

Editorial

A public discussion incorporating all the masses is necessary to oppose the bourgeois policies of the government, and on a programme for social transformations

The repudiation of the attack of Wilson — and by implication that of Owen also — on the links between the Labour Party and the world Communist movement is an expression of the crisis in the Labour Party and of the fact that a discussion on "where is Britain going" develops. Wilson's attack on "Mitterandism" showed all the fears of the bourgeoisie that the Labour Party — or at least a large sector of the left — is being drawn into the discussion in the world Communist movement, and in the world Socialist movement which is moving towards a revolutionary, anti-capitalist alternative to the old reformist, conciliatory policies of the workers leadership in France, Britain, Italy and the other major capitalist countries. Those of the Labour Party who originally defended the links between the Labour Party and the World Communist Movement did so, in the main, because they felt attracted by the discussion, by the ideas which exist and which are basically anti-capitalist. Owen and Wilson, and other bourgeois leaders in the Labour Party recognise that whatever the limitations of the discussion in the world Communist movement, it is a discussion which gives no support, to the capitalist system.

It is clear that the discussion in the Labour Party is very confused because they do not have a scientific method of thinking, they do not have the dialectical materialist method. This fact has enabled a sector of the Labour Left to pose that the defence of the links between the Labour Party and the Workers States and world Communist movement is a defence of "eurocommunism". This sector seeks to confuse the discussion and to use "eurocommunism" as a substitute for the reformist policies of social Democracy which now have no perspective, no historic basis. In reality "eurocommunism" is nothing more than the old reformist policies of the Communist Parties and the Social Democrats under another guise and they have no historic basis. They rest, as all reformist policies rest, on the possibilities of gaining concessions from capitalism and this means that capitalism has to have the possibility of developing the economy. Since it clearly has no such perspective, "eurocommunism" has no future and those who support it are constantly changing their positions. The French Communist Party leadership which previously defended — as Carrillo in Spain still does — the "mixed economy" has now to extend the programme of the Popular Union to encompass the nationalisation of most of the major industries in France. The Italian Communist Party leadership which defended the "historic compromise" yesterday, a position which resulted in a support for the existing bourgeois, Christian Democrat government in Italy, today is posing the necessity of going to government, is posing the perspective of a Government of the Left in Italy.

What determines these changes in the workers leadership in France and Italy is the world process including the weight of the Soviet Union and constant intervention of the workers and masses, in demonstrations and general strikes in France and, more particularly, in Italy. These are demonstrations and strikes in which the masses seek to answer the total crisis of capitalism with social transformations, with a programme of nationalisations under workers control. This is the programme of the Portuguese Communist Party in a stage where the conciliatory, reformist policy of Soares has, together with his government, collapsed.

The total crisis of capitalism comes from its own nature, from the inability of the system of private property, competition, and exploitation to develop the economy. However one of the determinate factors in this total crisis is the existence and development of the system of the Workers States. This is because the socially and economically superior system of a nationalised and planned economy is attracting and incorporating more and more sectors of the world economy in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Every "emergent" country, every ex-colonial country is forced to seek a relationship with the Workers States. Jamaica, for example, is, even without nationalising the economy, putting itself into an economic and commercial relationship with the Workers States. Thus whatever internal inter-capitalist competition exists — and it is very great between Japan and yankee imperialism and with German capitalism also — the main enemy for imperialism is the Workers States. This determines their policy which is the preparation for war. The world tour of Carter is part of this policy. He seeks to draw together the war alliance of imperialism and to weigh on those sectors in the bureaucracy of the Workers States which are most linked to private property which is why he goes to Poland.

Even so the trip of Carter will have no success in this respect and the Polish leader, Gierek, has to say that the visit of Carter can in no way change the relationship between Poland and the Soviet Union.

The defence made by Carter of the imperialist actions and policy of Israel shows that all his liberal phrases about "human rights" are sheer hypocrisy and that it is a mask for the war preparations of yankee imperialism. It is true that imperialism does not decide when and when the war will be launched. They are riddled with disagreements and disputes among themselves as the events in the Middle East have illustrated, and as the crisis in the Military junta of Pinochet in Chile over the "referendum" show. Carter has been forced in the Sadat and Begin talks to show the true face of yankee imperialism and all these manoeuvres and talks of "peace" have done imperialism no good at all. Imperialism does not decide when and where but, nonetheless, they prepare the war.

All these world factors, the world process of the Socialist Revolution force the Labour left to seek a new path, an alternative to the old policies. But the struggle to give the local Labour Parties more rights in the selection of MP's is no answer to this. It is an attempt to change the policies of the Labour government but the government reflects the Labour Party and there is no solution in organisational reforms. The problems are political and programmatic. The Labour

Turn to page 4

In This Issue:—

ARTICLES ON ...

- EUROCOMMUNISM
- THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

273 Friday 13th January 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM

28.8.77

PART TWO, CONTINUED
FROM RED FLAG No. 272

The working class continues living with the same difficulties as 30 years ago. There is no progress in the life of the working class. No progress whatsoever! There is not a single progress in housing for the British working class. Whilst the methods of production have elevated a thousand per cent, science and production have elevated a thousand per cent, and there is no progress for the working class as a result of the capitalist system. This can continue because of the Labour and trade union leadership and because the aristocracy of Labour represents a sector distinct to the sector which is leading.

The aristocracy of Labour is that which is in the factory, in the places of work; it is in the relationship of work with the workers, and it gives support to the apparatus. And, among them, they elect the apparatus and this aristocratic sector elects people who are not aristocratic but it attracts them, involves them in their own apparatus in a career and weigh on the working class. These were the conditions which they had and they still do this, but the perspectives are not those of continuing to find support in this process, because the situation is deteriorating socially and economically, more and more.

The upheavals in the Labour Party and the trade unions are caused by the insecurity produced by the world situation. The discussions in Britain on the Common Market is an antagonistic discussion. They discuss as if it were the end of the world, because capitalism feels that it is losing authority in competition with European capitalism. Then it wants to maintain a certain independence. In its turn, Yankee imperialism supports itself on British imperialism to exert a pressure and compete with European capitalism, because it feels that it is becoming weaker. It needs the Common Market to sell

and it needs to combat it because of competition.

The workers aristocracy lives all this. Hence they do not discuss the problems which the working class live, like the fall in the standard of living in Britain. There is an increase in repression in Britain. Democratic liberties do not increase but diminish. The social rights, gains from social struggles of the British working class, diminish. After 1945, there was complete social service, now they have thrown almost everything out. They reduce the medical services in all aspects. Before, they gave all sorts of free treatment, including spectacles, now they give nothing. Before they subsidised transport, now they remove the subsidy. The subsidy was also a farce because the proletariat paid it, but at least there was a subsidy. On the other hand, the subsidies to capitalism increase enormously.

They constantly subsidise the large factories. The state pays millions of pounds as gifts to private enterprises. On the other hand it deprives the workers of the right to have free spectacles. It reduces the financing or the subsidy on transport. This has an effect on the working class. But the Labour people discuss through all this leading aristocratic apparatus of the party and the trade union, as if it has to put up with this, otherwise it would be worse! Why would it be worse? Cuba was poorer, and has none of these problems. The poorest Workers States have none of these problems.

It is necessary to feel that the Communists have not conducted any useful activity for the perspective of the Workers State in Britain. They have done nothing. They have impelled a policy of competition with Labour and even in this competition they have not had the capacity to demonstrate the superiority of the Workers State. This was a political competition with the Labour leadership. This latest political

J. POSADAS

division does not go very far. It does not pose a programmatic conclusion but a divergence, a difference on some aspects. But they have to go to the depth. What is the programme for Britain?

There is a perspective for a Labour left and a very good one. It does not mean that it is going to be immediate or soon. But the conditions for the maintaining of British capitalism are being reduced constantly. The weight of British capitalism in the world is being reduced quite considerably.

This crisis in the Communist Party indicates that the Soviets need parties, seek parties which live with the working class of every country so as to have points of political support. Then this New Communist Party has to discuss all the problems. But they do not discuss them, because they have no tradition, preparation or confidence. They are insecure sectors. This division has happened and they say: 'We are not in agreement with the role of the Communist Party in Britain', but the experience shows that they have the same vices of formation as the other party, because the first thing which a Communist Party has to do is to say: 'What is our function here? What function do we play?' It is necessary to discuss with the Communists the function of the Communist Party of Britain in the quality and the condition of the class struggle in Britain.

