Discussion:

COMMENT ON OSMOND

A RECENT ARTICLE by Warren Osmond (ALR 6, 1969), dealing with the student radical movement in transition from the 'sixties to the 'seventies, poses the movement's problem as, "what is consciousness and how is it changed?" (p. 51; author's italics). The article suggests, with evidence, the need for a "mass line" approach to replace the original, outmoded "vanguard" / "confrontation" strategy. Two principal tactical changes are sketched as possible embodiments of the changed strategic perspective:

1. The seeking-out of felt needs (in this case, of students) as the basis for strategic demands.
2. The establishment of new, decentralised, individual modes of communication, to permit real dialogue and genuine understanding as necessary parts of the process of change.

I propose to make a few tentative comments on these ideas. The reader is urged to study Osmond's article in full, for in summarising I have not done justice to the strategic argument he presents. My comments will be made on the article itself, not on the above summary.

Osmond, in discussing the "felt needs" concept, has taken care to state that this is "far from being a capitulation to some form of reformism" (p. 53). He goes on to refer to the attempt (in previous strategies) "to force changes in the students' whole structure of needs, implying a massive jump from being a "bourgeois" student to being a "revolutionary" student. I believe he has two linked reasons for rejecting the latter strategy: (a) it treats students "as objects to be radicalised" (p. 52) — which is implicit in the notion of forcing changes; (b) because of this, it doesn't work very well — students are "alienated by the radicals", etc. I agree with these claims, and with the rejection of vanguardism.

However,

(a) The article does not explain precisely how the reformist trap is to be avoided. Thus the vital link between strategy and tactics remains to be elaborated.

(b) The discussion and summary (pp. 53-4) very strongly imply that we must reject not only the forcing of "changes in the whole structure of needs", but also the whole notion of this kind of change, however it is attempted. (See especially point 6 of the summary.) This amounts to a perfect formula for reformism.

I shall elaborate on these two difficulties in turn.

(a) An excellent discussion of the "reform and revolution" problem is provided by André Gorz's essay of that title (Socialist Register 1968; SDA reprint, Adelaide, 1969). Gorz states:

"In practice, what distinguishes a socialist strategy of reforms..."
is less each of the reforms proposed ... than: 1, the presence ... of organic ties between the various reforms; 2, the rhythm and modalities of their initiation; 3, the presence ... of a will to profit by the collapse in the balance provoked by the first reforming actions ...” (p. 4, SDA reprint).

(The “socialist strategy of reforms” is Gorz’s term for a revolutionary strategy in the pluralist, neo-capitalist context where, as he argues, a “gradual and cumulative” set of changes must initiate the revolutionary process. I shall observe here that the applicability of these principles to the present problem may be disputed.) Applying Gorz’s analysis to Osmond’s strategy, we may note that “felt needs”, in themselves,

(i) are independent,
(ii) may very easily be accommodated by the existing structure (or even anticipated by it),
(iii) neither contain nor provoke a change in consciousness, but at best could only be used by radicals to reduce the hostility of the mass of students.

Thus we must go beyond the insistence upon felt needs as a basis for strategy.

(b) The very essence of a revolutionary strategy is that it reflects, embodies and creates, organically, a change in the entire structure of needs. Thus in the university context, one of the unfelt (by most students) needs is the creation of an intellectual, rather than crudely “professional”, university. Surely the changing of consciousness must involve the creation, in the broad mass of students, of precisely this need. One could give other examples to illustrate the point that the very purpose of focusing upon felt needs is to change them, by permitting for (in this case) students the new possibility — the added option — of developing individually the inner logic of present needs, newly illuminated by a socialist framework.

It is implicit in the existing structure of felt needs that students are dealt with as objects by the power structure (in the lecture room, tutorial class, laboratory, and supremely in the exam), yet have not attained awareness of this. Osmond correctly points out that a simple vanguard/confrontation approach adopts this very objectification. Indeed, what is meant by the concept of “the radicals alienating the others” is that the “others” are treated doubly as objects — by the system and by the radicals — but only perceive the process as it is carried out by the radicals. Clearly this only puts barriers in the way of developing the students’ awareness that the system objectifies them. I agree with Osmond that this process has taken place, and that it must cease. But it must cease for a purpose — namely, the development of awareness, on the part of students, of their relations with the system. Such an awareness will assuredly not follow automatically upon the return to felt needs. Thus the change of direction proposed by Osmond is timely and correct, but the trajectory of his strategy is too short: felt needs are only worth returning to in order to be transcended.

