appointed hour, independent of the cadre, just like an eclipse.

The truth is that only if one makes praxis a fundamental concept and subordinates the scientific analysis of social formations to this, does the activity of the cadre in bringing the proletariat to the consciousness of its tasks, make sense. The completely undialectical character of the scientistic interpretation is shown by the way it can give the cadre's activity no connection with 'objective analysis' other than the purely external, instrumental, one. The origin of the cadre is quite unexplained on this view. The dialectical view sees the cadre as internal to the process (Cf. Thesis 3 On Feuerbach)

What the 'scientistic' view does essentially is to turn Marxism into just another 'interpretation of the world' - which may then be used, if it cares, for some extrinsic reason, by a cadre to 'change' the world, in spite of the fact that this is incompatible with the assumptions behind a positivist interpretation. This farrago is the easiest thing in the world for any bourgeois critic to knock down. (5)

In any case the 'scientistic' interpretation is incompatible with the theses of historical materialism itself, with its stress on the class-based nature of all ideology. In spite of its stress on materialism, at the level of the status of theory, it is fundamentally idealist. Just as bourgeois sociology does not deal with its own role, so the 'scientistic' interpretation makes claims to absolute objectivity, not understanding itself as grounded in a specific historical period, class struggle etc.

This interpretation with its contemplative attitude to the world reduces Marxism to the status of any other interpretation - it 'just happens' to be correct whereas others are wrong. But surely the peculiar nature of Marxism is that it is a theory which explains itself, and guarantees its truth relative to bourgeois theory, by expressing in theoretical terms the practice - past and future - of a definite class engaged on a concrete historical struggle. It grounds its claim to be truer than bourgeois theory on the fact that the interests it expresses are not those of a small ruling group but of the immense majority of mankind - hence ideologically distortion is minimised. The test of its truth is not the mechanically observed correspondence of the theory and its object but the success of the practical transformation which the theoretical moment both explains and facilitates.

(Turning now to the review proper); Dr. Avineri justifies the production of his book by the need to divorce the debate about Marx "from explicit or implied political objectives." (6) It is all the more interesting then that the defects of his work do not flow from lack of scholarship but precisely from the effect of an implicit political objective - in this case that of saving Marx from Lenin. Parts of this work very definitely have the objective of debunking Leninism by contesting its claim to be Marxist. This involves a "double distortion" - either of Lenin or Marx according to convenience. Mainly it takes the form of reducing Lenin to a 'Jacobin' conspirator and turning Marx into a gradualist by misusing the notion of "aufhebung". Since no evidence whatsoever is given for the distortions of Lenin which creep in mainly in asides we shall not concern ourselves with them but concentrate on saving Marx from Avineri. The political objective of this will be to block the escape route by which many concede Marx's genius while avoiding his revolutionary conclusions.

It needs to be said at the outset that what we have here is by no means a hack job but a sincere scholarly production with many passages that are well worth study. It is perhaps all the more significant that when Dr. Avineri's scholarship does break down it is on a matter of no less political consequence than that of the place of proletarian dictatorship in Marx's thought. We may clear this up first.

In discussing the closing paragraphs of the second chapter of the Communist Manifesto Avineri says that not only does Marx not use the term dictatorship of the proletariat in this context but that "he does not use the term more than two or three times in his life, and then always in what is basically a private communication." (7). The said communications are Critique of the Gotha Programme and the letter to Weydemeyer of 5th March 1852. What Dr. Avineri does not say is that in the latter epistle Marx describes the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' as one of his three unique discoveries. It would indeed be extraordinary if he had kept this discovery a personal secret!

To begin with although it is true that the Manifesto does not include the phrase there is a pretty good paraphrase of its content in such expressions as "raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class", "its political supremacy", "the producers organised as the ruling class", "despotic inroads on the rights of property". As Lenin says (in State and Revolution), these formulae are still abstract, but that the content is class dictatorship is clear enough.

Certainly Bakunin in his Statism and Anarchism (1873) reads it this way in his polemic against the theory of "revolutionary dictatorship". He quotes the Manifesto and says that the Marxists admit this means dictatorship but console themselves that it will be temporary. (8)

However if Avineri wants chapter and verse for a public statement it is to be found in The Class Struggles in France published in 1850 and to be found in the standard 1962 edition of the Selected Works. Here we find the slogan; "Overthrow of the bourgeoisie! Dictatorship of the working class!" (9). Even more clearly: "This socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as

the necessary transition point to the abolition of class distinctions generally....." (10).

Moving now to the book as a whole, the early chapters are the best with good material on Feuerbach's transformational method, the proletariat as universal class, alienation, and consciousness. The distortions of the later chapters and the flaw in the book as a whole are due to difficulties arising from the complexities of the dialectical concept of Aufhebung which pertains to the nature of dialectical transitions. In understanding this untranslatable term one has to do justice both to the notion of abolition - break - leap and also to that of preservation and continuity. Avineri is one of those who give too much weight to the latter side and almost achieves the incredible feat, for a dialectician, of turning into a gradualist (q.v. the discussion of the Manifesto below.)

Avineri takes his cue from Marx's early writings in which the demand for the aufhebung of the State is put forward, and such terms as 'true democracy' and 'universal suffrage' are mentioned in this connection. In his early chapters Avineri argues correctly that by talking of 'true democracy' Marx by no means aligns himself with the usual variety of radical democrat; because this new society was to be based on "man's communist essence" with the abolition of private property and the state. (11) However the later chapters leave the reader genuinely puzzled as to what Avineri does mean by the aufhebung of the State. The treatment still seems far too Hegelian in that sometimes he does seem to believe that the State could have a real rather than illusory, universality in content.(12) Furthermore although Avineri correctly denies the existence of a sharp opposition between a 'young' Marx and a 'mature one', it should nevertheless be clear to any student that Marx's career represented a development in which the terms of his problematic changed. Thus although Marx did concentrate his attention at first on the difficulties of realising the Hegelian postulate about the universality of the State it by no means follows that the later work produced an answer to that same question. The turn towards political economy marked the realisation by Marx that a different question was needed. The problem of the State then becomes a 'secondary one within the transformed problematic. The unreality attending the later chapters of Avineri's work flows from his failure to relocate the problem in this way. Instead he picks out bits and pieces from the mature Marx in an attempt to show how to answer the early formulations of Marx's problematic. The central tenet is that "universal suffrage" constitutes the aufhebung of the State. Here (pages 202-220) the most extraordinary nonsense is produced. He gets into a terrible tangle trying to reconcile this alleged universality with Marx's clear position that the transition to socialism is the work of the proletariat imposing its will against that of the old ruling class. He also has trouble differentiating it from the parliamentarism Marx attacks. For example he is reduced to arguing (on p. 210) that parliamentarism for Marx was the limited suffrage of property qualifications. He forgets here On the Jewish Question with its trenchant critique of American states in which "the non-owner comes to legislate for the owner of property."

The petit-bourgeois utopianism inherent in his position comes out

nowhere more clearly than in the pathetic remonstrance: "The abolition of universal suffrage in a revolutionary situation, according to Marx, means reversion to a partial, illusory universalism with one segment of society declaring itself the voice of all society. For Marx such a pars pro toto, bourgeois or, for that matter, Leninist, would never be able to carry out the universal postulates inherent in the state, and abolish the state." (13)

The authority claimed for this is not given. However if we do want to discover the position of universal suffrage in a revolutionary situation "according to Marx" let us consult The Class Struggles in France: "Universal suffrage had fulfilled its mission. The majority of the people has passed through the school of development, which is all that universal suffrage can serve for in a revolutionary period. It had to be set aside by a revolution or by the reaction."

On the question of the transition to socialism Avineri seizes on the programme outlined in the Manifesto (in spite of the fact that the authors in the 1872 Preface said that some parts of the Manifesto were defective and especially "no special stress" is to be laid on these measures.) He points out that it does not include nationalisation of industry as such. From this fact he draws the extraordinary conclusion that the aim is to "slowly ease private industry out...- not through one-sided political means, but by gradually creating the economic conditions which will make the further existence of private industry unviable." (14) This is a nonsense because even if slow, these measures are quite definitely political (abolition of inheritance, tax reforms etc.) and are quite certainly one-sided in relation to the social situation since this political attack on a class socially still in power will raise contradictions to an extreme - further developments cannot possibly be "peaceful and orderly" as Avineri claims. (15) On the contrary a violent reaction would ensue which would make necessary the "further inroads" Marx mentions (though it must be admitted that the paragraph in the Manifesto introducing the programme is vague and ambiguous on the question of the perspective opened up by such changes.)

Another conclusion Avineri draws from this list of measures involves a quite crucial misinterpretation of Marx's theory of the state. He says: "By applying this policy the proletarian state will be the first state in history to use political power for universal and not partial ends. This programme thus realises the Hegelian postulate about the universality of the state. Dialectically, the state that would really carry out its universal potential must end with communism and consequently with its own abolition, since 'public power will lose its political character'. The ultimate realisation of the Hegelian idea of the state as universal power implies according to Marx, that, once the state is truly universal, it ceases to exist as a differentiated organism." (16)

First of all this interpretation misses out that the measures are admitted by Marx to be "despotic" i.e. within the existing dialectical contradiction they are partial measures of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. Even though the eventual result is the abolition of class distinctions it remains true that the state power is never properly universal and thus does not realise any Hegelian postulate to that effect.