The condition and the perspective of the class struggle in Britain is clear. The working class is concentrated in the Labour Party and in the trade unions. There is a bourgeois leadership which has to make concessions, has to yield to the masses but it produces no anti-capitalist measure. The Communists believe that they are the party of the working class, because there is not a Socialist programme of social transformations in the Labour Party. But

Turn to page 2

THE LABOUR PARTY

continued from page 1

the working class party is not necessarily that which has the programme. We have a better programme than them, and we are not the party of the working class. The party of the working class is that which has the social support of the masses. If it does not have the programme, it is another problem.

The Labour Party has the masses. The masses have passed through multiple experiences and they are in the Labour Party. They are there and they do not leave the Labour Party. Thus, it is necessary to see that there is no perspective and conditions for a new party. There are no conditions because there is no other political force, there is no other authority in front of the class. The structure of the Labour Party is solid. It is bureaucratic, totally bureaucratic and bourgeois, but it is a solid structure and dominates everything. Even so, it cannot prevent a discussion to seep through, to transcend, and anti-capitalist discussions take place. The party was formed when capitalism was strong and could still develop some authority. Now the party has lost this and it gets worse all the time. Then it is necessary to count upon this perspective.

It is necessary to show the Communists that in this perspective, they do not have any strength or authority or base in the working class. They have a miners leader and a leader of white collar workers, they have leaders but not mass leaders. They are leaders which the Labour left allow because, at the same time, it is a credit for the Labour leadership. The proof is that these leaders of the miners, for example, have no Communist mining currents. It is a leadership without bases. This means that the working class supports itself on the Communist leaders whom it sees to the left of its party to impel the struggles, but it remains in the Labour Party because it sees that this is the centre of the working class. There is no historic time, nor conditions, so that in a few years the Communists can substitute for the Labour Party. In five or ten years everything will be decided.

In this discussion it is not a question of contempt, of being offensive or minimising the Communist Party, but an objective conclusion. They cannot be the leadership of the working class, because there is no time for it and they do not have the policy nor the tradition nor the understanding and the working class is in the Labour Party. Thousand experiences show this. The thousand experiences are shown in the way they put up with the bourgeois policy of their leadership.

But the working class has not submitted. When it can raise its head it impels. There is a whole bureaucratic structure which impedes the proletariat weighing. To deal with this, one cannot proceed relying on the fact that the workers area, the constituency or a trade union are going to be able to advance. There is no historic time and we do not have

the strength to do this. The bureaucratic apparatus of the Labour Party is very superior to that of Stalin, infinitely superior to it. It is very old, it has more tradition and more structure. But it is also more afraid than Stalin. The latter was based on the Workers State and had to allow somehow the active defence of the Workers State. The Labour Party has to defend no Workers State but the policy of conciliation.

It is necessary to discuss with the Communist comrades in what conditions they are going to be the party of the working class. Discuss! What stage? How? You have been active for so many years and have found no echo. And, in fact, less and less. The Labour Party has existed for years and has the working class. But the working class shows it supports every movement of progress or struggle of advance. That is to say, the working class has made its experience in the Labour Party and has stayed there.

The epoch of Stalin affirmed the bureaucratic power of the social democracy in Britain, because the social democracy said: 'This is Communism'. The first stage of Rumania and Czechoslovakia also contributed to this. It was not identical, but it had this effect. It was a brutal bureaucracy. Later, there was a change. In its experience, the British working class takes account of this. It does not have the possibility to draw these political conclusions, because it has to live every day, to deal with the problems of life which occur all the time. It does not have the cultural or scientific preparation necessary, and thus it has to be guided by very general conclusions. It sees an instrument around which it concentrates, and it seeks to make it change.

In front of this, what can the Communist Party do? How is it going to win authority over the class? And what is the programme to change Britain? If the Communist programme is the same as the Labour one, it is not going to be welcomed. Then, what is the programme for the Communists? How to advance to eliminate capitalism, to make Britain advance? They do not have it. The Communists do not have as a central slogan, 'Down with the monarchy', 'Long live Socialism'. The working class does not see any superiority, the workers vanguard does not see any superiority in the Communists compared with Labour. Had the Communists developed a policy of a revolutionary, anti-capitalist class programme, they would have influenced the Labour Party with slogans such as 'Down with the monarchy, Long live the Republic'. Even without speaking of a Socialist republic, a democratic republic with a Socialist programme, in which one struggles for Socialism, is necessary. The Communists do not pose this. They have lived all the prejudices that the British monarchy has communicated to the population through the labour bureaucracy. The working class has been prevented from weighing

by the bureaucratic apparatus and also by the Communist apparatus.

Then what is the policy, the programme with which the Communists hope to do better than the Labour leadership? There is no perspective for this or for the Communists to be the party of the working class. On the other hand, there is a perspective to influence, to organise the anti-capitalist, anti-monarchical left in Britain. It is necessary to discuss on this basis.

It is necessary to discuss the problems of euro-communism, of pluralism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian internationalism, the roads to Communism, to discuss all these problems. What sense has the rupture in the Communist Party? If there are no changes of programme or tactic, of policy and

objectives, why the rupture? When they break without making changes, it is somewhat like slamming the door when leaving and finding oneself still inside. There has not really been a break. The New Communist Party has neither programme, policy or different objectives. It has different assessments according to what they publish in their paper. They still do not draw different conclusions. And it is necessary to say to them that they have to do so.

The old Communist Party with its programme does not have a perspective. On the other hand, the New Communist Party can have one if it makes an anti-capitalist programme, of support for the Soviet Union against pluralism, against the European Common Market, for the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe. This is the programme. If there is not a programmatic differentiation, it means simply one more party or tendency. This is why they are timid in opposing the old Party. They do not really break from it. Because they do not have theoretical, political or programmatic security. The road for progress in Britain is within the Labour Party and the trade unions; not submitting to them, but with an anti-capitalist programme, helping, explaining and intervening in the important movements to win authority. In important movements strikes, even of average importance, it is necessary to intervene, because this gains authority in the workers vanguard which influences the intellectuals. It is necessary to make a work towards the intellectuals.

The crisis, programmatic crisis, is going to intensify much more. The Labour Party tries to play down the crisis, presenting it as a crisis of economic difficulties. Whose economic difficulties? Those of the capitalist system. We reiterate that it is very good to intervene in the important or middle strikes, but the strikes do not decide the process. The strike is an instrument of the mobilisation of the masses, but what programme mobilises the strike? What objective does the strike seek? There can be many strikes in Britain, very bold and of great depth, none has taken place without consequences. The strength of the bureaucratic apparatus is shown in that it has

prevented the transcendent importance. But it is a bureaucratic apparatus which is based on the conditions of another stage of history. The Soviets do not have the same position as before, and we are going to influence to try to develop a class tendency in the British workers movement. This is going to be very rapid. One cannot expect it in a year or six months. But it is a relatively rapid process, because all the world process influences this.

In Britain there is little intellectual and scientific life. Comparatively, they have less than in Uruguay. The bureaucratic apparatus impedes every scientific discussion. It impedes the discussion of the situation and the policy in the world. There is no life in the Labour Party and our Section cannot substitute for it.

A new layer has to develop in Britain, not new in everything, but new in relation to the present leaders. The left groups have made various efforts. But they have all failed because neither their policy nor their programme correspond to necessity. They hoped that the Labour Party and the Communist Party would break up, and it has not been like this. It is necessary to push forward a policy of persuasion aimed to organise the left groups.

It is necessary to influence policy and programme, not in a trade union way. The trade union is an instrument, the programme is what decides. It is not the trade unions which decide. It is programme and policy which do. Thus it is not the trade union life which is going to decide. It has importance to impel, to influence as a point of support and including in a general strike, it can be decisive. But not now, because there are not the prior conditions. Then it is necessary to seek points of support to have political authority.

In the world Communist, and in consequence in the Socialist movement, the programmatic, theoretical, political and practical discussion advances slowly, but without interruption. In this polemic in France, the Socialist leaders have no notion what is happening. They still believe this is the epoch of Algeria. It is a discussion which educates all the Socialist masses, and they believe that they are going to manoeuvre from above. But it is no longer the epoch in which they can do what they want. They can manoeuvre, but they are not going to maintain themselves as they did before, because this discussion in the world Communist movement is also educating a very advanced sector of Socialist cadres, leaders and militants.

