

A.L.P. branches I worked hard to build up from nothing gave me a forum.

Best wishes.

[Although the writer was prepared to have his name attached to the above letter, I do not think the economic risk of reprisals warrants me using his name. I, as Editor, however, guarantee the writer's authenticity and reliability.—J. Dawson.]

"Lenin Said"

That is the heading on many advertisements of Liberal and Bank origin to make it appear that the Chifley Labor Government are influenced by the Communists in nationalising the banks.

Starkly factual, however, it is that the nationalisation of banking in Australia is a major part of the Permanent War Policy of the Labor Government. That capital shall be controlled and directed to industries whose set up in factory and machines will be useful to capitalistic Australia in waging the next war, is dependent (in Chifley's view) upon the banks being nationalised.

It is definitely NOT a policy for the comfort and well-being of the working class.

Chifley may delude himself—he appeared to speak from the heart and earnestly when he said it was "love for humanity" that was the basic urge in nationalising the banks. Many "socialists" appear to believe that in following capitalistic trends and expanding Australia's capitalistic resources that somehow and some time the set-up will benefit the workers and that a "workers' government" may usher in socialism. There is a present confusion that State capitalism is a sort of road to socialism.

Chifley's "love of humanity" urged him to debunk "the crocodile tears" of the Menzies' opposition, but they, too, may want to be altruistic so long as they and the "people" they represent get first cut of the exploited surplus extracted from wage-labor.

After all, is there any difference, so far as the exploited wage-workers are concerned, in the fact of private owned capital taking its cut direct now, or later in State bonds interest when the nationalisation of banking and finance is a definite method of "obtaining millions and billions for large State operations" (Lenin)?

SUCH AS THE JET-ROCKET BOMB RANGE. Such as expensive air-carriers for the Navy, and destroyer vessels, so wonderful and intricate in every detail, intended to destroy similar vessels and **HUMAN LIFE.** Such as diverting hundreds and thousands of workers from such useful work as production of food, clothing and houses, to the production of industries and the factories and machinery necessary for them **THAT WILL BE USEFUL IN THE NEXT WAR.**

In short—the nationalisation of banking IS A BLOODY BUSINESS to facilitate the coming murderfest and Australia's part in it.

It is NOT FOR THE COMFORT AND WELL-BEING OF THE WORKING CLASS.

The State can be MUCH WORSE

than the private capitalist employer, or even than the finance capitalist. It was in Germany; and it is in Russia.

Both the opposition to nationalisation of banking and those favoring it (including Communists and Trotskyists) used Lenin's remarks for each their own ends.

Of what gain has it been to the enslaved millions of Russians in the Arctic north that bank nationalisation enhance the military prowess of the country to an enormous degree?

Of what gain will it be to Australia's productive workers that under nationalisation of banking they will be exploited by the State to provide the millions to enhance the military prowess of Australia and cause the death and misery of Australians and human beings of other lands?

So let us see what Lenin did say. Our extract is from *The Threatening Catastrophe and How to Avoid It* (Little Lenin Library, Vol. II, p. 13). Interpolations in square brackets are ours.

"The advantages from the nationalisation of the banks for the whole people, and not especially for the workers (for the workers have little to do with banks) [words Lenin's, but italics ours], but for the mass of peasants [farmers] and small industrialists [small employers—exploiters of wage labor] would be enormous. The saving of labour, as a result, would be gigantic, and assuming that the State would retain the former number of bank employees, the nationalisation would signify a highly important step in the direction of making the use of the banks universal, in the direction of increasing the number of their branches, the accessibility of their operations, etc., etc. The accessibility and the easy terms of credit, particularly for small owners, for the peasantry, would increase immensely. As for the State, it would for the first time be in a position to survey all the main monetary operations without concealing them, then to control them, then to regulate economic life, and finally to obtain millions and billions for large State operations, without paying the capitalist gentlemen sky-high commissions for their services [but still obtain those millions from the same source as the capitalists did, i.e., from the exploitation of wage labor]. This is the reason—the only reason—why all the capitalists, all the bourgeois professors, all the bourgeois, all the Plekhanovs, Potresovs, and Co. serving the bourgeoisie against the nationalisation of the banks, inventing thousands of pleas against this greatest and most urgent measure, although even from the standpoint of 'defending' the country, i.e., from the military standpoint, this measure would be a gigantic plus, enhancing the 'military prowess' of the country to an enormous degree."

When the State "compensates" the private owner shareholders of the banks by buying their shares or giving them State bonds, the bank continues as before as a social institution, run by co-operative social labor, but with private appropriation of the surplus. Whether they receive it as dividends on bank shares or as interest on State bonds, the fact remains that they do receive an

appropriated surplus which can only come out of production and be produced by useful labor.

Whether it is Wall Street, Lombard Street, or the State, it is still the same old exploitative system.

The workers have no interest in the nationalisation of the banks.

They would, however, be greatly interested in the ending of the money system itself, which uses the money-trick of wages to ROB the producing workers of the greatest part of the wealth their labor power produces.

The old system will not go out of itself. The workers will still be robbed and exploited until the workers STOP it.

Workers' Councils are a necessary organ for the workers to get rid of the parasites.

Nationalisation of banking will be used, as all State practice has been, to further ROB the wage workers.

Their real wages WILL BE LESS. And all that is visualised for the workers by both "Labor," Communists and Trotskyists is a wage-system. We sincerely say that the real wage in Russia is less than in Britain or Australia, far less than in U.S.A.

A BRITISH CHARACTERISTIC Compromise

Prof. G. D. H. Cole has written *The Intelligent Man's Guide to the Post-war World* (Victor Gollancz, London, 1143 pp.), propagating "a non-revolutionary, ethical socialism of the Fabian sort," and enunciates his belief in compromise, that Britain's role is to pioneer for Western Europe a middle way between Russian authoritarianism and American *laissez-faire* economics—to demonstrate that Parliamentary democracy (in administering the capitalist mode of production by the exploitation of wage-labor) can combine socialist planning with traditional liberties of speech, thought and association.

This compromise of "reform" can be judged by its practice and its results in capitalist Britain to-day and to-morrow.

VALUE OF ANARCHY

The inherent virtue of Anarchism as a philosophy of practice, to me, lies in the stressing of the individual, not as leaders (i.e., leaders act with the force of gravitation to attract, to pull towards them all those they can dominate and impose their ideas upon); Anarchism, on the other hand, stresses the role of the individual as molecular (a cohering together), a unity, a solidarity of men and women of vision, humanity and determination who attract by the influence of example; by their PRACTICE, to merge with the force of an internal revolution—from within the working class. In the conception of the spontaneous creativity or the revolutionary masses, the individual has a place—to serve and point the issue by the example of his practice as a unit of the engendered creativity. As servers of the revolutionary needs, such an anarchist is as a well-beloved tool, tested in use, without which a revolutionary upsurge is unthinkable, as would be a craftsman without his tools. To assist in the art of social self-regulation through the example of their own individual practice is the role of the Anarchist.

—J.A.D.