The peculiar dialectical transcendence involved in the proletariat's rule is that while wielding state power in their own interests they lay down conditions which lead to the creation of a classless society, i.e. the transition is not one in which the proletariat "becomes the absolute side of society, for it is victorious only by abolishing itself and its opposite. Then both the proletariat and the opposite which conditions it, private property, disappear." (17)

Marx himself has already replied to Avineri's interpretation in advance in the very paragraph of the Manifesto following the list of measures so it could hardly be missed.

"When, in the course of social evolution, class distinctions have disappeared, and when all the work of production has been concentrated into the hands of the associated producers, public authority will lose its political character. Strictly speaking, political power is the organised use of force by one class in order to keep another class in subjection. When the proletariat, in the course of its fight against the bourgeoisie, necessarily consolidates itself into a class, by means of a revolution makes itself the ruling class, and as such forcibly sweeps away the old system of production - it therewith sweeps away the system upon which class conflicts depend, makes an end of classes, and thus abolishes its own rule as a class."

It is made absolutely clear in this passage that the transitional regime is one in which one class uses force to subjugate another. This must put paid to any interpretation which conceives of it as realising the Hegelian postulate about the universality of the State. A State which was truly universal in form and content would not need force to hold down one section of its citizens. That this must be so no doubt accounts for the lame attempts Avineri makes to argue that force by the revolution is undesirable and indeed unnecessary, (e.g. p. 218) This passage also makes clear that public authority does not lose its political character until communism has been achieved - until then we have rule by one class over another while it "forcibly sweeps away the old system of production." This is quite incompatible with Avineri's claim that the state carrying out its universal potential must end with communism.

Avineri's crucial mistake is to stay within the Hegelian problematic defined in terms of the "state as universal power". Briefly, Hegel held that the family represented a one-sided universality in which the individual did not distinguish himself as such; civil society (i.e. the generalisation of private property) represented a one-sided particularity; the synthesis in the modern state was supposed to reconcile individual aspirations within a universal order regulated by rational laws and morality. Avineri misinterprets Marx's early critique of Hegel in so far as he seems to think that all Marx added was the understanding that "once the state is truly universal it ceases to exist as a differentiated organism." He takes this to be a practical programme - hence all the material he produces on suffrage, force and other problems of transition interpreted from this standpoint.

In fact Marx's critique was much more negative and resulted in a switch to a new problematic in which the crucial questions were not posed in terms



of the state at all. Marx's true position was that the state could not be made truly universal just because it necessarily existed as an organism differentiated from, and standing over against, civil society.

In order to prove this it is in order to ask what conditions would have to be realised in order to overcome the illusory nature of the universality possessed by the state and conclude that their realisation would involve its disappearance altogether but it is a big mistake to read this immanent critique as a practical programme and conclude that communism is to be realised through the aufhebung of the state.

The switch by Marx to a new perspective occurs as early as the 1843 Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right. Here Marx retains the Hegelian category of 'universality' but introduces the question of class in order to give the term a new context. Instead of trying to produce a political form which would incarnate an abstract 'universality' Marx points to the concrete material (as opposed to political-spiritual) existence of the classes with their particular possessions and interests, and identifies the proletariat as the class to whom no particular wrong but "wrong in general" is done. Being at the sharp end of all the contradictions in society it is the element of total negativity in the situation. It has no particular wrong to redress but can only liberate itself by a universal restructuring of society which will remove all class limitations and inequalities. It is not the "aufhebung" of the state through its becoming concretely universal that Marx demands, rather he turns to the question of how to accomplish the "aufhebung" of the proletariat, and concludes that out of the practical necessities of its peculiar position as a class "in, but not of, civil society" it will accomplish its own transcendence by abolishing itself as a class through a total restructuring of the conditions determining it as such. (However it is equally clear that the first phase of this dialectical development is one in which it is in irreconcilable struggle with the existing ruling class.)

The problem of the state comes out in the wash. If the classes go then the institutions of class rule go too - whether it be the old bureaucratic police machine or the organisation of the armed majority for "forcibly" sweeping away the old system. To reduce the argument to a formula - Avineri thinks the state disappears when it becomes universal: Marx argues it disappears when society has become universal i.e. classless, but while it exists it is always "the organised use of force by one class in order to keep another class in subjection".

The argument is not merely a semantic one because it leads to differing attitudes to transitional problems such as suffrage, force etc.

It is however, very confusing besides all the talk about "making the state a truly universal organ", to find that Avineri keeps up a running campaign against "politics" - starting from Marx's critique of the French Revolution, in his early work, as "merely political". His point here seems to be that it is no use declaring universal brotherhood from above (i.e. politically) - one must wait until conditions are ripe through the internal development of the economy etc. This would be O.K. except that Avineri often seems to fall into the trap of hoping for a 'merely social'

revolution without any horrid political action, especially the use of force. ("One can summarise Marx's position by saying that for Marx physical power will either fail or prove to be superfluous. By itself physical power achieves nothing."(18) )

One cannot do better here than quote Marx at the end of The Poverty of Philosophy: "War or death; a bloody fight, or extinction. Such is the unavoidable alternative!" (19)

Another place where Avineri charges Leninists with belief in the omnipotence of politics is on the vexed question of the uniqueness of proletarian revolution in relation to socio-economic conditions. He draws on Lange's version of it. (20). The situation of the proletariat seems to be unique because it has no existing socio-economic base to predicate a struggle for power on (unlike the bourgeoisie who possessed wealth and culture). Thus they have to construct socialist economic relations after taking power, whereas the bourgeoisie was able to develop capitalist relations of production a good way within the old system. The bourgeois revolution really consisted in one oppressing class displacing another in the political-legal sphere and consecrating as dominant a system of productive relations which was already displacing the old.

Avineri does not believe the socialist revolution in fact differs from previous ones in this respect and calls in Marx's remarks about the emergence of joint-stock companies and co-ops to prove that political power "does not create the new structures realised".

Once again Avineri's gradualist streak has got the better of him - a careful reading of the texts shows that a difference still remains because although the joint-stock companies show that the situation is ripe for socialist ownership proper they are themselves still firmly within the category of the private property system and cannot grow over into the new one given a favourable political climate - they have to be revolutionised - while Marx saw the co-ops as exemplars rather than a base for growing over into the new system.

Marx expresses this dialectically by saying that the stock company "is the abolition (Aufhebung) of the capitalist mode of production within the capitalist mode of production itself, and hence a self-dissolving contradiction..." (21)

It is clear that here we have a contradiction within the system of production and this does nothing to alleviate the situation of the proletariat in the face of people who no longer perform any essential function whatsoever but are "parasites in the shape of promoters, speculators and simply nominal directors; a whole system of swindling and cheating by means of corporation promotion, stock insurance, and stock speculation." (22) The solution to this absurd contradiction still requires the major transition to socialism via expropriation, the condition of which is proletarian state power.

Marx compares stock companies to co-ops as follows: "The capitalist stock companies, as much as the co-operative factories should be considered as transitional forms from the capitalist mode of production to the assoc-

iated one, with the only distinction that the antagonism is resolved negatively in the one and positively in the other." (23) So the coops appear as more of a breakthrough because here the contradiction is resolved "positively" and the parasites are got rid of. Indeed in Marx's day there were many who saw in the spread of co-operative production the mode of transition to socialism. Marx however was always more cautious and saw them mainly as proof that capitalists were not necessary rather than basing on them a main perspective of socialist strategy. Even in the up-beat Inaugural Address he accurately diagnosed their fate: "...Co-operative labour if kept within the narrow circle of the efforts of private workmen, will never be able to arrest the growth in geometrical progression of monopoly, to free the masses, nor even perceptibly to lighten the burden of their miseries...To save the industrious masses, co-operative labours ought to be developed to national dimensions, and consequently, to be fostered by national means."

Of course no such fostering took place and lack of capital extinguished all efforts, except the retail side. In retrospect it can be seen that co-operative factories could only exist in the early days of capitalism before the huge growth of monopoly capital. Monopoly capital has only recently spread into retail organisation and it is obvious that no new co-op retail organisation could start now - while the existing organisation is not exactly the most noticable force for socialism. Even as exemplars co-operatives suffer from the fact that under a capitalist regime, without the support of planned social production, they can do little to "lighten the burden."

It is clear then that although co-operatives anticipate a new social regime Marx saw the actual process of transition as based upon the revolution within the capitalist sector. Avineri is perfectly correct to draw attention to these passages which stress the element of continuity involved in the taking over of a material base, the negations of capitalism within capitalism, etc., but it is still true that significant differences remain between the proletariats' situation and that of previous classes and these do put a high premium upon its political understanding and will - that this be 'Leninism' notwithstanding.

D. Avineri finally discloses his hand in the Epilogue in which he blames Marx for "endowing the present generation with eschatological significance" and overlooking the possibility of "the combination of his philosophical and historical theory with the Jacobin tradition of merely subjectivist revolutionary action; Leninism embodied such a combination". (24) However these points are made too briefly and vapourously to be worth serious analysis so I have preferred to pick up some of the more detailed points above. In sum we have a book which at first sight looks promising - at its strongest the best exegesis of many Marxian themes in English - but finally turns out to have irritatingly perverse aspects.