The discussion in France is a public discussion in which in general the Communists are right, even bureaucratically. Even in a limited way the Communists progress in anti-capitalist measures. It is not like the Socialists. The Socialists have to defend themselves and the situation is the reverse of the Gallup polls which say that it is the Socialists that are growing more within the left. We do not believe this. It is the Communists who are increasing their authority in the working class. The Socialists increase among the petit bourgeoisie. In

the working class, it is the Communists who have increased their authority more than before. Hence now the CGT intervenes openly. This is going to influence the Labour Party and the Communist and Socialist parties in Italy also. In this country, sectors of the proletariat, of leaders, of middle labour cadres are going to see that the white collars and the labour aristocracy are those who lose positions and support. They are going to be influenced by this.

Mitterrand was influenced. He was Minister against Algeria and now where is he? This is not transferable to Britain, but shows the inability of capitalism to keep the Socialist movements - including Labour - secure and constant under its authority, even with the tradition, the Labour bureaucratic structure that there is. Necessity is superior to all bureaucratic movements; undoubtedly the bureaucratic apparatus has a very great importance for the stages and phases, because it holds back but it cannot impede. Stalin was the most frightful apparatus in all history, and Stalin finished because of this necessity.

The bureaucratic apparatus of the labour aristocracy also has no perspective. As it is a structure of a country which economically was very solid, it could endure quite a lot more, but not maintain its position.

It is necessary to see that the polemic in France is going to influence all the Socialist parties and it is necessary to intervene in this. In France this anti-capitalist level is discussed - even limitedly, even with the errors of Marchais who proposed bonuses, compensations and rents for the nationalisations. It is not completely wrong, however, because as one proposes to pay compensation over thirty years, in five years there will not be one penny to pay. When there is such a discussion, in France it is going to influence the British movement.

All the groups have failed in Britain. From the Mandelist groups who end up being anti-Trotskyist, up to Grant who is also anti-Trotskyist. And this is because none felt they had the ability or were prepared to go through this stage of a certain isolation, not a total isolation but a certain isolation. Had we been totally isolated, we ourselves would not have sustained the weight of it because it would have been that we were wrong. But, when we have not been isolated and always had the masses to verify that we are useful, it is because we are a necessity. Our Section is a necessity in Britain. It is the only organisation which remains representative of the ideas, the purity of the revolutionary ideas, not as decoration, not the purity which decorates, but the purity which the ideas make necessary.

The Trotskyist groups are denatured, the same in capitalist Germany. It means that all these people who believed that it was only necessary to shout against capitalism and people would come have failed. The working class has experience. It sees that there are twenty Workers States which the Communists made, and

not these people. One has to be an idiot to believe that the working class is so stupid as not to see this. The experience of the working class is made in this way. The workers are not in the same position as ourselves who can read, discuss and meet. They have to live the everyday life and do not have the possibility of having our culture and experience. Had humanity our experience and culture, capitalism would have disappeared a hundred years ago.

It is necessary to realise that the British working class has the experience made in the Labour Party for well over half a century. The Fabian Society, on which the Labour Party was in part based, developed in the 1890s. The working class made its strikes in the ambience of the Labour Party. No movement could have any importance without the Labour Party. There is no possibility of a new party. There is the possibility for a movement which influences, yes. The groups have failed in what they tried to do, because they had neither policy, consistency nor confidence in ideas. They had no confidence in them, hence they had one position today, another tomorrow, and they decline, decline, until they end up like Grant — that is to say, against. All the Trotskyists in Britain are now anti-Trotskyist. All the Trotskyists of Italy are anti-Trotskyist. They render homage to Trotsky to malign and attack the USSR and the Communists, and nothing more. Their positions are counter-revolutionary.

It is necessary to discuss also in Britain a programme of demands together with the struggle for social transformations. Immediately, it is necessary to call for a reduction in the hours of work with the same wage, sliding scale of wages and hours, that is to say work sharing with those unemployed and on the same wage. If the boss cannot support such a process, let the state do it! Call for trade union democracy, and democratic rights to discuss all the problems. Election of delegates in the place of work, from each section or department, so that the sections discuss and make declarations in assemblies with a programme. Pose the right of publications for all tendencies, including the most leftist groups to write. It does not mean that we are in agreement, but they have a right to write, to exchange ideas. This is a task of persuasion and it is not new. We have posed it already on other occasions. Ted Grant posed it before.

It is necessary to intervene on conditions of work, on hygiene, security, on the guarantee of the standard of life of the workers. The unemployment benefit is a conquest of the proletariat and it shows the fear the bourgeoisie has of the proletariat which forces it to do this. It is the mobilisations of the proletariat which snatched more than the bourgeoisie wished to give. In the beginning the bourgeoisie did not give up to 90% of the wage, as it gives now. Before, it gave 40%. The mobilisations imposed 90%. This is a conquest of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie would not have given it. They would have launched the war, fascism. Now they cannot do it,

and they have to yield. At the same time, the struggles of the proletariat of every country and the Workers States impose this. The masses look at the Workers States and say: 'In those countries there is no unemployment'.

It is necessary to feel that the British masses see also that in the Soviet Union there is no unemployment. It does not have the form to express it, but part of its staying in the Labour Party is because it sees that the Workers State is superior and it aspires to arrive at being a Workers State. It does not have the leadership, the preparation, the understanding, it does not push forward the political life, but the working class lives politically. If the working class did not live politically, fascism would have triumphed twentyfive times over. Fascism cannot organise a movement because it would crack open and it has to export bodies like Kapler. It shows its impotence because they do this to see if they can animate fascism. This means that the bourgeoisie has no other force or perspective. It prepares the war because it does not have any other solution and in the worst conditions for itself, with the neutron bomb which will return against it.

It is necessary to realise that in the Labour movement, trade union movement is important, but what decides is not the trade union as a trade union. It is the workers, yes, who decide — but politically. They have an immense strength which it is necessary to support in the trade unions but it is necessary to create a leadership. And the leadership cannot be made in the trade union movement. It is not the trade unions that lead the party. They influence it, but there is a relation of interest between the Labour bureaucratic layer and the bureaucratic layer of the aristocracy of the Labour. This relation today is not immoveable, the process no longer feeds them. The nutrition which maintained it ceases. In Germany also.

There are quite a lot of symptoms of crisis in Germany. They pay, they give to the unemployed, but this is going to be changed. The unemployed is going to have to accept the work they offer or be thrown out. But now the worker says: 'This is not my work, I want my own work'. Now they give to the worker only a little while to make his mind up. As the deficit of the state increases enormously, they take measures to remove the subsidies. Payments for pensions, holidays, medical services, decrease. The price of the transport doubled. In Germany, it is the dearest in the world.

Then it is necessary to feel that the process which advances does not strengthen the existence of the labour aristocracy, be it British or German. Now it is not sustained but weakened. The Communists hope for this but without party, without policy. Hence they say: 'We are the Party of the working class'. No, the working class is not going to the Communist Party. The working class is going to take power as a working class in the Labour Party. It is necessary to discuss with the Communists publicly, analysing to orientate them, to persuade them that they are not the

party of the working class. These are not just words! The Communist Party had existed since 1926 and it has nothing. They have fifty years of tradition and had the support of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union.

In the Labour Party one cannot be deceived by what happens at the top. It is necessary to see that from the top, from Callaghan down to the worker cadres, there is a whole layer of bureaucrats, not one sector, but layers of bureaucrats. Now the British economy cannot concede to the bureaucrats, it does not support and affirm them economically. In Germany they are still sustained, but soon it will stop there also. This is accompanied by the advance of the struggle of the masses of the world which influences Britain. It is necessary to rely on this process. One cannot expect a rectification of the Communist Party, nor is there any place for them to do it. But it is necessary to expect an impact of the world course of the revolution in Britain. What is the course, what is Britain going to be tomorrow? Labour? This is absurd! It is not going to be Labour! A process where the capitalist economy is going into disaster whilst the Workers States advance is going to influence in Britain. The Labour leadership is not immoveable. It is not firm or secure. It has no resolution, because it is in the wrong. The apparent resolution there is in the Labour leadership is because there is no other leadership. And it is based on the errors and false policy of Stalin and of the Communist parties. But now there is no possibility of continuing supporting oneself on this. Capitalism cannot give more support. It is necessary to count upon such perspectives. It is necessary to feel that to make a task of education in Britain has to be made in Britain. Education does not mean to teach, but to learn to be persuasive and to intervene in the education of a new leadership.