In experiencing individually the transformation of their felt needs, students will for the first time perceive themselves, not dimly but clearly, coherently, consciously, as potential subjects rather than objects — i.e., as the “natural” controllers of their own destinies. Indeed, this is precisely what the awareness of objectification means — the two perceptions are opposite sides of the same coin, they cannot exist without each other. And this “coin” is, of course, the very contradiction (namely, between what is and what might be) which, being capable of
resolution only through struggle, provides the "subjective" driving force for revolutionary change. This is the significance of consciousness and its mode of relation to "objective" conditions. Consciousness, then, does not emerge unless the existing needs are themselves made the subjects of change.

How to go about changing, or transcending, felt needs remains the big question, and I shall only offer a couple of preliminary suggestions.

First, to reiterate Warren Osmond's point, wherever a need is felt or an issue arises, there must be a radical voice to speak to the need. This will mean an involvement of a very special kind in "campus politics". Every issue will, in effect, have to be attacked from the left — i.e., the very terms of the issue must be called into question. Certain requirements follow: Radical students cannot lead the campaigns over particular issues unless the terms of the issues have been thrashed out into terms acceptable to the radicals. (Example: Should there be 4, 5 or 6 students on Council? — to be an SRC-pushed issue. What is the role of the university? — to be the debating terms constantly pushed by the radicals.) Radicals must seek to reform, as a first and lasting priority, the mode of debate on campus. (Examples: Scrap lunch-hour meetings with black/white motions, create extended teach-ins for which lunch-hours are just preparation. Use teaching facilities to create dialogue — e.g., turn tutorials into radical course critiques, write radical essays and have them run off and distributed. Develop counter-newspapers on campus, in which the details of struggles are documented and analysed.) In sum, the radicals should change the form and language of the existing debate, by starting from it but resisting reformist immersion in it.

Secondly, a revolutionary strategy must include the creation of new needs — needs which do not come under the heading of "campus politics" as the term is ordinarily used. Here we touch on the limitations, in my view, of the strategy outlined by Osmond. But we also arrive at the dilemma of the vanguard — that it is sterile and self-defeating to simply "create" needs absolutely de novo, i.e., with no relationship to existing, "felt" needs.

The resolution of this problem, which would amount also to a resolution of the reform/revolution question might lie in the elaboration of a different kind of critique: one that is based, explicitly, on a more or less defined alternative. Such a critique would not start with "felt" needs, but should be made to end with them: the alternative is proposed, elaborated, discussed, and it is shown how the alternative would meet and abolish existing needs. (Example: Political science courses at present force the student to absorb a large bulk of institutional detail — how many members in the house of commons; which countries have bicameral systems. It is reasonable to speculate that students as a whole dimly perceive the uselessness of such rubbish, and feel quite strongly that it is boring. A radical alternative — which might be transmitted in the form of pamphlets handed out in lectures — would start with quite different assumptions (e.g., real power matters more than formal power; politics cannot be split off from life and work), and would embody the outline of a different course. It would be pointed out, in developing the alternative, that a study of this kind would be not only more intellectually honest and more appropriate here and now, but also more interesting, less tedious, etc. In this way, new needs would be created, which embodied yet transcended the old ones.)
Finally, I wish to mention the trap of building up an even more selfish class of university-trained young people. The acceptance of felt needs creates such a danger; the building up of new needs may even intensify it. It will be meaningless to create a set of universities in which academic freedom (so called) extends to all, in which the very real repression of students is overcome, if these changes are not linked organically to a change in the self-awareness of students — awareness of their status as amongst the most privileged members of one of the most affluent and morally degraded societies in the world.

Students must discover that the condition of their own liberation really is the liberation of all their millions of brothers throughout the world, that there is no meaning in an oasis of equality in a desert of inequality. The existence of “academic socialists” speaks eloquently to the fact that this kind of danger is not automatically met by the creating of a higher form of struggle: that is, no struggle transcends itself, yet what a revolutionary socialist consciousness requires is that the university struggle must continuously be transcended. With the shift in emphasis from Vietnam to student power, there is a real possibility that the struggle may develop an introspective twist that would work against the “struggle to transcend the struggle”.