### Bibliography and Notes

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 180. F.L.P.H. Moscow 1961.
2. David Fernbach, Avineri's view of Marx. New Left Review 56.
3. *ibid.* p. 63.            4. *ibid.* p. 64.
5. see H.B. Acton, The Illusion of the Epoch; conclusion. Also see Sartre, Materialism and Revolution in Novak ed, Existentialism and Marxism
6. S. Avineri, The Social & Political Thought of Karl Marx p. vii.
7. *ibid.* p. 204.
8. G.P. Maximoff ed. The Political Philosophy of Bakunin. Pt. 3 Chap. 4.
9. Karl Marx, Selected Works p. 162. F.L.P.H. Moscow 1962.
10. *ibid.* p. 223.
11. Avineri *op.cit.* p. 34.    12. *ibid.* pp 206-209.    13. *ibid.* p. 212
14. *ibid.* p. 206.    15. *ibid.* p. 206.    16. *ibid.* p. 206-207
17. Marx & Engels, The Holy Family Ch. 4.
18. Avineri *op. cit.* p. 218
19. Translation taken from The Communist Manifesto Ed. D. Ryazanoff, explanatory notes p. 133. Russell & Russell, New York 1963.
20. Avineri *op. cit.* p. 181
21. Karl Marx Capital Vol III p. 427-9 and *ibid.* p. 178.
22. *ibid.*            23. Marx, Capital p. 431.    24. Avineri, *op.cit.* p. 258

## TURKEY'S PETERLOO?

by Spartacus

Tuesday 16th June saw the first organised trade union demonstration in Turkey's history against government legislation aimed at curbing the growing power of trade unions in the industrial cities and towns of what is still a backward country economically, politically and socially.

Over 100,000 workers are estimated to have fought with police and troops in the streets of Istanbul and other major industrial cities. The issue was the proposed legislation before Parliament which aims to outlaw Devrimci İşçi Sendikaları Konfederasyonu (Revolutionary Workers' Trade Union Confederation) - known as D.I.S.K.

The troops were called in because the workers had threatened to defeat the police and in one place, Kadıköy (on the Asian side of the Bosphorus) had put the police to flight, overturned the vehicles to form barricades, sacked the administrative building and had only been defeated by troops armed with automatic weapons and backed up with tanks.

Other places in Istanbul where clashes occurred included Levent (where there is a large industrial estate), Galata Köprüsü, Atatürk Köprüsü, Topkapı, Bakırköy, Cagaloglu, all on the European (Rumeli) side; and Kuzguncuk, Umraniye, Üsküdar and Kartal on the Asian side (Anadolu) of the Bosphorus.

By far the most serious clash occurred at Kadıköy, but so widespread was the demonstration, which turned into a riot when police intervened brutally, that the authorities suspended the ferryboat service across the Bosphorus and opened the Atatürk and Galata Bridges across the Golden Horn thus effectively dividing the city into three, and preventing workers from further co-ordinating the struggle.

It is reported that at a later stage, before the Army was called in and when the police were calling for reinforcements that at Eminönü riot police refused to go into action because they were vastly outnumbered by the workers who were obviously ready to fight.

The Army was called in. Police had been firing indiscriminately into the body of the demonstration, inflaming the workers to the point where, in spite of the hail of bullets they charged the police ranks and overcame them. The Army using tanks soon had the demonstrators "under control".

One estimate, on good authority, was at least 23 workers killed, and at least 300 injured. Official figures: two workers and one policeman killed, 100 injured.

Martial law was declared and a curfew imposed. Leaders of D.I.S.K. have been arrested and although the calling of the demonstrations was quite legal under Turkish law they are now being tried before a military court. Martial law was declared after the demonstration - at 9 p.m. Tuesday.

There are 1,300,000 trade unionists in Turkey. There are two Confederations, TURK-İŞ (pronounced Turk-ish) and D.I.S.K. (as written). TURK-İŞ has a membership of 800,000 and is government-sponsored. D.I.S.K. has a membership of 50,000 and is independent.

Federations are organised according to industries. Under existing law you can organise a union in an industry and join a confederation of your choice. Law 274 permits trade unions to combine in Federations.

The proposed alteration to it is that before a Federation in a particular industry can be recognised it must have one-third of the members of that industry as its members.

Federations can then be organised into Confederations. Under existing law 275, any Federation in a particular industry without reference to percentage of the total workers in that industry can join a Confederation of its choice.

The proposed change to law 275 is that only recognised Federations (as defined in amended law 274, with one-third of the members of that industry) can become affiliated to a Confederation.

There would only be one Confederation that can qualify under the new law: TURK-IŞ.

The government ruling party (ADALET) and the main opposition party (HALK CUMHURİYET) are in favour of the changes in the law. They claim these changes are necessary to "protect workers from unscrupulous gangster-organisers".

It is a fact that most of the racketeering unions are known to be affiliated to TURK-IŞ, which is government-sponsored and controlled. They are known as 'yellow unions' because they are paternalistic and approved by the government. The change in the law will not stop racketeering; it may even encourage it. It will certainly outlaw the militant unions organised in the smaller Confederation, D.I.S.K.

It is generally agreed among all shades of opinion in Turkey that the real aim of this new law is to outlaw D.I.S.K. whose power and influence among workers with real grievances appears to be growing fast.

That the Demirel government was prepared to take the step of provoking these riots, which cannot have been entirely unexpected as a reaction by the government in Ankara, is a measure of the panic they (the government) must feel at the growth of an organised revolutionary opposition in the main industrial cities and towns of Turkey.

Istanbul, in common with other industrial cities, is growing at a tremendous rate. The majority of workers are first-generation proletarians, having moved into the city from the countryside in search of a higher standard of living than the abysmal poverty that generations have passively accepted in the East. Thus in Istanbul and other industrial towns and cities the situation of the majority of workers is similar, in some respects, to that of immigrant workers in Britain. They are referred to by the traditional city-dwellers - sophisticated middle-class - as "animals", and are supposed not to be able to think for themselves. Because they are "animals" they are treated with a similar degree of viciousness and intolerance as Commonwealth citizens in Britain; not for reasons of colour or race so much, but mainly because they are regarded as "inferior animals".

There is no doubt about the tension felt among the bourgeoisie in Turkey. This ruling class, until now so complacent, so overfed and so 19th-century in its undisguised aggression is now sniffing the air nervously, scenting "the animals" who are no longer willing to be domesticated without a snarl and without biting the hand that represses.

The question remains 'Why did the Demirel government take this action at this time?' It is possible that they think - and they may be proved right in the short-term - that they have nipped the movement in the bud and that martial law eventually backed up by legislation outlawing all but 'yellow' unions would serve their purposes in keeping the working class isolated in units of production and incapable of organising effective opposition due to harassment, since such organisation would be illegal.

However, at the present moment it is just as possible that the Demirel government has over-estimated the usefulness of the Army as a substitute for political consensus and that the workers of Istanbul may yet stage a comeback. In which case it is to be hoped that the workers of Istanbul have learned some lessons from their defeat of Tuesday 16th June.

A banner carried by a worker on the Tuesday demonstration contains the key to a change in the present deadlock. "Workers and soldiers hand-in-hand". ("İşçi ordu elele").

An eye-witness reported seeing a worker at Eminonu, when threatened by a soldier wielding a rifle with a fixed bayonet, bare his chest and challenge the soldier to kill him. The soldier drew back, confused. He had been ordered to clear "communists" from the streets, (he has been taught from childhood to hate and fear "communism") but not fellow-countrymen from Anatolia! The worker is first-generation, from the same region as the soldier, and is obviously not a "communist" from over the hill.

After martial law was imposed we heard that many workers were fighting a rearguard action by sitting at machines and refusing to work. Unfortunately it is difficult to assess how widespread resistance is, but there is a rumour that D.I.S.K. is pushing for a general strike. However, with the principal organisers either on trial or in prison awaiting trial before a military court it is probably a rumour without possibilities of realisation at the present time. (The military authorities argue that they have jurisdiction to try the leaders of D.I.S.K. because the riot which made martial law necessary was obviously the fault of the D.I.S.K. organisers. They are particularly concerned that the workers should not be tried before a civil judge, since the judiciary in Turkey is notoriously independent!)

Turkey's estimated population is about 32,000,000. Of these about five or six million are workers. Of these only 1,300,000 are in trade unions and now D.I.S.K. members will either have to belong to a union in TURK-İŞ - the "pudding club" Confederation - or no union at all.

The overwhelming majority of the population are peasants. They are apathetic, live in incredible poverty and are very conservative, supplying the main electoral support of the ruling Adalet Party (Justice Party). They are fanatical believers in Mahomet, and fanatical opponents of "communism".

For at least 20 years now there has been some sort of agreement between America and Turkey regarding Turkey's strategic proximity to the Soviet Union. Turkey's bourgeoisie (maybe without good reason) fears the nearness of the Soviet Union as a threat to its existence and until recently has been only too pleased to permit American military presence on some scale here. But within the last two or three years this American presence has become very unpopular, not only with the working class but with significant numbers of the middle and upper classes who have a love-hate relationship with America, (as do other European powers).

Turkey, however, cannot entirely do without American help in guarding against the "communist menace" from without and WITHIN. Turkey has had massive American aid for military appropriations, most of the jeeps, lorries, guns and tanks are American supplied or bought with American "loans".

The Turkish government would like to be able to man the bases now operated by the Americans, but the backward economy of Turkey cannot support this transition. Thus when the Turkish government echoes popular feeling publicly in naming a date for American withdrawal from commitment in Turkey, in private they are only too anxious to point out to the Americans that they cannot possibly afford to keep up the sophisticated apparatus which the Americans have evolved to "protect" Turkey's borders.