28/8/77

J. POSADAS

Eurocommunism

continued from page 4

surplus value created by the proletariat and in the name of whose interests does the Labour government allocate it to arms manufacture and war preparations? We propose a democratic functioning for the Party, not a farce of democracy or a democratic jargon. We propose public meetings, debates, with the Communists, the left groups, the trade unions and the workers, together with the comrades of the Labour Party to discuss. What is the way to construct the Party, transform it into a Socialist Party. We will find that a thorough discussion leads to the conclusion: 'democratic socialism' and 'eurocommunism' do not exist. What exist is the dictatorship of capital, and democratic socialism has to mean the struggle against the owners of the means of production, against the state of the owners, the capitalist state, and therefore, against its stooges in the Party, which includes very centrally, the government. We propose that all this be discussed, articles be written, papers and pamphlets written by the Labour comrades, to elucidate all these problems, and organise the Labour Party into a Socialist Party, whatever the ruptures this may entail.

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION SHOWS THE ONLY WAY TO PROGRESS IS BY SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

The perspective of a whole continent being taken out of the hands of imperialism is being raised with the development of the revolution in Africa. In a previous stage, this situation would never have been accepted without the invasion of imperialism to protect their own interests of plunder. Now, however, imperialism cannot do anything to prevent themselves being thrown out. In particular, the British Empire, which once had extensive boundaries encompassing a fifth of the world, is now non-existent. Under developed countries have found that the only way to progress is to carry out a policy of social transformations. They have no possibility of a bourgeois phase of development.

The changes in the policy of the workers states have meant an enormous impulse to the world revolution. The Soviet Union and Cuba, through their interventions in Africa, to Angola and Ethiopia, have confronted the capitalist system and have not allowed NATO to invade. It is the audacity of the workers states which force imperialism to feel that they can no longer dominate as before. The question of a whole continent being expropriated from imperialism could not have been envisaged without a change in the policy of the workers states. Faced with a constant series of defeats, Owen went as the representative of British imperialism to negotiate to contain the revolution. But all the lengthy negotiations to try and find a bourgeois solution were a failure, because the 'nationalist' movements have still insisted on the armed struggle to finish with the reactionary regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. Thus despite all the pressures to find a conciliatory solution — a middle road — between the forces of reaction and progress, this has not been possible.

The negotiations of Owen appeared as though they were supporting the downfall of the Smith regime, but all the sinister intentions of British Imperialism remain. For example, the criminal massacres perpetrated in Mozambique by the Rhodesian forces, which were not at all condemned by Owen. British imperialism can no longer openly afford to support South Africa or Rhodesia, because of the lack of any social support at home to do this. It shows an enormous weakness; Britain, a country with imperialist traditions and every aspect of its culture fused integrally with this heritage, cannot maintain the last vestiges of its Empire. They have not been successful in containing the revolution by trying to modify the more blatantly repugnant repressive character of the bourgeois regimes there, in order to justify their continuation. Not only cannot imperialism stay in the colonies, it is kicked out by the revolution. It is this changed situation which means the possibilities of advancing much further in the struggle against British capitalism at home. Imperialism has immense military resources and yet it is impotent to prevent itself being thrown out. The queen is able to give honours of the British Empire, but she doesn't rule an Empire any longer! In other words, British imperialism has an apparatus, which tries to maintain a facade of strength thereby hoping to continue the submission in thought of all sorts of sectors, but really the epoch of imperialism is over, the colonies have almost disappeared, and the peoples who used to be subjected to their rule instead are able to develop towards socialism.

Africa has been a victim of continuous plunder by various imperialisms throughout its history and the result is that not one single country there has ever been developed. The myth of British interests coinciding with the peoples of the colonies is clearly demonstrated in the enormous division between rich and poor. The under developed countries are left in the framework of exporters of raw materials to the large capitalist countries, because if the internal economies of these countries were able to develop, they would compete with capitalist interests elsewhere. Thus the ruling class has no interest in providing a decent standard of life for the population, because their structure as a system does not allow it. Their disinterest for the people exists for this reason, and they have no possibility of altering it. The masses refuse to continue to accept their subjection to the poverty and squalor which they have to suffer daily, when they have the example of the workers states which show that it is possible to develop the economy for the benefit of all the people. The workers states can open up new areas of territories which were immensely backward, and almost uninhabitable, like Siberia, whereas, in South Africa, all they can do is clear away the slums by bulldozing the shanty towns and leaving families homeless. The masses in Mozambique, Angola and Ethiopia, even with the scanty existence to which they are accustomed, are decided in their attitude to throw out the bourgeoisie, to throw out private property which is a block to the progress of humanity, and construct socialism. Whilst in Zimbabwe, Mugabe, has spoken of socialism as the only solution. The masses in Africa are therefore not at all backward, they recognise that a struggle for social transformations is fundamental and provides the only way for them to develop. Expropriation of imperialist interests, nationalisation of the land, and state monopoly of foreign trade allow planning so that the internal economies can develop for the first time.

One of the principles of imperialist thought which is still apparent in the labour movement is the conception that somehow Britain is different from other countries in its struggle for socialism. With the disappearance of the Empire, this concept has less and less bases to prevail because it is increasingly difficult to attribute to imperialism a force which manifestly it does not have. The petit bourgeoisie have a considerable solidarity with the struggle in Africa, and see that the masses of the world have thrown out the queen of Britain. The unquestioning attitude towards the monarchy in the past now tends to lead to an ambience of discussion about whether we need a queen, and the role she plays. How to solve the problem of the under developed regions in Scotland, Wales and Ireland? In Africa the people found that the only solution was a struggle for social transformations. Why not develop this struggle here? If British imperialism has been thrown out elsewhere, why should it be assumed that somehow it can maintain itself internally? It is only an apparatus which prevails, not any inner dynamism or capacity.

IMPORTANT — CHANGE OF PARTY ADDRESS

From 1st January 1978, the Party address is:—

IV INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

24 CRANBOURN STREET

LONDON, W.C.2

In future no correspondence to be sent to Adminaid, Sheffield.

Editorial

continued from page 1

left does not control the Labour Party and they do not have an anti-capitalist programme which poses social transformation in this country. And one of the aspects which impedes the discussion and formulation of an anti-capitalist programme is the equivocal attitude which they have to the government of Callaghan. They still hope to be able to influence and to reform it. The truth is, of course, that in all its actions the Labour Government defends capitalism. It maintains the imperialist role of Britain in the assassinations and repressions in Bermuda, in Ireland and in the support of the policy of yankee imperialism in NATO, in the Middle East, in Rhodesia and South Africa. Internally it gives large subsidies to private industry like that given to Chryslers or it gives a sector of North Sea Oil which was developed with government finance to private industry in the form of a free gift. Its attitude to the firemen's strike is not that of a disinterested party standing between the bosses and the workers. No, it is that of someone who supports fully the bosses and who does everything possible to break the strike. It is true that the margin for reforms within capitalism is very limited and that capitalism has little if anything to give. If the firemen win a concession they will be followed by the police and all sorts of other sectors of workers in demanding a better standard of living. But even within the limited reforms allowed by the system it has to be recognised that the Labour government is absolutely committed to the interests of capitalism. The Labour left in order to advance has to repudiate the policy and actions of the Labour government in the same way as they repudiate the statements of Wilson and Owen.

There is still a possibility of Governments of the left in this final stage of the death agony of capitalism and this is a very obvious possibility in both France and Italy. However a different kind of Labour government is determined by changes in the Labour Party and this means that the left has to organise itself as a tendency based on the anti-capitalist programme. In order to do this it has to find the force which does not exist in the structure and apparatus of the Labour Party. And that force is not new, "democratically selected MPs" but the working class. The working class is the force in society which by its nature is collective, is communist and has an interest in social transformations. It is the proletariat which, in the final analysis, transmits all the influence of the world socialist revolution, the struggle of the masses in Africa, Asia and Latin America which is expelling imperialism, the existence and development of the system of 20 Workers States and the struggle of the masses in France, Spain, Portugal and Italy. Its most concentrated expression is the Soviet Union. It is necessary to break the united front of the unions with the government, so that the unions unite with the Labour party on a programme of social transformations.