Briefly, this might be countered in two ways. First, the base of campus support for the NLF must be strengthened. Secondly, the movement must as soon as possible come to grips with the plight of the ancillary staff — the slave class of the university system. It is important to note that even an elementary critique of both these problems will inevitably involve complex challenges to both the university system and the capitalist mode of production. In this way, the stage might well be set for a very wide transcendence of felt needs, and hence for the development of a sensitive socialist consciousness in some of the 100,000 university students of this country.

Adrian Wilson
(Medical Student, Adelaide University)

OBITUARY:
NORMAN LINDSAY

SO NORMAN LINDSAY is dead. When you were raised on The Magic Pudding you can’t help feeling sorry.

He had a long life. He was 90. It seems that the gods did not love him. And yet they might have been more grateful, for Lindsay did his best for some of them — particularly for the female pagan divinities! Do you remember his Venus Crucified? That was a fine etching, whose repute alone must have lured many a young lady to visit an art-loving bachelor’s flat.

Lindsay hated Puritans, and put a lot of them into that picture. There they are, hammering the nails in and enjoying it! The Cromwellian dragoon, the wild-eyed evangelist, the pious grocer with hands folded in prayer and one sharp eye on the till.

The ironic thing is that Lindsay ended up on their side. Not on that of the dragoon Other Rank, perhaps, but on that of the Pentagon. Not with the hard-working parish minister, but with millionaire-Christianity. Not with the corner storekeeper, but with the chain-store owners. When the Bulletin was at its pro-Fascist worst, Lindsay was doing its political cartoons.

Just for the money? No, apparently from conviction. Lindsay publicly declared himself a supporter of
the class system. As it became more and more obvious that the class system was insupportable, so Lindsay found less and less to say in his pictures. He slid downhill into cliché and repetitiveness and the aesthetics of the chocolate-box.

I do not say that he would have done better to produce enormous portraits of Stalin instead. I certainly do not blame him for not getting with the trend and go-going all psychedelic. In fact I rather write off a lot of the New-Left-revolutionary stuff as being "Lindsayesque" in its preoccupation with what is purely sensual.

What I blame him for is his deliberate cosmopolitanism, his rejection (in all but a very few works) of what is national, his affectation of the silly attitude that the artist or writer is some sort of godlike, superhuman creature. Evidently his early admiration of Banjo Paterson taught him nothing about fundamentals, though it may have improved his horsemanship.

But he did write *The Magic Pudding*; and on that account alone, though the gods did not love him, countless Australian children did and still do.

**JOHN MANIFOLD.**

**DICTATORSHIP—ONCE AGAIN**

I FOR ONE do not necessarily agree with every point of view expressed by National leaders of the Communist Party, but unlike Alan Miller (ALR 6/1969) I personally welcomed John Sendy's article on Proletarian Dictatorship as an attempt to engender and encourage greater understanding of the theoretical and practical problems involved. I am certain that few will see it as an attempt to undermine the concept, but rather as an effort to lift a very important subject into the field of critical scrutiny and discussion; an attempt indeed at scientific and objective analysis rather than dogmatic assertion and reiteration. Only in this way will the Communist Party of Australia be able, in the light of Australian conditions, to develop and enunciate a positive program for radical social change.

Having read Alan Miller's contribution therefore, one can well understand his concern, since there seems to be a ready willingness to dogmatize, and an equal unwillingness to accept the fact that the CPA leadership sets out to objectively examine all points of Communist philosophy and ideology, so that it may evaluate in a positive and honest fashion the distortions or errors that have been made, and are being made. For dogmatists, and these in the main lead in the criticism of party policy and leadership, to question the unquestionable is an unpardonable sin. Everything is, and has to be, above reproach and beyond doubt. Error is unthinkable and, if proved, irrelevant.