The Turkish Army is conscripted and most of the adult male population has been, will be, or are in the Army or on reserve from the Army. Again since the majority of the population are still peasants, the Army is largely a peasant-conscript Army, having little or no sympathy for the sophisticated ideas expressed by militant workers who want to organise their own trade unions (an incomprehensible idea to a peasant) and who earn far more than the farmers and peasants of Anatolia.

However, many officers are thinking about the excessively narrow and repressive society they find themselves helping to bolster and there are junior officers - how many is hard to say - who have great sympathy for the workers involved in the recent demonstration and are concerned about the government's attack on constitutional rights. Up till now it has been legal to join a union of your choice, to form your own union and to organise your own Federation.

Most people in Istanbul are surprised when asked what the ordinary soldier thinks. "The ordinary soldier doesn't think" they say.

Until last week the same people would have told us: "The ordinary worker doesn't think". In fact many of them still believe the workers are being led astray by subversive elements, and, in flagrant contradiction of that theory, by "gangsters" who operate unions like the American "protection" unions.

It is inevitable that people with various revolutionary political convictions are involved in trying to influence the workers. It is possible that some people have attempted to, or succeeded in organising unions by terrorising some workers, but it is difficult to believe that 100,000 workers in Istanbul alone (and, according to reports, smaller numbers in Ankara and other industrial cities and towns) will face up to troops and



tanks because they are "threatened" by "gangsters".

The anomaly of a membership of 50,000 workers in D.I.S.K. and the far greater numbers who demonstrated against the proposed repressive legislation is explained by right-wingers as "fear of the gangsters who threatened workers who were members of TURK-IS and people who weren't in trade unions at all that if they didn't demonstrate they would be beaten up," and by sympathisers of the demonstrators by the fact that many workers who weren't in trade unions or were members of TURK-IS were so incensed by the government's proposals that they came out in sympathy.

One factory-owner when asked if his workers were in a union said: "Oh, my workers aren't in a trade union; we believe there must be only one authority in a factory," but he admitted that his workers "went home" on the day of the demonstration. The majority of non-union firms were closed on the Tuesday of the protest. Many workers joined the demonstration, many went home. A lot of members of TURK-IS - the "pudding club" Confederation joined in.

In Istanbul at present - the largest industrial complex in Turkey and a city which attracts many tourists - there is martial law, and no doubt under cover of military rule the authorities are doing their best to weed out any elements likely to cause "trouble."

A curfew which was in force at 9 p.m. for two days, ten p.m. for another, 12 midnight for two more, and finally one p.m. was finally lifted when it was found to be more inconvenient to the night-life of the bourgeoisie and tourists than it was effective in keeping workers behind closed doors. So many people wandered about after the curfew thinking it didn't apply to themselves that the military must have despaired.

When martial law is declared revolutionaries know that workers have pushed the bourgeoisie beyond the usual liberal "checks and balances".

By a series of decrees in the 'twenties and 'thirties Kemal Ataturk, the despotic benevolent dictator of modern Turkey established a remarkable hotch-potch embodied in the present law and constitution, which the Demirel government is now accused by many of attempting to circumvent. Among other things, Ataturk established the legal system basing it upon the French legal code, the judiciary became an independent body and has recently been a thorn in the flesh of the government, often refusing to condemn political demonstrators on legal technicalities. The Constitution also, apparently, contains written guarantees of the right to organise trade unions, the right to free speech and freedom of association, all ideas borrowed from the West and, in Turkey, imposed by Ataturk in a series of decrees, a remarkable example of victory without struggle. But, of course, the workers are just beginning to test the viability in reality of a constitution embodying ideas which were foreign to this backward agricultural country just recovering from the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. In fact, Turkey's economic development depends decisively on outside help; it is impossible for the country to develop rapidly without help. At present Turkey is strangled with trade agreements of a disadvantageous nature.

It is possible that the Demirel government, seeing the growing organised power of the workers here, decided to force the issue once and for all. But it is just as likely that they have not yet learned the lesson that Western European governments have now learned by heart, especially in Britain and Sweden, that they must learn to live with workers organisations, especially trade unions, and attempt at all costs to take them over and use them to control the workers. This idea is not working in Turkey at present because the Demirel government have been too crude, perhaps because they still feel contemptuous of the workers' real ability to "come-back" and retaliate.

The thoroughness and naked force used, first by the police and then by the Army to put down this demonstration compares with Peterloo and 1905 in Russia. That it has not been noticed throughout the world is an indication of the over-familiarisation of jaded tele-palates with continuous global violence. Unlike Peterloo and 1905, the recent demonstration in Turkey was a case of workers demonstrating to retain rights already granted by law and threatened by new legislation (an interesting parallel with recent suggested legislation in Britain).

Modern industrial technology is coming to Turkey, imported by some wealthy Turkish businessmen, but more often exported by American-European combines. Forced by modern technological innovation to organise faster than their fore-runners in Europe and America, the members of the Revolutionary Workers' Trade Union Confederation have rapidly acquired as sophisticated an understanding of tactics in modern industrial warfare as any workers in the world with the added advantage that they do not suffer from the 'hang-ups' of modern industrial workers in Western Europe, especially Britain. They have less to lose, in their own eyes. They do not easily identify their interests as the 'state' interests or 'bourgeois' interests. They have not been brainwashed by centuries of "democracy", of trade union affiliation to reformist "sell-out" politics. They are ready to struggle and struggle bitterly. When they grow strong enough may we hope that they will find their Western European counterparts as ready, willing and as eager - as clear headed as they already show signs of being?

Tuesday 16th June was no idle skirmish in Turkey. Not only Istanbul but Ankara, Izmir and every industrial city was involved. Bitter feelings have been aroused. People who are working from dawn to dusk for incredibly low wages by Western standards and who have just become aware of their power through trade union organisation are threatened with the reality of the power of the bourgeoisie invested in the government and executed by the police, and when they fail, the military.

Banners displayed during the demonstration included the following: "We are protesting for our freedom and we are powerful!", "We are against those who are taking trade union freedom from us and our constitutional rights".

Now the military rule effectively prevents a coherent report of workers reactions to this defeat. The leaders of D.I.S.K. are in prison or on trial. At this moment we are not certain of the charges and to some extent what these charges are is an academic question. The reality is that D.I.S.K. is beheaded and the question is - now that D.I.S.K. has effectively been out-

laved, how many workers will be prepared to risk imprisonment and possibly death in joining an illegal, underground organisation - as is almost certain to spring up among the hard-core survivors of the revolutionary Confederation.

No clear answers to these questions are available at present but it is very clear that the ruling class in Turkey fears the power of a working class which is only about one-fifth of the total population, because of a minority of that class who have begun to demonstrate their ability and understanding in organising effectively against the Turkish boss class, showing signs of posing clearly-defined revolutionary objectives.

These objectives include worker's power (workers control through Workers Councils). It can be argued that this would not happen in an "advanced" country like Britain. That the ruling class is much more subtle and infinitely more sophisticated.

But there have been occasions even in the comparatively recent past when the British ruling class has either let the mask slip or had it, albeit momentarily, torn from its grisly face. Troops are in Northern Ireland in some numbers and although the British papers never tire of telling us that the "background" to these "troubles" is religious bigotry we know that the objective factor is economic and political discrimination.

If an independent revolutionary organisation were begun by workers in Britain and other European countries with clearly-defined revolutionary aims, rooted in working class organisations and with working class procedures and traditions of democratic control and concensus clearly embodied in its constitutional procedures and practice; independent of all bourgeois and petit-bourgeois influences; who could be sure that such an organisation could continue long in the climate of the Britain of "In Place of Strife" and proposed Tory-government anti-trade union legislation without a confrontation with the last resort of the repressive state?

Obviously there is a crying need for such a workers revolutionary organisation, across Europe; across the World. But in the absence of a revolutionary international workers-controlled organisation to co-ordinate and clarify such struggles they will always be defeated in isolation by the "last resort", the Army of the particular state involved in a "dispute" with its working class. Until that "last resort" can be subverted or overcome by greater fluidity and subtler tactics on an international scale.

Events like the recent workers massive demonstration and riots in Turkey are not divorced from the frantic attempts by Western capitalist governments to attempt to "tame" their unions, nor from periodic clashes in Russia and China (of which news seeps out in distorted form from time to time).

We always tend to end our articles with an exhortation to revolutionary endeavour, but in all seriousness we should consider carefully where our efforts are leading us and whether we are yet on the right path, without a significant section of the Western working class convinced of their vital need to abolish their oppression by the boss class in the only possible way.

The reason the movement in Turkey is so important is just that the Turkish working class - or an important element in it - have no illusions

about the need to overthrow the power of the ruling class by revolution. But in isolation their efforts are doomed to either complete failure or stagnation in a stillborn effort - a kind of "halfway" revolution which might successfully overthrow the present ruling class but would most likely lead to stratification into another bourgeois centralised Stalinist-type set up, all too familiar in Eastern Europe, Russia and China.

Yet the possibilities if such a revolution were linked to outside endeavours (even as close as Greece) would become very exciting and not at all ridiculous.