The question already posed in the Labour Party itself — and this is the significance of the crisis of the links with the world Communist movement is "where is Britain going"? This discussion has now to be widened to all the masses, to the working class, to the women, the students, the police and the army. As Comrade Posadas poses we have to say "Where is Britain going" and to add "to Socialism" and this on the basis of a programme for social transformation, an anti-capitalist programme of nationalisations and workers control. In this discussion has also to be posed the necessity of the Labour Party/Trade Union United Front which means to link the problem of the development of a new anti-capitalist leadership which is going to take place in the Labour Party with the force of the proletariat which is organised in the trade unions.

THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

The struggle for anti-imperialist positions therefore means struggling against capitalism here. The best way to give solidarity to the African revolution is to struggle against the imperialist role of the Labour Government. Owen's trip to Africa underlined the close relationship with Yankee imperialism where Owen is carrying out the joint policy of the Yanks and the British. A new left in the Labour Party and trade unions in this country will be formed on the understanding of the need for a policy of social transformations and to break with the imperialist policy of the Labour government.

EUROCOMMUNISM... Continued from right-hand column

such conceptions, all we can see is that they permit de facto the defence of the dictatorship of private property and let the government get away with murder. The government is murderous, because it defends the social interests of private property. And private property in total crisis is murderous. It seeks to resolve the crisis by means of throwing out old people from hospitals, closing schools, stopping public health and services and giving all resources to private industries, and war preparations. This is murderous, how can any one confuse this

with 'democracy'?

For all those, and they are many in the Party, who talk of 'democracy' and show such a concern for it in the USSR for example, why do not they call for democracy in the Party, allowing discussions, public meetings, with the trade unions and workers from the factories, to discuss such problems? Why should the article of Wilson be discussed by selected bodies and the NEC? Democracy must mean more than this. And in depth, it has to mean the right to question what use is being made of the

Turn to page 3

TO FUNCTION AS A PARTY, THE LABOUR PARTY CANNOT TAKE A EUROCOMMUNIST POSITION

The recent dispute between the Wilson tendency in the Labour Party and those who support Mitterrand, and the final re-election of Kitson to his post in the NEC are signs of crises in which the relationship of the Party to the Soviet Union is being re-appraised, whilst sectors of the Labour Party would like to link with the Communist movement only to the extent to which this relation is still within the bounds of 'eurocommunism'. Eurocommunism is a contradiction in itself, because Communism is a world wide conception, a universal system, whilst 'euro' refers to a localist, national or particular conception. It is a conception which comes from the abandonment of the universal method of thought, of marxism in the world communist movement in a previous stage, and also part of the policy of conciliation with various national bourgeoisies. What is at stake therefore is: "which way for Labour? The way of Communism, or the way of reformism?". When such a question begins to be posed in the Party, it is because the bureaucracy and the right of the Party find it less easy to isolate the Labour and trade union vanguard from the world, and the reality of the construction of socialism in the world. Such a discussion is still veiled and distorted by the weight of the apparatus of the Party. The left of the Party has to seek to debate these problems radically outside the apparatus, but in the Party so as to construct a Socialist Party from the Party which there is today, towards a Party for social transformations. We propose that this discussion helps a clarification on the objectives of the left, and their realisation of the need to construct from Labour, a Socialist Party.

MITTERRAND AND A LINK WITH THE COMMUNISTS

The rejection by the NEC of the Party of the article Wilson wrote in the 'Figaro', the re-election of Kitson at his post, the continued link with the world Communist movement in general, all this shows that the right and the centre — who dominate the Labour Party — are not completely successful in crushing discussions, debates and judgments in the Labour Party on the nature of Communism. It is important to define what 'democratic socialism' is. For the Labour leadership in general it tends to be capitalism. And as there are no publications, there is no party life in the Labour Party, except for groups of comrades who try to orientate themselves in the various areas where they are, then, antagonistic conceptions continue to co-exist in the Labour Party. This maintains the heterogeneity of the Party, and allows the control of the parliamentary Party over the Party and in the end, the submission of the Party as a whole to a purely electoral functioning, not a school of how to construct Socialism. The debate between the Labour Party and the French Socialist Party over 'Mitterrandism' shows that whilst the right and the centre can still dominate through the apparatus, the left is the one that has the interest to link with the Popular Union of France, with the CPSU, and in general with the world Communist movement.

We call for articles, conclusions

EUROCOMMUNISM MEANS PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

'Democratic Socialism', is clearly the hope to construct Socialism differently from the USSR, avoiding the confrontation with the state and the insurrection of the workers. This is also what the Communists who support 'eurocommunism' are trying to do. Such a conception can exist in the head of comrades. But in reality, it cannot exist because power in the capitalist system is not exercised through individuals, or through parliament. Even though individuals and parliament can play a role, what decides the functioning of the country is the economic functioning, through production. Production is the process by which the surplus value is created, and therefore

to be drawn, public meetings and discussions by the left of the Labour Party and the trade unions, on the question of eurocommunism. Wilson warns against it, confusing it with what he calls 'Mitterrandism'. In fact he warns the bourgeoisie against it because the Labour Party links not with Mitterrand only, but with the French Communist Party and the debate in the world Communist movement. Wilson acts as the policeman of imperialism in the Labour movement. The fact that the Socialist International has such leaders (he is a secretary of it) shows how entrenched the Labour Party is in the social interests of private property, and what international links these social interests have constructed in the workers movement. But at the same time, the NEC has denounced him, which was necessary. However, it is not enough, because still the confusion remains. Supporting Mitterrand without clarifying the position of the Party over eurocommunism, still leaves the Party open to confusion over what is 'eurocommunism'. It is good to reject Wilson, but not good enough to welcome Mitterrand. It is necessary to discuss that Mitterrand has intervened in the Wilson/Labour Party conflict, saying that he defends his relationships with the Communists, for the sake of 'democratic socialism'. This tends to maintain the confusion which there is in the Labour Party and we call for a discussion.

assassination at work for profits, none of this is subject to public scrutiny, intervention, debate and disagreement. It is imposed by the economic functioning of the country, dictated by the need of capitalist accumulation and preservation. If there was, at the point of production, a force to prevent the boss from dictating in this way, then the boss would have to be deprived of his right to ownership of the means of production. Then, the workers would dictate where to invest, and for their own interests. As this is antagonistic with the interest of the boss, who wants the largest profit possible, then it has to be either one — the boss — or the other — the workers — who decide in production. The daily confrontations that arise from the constant struggle of the proletariat against the boss, is the class struggle. There, in production and in the economy, the real battle is fought on who controls and for whose interest.

Portugal shows very clearly that when the land was taken over in Alentejo, and most of the firms and banks put under workers control, a dual power situation was created, which needed to stabilise the full power of the proletariat by means of a state form adequate to workers power (to start with, a Socialist and Communist government). However, as this was not achieved, and the Socialist Party refused absolutely to support itself on the Communists, it is allowing the capitalist class to struggle to reclaim its former possessions and power. If democratic socialism was possible, then we should have it in Portugal. The comrades of the Labour Party have to discuss why it is that there is not a democratic socialism in Portugal. There is not, because power is not in parliament, or in one parliamentary leader or other or in the prime minister. It is in the economy, and the state is the organism which has structured itself in the economic relations to stabilise the power of the dominating class in the economy. So, to obtain 'democratic socialism' we need to expropriate the bourgeois class of ownership through which its dictatorship is exercised in the economy and through the state apparatus. Otherwise, the bourgeois state continues, which has nothing democratic about it.

OVERCOME EUROCOMMUNISM TO CONSTRUCT THE PARTY

Eurocommunism and democratic Socialism have this in common that they are conceptions in the mind, which cannot have an application in reality. Had they an application in reality, the socialist parties would have led by now to the construction of new states. And what have the Socialist Parties achieved? This discussion is serious because it leads to giving the reaction a force it has not.