Sendy is rebuked for attempting an evaluation of the practice of "Proletarian Dictatorship", and assessing its relationship to theory, or intention. He ought not do so, according to Miller, because he either doesn't understand the theory, or more probably because he is deliberately setting out to undermine it. For Miller it is quite clear (though is it not strange that he sees little distortion, comprehends few problems), and therefore ought not be the subject of discussion and debate, and this after all is all that Sendy is doing; discussing, debating, the concept. True, the monstrous distortions of socialist legality imposed by Stalin are acknowledged though even here there ought to be a clearer appreciation of not only what he did, but
that he was indeed able to do it. This is seen simply as a departure from "Collective leadership", though precisely what is meant by collective leadership is not made clear. Does it simply mean that there ought to be a dictatorship of not one, but a number — an elite perhaps? Again, Alan Miller does not distinguish between "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and "Dictatorship of the Communist Party". Perhaps he regards them as synonymous. Be that as it may, it is a real theoretical and practical problem.

Re-examination, discussion and debate is naturally opposed by dogmatists, and there is inevitably a failure, deliberate or otherwise, to see that such is motivated by a desire to establish in Australia a Socialism free of the errors, the mistakes, that have been made in established Socialist states. This is done by Australian Communists, not to belittle the efforts that have been made in the USSR and elsewhere, though any differences should be openly aired, but because there is a recognition of the profound responsibility of Australian Communists to establish a society free of dogma, where there can be a creative application of the Communist philosophy, and thus a fulfilling by the CPA of its internationalist responsibilities. This does not mean that the Communist Party must not, and cannot, be the leading force for revolutionary change or in a revolutionary government. If the Communist Party is to be the vanguard of the working class and the revolutionary movement, it will, as it must be, on the basis of advocating correct policies in an open contest of ideas.

And such an open contest need not be seen as counter-revolutionary, as Alan Miller seems to infer when he refers to the Democratic Rights Charter, but rather as a manifestation of real political democracy. It is most untrue to say that there is an objection to party leadership in Soviet life when in fact it is the KIND of leadership that is questioned. Alan Miller, along with some others, seems to see the Communist Party as having some kind of divine right to leadership, and in Australia this must mean that co-operation with other progressive elements (coalition of left forces) is subject to this "fact" being acknowledged. Hardly the basis for developing a united front.

Sendy is further rebuked for describing Stalin's regime as "totalitarian" and referring to current Soviet "bureaucratic, hierarchical institutionalism". Was not Stalin's regime totalitarian? Is there not reason to be concerned at the bureaucratic excesses in contemporary Soviet society?

Maybe this whole question of differences within the CPA could be resolved simply, by supplying every Communist with a pair of the rose-coloured spectacles similar to those Comrade Miller must be wearing.

H. AUSTIN

WORKER'S CONTROL

AS JACK HUTSON SAYS, the slogan of "Worker's Control" is not new. It was not only raised by the Guild Socialists, Anarchists and so on in the early days of the development of workshop organisation, it was also raised in the Second World War by the Independent Labor Party and Trotskyist groups in the U.K. to divert the workers away from the life and death struggle against fascism. Prior to this, similar slogans were advanced by Anarchists and Trotskyists during the Spanish Civil War.

Those who desire to press on with this "Worker's Control" campaign do
so it seems because they feel that this slogan can direct attention to the need to change the capitalist controlled system and replace it with Worker's Control (Socialism). The advantage of the term "Worker's Control" over the term "Socialism" is not explained.

In my view the word "Socialism" is far better because it is the complete alternative to capitalism and its explanation calls forth a wide discussion on all the political, economic, moral and cultural aspects of it, whereas "Worker's Control" is only part of the meaning of Socialism.

The big illusion that seems to be accepted in some quarters as sound reasoning is the idea that "Worker's Control" can be introduced gradually and that one day we will discover that the workers have gained complete control over all the factories. This idea of gradually elbowing the employers out of control, bit by bit, until the workers have taken over is quite unreal.

In the course of the industrial struggle the workers advance and struggle for democratic demands. If these demands are won, it means that certain spheres of industrial activity, previously controlled by the employer, are taken from them and are controlled by the workers.

But as long as the capitalist system prevails the workers are not able to secure the essential reins of control — the ownership of the plant, the supply of raw materials, the markets for the finished product, the accumulation of capital, the distribution of profits and so forth. These features of control are only taken from the capitalists when the workers win political power.

The advocates of "Worker's Control" would have us believe they are very revolutionary when in actual fact it is precisely this revolutionary factor in the struggle for Socialism — the transference of State power from one class to another — that they miss entirely.