For many years Greece has been staving off revolution. She was ably assisted as far back as the Yalta agreement when Churchill and Stalin (Roosevelt didn't count!) carved up the world between the two power blocs - East and West. Greece was agreed to be in the Western sphere of influence, specifically the British sphere of influence, and so Stalin smiled while Greek communists were slaughtered with British military assistance. Revolution in Greece - since the struggle was isolated - was effectively defeated. Similar revolutionary possibilities were contained and defeated in France and Italy.

Now, however, and once again, the ruling class throughout Europe and in America is on the defensive. (How many times this century?) The only reason they can continue to outflank their respective working classes is the lack of an effectively co-ordinated and imaginatively-dynamic revolutionary international workers organisation, with ideas radically rethought in the light of the stultifying experience of the last 50-odd years.

Until we seriously work for and get this new genuine international of workers with real revolutionary intentions, such struggles as those of the Greek workers and the Turkish workers will continue indefinitely without hope, for they will always be crushed with the help of powerful Western capitalist nations, particularly Britain and America, and with the indifference of the Eastern bureaucracies of Russia and China.

.....

### WOMEN'S LIBERATION IN PERSPECTIVE

by Carol Day

In Russia and China, while the most advanced section of the working class was the industrial proletariat, the revolutions in these countries were brought about by an appeal which was also able to mobilise the peasantry. Similarly in contemporary West European politics we must not neglect the aspirations of the traditionally more backward sections of the working class, the most sizeable part of which is composed of women workers.

The present increased demand for economic equality and equal opportunity strikes at the economic base of capitalism and while it is possible for this demand to be met under the present set-up it will also lead to an important strengthening and unity of the working class which cannot be achieved while men and women are squabbling among themselves for the crumbs from the employers table.

It is important to know something of the conditions leading to women's present position in order to assess some of the merits of a campaign for equality. This field has been fairly well covered by Engels in "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State", and by Bebel in "Women Under Socialism".

The relations between men and women have materially changed in the previous course of development of society, and it goes without saying that with further changes in the system of production and distribution, the relations between the sexes are bound to change again.

Mankind has developed through the stages of savagery where both polyandry and polygamy were practised, barbarism where marriage was restricted to those within the same age group and civilisation during which monogamy was developed. Certain marriage forms of previous stages have inevitably been carried forward into the present stage.

In primitive society it is probable that the family existed in a very different form from today with readily dissoluble unions and also that descent was reckoned in the female line, since it may more readily be determined who is a child's mother than its father. Children did not belong to one couple but to a family group. The study of history and indeed of tribes remote from civilisation even today shows that the relation between the sexes was completely different from the present status quo. As each stage of economic development has its own condition of production, so likewise each has its own code of morals, which is a reflection of the social condition.

When descent in the female line was replaced by descent in the male line woman became a slave. Men purchased their wives and their chastity-women became a commodity on the market. A major selling point being her chastity, restrictions were placed upon her before and after marriage.

How did it happen that women found themselves placed in this position? Ironically it was due to some extent to their prowess in the domestication of animals and in the development of primitive crafts and agriculture. The goods so produced being originally owned communally became eventually the object of competition and warfare among peoples at differing stages of development. The acquisition of property became important and man the warrior wanted to make sure that his own children inherited his wealth and hence laid restrictions upon his wife to make sure that they were his own children. Hence the demands of inheritance based upon the ownership of private property led to women occupying an inferior social position because of their role as mothers. Even in social strata where no-one owned property the desire to do so usually resulted in their accepting the same norms as the middle and upper classes. This situation was reinforced by the law of the land.

With the further development of the means of production women became even more alienated. Productive and cultural activities took place outside the home - by now considered as the woman's sphere - in Greece a stage was reached when there were three categories of women - wives, prostitutes and intellectual companions, the three categories being mutually exclusive.

The Industrial Revolution should have brought about the emancipation of women with its techniques of mass production and development of so-called

labour saving devices, but instead it doubled their oppression. The importance of the family unit as a centre of production dwindled away to nothing. The new woman had to work under the double yoke of working for a living and of household duties.

By saying that a woman's primary role is that assigned to her by her biological function i.e. motherhood the ruling class has obscured the class struggle with sex competition. Working class women often feel that they have more in common with the wives and daughters of the rich than with the sons and husbands of the working class. Hence they have become a pool of cheap labour holding down the wages of all and the tightly knit family has become the arena in which the ideology of the status quo is passed on to the next generation.

How are we going to attack the system which perpetrates such injustices, where in this country 6 million women are without equal pay, where family planning advice is still mainly provided on an ad hoc basis by voluntary organisations and where girls are educated to consider marriage a career and the height of their ambition.

It is not a question which can be conveniently filed away under the general heading 'the fight for socialism', any more than the aspirations of the black people can be dismissed with the slogan 'workers of the world unite'. Just as the oppression of the black people is the product of the imperialist stage of development and is reinforced by an ability to distinguish them by skin colouration; so the oppression of women is the product of an earlier stage of development including feudalism and capitalism and is made easier by the ability to classify people according to their biological function.

However, it is not necessary to fall into the trap of some of the early feminists, who believed that equality could only be achieved by childless women. Having children is an important social task, it is not illness and should not be a misfortune for which a woman is financially penalized, both during her confinement due to loss of earnings and during the rest of her life by lower wage rates.

Women must look to their own strength to rectify the situation. It is no more feasible for women to expect men to liberate them, than it is feasible for the black people to expect it from the white liberals. One of the most important demands is for economic equality, voiced in the slogan "Equal pay for work of equal value", since this could lead not only to a change in women's position but also to a radical change in the distribution of wealth, if we could ensure that the cost of equal pay is paid for from the employers' profits, rather than by being taken from men's wage packets. Such a step must have the active support of the Trade Unions. In order to make women more T.U. conscious, a link must be made between women's awareness of oppression and the need to be organised industrially. In this respect organisations such as NJACWER (National Joint Action Campaign for Women's Equal Rights. Secretary Mrs. Jean Watt, 4 Raisbeck Court, 26 Rosendale Road, West Dulwich, London S.E.21.) are invaluable, since they provide a meeting point for those people active in the field of women's rights, both inside and outside the trade unions. NJACWER is also an important pressure group

on the woman question which might otherwise be swallowed up in the general fight for socialism and better working conditions.

An important corollary to the demand of equal pay is that for equal opportunity and training. Not only should women have the right to work, whether married or not, but the opportunity should be there in the form of equal access to all jobs and training schemes and also in the form of extensive child care facilities to enable women to take advantage of these opportunities.

It is hoped that we are now at the starting point in the education of the contemporary left on women's rights, since an understanding of the problem is critical to any socialist programme and in most countries of the world it has been much neglected.

.....

### THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF WOMEN'S LIBERATION

by Margaret Benston

"The position of women rests, as everything in our complex society, on an economic base."

- Eleanor Marx and Edward Aveling.

The "woman question" is generally ignored in analyses of the class structure of society. This is so because, on the one hand, classes are generally defined by their relation to the means of production and, on the other hand, women are not supposed to have any unique relation to the means of production. The category seems instead to cut across all classes; one speaks of working-class women, middle-class women, etc. The status of women is clearly inferior to that of men, (1) but analysis of this condition usually falls into discussing socialization, psychology, interpersonal relations, or the role of marriage as a social institution. (2). Are these, however, the primary factors? In arguing that the roots of the secondary status of women are in fact economic, it can be shown that women as a group do indeed have a definite relation to the means of production and that this is different from that of men. The personal and psychological factors then follow from this special relation to production, and a change in the latter will be a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for changing the former. (3) If this special relation of women to production is accepted, the analysis of the situation of women fits naturally into a class analysis of society.

The starting point for discussion of classes in a capitalist society is the distinction between those who own the means of production and those who sell their labor power for a wage. As Ernest Mandel says:

"The proletarian condition is, in a nutshell, the lack of access to the means of production or means of subsistence which, in a society of generalized commodity production, forces the proletarian to sell his labor power. In exchange for this labor power he receives a wage which then enables him to acquire the means of consumption necessary for satisfying his own needs and those of his family.

"This is the structural definition of wage earner, the proletarian. From it necessarily flows a certain relationship to his work, to the products of his work, and to his overall situation in society, which can be summarized by the catchword alienation. But there does not follow from this structural definition any necessary conclusions as to the level of his consumption... the extent of his needs, or the degree to which he can satisfy them." (4)

We lack a corresponding structural definition of women. What is needed first is not a complete examination of the symptoms of the secondary status of women, but instead a statement of the material conditions in capitalist (and other) societies which define the group "women." Upon these conditions are built the specific superstructures which we know. An interesting passage from Mandel points the way to such a definition:

"The commodity... is a product created to be exchanged on the market, as opposed to one which has been made for direct consumption. Every commodity must have both a use-value and an exchange-value."

It must have a use-value or else nobody would buy it... A commodity without a use-value to anyone would consequently be unsalable, would constitute useless production, would have no exchange-value precisely because it had no use-value.

On the other hand, every product which has use-value does not necessarily have exchange-value. It has an exchange-value only to the extent that the society itself, in which the commodity is produced, is founded on exchange, is a society where exchange is a common practice...

In capitalist society, commodity production, the production of exchange-values, has reached its greatest development. It is the first society in human history where the major part of production consists of commodities. It is not true, however, that all production under capitalism is commodity production. Two classes of products still remain simple use-value.

The first group consists of all things produced by the peasantry for its own consumption, everything directly consumed on the farms where it is produced...