The lingering on of these conceptions in the Labour Party delay the process of the construction of the Labour Party into a Socialist Party with a programme of social transformations. For all the concern for 'democracy' expounded by the defenders of See left-hand column

Editorial

FOR DISCUSSIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN EUROPE

The Tribune group of Labour MPs have issued a statement against Carter's attacks on the entry of Communists into the governments in capitalist Europe. The recent trip of Carter was a conscious attempt to organise reactionary sectors in various parts of the world. It was a journey to try to give confidence to capitalist forces, to sustain them, encouraging them to continue. His trip was a failure and it has not achieved its objective. Carter saw Sadat but Sadat is in no way strengthened and his whole attempted agreement with Israel is a fiasco. He makes a speech in the Egyptian parliament in which he shows complete indecision and panic. All these bourgeois regimes are unstable as is seen by the general strike in Tunisia.

Capitalism in Europe has much money but it also has great insecurity. In the same way as Carter was trying to encourage the reactionary regimes in the Middle East to resist the pressures on them, in Europe he sought to strengthen the forces against the Communist parties. A sector of the European capitalists, because they are so weak, are prepared to let the Communists into the government hoping the eurocommunist ideas will prevent them from taking substantial moves against the system. However the future of the Communist parties is not the eurocommunist road, hence Carter's concern to stop them going to government. Pluralism would mean the right for capitalist forces to intervene. The European court in Strasbourg has said to all the European bourgeoisie, "what the British are doing in Ireland you must do". This is in effect what the decision of the court means, it is the formal open acceptance of capitalism's right to torture. Pluralism would be the right for these forces to intervene. The experience of Chile shows that when the Communists and Socialist parties advance against capitalism, capitalism throws democracy out of the window. Pluralism does not exist, we support the taking of as many gains through parliament as possible but this is only a stage and eventually it is either capitalism or the forces of progress that decide.

In Italy, the Communist party leadership has supported eurocommunism and also the "historic compromise" with the Christian Democratic party. This comes from a timidity, the leadership wishes to advance but to go slowly with compromises on the way. Already the Communist party has made a change and is saying it is prepared to go to the government without the Christian Democracy. This process of the Communist party altering its positions to taking more resolute measures against capitalism is going to continue. How is the left in the Labour party best able to link with Communist parties? In what way can an alliance be made with them to tackle the social problems? The way to achieve this is to adopt an anti-capitalist programme with them. In France the Communist party has the programme of nationalisations; it means when they go to government they have measures to implement which are against capitalism. In Britain this programme does not exist and it is necessary to develop such a programme that is capable of developing an alternative. Wilson resolutely supported Carter's attacks on the Communist parties, because he sees that what is taking place in the Communist Movement is going to stimulate the development in Britain. Compared with the Communist Movement the process in the Labour party is slower. The government carries on with the reactionary policy and every day the conditions of life for the population decline. The cost of the meals for the school children has been raised by the government by an enormous amount, with the intention of a further increase at the end of the year. What democracy is this, that half a million more children have now stopped eating school lunches because their families cannot afford the cost? Any amount of demands for the government to stop these measures will not work. There have already been constant demands for the government to change its policy, including 80,000 who marched last year against the cuts in public expenditure, and still the government pursues a totally capitalist policy. There is no perspective of the Labour government being transformed, it is consciously a government of British capitalism. So what is the perspective in Britain?

FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSIONS ON WHAT WAY FORWARD FOR BRITAIN

Capitalism and the government cannot give anything, so it is necessary to proceed without capitalism and the government that sustains it. Inside the Labour party the apparatus impedes the discussion of an alternative. We therefore consider it is necessary for the left in the party to develop its own discussions on what is the future for Britain. There is a new situation in the country, capitalism is in increasing crisis and no concessions are given, which gives a better opportunity for the left to develop. We propose public discussions on what is the future for Britain. To have meetings where the Labour left, Communists, left groups and ourselves can discuss what is the political programme for the left to achieve socialism. We see the future for Britain as a Communist future, that the left has to have the programme to develop the workers state. It is only by constructing the workers state that it is possible to progress and solve the social problems. In Mozambique they are doing this and they reeducate the criminals by constant discussions and then they take a full part in society. In France the prisoners have been making hunger strikes to protest about being in cells on their own with no contact with other prisoners or people outside. Capitalism's solution is to shut people away, because they cannot solve any of these problems. It is its way of life, which is based on individual interest and competition, that causes all these problems.

Publications of the left are required where the left can write about all the fundamental issues. Is pluralism possible for Britain? Is it right that capitalism, which murders the Irish masses, be allowed to speak?

Turn to page 3

FULL SUPPORT FOR THE SOVIET INTERVENTION IN ETHIOPIA!

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

274 Friday 10 February 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

The crisis of Italian capitalism, the trade union/workers parties united front and the government of the Left

J. Posadas

8-12-77

The situation in Italy is very good for social transformations, even if in a limited way. This is an excellent situation. The trade union/party United Front progresses.

The proposal of the CGIL, UIL and CSIL to oppose the strike of the autonomous trade unions and to make the trains run during the Christmas period, in principle is not bad. What must be done is to explain that they are not against the strike, but not at this moment. It is necessary to explain to the workers the reason for the suspension of the strike. They can make it afterwards. This attitude wins people. To strike now is an error of the autonomous trade unions.

At the same time it is necessary to discuss with them, not to reject discussion if they have demands to make, but posing when to strike. A public discussion! The CGIL, the UIL and the CISL elude this. They make a dispute with the autonomous trade unions.

It is necessary, at the same time to draw up a general programme of the trade union movement. The conditions of life in Italy get worse all the time. It's a lie when they say that the lira is firm, there is a debt of 35 milliard lira. They maintain the lira on the basis of a constant debt. Thus, it is necessary to pose as a solution what programme? Yes, the programme which the present government has, is to sustain all the big capitalists, the great swindlers, the fascists, the fascist judges, all this. It is necessary to propose a programme for changes.

The Communist Party poses 'a new economic policy'. But what policy? A new economic policy can be on this same line, of defence of the capitalist system. A new economic policy of agreements, but for what? For example, an outstanding fact which it is necessary to discuss in the Communist Party is that there is a very great offensive on the part of world capitalism, of the Yanks, to hand over to all the state properties to private control. But, before doing this, the state shells out, paying all the debts,

finances the development of the enterprises. And then it returns them to private property. This is the objective of the capitalists. That is to say, they return the state or semi-state enterprises to private property, but prior to that the state took over the debts, and now provides loans so that they function.

The Communist Party must protest against this. The state enterprises must be maintained as state enterprises under workers control with a programme of production for hospitals, roads, transport, water, gas, hygienic service etc. There are a thousand things to improve, including steel.

The top Socialist layer is going to oppose changes, but there is now a Socialist sector which seeks to understand that that it is necessary to make changes. The Communist Party must discuss; it is necessary to make discussions on the programme for social transformations, otherwise there is no progress. The state pays the debts of all the capitalists, and things get worse.

It is necessary to take into account two fundamental principles of the present crisis of the capitalist system. The first is that it is not the economy, it is the existence of the Workers States, of the Soviet Union, of China and of Cuba which impedes capitalism, the functioning of the capitalist states.

It forces them to turn against the world development of the revolution, to prepare the neutron bomb. The second aspect is the normal crisis of the capitalist system which has now no solution. It resolved by war the two previous crises; now, it cannot do so. It's going to launch the war, but it will not solve the problem.

It is necessary to analyse objectively. Capitalism cannot re-employ all the unemployed workers. It cannot do this any more. It is not in the conditions to extend production to consume. Italian capitalism itself, with a mediocre investment, can double production today. The technical means to do it exists. But to whom to sell it? Who is to buy it? If the Italians invest, it is

not just money, it is the money of the Yanks, of the Germans or of the Japanese. The Japanese are in conditions to produce what Italy produces at half the price. And the Yanks demand of the Germans that they finance the debt of the United States because now 17 million unemployed cannot be absorbed. They could absorb two, three or four millions, the rest, no; and to continue the life of the capitalist system, they have to compete with the Workers States. They have to compete in price, in quality of production, and the Workers States are competitive.