Of course, the struggle for greater trade union and workers rights in industry is part of the struggle for Socialism, and Communists who have won positions of leadership among workers must explain this fact and must continuously carry on education and propaganda work among the workers showing the link between the immediate demand and the ultimate socialist objective.

Yet, we find this slogan of "Worker's Control" advanced. It seems that this slogan seeks to embrace a bit of each. It is, we are told, both an immediate demand and an ultimate goal but in actual fact it is neither one thing or the other.

There is no real point in talking about "Worker's Control" as a separate question, as a thing in itself, as a distinct aim, because worker's control is an integral feature of the new Socialist society we aim to achieve.

To raise the demand for "Worker's Control" (assuming we can get unanimity among its advocates as to what precisely is meant) at a time when the fight for peace, the fight for civil and democratic liberties and the industrial economic struggles are all urgent issues requiring immediate attention is to raise a slogan that neither stimulates nor unifies the movement. It becomes a diversion. This is why the experts of diversion, the Anarchists, the Trotskyists and the Hill Group are enthusiastic about it.

As I have already said, the idea that we can develop a campaign to secure, bit by bit, more and more worker's control over this and that factory until we have wrested control from the employer is completely
unreal. What on earth do those, who advocate this point of view, think the employers and the capitalist State will be doing in the meantime? Yet, we cannot escape from the conclusion that the Anarchists and Trotskyist at least would have us think this way. One gets the impression from Denis Freney that we need worker's control without any kind of State. It seems that when we control the factories the capitalist State will disappear, and we do not need a Socialist State because it would be bureaucratic anyway. It is difficult to understand how some communists can take this political half wit seriously.

One of the features of industry in Australia that distinguishes it from a number of European countries is the comparative weakness of job organisation. Over 60 years of the arbitration system has created the widespread view that wages and conditions are matters for experts (officials, lawyers, court advocates) and there is little for the rank and file to do. Comrade Lance Sharkey said in 1959, “The Shop Committee movement in Australia was weak and has only really commenced to grow under the influence of our Party”. (*The Trade Unions*, P. 39).

What is needed in Australia is a campaign to strengthen trade union and political organisation in the factories and other jobs. This is the most urgent current industrial task. This is the task to which Communists and other left wing workers must now earnestly turn their attention. A conference to secure clarity on the immediate issues and to discuss measures for strengthening rank and file union organisation, is more necessary, more real and more urgent than any gathering to discuss “Worker’s Control”.

The need is to develop a powerful Shop Stewards movement here in Australia. Any talk of worker’s control without a powerful Shop Stewards movement is infantile “Leftism” that is miles away from reality. As Comrade Lance Sharkey also said, “After the taking of political power by the workers the Shop Committee role is again extraordinarily important. The Shop Committee, together with the Party branch in the factories, realise workers control of industry” (*The Trade Unions*, P. 39, emphasis added).

J. Goss

**STATE AID — A COLD, HARD LOOK**

STATE AID remains one of the more emotionally charged political issues of the day. For this reason, any rational evaluation of its costs, impact and effects is a most important contribution to the debate which continues to rage. The question of State Aid to non-State schools is too important to be left to the whims of vote-catching politicians, or to the hopes of certain sectarian and self-interested sectors of the community.

Recent studies clearly show that the present system of “across the board” payments to non-State schools results in a further widening of the gap between the wealthy sections of the population and the rest of the people. Research done by Professor P. J. Fensham at Monash University illustrates this fact most dramatically. In a study of secondary education, his survey proves fairly conclusively that the Government’s contribution to the education of children at fashionable non-State secondary schools is virtually equivalent to the Government expenditure on a pupil at a Government secondary school.

The study is confined to the upper income type of private school, Professor Fensham has estimated that the aid given to these schools is
greater than that given to the poorer private schools (i.e. the bulk of parochial Roman Catholic schools). Furthermore, it is almost equal to that granted, on average, to children at Government schools. The following table brings these facts out sharply:

Existing and proposed aid from Federal and State Governments to Victorian independent secondary schools expressed in terms of an equivalent amount per pupil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A GIRLS' SCHOOL</th>
<th>A BOYS' SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State per capita (20 plus 20)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal per capita</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (average)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll tax saving</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth schools</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Govt schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax deductions to parents</td>
<td>135?</td>
<td>135?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>292+</td>
<td>309+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures almost match the estimated $332 for the cost of educating a Victorian child in a State secondary school.