The second group of products in capitalist society which are not commodities but remain simple use-value consists of all things produced in the home. Despite the fact that considerable human labor goes into this type of household production, it still remains a production of use-values and not of commodities. Every time a soup is made or a button sewn on a garment, it constitutes production, but it is not production for the market.

The appearance of commodity production and its subsequent regularization and generalization have radically transformed the way men labor and how they organize society." (5)

What Mandel may not have noticed is that his last paragraph is precisely correct. The appearance of commodity production has indeed transformed the



way that men labor. As he points out, most household labor in capitalist society (and in the existing socialist societies, for that matter) remains in the pre-market stage. This is the work which is reserved for women and it is in this fact that we can find the basis for a definition of women.

In sheer quantity, household labor, including child care, constitutes a huge amount of socially necessary production. Nevertheless, in a society based on commodity production, it is not usually considered "real work" since it is outside of trade and the market place. It is pre-capitalist in a very real sense. This assignment of household work as a function of a special category "women" means that this group does stand in a different relation to production than the group "men". We will tentatively define women, then, as that group of people who are responsible for the production of simple use-values in those activities associated with the home and family.

Since men carry no responsibility for such production, the difference between the two groups lies here. Notice that women are not excluded from commodity production. Their participation in wage labor occurs but, as a group, they have no structural responsibility in this area and such participation is ordinarily regarded as transient. Men, on the other hand, are responsible for commodity production; they are not, in principle, given any role in household labor. For example, when they do participate in household production, it is regarded as more than simply exceptional; it is demoralizing, emasculating, even harmful to health. (A story on the front page of the Vancouver Sun in January 1969 reported that men in Britain were having their health endangered because they had to do too much housework!)

The material basis for the inferior status of women is to be found in just this definition of women. In a society in which money determines value, women are a group who work outside the money economy. Their work is not worth money, is therefore valueless, is therefore not even real work. And women themselves, who do this valueless work, can hardly be expected to be worth as much as men, who work for money. In structural terms, the closest thing to the condition of women is the condition of others who are or were also outside of commodity production, i.e., serfs and peasants.

In her recent paper on women, Juliet Mitchell introduces the subject as follows: "In advanced industrial society, women's work is only marginal to the total economy. Yet it is through work that man changes natural conditions and thereby produces society. Until there is a revolution in production, the labor situation will prescribe women's situation within the world of men." (6) The statement of the marginality of women's work is an unanalyzed recognition that the work women do is different from the work that men do. Such work is not marginal, however; it is just not wage labor and so is not counted. She even says later in the same article, "Domestic labor, even today, is enormous if quantified in terms of productive labor." She gives some figures to illustrate: In Sweden, 2,340 million hours a year are spent by women in housework compared with 1,290 million hours spent by women in industry. And the Chase Manhattan Bank estimates a woman's overall work week at 99.6 hours.

However, Mitchell gives little emphasis to the basic economic factors (in fact she condemns most Marxists for being "overly economist") and moves on hastily to superstructural factors, because she notices that "the advent of industrialization has not so far freed women." What she fails to see is that no society has thus far industrialized housework. Engels points out that the "first premise for the emancipation of women is the reintroduction of the entire female sex into public industry... And this has become possible not only as a result of modern large-scale industry, which not only permits the participation of women in production in large numbers, but actually calls for it and, moreover, strives to convert private domestic work also into a public industry." (7) And later in the same passage: "Here we see already that the emancipation of women and their equality with men are impossible and must remain so as long as women are excluded from socially productive work and restricted to housework, which is private." What Mitchell has not taken into account is that the problem is not simply one of getting women into existing industrial production but the more complex one of converting private production of household work into public production.

For most North Americans, domestic work as "public production" brings immediate images of Brave New World or of a vast institution - a cross between a home for orphans and an army barracks - where we would all be forced to live. For this reason, it is probably just as well to outline here, schematically and simplistically, the nature of industrialization.

A pre-industrial production unit is one in which production is small-scale and reduplicative; i.e. there are a great number of little units, each complete and just like all the others. Ordinarily such production units are in some way kin-based and they are multi-purpose, fulfilling religious, recreational, educational, and sexual functions along with the economic function. In such a situation, desirable attributes of an individual, those which give prestige, are judged by more than purely economic criteria: for example, among approved character traits are proper behavior to kin or readiness to fulfill obligations.

Such production is originally not for exchange. But if exchange of commodities becomes important enough, then increased efficiency of production becomes necessary. Such efficiency is provided by the transition to industrialized production which involves the elimination of the kin-based production unit. A large-scale, non-reduplicative production unit is substituted which has only one function, the economic one, and where prestige or status is attained by economic skills. Production is rationalized, made vastly more efficient, and becomes more and more public - part of an integrated social network. An enormous expansion of man's productive potential takes place. Under capitalism such social productive forces are utilized almost exclusively for private profit. These can be thought of as capitalized forms of production.

If we apply the above to housework and child rearing, it is evident that each family, each household, constitutes an individual production unit, a pre-industrial entity, in the same way that peasant farmers or cottage weavers constitute pre-industrial production units. The main features are clear, with the reduplicative, kin-based, private nature of

the work being the most important. (It is interesting to notice the other features: the multi-purpose functions of the family, the fact that desirable attributes for women do not center on economic prowess, etc.) The rationalization of production effected by a transition to large-scale production has not taken place in this area.

Industrialization is, in itself, a great force for human good; exploration and dehumanization go with capitalism and not necessarily with industrialization. To advocate the conversion of private domestic labor into a public industry under capitalism is quite a different thing from advocating such conversion in a socialist society. In the latter case the forces of production would operate for human welfare, not private profit, and the result should be liberation, not dehumanization. In this case we can speak of socialized forms of production.

These definitions are not meant to be technical but rather to differentiate between two important aspects of industrialization. Thus the fear of the barracks-like result of introducing housekeeping into the public economy is most realistic under capitalism. With socialized production and the removal of the profit motive and its attendant alienated labor, there is no reason why, in an industrialized society, industrialization of housework should not result in better production, i.e. better food, more comfortable surroundings, more intelligent and loving child-care, etc., than in the present nuclear family.

The argument is often advanced that, under neocapitalism, the work in the home has been much reduced. Even if this is true, it is not structurally relevant. Except for the very rich, who can hire someone to do it, there is for most women, an irreducible minimum of necessary labor involved in caring for home, husband, and children. For a married woman without children this irreducible minimum of work probably takes fifteen to twenty hours a week; for a woman with small children the minimum is probably seventy or eighty hours a week. (8) (There is some resistance to regarding child-rearing as a job. That labor is involved, i.e., the production of use-value can be clearly seen when exchange-value is also involved - when the work is done by baby sitters, nurses, child-care centres, or teachers. An economist has already pointed out the paradox that if a man marries his housekeeper he reduces the national income, since the money he gives her is no longer counted as wages.) The reduction of housework to the minimums given is also expensive; for low-income families more labor is required. In any case household work remains structurally the same - a matter of private production.

One function of the family, the one taught to us in school and the one which is popularly accepted, is the satisfaction of emotional needs: the needs for closeness, community, and warm secure relationships. This society provides few other ways of satisfying such needs; for example, work relationships or friendships are not expected to be nearly as important as a man-woman-with-children relationship. Even other ties of kinship are increasingly secondary. This function of the family is important in stabilizing it so that it can fulfill the second, purely economic, function discussed above. The wage-earner, the husband-father, whose earnings support himself, also "pays for" the labor done by the mother-wife and supports the children. The wages of a man buy the labor of two people.

The crucial importance of this second function of the family can be seen when the family unit breaks down in divorce. The continuation of the economic function is the major concern where children are involved; the man must continue to pay for the labor of the woman. His wage is very often insufficient to enable him to support a second family. In this case his emotional needs are sacrificed to the necessity to support his ex-wife and children. That is, when there is a conflict the economic function of the family very often takes precedence over the emotional one. And this in a society which teaches that the major function of the family is the satisfaction of emotional needs.(9)

As an economic unit, the nuclear family is a valuable stabilizing force in capitalist society. Since the production which is done in the home is paid for by the husband-father's earnings, his ability to withhold his labor from the market is much reduced. Even his flexibility in changing jobs is limited. The woman, denied an active place in the market, has little control over the conditions that govern her life. Her economic dependence is reflected in emotional dependence, passivity, and other "typical" female personality traits. She is conservative, fearful, supportive of the status quo.

Furthermore, the structure of this family is such that it is an ideal consumption unit. But this fact, which is widely noted in Women's Liberation literature, should not be taken to mean that this is its primary function. If the above analysis is correct, the family should be seen primarily as a production unit for housework and child-rearing. Everyone in capitalist society is a consumer; the structure of the family simply means that it is particularly well suited to encourage consumption. Women in particular are good consumers; this follows naturally from their responsibility for matters in the home. Also, the inferior status of women, their general lack of a strong sense of worth and identity, make them more exploitable than men and hence better consumers.

The history of women in the industrialized sector of the economy has depended simply on the labor needs of that sector. Women function as a massive reserve army of labor. When labor is scarce (early industrialization, the two world wars, etc.) then women form an important part of the labor force. When there is less demand for labor (as now under neocapitalism) women become a surplus labor force - but one for which their husbands and not society are economically responsible. The "cult of the home" makes its reappearance during times of labor surplus and is used to channel women out of the market economy. This is relatively easy since the pervading ideology ensures that no one, man or woman, takes women's participation in the labor force very seriously. Women's real work, we are taught, is in the home; this holds whether or not they are married, single, or the heads of households.