The Workers State, which is a competitor outside the area of capitalism, impedes the development of the capitalist system. The Germans have an immense accumulation of capital, a surplus of three thousand million marks, but what to do with it? Before, they invested in the colonies. Now there are no colonies in which to invest. There are none, because the Workers States exist, the Soviet Union exists. Before, they exported production at half the price; now, although it's still needed, it is rejected. That is to say that the crisis of the capitalist system is not motivated only by economic reasons but by the existence of the Workers States. It has no solution.

It is necessary to discuss publicly what is the nature of the crisis of Italy. What is it, bad government? Yes, it is a catastrophic government and the catastrophic government intensifies the crisis, but the crisis comes from the existence of the capitalist system itself. Throughout Europe and in the United States, there are very cheap Italian shoes and they sell a lot of them? At the cost of what? Through 'black labour' (secret domestic labour). There are millions of people who live working all day long for this. Where is Italian democracy.

This is democracy! Is this the democratic state? It is a state where people live to work and nothing else. All the family works to live. Capitalism cannot overcome this situation. The condition of capitalism is to continue in this

Turn to page 2

The crisis of Italian capitalism . . .

continued from page 1

way. It forms part of the strength of Italian capitalism. But 'black work' is inhuman. Italian capitalism cannot progress. Not for lack of market or capital, but the actual need to reanimate the capitalist system. It is necessary to pose that this is the crisis in Italy.

Discuss how is the crisis of Italy going to be overcome? With a better programme for agriculture, but for whom? The problem is not a better programme, better lands which produce better prices. The problem is that these are in the hands of the landowners. And the ECM forces them not to produce. A government is necessary which organises so that everything is produced at a reasonable price, so that they see it is not capitalist. Even a government in which the Communists enter has to do this, or else increase the actual deficit of the capitalist system. This is in discussion now.

The crisis of capitalism does not exist because unemployment exists. Unemployment cannot be contained now, nor overcome. Capitalism cannot re-absorb any more the 17 million unemployed. It is not through the lack of a market, the market exists. In the reports in the bourgeois press on statements of the National Bank of Italy, they say that in the main branches of production, including the car industry, previous production has been overtaken and that there is no market. Competition increases more and more with Italian production and, as part of that, Italian steel. Italy produces steel and sells it in Europe. Now the ECM says that they cannot sell any more. They are financed not to sell. This is madness. But it is shown that the depth of the crisis is not that there is no one who buys, it is that the capitalist system pays so as not to produce. If the capitalist system is eliminated, consumption opens up and, with it, the need for more steel. Within the capitalist system, production is very limited. To live, the capitalist system has to dismiss workers and invest to increase the rhythm of production. Then it increases the rhythm of production and it does not need more workers, hence it cannot take in the unemployed.

In 1918 and in 1939 also there were millions of unemployed. Capitalism resolved the problem by killing them in the war. But this time, no. The war is going to do this, but it is not going to resolve unemployment. Hence capitalism is afraid and makes the neutron bomb.

It is good to want to advance without conflict, we agree. It is good to advance electorally, we are in agreement. But to what limit? This has to be discussed. Is it possible to resolve the crisis of Italy with a new programme of production? Yes, if it is possible. But what programme? If it is capitalist, it resolves nothing. It is enough to see that the main enterprises that are state-owned have an immense deficit. What is the basis of this? Production is good, the workers work well, the wages of the workers are average. What is the reason for the problem? That the worker does not work? The Italian worker works like all the workers of the world. It is the system of production and the existence of the capitalist class which is the problem. It is necessary to face up to this.

If the state replaces the

capitalist, it can set up some enterprises. It can do quite a lot. It can make also a programme of production. But, if it is capitalist, it will be the capitalist who will profit, and it will clash with the workers movement. It is necessary to make a programme of production which cannot be capitalist, without immediately posing the fall of the capitalist system; but, yes, proposing a public discussion: capitalist programme or workers programme. It should be accompanied by the intervention of everyone, discussing in the factories, the streets, the workers areas, and the schools.

It is necessary to discuss: how to emerge from the crisis? The crisis does not come from the colleges, it is the crisis of production, of unemployment, of the quality of the products. Then it is necessary to come out of this crisis. In the workers movement, it is necessary to discuss now a programme to overcome the crisis of the capitalist system, not of this government. It is not a crisis in the void, as some say, but it is necessary to propose how to resolve the problems of the crisis which exists now, with a programme such that the state enterprises remain in the hands of the state, but controlled and led by the workers movement, by directors who are controlled by the workers movement, and with a plan of production controlled by the workers movement. At present, the programme of production is controlled by the directors who are all representatives of the capitalist enterprises.

The president of the bosses organisation in Italy (Confindustria) proposes that the state pays all the debts of enterprises and, besides, gives them money! It is the state which pays capitalism. Instead of giving money, why not nationalise it? It is a lie that the state enterprise is in deficit. There is a deficit because it is controlled by the capitalist managers; but, under workers control, there will be a surplus, not a deficit. It is necessary to elevate this discussion in the workers movement, in the trade unions, in the workers centres, to discuss on this basis.

It is necessary to discuss on agrarian production. We are in agreement that it is necessary to produce more from the land, but in what form? Under capitalist enterprise it cannot be done. It needs an investment of capital, an investment in machinery, a market which from the capitalist point of view cannot exist. But, at the other end, people do not consume enough. Today, in one hour, more tomatoes are produced than in one day previously. And there could be a much greater consumption. Under capitalism there is no interest in producing for consumption; they produce for profit. Then capitalism has no interest in increasing the quality and the quantity of production. This should be discussed.

The Communist Party proposes a state which controls, which leads. But, for the capitalist? The capitalist works from the point of view of his own interest. In European competition of the ECM, from the capitalist point of view, Italy is the weakest of all the industrialised capitalist countries. It is also where it can be seen that there is no field for 'eurocommunism'. The Communist Party of France was opposed to entry by Portugal, Greece and Spain in the Euro-

pean Common Market because these will compete. Thus, the French Communists defend their peasants, but basically with this policy it is the landowner that they are defending. This is where eurocommunism leads to

The correct proposal is a Socialist European market. Then there is no poor or rich market. This poses the need for the planning of the economy. This cannot be done immediately today, we agree; but it is necessary to propose it. The solution lies in the Socialist planning of Europe.

It is necessary to discuss these problems for Italy. All the world process is against Italian capitalism. It is necessary to discuss more the world process. 'UNITA' publishes quite a lot, and it is good - on Ethiopia, for example. It is good what the Communist Party does with these trips, as in Ethiopia, Spain and France. But it is necessary to discuss within the Party, so that the mass of the Party is educated, learns, understands, and intervenes with ideas. It is necessary to discuss, for example, the position on Ethiopia which is quite good; to discuss them in the Party, to form seminars, discussions in the life of the cells. Let them discuss the result of the strike of the engineers, which was like a general strike in Italy, and which shook the world. The United States was afraid of the general strike in Italy because they asked 'where is eurocommunism?' This strike does not lead to 'eurocommunism', it leads to the abolition of capitalism and the Yanks see that it is like this. It is necessary to discuss that this strike means an immense force for a Government of the Left to utilise.

We do not propose to overthrow the capitalist system now. We pose a Government of the Left, with a programme of the left; not a Popular Front with a capitalist programme, but a programme of the left with anti-capitalist positions. This, indeed, does not propose the abolition of the capitalist system right now, but a programme of the left leading to the abolition of the capitalist system. Discuss this! For example, in the factories let us discuss the result of the general strike, what is its significance? Italy has a unanimous will! The whole of Italy went on strike. It was a strike of the engineers, but all Italy was in it. The leadership expected a hundred thousand, but half a million turned up!

When there is such a mobilisation it is because Italy is ready to fight, it wants to change things. Discuss this conclusion! Oblige capitalism to give concessions, to weaken the capitalist front. We do not propose to overthrow capitalism, but to weaken the capitalist front, which can be done and very effectively, preparing later stages. It is necessary to discuss with the Socialists, A quite good left is developing in the Socialists, that, as a minimum, takes account of the fact that Italy cannot continue in this way. It does not have precise ideas, but it sees that the situation cannot continue like this. And this expresses the influence from below that wants to change.