The figures in the table require a little explanation.

1 The State contribution of $40 consists of the $20 now paid and the $20 increase proposed by Sir Henry Bolte in recent legislation.

2 The Federal per capita grant of $50 is a straight Commonwealth hand-out.

3 The transport allowance is a payment made by the Government when the school is more than 3 miles away and the student is not travelling past another of the same denomination. This sum can be quite large for the Wesleys' or Methodist Ladies' Colleges, but is insignificant for Catholic parish schools.

4 The saving on payroll tax arises from the fact that non-State schools do not pay this tax, whereas State schools do. Professor Fensham thus takes this as a direct charge against education.

5 The Commonwealth and Junior Government scholarship charges arise from the fact that the wealthy private schools have a higher proportion of students on such scholarships than the State schools. This is no doubt due to the fact that the parents of these students can afford to give their children more assistance and opportunity to stay at school longer.

6 The tax deduction to parents is a conservative estimate of the tax savings resulting from fees and other costs associated with sending children to private schools over and above that which is incurred by parents of State school pupils.

The figures in Professor Fensham's table do not include various grants for science laboratories, libraries and capital expenditure. Such expenditure can be readily calculated.

Thus in Victoria, in the three financial years from 1968 to 1971, the Commonwealth has allocated $1,641,900 for science laboratories and apparatus, and $708,600 for libraries in non-Catholic private
schools. This runs out at an annual expenditure of $783,500 or $30 per student per annum. Some of the more wealthy schools have received very substantial grants from the Federal Government. For example Scotch College has been given $100,300. Kingswood College $90,550, Mentone Girls’ Grammar $82,000 and Elsternwick Methodist Ladies’ College $60,000.

The survey makes it clear that there would be little difference in the cost to the Government if the pupils of these private schools moved into State schools. The number of private schools in the category studied in the survey would account for approximately half the secondary pupils in non-State schools. This number includes the majority of non-Catholic and some of the Catholic schools.

As the Financial Review of the 5th December said: “What this all means in effect is that the poorer Roman Catholic schools, about which there is obviously a general feeling of sympathy in the community and from which the political pressure has principally arisen, have generated a situation in which they and the Government schools are little better off, while schools which were surviving on their own terms before State aid was introduced are getting a bonus.”

CATHY Mc DONALD

LENIN, COMINTERN AND WORKERS’ CONTROL

LENIN ON WORKERS’ CONTROL

A NUMBER of writers in ALR (e.g. Tom Supple, No. 5, 1969) and elsewhere have criticised the objective of “workers’ control” as an illusory slogan to advance under capitalism. The idea that the workers could, or should try to, control the controllers, control production, has been declared anarchist and/or utopian.

In view of the fact that such declarations are often made in the name of “Leninism”, it may be of interest to point to some of Lenin’s writings on this question and decisions with which he was associated.

There are, for example, a number of articles of 1917, prior to the revolution, such as The Impending Catastrophe and How to Avert It. Some may feel inclined to dismiss these as not generally relevant, but only applying to a revolutionary situation, so let us look at some decisions of the Communist International in Lenin’s day.

For example, at the 3rd Congress of the C.I. (July, 1921) the resolution on relations with the Red International of Labor Unions said in part:

“All the economical struggles of the working class should gather around the slogan ‘Workers’ Control over Production’, which control ought to be realised as soon as possible without waiting for the ruling class and the government to prevent an initiation of the same.” (Pamphlet published by the C.P. of Great Britain, p. 73.)

The Fourth Congress (Nov.-Dec., 1922) sent a letter to a Congress of Factory Councils in Germany which stated:

“The most important question at present is the formation of a united proletarian fighting front for the defence of the eight hour day, for ensuring sufficient food for the workers, for workers’ control of production, and to offset the organisation of German fascism...” (CPGB pamphlet, p. 19.)

What Lenin said on a particular subject in particular conditions should not be taken as disposing of an argument, but it should at least weigh with those who like to proclaim themselves “Leninists”.

E.A.