At all times household work is the responsibility of women. When they are working outside the home they must somehow manage to get both outside job and housework done (or they supervise a substitute for the housework). Women, particularly married women with children, who work outside the home simply do two jobs; their participation in the labor force is only allowed if they continue to fulfill their first responsibility in the home. This

is particularly evident in countries like Russia and those in Eastern Europe where expanded opportunities for women in the labor force have not brought about a corresponding expansion in their liberty. Equal access to jobs outside the home, while one of the preconditions for women's liberation, will not in itself be sufficient to give equality for women; as long as work in the home remains a matter of private production and is the responsibility of women, they will simply carry a double work-load.

A second prerequisite for women's liberation which follows from the above analysis is the conversion of the work now done in the home as private production into work to be done in the public economy. (10) To be more specific, this means that child-rearing should no longer be the responsibility solely of the parents. Society must begin to take responsibility for children; the economic dependence of women and children on the husband-father must be ended. The other work that goes on in the home must also be changed - communal eating places and laundries for example. When such work is moved into the public sector, then the material basis for discrimination against women will be gone.

These are only preconditions. The idea of the inferior status of women is deeply rooted in the society and will take a great deal of effort to eradicate. But once the structures which produce and support that idea are changed then, and only then, can we hope to make progress. It is possible, for example, that a change to communal eating places would simply mean that women are moved from a home kitchen to a communal one. This would be an advance, to be sure, particularly in a socialist society where work would not have the inherently exploitative nature it does now. Once women are freed from private production in the home, it will probably be very difficult to maintain for any long period of time a rigid definition of jobs by sex. This illustrates the interrelation between the two preconditions given above: true equality in job opportunity is probably impossible without freedom from housework, and the industrialization of housework is unlikely unless women are leaving the home for jobs.

The changes in production necessary to get women out of the home might seem to be, in theory, possible under capitalism. One of the sources of women's liberation movements may be the fact that alternative capitalized forms of home production now exist. Day care is available, even if inadequate and perhaps expensive; convenience foods, home delivery of meals, and take-out meals are widespread; laundries and cleaners offer bulk rates. However cost usually prohibits a complete dependence on such facilities and they are not available everywhere, even in North America. These should probably then be regarded as embryonic forms rather than completed structures. However, they clearly stand as alternatives to the present system of getting such work done. Particularly in North America, where the growth of "service industries" is important in maintaining the growth of the economy, the contradictions between these alternatives and the need to keep women in the home will grow.

The need to keep women in the home arises from two major aspects of the present system. First, the amount of unpaid labor performed by women is very large and very profitable to those who own the means of production. To pay women for their work, even at minimum wage scales, would imply a

massive redistribution of wealth. At present, the support of a family is a hidden tax on the wage earner - his wage buys the labor power of two people. And second, there is the problem of whether the economy can expand enough to put all women to work as a part of the normally employed labor force. The war economy has been adequate to draw women partially into the economy but not adequate to establish a need for all or most of them. If it is argued that the jobs created by the industrialization of housework will create this need, then one can counter by pointing to (1) the strong economic forces operating for the status quo and against capitalization discussed above, and (2) the fact that the present service industries, which somewhat counter these forces, have not been able to keep up with the growth of the labor force as presently constituted. The present trends in the service industries simply create "underemployment" in the home; they do not create new jobs for women. So long as this situation exists, women remain a very convenient and elastic part of the industrial reserve army. Their incorporation into the labor force on terms of equality - which would create pressure for capitalization of housework - is possible only with an economic expansion so far achieved by neocapitalism only under conditions of full-scale war mobilization.

In addition, such structural changes imply the complete breakdown of the present nuclear family. The stabilizing consuming functions of the family, plus the ability of the cult of the home to keep women out of the labor market, serve neocapitalism too well to be easily dispensed with. And, on a less fundamental level, even if these necessary changes in the nature of household production were achieved under capitalism it would have the unpleasant consequence of including all human relations in the cash nexus. The atomization and isolation of people in Western society is already sufficiently advanced to make it doubtful if such complete psychic isolation could be tolerated. It is likely in fact that one of the major negative emotional responses to women's liberation movements may be exactly such a fear. If this is the case, then possible alternatives - co-operatives, the kibbutz etc. - can be cited to show that psychic needs for community and warmth can in fact be better satisfied if other structures are substituted for the nuclear family.

At best the change to capitalization of housework would only give women the same limited freedom given most men in capitalist society. This does not mean, however, that women should wait to demand freedom from discrimination. There is a material basis for women's status; we are not merely discriminated against, we are exploited. At present, our unpaid labor in the home is necessary if the entire system is to function. Pressure created by women who challenge their role will reduce the effectiveness of this exploitation. In addition, such challenges will impede the functioning of the family and may make the channelling of women out of the labor force less effective. All of these will hopefully make quicker the transition to a society in which the necessary structural changes in production can actually be made. That such a transition will require a revolution I have no doubt; our task is to make sure that revolutionary changes in the society do in fact end women's oppression.

## Bibliography and Notes

1. Marlene Dixon, "Secondary Social Status of Women." (Available from U.S. Voice of Women's Liberation Movement, 1940 Bissell, Chicago, Illinois 60614).
2. The biological argument is, of course, the first one used, but it is not usually taken seriously by socialist writers. Margaret Mead's Sex and Temperament is an early statement of the importance of culture instead of biology.
3. This applies to the group or category as a whole. Women as individuals can and do free themselves from their socialization to a great degree (and they can even come to terms with the economic situation in favorable cases), but the majority of women have no chance to do so.
4. Ernest Mandel, "Workers Under Neocapitalism", paper delivered at Simon Fraser University. (Available through the Department of Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby. B.C., Canada.)
5. Ernest Mandel, An Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory (New York: Merit Publishers, 1967), pp. 10-11.
6. Juliet Mitchell, "Women: The Longest Revolution," New Left Review, December 1966.
7. Frederick Engels, Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1968), Chapter IX, p. 158. The anthropological evidence known to Engels indicated primitive woman's dominance over man. Modern anthropology disputes this dominance but provides evidence for a more nearly equal position of women in the matrilineal societies used by Engels as examples. The arguments in this work of Engels do not require the former dominance of women but merely their former equality, and so the conclusions remain unchanged.
8. Such figures can easily be estimated. For example, a married woman without children is expected each week to cook and wash up (10 hours), clean house (4 hours), do laundry, (1 hour), and shop for food (1 hour). The figures are minimum times required each week for such work. The total, 16 hours, is probably unrealistically low; even so, it is close to half of a regular work week. A mother with young children must spend at least six or seven days a week working close to 12 hours.
9. For evidence of such teaching, see any high school text on the family.
10. This is stated clearly by early Marxist writers besides Engels.

Article reproduced by kind permission of Monthly Review. September 1969.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Europe versus America? - Contradictions of Imperialism by Ernest Mandel.  
New Left Books London 35/-

In this short book (139 p.) Ernest Mandel sets out to examine the problems and contradictions facing the West European bourgeoisie in its attempts to compete with U.S. imperialism. Also he examines the relative decline of U.S. imperialism in the last decade. The book is extremely well documented with references and illustrative examples of the points Mandel wants to drive home.

One of the most important phenomena that has arisen in the post-war world and especially in the last decade has been the international concentration of capital (Mandel seems to use this term rather indiscriminately to cover concentration, i.e. growth of individual capitals by accumulation, and centralisation, i.e. the bringing together two or more existing capitals by way of mergers etc.) Mandel distinguishes four forms which this concentration takes-

- a) The complete takeover of a nations industry, or at least the most significant portions by outside capitalists. Thus the country is reduced to a semi-colony.
- b) Where only certain sectors of industry are taken over by foreign capital.
- c) Interpenetration of various capitals without any one country predominating.
- d) Concentration purely within the national boundaries.

He argues, and brings forward material to back up, that all of these processes are taking place, but that the one that is being pushed forward most vigorously is the interpenetration of capital. He convincingly demonstrates that the very nature of capitalism today urges on this process via international competition and technological innovations that this induces on an expanding scale. He writes about the third industrial revolution that we have witnessed since the end of the last war (which comprises atomic power, automation, computers etc.) and points out how this has been part cause and part effect of this capital concentration. This arises today because there are some projects that need such vast amounts of capital to get them off the ground.

Mandel also brings into his analysis the thesis that since the last war we have lived through an upward movement of a Kondratieffe 'long wave', and now we are moving into a downward movement. This would partly account for the long and sustained boom in the capitalist world since the early 1950's. However, this does somewhat contradict Mandel's references to the 'permanent arms economy' which are thrown in without any explanation of what he means by this phrase. One can only presume that he means something different from what the Cliff-Kidron school infer from this, since he is at some pains throughout to snipe at Kidron in his extensive footnotes.

We can see then that the main theme of the book relates to the question of whether American imperialism will dominate West Europe completely in the coming decade or whether the West European bourgeoisie can extend the EEC and develop large and powerful units with which they can not only survive



but also compete. In the process it becomes abundantly clear that the nation state is no longer a viable instrument for the protection of capitalism in Europe.

However, Mandel does not deal adequately with the question raised by Servan-Schreiber (The American Challenge, Pelican Books); the tremendous expansion of U.S. capital inside Europe and the prospect of it becoming the third largest industrial power in the world within the next decade. Mandel's treatment of this point is somewhat cursory.

Although there is a chapter devoted to the division of the world market and some very useful material provided regarding the relative decline of the importance of the 'Third World' in international trade, there is no attempt to analyse the real changes that this indicates as to the nature of imperialism. One sentence points to very important problems that this trend brings: "It is evidence of the increasing trend of industrial nations to exchange their industrial products amongst themselves, thus denying the safety valve of the export of industrial goods to non-industrialised countries." Yet this point is never taken up and developed. This is rather disappointing because the whole process raises quite fundamental questions about the theory of imperialism and also the concrete one of the continued impoverishment of the colonial world.

At one point when writing about the working class and inter-imperialist conflict Mandel gives an indication of how out of touch he is regarding the realities of the British scene when he writes "...it should be noted that the attempt by Enoch Powell in England to exploit racist currents politically has so far only found an echo among the most demoralized and backward sectors of the British working class." If Mandel does not understand that Powell has in fact found quite wide echos in most strata of the population and that he (Powell) has in fact legitimised racial prejudice to some extent then he is whistling in the dark.

The above is perhaps indicative of the rather sweeping generalities which are scattered through this short book. It is merely a skeleton on which much more could have been built. There is a great deal of information here but it has been compressed to the extent that it cannot deal with all the questions it raises. At the end of the book there is an impressive list of sources quoted, but unfortunately no index. Whilst it is a book that should be read because of the questions it raises, it is overpriced at 35/-.

Ken Tarbuck

Unless Peace Comes: A Scientific Forecast of New Weapons (Ed. Nigel Calder)  
Penguin 7/-

This is one of the increasing number of books, whose intent is to frighten the reader about the potential consequences of science and technology, without providing any political perspective as to how to forestall them. It contains sixteen essays by scientific and military experts, who are about equally divided between left liberals and establishment technocrats, including two who were very senior NATO executives. They speculate on the nature of warfare in the last twenty years of this century, being almost

entirely concerned with conflict between great powers.

The theme of the book is well expressed by the penultimate sentence:- "But the worst forebodings will surely be fulfilled and even the most modest visions of a better world will be smashed, if the present military tendencies continue". Many horrific forms of warfare are discussed - orbiting bombs, nerve and other gasses, diseases so powerful that three grams of infected tissue would be sufficient to infect everyone alive, robot bombs, agents which change climates, the destruction of the ozone layer which protects the earth from lethal ultra-violet rays from the sun, etc. Yet they provide no argument to show that the deterrence principle will fail, for the possibilities for defence seem to be far weaker than those for offence and so an intentional first-strike would remain counter-productive. The much vaunted anti-ballistic missile shield seems likely to be very easily pierced, and even if successful its use would probably result in a slower mass death due to fall-out of all living in the hemisphere in which it was used. Moreover the probably continuing difficulty of detecting the nuclear submarine should give a super-power more time to decide whether an attack was accidental or intentional and so reduce the chance of a reprisal being made to an accidental attack. The likelihood of an increase in time being available for decisions is strengthened by the possibility of science-fiction like entities such as the slow-moving, enormously armour-plated, nuclear-bomb-carrying robot which creeps on a circuitous path past an enemy's cities to its target, undestroyable except by a nuclear weapon which will destroy a city, but stoppable by a signal from its own government. Thus it would seem that, just considering weaponry, the mutual destruction of super-powers will become less rather than more likely.

Of course, small scale wars and localised accidents will become increasingly devastating. The latter situation, though, is no different from that arising from the ordinary commercial use of science. For example, if anything were to go seriously wrong with the storage of the presently existing atomic waste at the Windscale Processing Plant at any time during the next 1,000 years, the whole of Cumberland might have to be evacuated!

The political consequences of the new weapons are rarely discussed, the economic consequences hardly at all. Harvey Wheeler, of Fail Safe fame, considers that the increasing use of computers in warfare will increase the militarisation of politics. At a superficial level he may be correct, but since the interrelation between the military and the capitalists in the USA is not discussed his argument is completely unsatisfactory. He further considers that the ability to predict one's opponents' moves will greatly increase with the development of computers and so lead to successful pre-emptive strikes. Yet his own example, Vietnam, seems to support the view that it will not be possible to simulate the development of consciousness by the use of computers for a very long time, if ever. In fact, Dedijs in a short but cogent chapter concludes that the new weapons will not alter the military balance away from the guerilla, arguing that "unless the regular forces are prepared to lay waste the entire country...there will always be somewhere for the guerilla to conceal himself from attack by modern weapon systems." Armaments will clearly be able to continue to soak up surplus, although with probably increasing dependence on the electronics industry.

In addition, the growing importance of under-sea warfare might produce a spin-off of a new under-sea imperialism.

Just as the nuclear-bomb affected world history, so the nature of these weapons may well have a very important effect in twenty years time. However this book fails to provide any real guidance on what these effects might be, apart from suggesting, possibly fallaciously, that they are likely to include our deaths.

Tim Shallice.

The Bolsheviks & Workers' Control 1917 to 1921. Solidarity 1970 5/-

This pamphlet from "Solidarity" is an explosive one. It attempts "a new kind of analysis of the fate of the Russian revolution" (p.1) by presenting 'factual material' on the struggles over control and management of industry between 1917 and 1921. Fundamental to its whole interpretation of this period is a total rejection of the Leninist party. Bolshevism is described as

"...a monstrous aberration, the last garb donned by a bourgeois ideology as it was being subverted at the roots." (p. 85)

The author identifies its 'hierarchically structured vanguard party' concept, its 'centralization' and belief that the party could be absolutely identified with the class because it embodied the historical destiny of the class, as fragments of bourgeois ideology which made the degeneration of the party and the revolution inevitable. Brinton argues that the Bolsheviks were never committed to workers' self-management - workers' power at the point of production - and that they cynically advocated workers' control only as a tactical stage in the seizure of power. From the beginning, he argues, the Bolsheviks fought every manifestation of autonomous revolutionary workers' initiative; they implemented a hierarchical system of control over economic and political life, dominated by members of a party cut off from the class it was supposed to represent and ending as a party in opposition to that class.

"In other words within a year of the capture of state power by the Bolsheviks, the relations of production...had reverted to the classical authoritarian pattern seen in all class societies." (p. 48)

Before considering the value of the pamphlet as a whole, a number of criticisms must be made. First the form of the pamphlet necessarily distorts its content. The author describes it as "...at best a selective industrial chronology. In most instances the facts speak for themselves." Facts do not speak for themselves. This is among the worst outrages committed on history by bourgeois ideologists. Comrade Brinton cannot hope to sustain an argument as fundamental and far reaching as the one he poses on the basis of an 'industrial notebook'. The fact that it is documented in great depth does nothing to offset this fundamental disability. It is not that the themes he argues around are swamped by factual information, but that they are left suspended in mid-air by the lack of a full exposition and analysis.

In fact the pamphlet is profoundly ahistorical.

The aim is to trace the struggles in the working class movement and the Bolshevik party over industrial policy; the rise of the factory committee movement, its defeat by the Trade Unions and the Bolsheviks, the subordination of the trade unions to the party-dominated state apparatus, and the role of the various oppositional platforms. No amount of documentation will allow the author to lift these struggles out of the concrete historical situation - both objective and subjective - which existed at the time. But this is precisely what is attempted. The total failure to provide any analysis of the objective historical conditions, and perhaps the reason why, is revealed in the scathing comment on page 44, under the heading May 25th.

"Those who wish to incriminate the civil war for anti-proletarian Bolshevik practices may do so from now on."

Is the author not aware of the state of economic collapse in Russia before the civil war began? But if Bolshevik apologetics have been one-sided that is all the more reason for the author not to fall into the same trap.

This serious mistake leads to a total failure to deal correctly with Lenin's writings of this period. The validity or otherwise of Lenin's position on the employment of bourgeois technicians, his concept of workers' control, one-man management etc. are all rooted in his analysis of the objective conditions limiting revolutionary development. In "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", on the question of payment of bourgeois specialists, he freely admits that, "...this measure is a compromise, a departure from the principles of the Paris Commune and of every proletarian power..." But Lenin cannot be challenged simply on this statement but only on the reasons for this departure. Here there would be enormous scope for debate - but the debate must centre on the total historical situation, not just on what happened. Brinton is quite right to reject the view that the whole course of events was objectively determined.

"Bolshevik ideology and practice were themselves important and sometimes decisive factors in the equation at every critical stage of this critical period." (p. 84)

But equally history is not made by the subjective will of human actors as this pamphlet would apparently have us believe. In this pamphlet its most disastrous consequences are to reduce Lenin to an advocate of state capitalism pure and simple, and to reduce genuine social struggle to the level of Bolshevik intrigue.

Nevertheless this pamphlet is important. Within the limitations described above it is an extremely full documentation of struggles which have a profound importance for the marxist left. Obvious and crucial is the relationship between class and party, but more specifically in terms of the period 1917 to 1921, the validity of the various oppositional platforms the nature of the degeneration of the Bolshevik party, and a critical re-appraisal of Lenin's leadership. The potential impact of this pamphlet in demanding a re-appraisal of the early years of the Russian revolution could be immense - and I probably have not done it justice in this review. BUT it would need to be re-worked into a total historical analysis of the period.

K. Whitston.