The working class spoke through the engineers on December 2nd. Italy spoke there. But the Communist Party has to speak. The Party must speak

and give an opinion, allow the base of the Party to intervene because, in relation to what they are doing now, the Party only listens to selected cadres. It is necessary to see that the members of the Party discuss and intervene directly, that all the cells, all the sections have an animated life and propose an activity towards the students, towards the trade unions, towards the youth, the peasants, the unemployed, to provide a whole plan for employed and unemployed.

What is the common plan for the employed and the unemployed? Comrades say that Italy must all work! But how to develop Italy? Under capitalism it is not possible to develop Italy! The Mezzogiorno finds no answer in the capitalist system, and the problem of Italy is not the Mezzogiorno, it is the whole of Italy. It is necessary to develop the whole Italy. The Communist Party has to discuss this. It has to realise that it does not count on the strength of the class. The workers do not speak, do not comment, do not develop their opinion. For example in the factory, in the workers area, in the schools; let them speak, let them analyse, let them propose. Now it is not like this; the Party gives orders then closes the door. The militant does not weigh, does not contribute to the daily life of the class, of the petit bourgeoisie, of the students, of the parents, they do not intervene. It is a force which does not participate in the struggle. It is necessary to make it participate.

The perspective of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party is correct: to win the left of the Christian Democrats. It is a policy of the Italian Communist Party, and it is not bad. The intention, the objective is good, the method no. The Christian Democratic left is not the leaders and the MPs, but the worker, peasant and petit bourgeois base, that is the Christian Democratic base. It is correct to lead and orientate, to influence the MPs and leaders, but also it is necessary to aim at the base, at the Christian Democratic base which, on the second of December 1977 joined with the whole of Italy. The Christian Democratic base was there! Then it is necessary to influence it, and the way to influence it is with a programme of change, of transformations, of analyses, showing that capitalism does not advance.

There is no reason to be afraid that imperialism is going to intervene. If the Yanks intervene, the Soviet Union will intervene also. The Yanks know it, hence do not intervene and they conceal their intention. The Soviets cannot allow a relation of forces unfavourable to Europe. All the policy of Egypt shows that it made a programme of rapprochement, of a united front with Israel against the Arab revolution. It failed, and now this comes to light. And the policy of the Yanks in Europe is going to fail too.

The Soviets cannot let the relations of forces in Europe go backwards. They are going to intervene. It is not a military question, but economic and social, and the Soviets intervene very well. They intervene more and more. But the problem is not to see if the Soviets intervene or not - they are going to intervene - but the relation of forces favours a discussion in the Italian Communist Party. The Party can meet and discuss every day. The Party can discuss in the factories, in the

cells, in the sections, to discuss a programme of changes. This will influence the Socialist masses and the Socialist leaders. It may frighten the leaders of the right of the Socialist Party, but not all that much, because they expect this. On the other hand, it is going to elevate the Socialist masses to intervene. Otherwise, if the discussion remains in the air, among the leaders, then there is no discussion at the base.

It is good to make negotiations. The Party has to make negotiations but, at the same time, negotiation with Christian Democratic leaders, Socialists, Republicans, does not prevent discussion in the cells of the Party, in the colleges, universities and the factories.

The polemic between Benvenuto and Trentin should be made really public so that everybody discusses and gives an opinion. Let all the tendencies intervene, this is democracy. It is necessary to discuss publicly. Everybody must be able to discuss the need for changes. Italy must not stop. Everyone must work. How to do it? How to increase production so that everybody has enough to consume? Discuss this!

It is necessary to discuss the world situation in the Italian Communist Party. It is against the capitalist system. Let the Party discuss and publish in UNITA. For example, the report of Pajetta on Ethiopia should be discussed in the cells. The crisis of Spain, discuss it in the Party. There is a crisis of Spain, in which the Communists enter the government of Catalonia with what programme? Let us discuss these problems. This tactic is an enormous backwardness as much in Catalonia as in Andalusia. It is a retreat. Autonomy is not a progress, it is a retreat. Centralisation allows a development of the economy and of culture, whilst decentralisation makes the economy, culture and science retreat. It is necessary to discuss in the Party why this is going to be posed also in Italy.

If in Italy there is a process very shortly of advance of the revolution, tendencies are going to emerge demanding autonomy. Sardinia, autonomy. Sicily, autonomy. This is a method of capitalism. In Belgium, it is the same.

Belgium is divided into three parts: the French, the Walloons and the Flemings. This impedes the centralisation of the country and, now they have to try to prevent the workers movement from advancing. The Flemings demand autonomy and separation. These are manoeuvres of capitalism. It is necessary to discuss this in the Party. The more the Communist masses are educated, the more they understand the problems of Italy. Neither the Communist Party nor the Socialist Party discuss in this way. It is necessary to do it.

What is evident is that the Communist Party wants to enter the government. It is necessary to ask now: with what programme? To enter the government for what? Capitalism does not have the strength to come out from this crisis. It supports itself on Communists and Socialists. It seeks the support of the Communists and the Socialists to win time. The Communist and Socialist leaderships are afraid of the crisis, while the workers movement shows that it has a very great power. Why not present a United Front of the trade unions, Workers Centres, Communist and Socialist parties! It is not a

The crisis of Italian capitalism . . .

continued from page 2

crisis in the void. There is no fascist coup ahead. The fascists do not have the strength to make a coup. The right has judges, people at the highest levels who decide from above, but outside that, they do not have any strength. They do not have points of support and bases in the population. The population, on the other hand, has the experience to intervene, it has the experience of its triumph in 1945 and of the triumph of the Workers States. It has much experience. Capitalism has to deal, not with a disorganised population, but with a militant one. Then it is necessary to discuss. We have all the strength, why not go forward.

If Yankee imperialism is going to sabotage, it cannot do very much; it can do very little. It cannot send troops or aeroplanes, or atomic bombs. That is to say, there are very good conditions to advance, not all at once, but with a programme for the Government of the Left. This is the slogan of now, for the groups, the Communist masses and Socialist masses. The Communist militant is very influenced by this situation. Then it will be possible to go from the Government of the Left forward to break the capitalist system. One of the bases which gives strength to the right in the Communist Party is that, in the Socialist Party, they are afraid and they use this to contain. But the Socialist base, is not like this.

The Engineering strike was complete: Communists, Socialists, Christian Democrats, Republicans, the lot. The whole country was a meeting. It has very little result to exert a pressure just speaking of the strength of this mobilisation. It is necessary to make proposals. Propose a programme of the left to clean up all the debts of the state enterprises and semi-state enterprises, with workers control; a programme of production, not letting the capitalist administration continue as before.

Another aspect is that all the enterprises which collapse, which they close down, the state should take over; not close them, but hand them over to workers control. This should be proposed. Capitalism is impotent, but the working class is capable — with the Communist Party and the trade unions, the CGIL, the CISL and the UIL. It's necessary to propose a plan, a programme of agrarian production for Italy, independent of the ECM, for the consumption of Italy, including meat production also. They have paid Italy to kill the cows, how not discuss all this? It is not only a matter of a programme for Italy, but for the ECM also, which is the European multinational of big business. It is necessary to propose this, a thing which the French Communists are raising!

It is necessary to discuss more the world situation in the Communist Party: what is happening in the world? Why not discuss the report of Pajetta on Ethiopia? Discuss it! It is good what UNITA publishes, but discuss it in the whole Party to draw conclusions, understand and educate.

J.POSADAS

8.12.77

EDITORIAL continued from page 1

In the World Communist Movement they are having to discuss these issues, on what is the way to construct socialism. The discussion in the French and Italian Communist parties is all part of this and it is necessary for the left in this country to participate in it. To do this, there is a need for publications; at present there are no publications of the Labour left that discuss, it is necessary to make them. The publications need to have articles on what way to elevate the standard of life of the population. The population in all the workers states have constant improvements in their living conditions, there are more schools and houses every year and the safety for the workers in the factories is a major preoccupation. Under capitalism, life is a constant struggle with none of this security for the people.

DEVOLUTION IS NO ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM OF THE REGIONS

The superiority of the workers states comes from the planned economy based on the nationalised property. In Britain there are a number of nationalisations, but they all have a boss at the top that is a capitalist. In Leyland they put Edwardes there, on an enormous salary to manage it as any capitalist firm is run. The profitable firms capitalism keeps and those that are nationalised are run for the benefit of the bourgeoisie, the state pays for all the losses and the market economy continues. In the workers state there is the possibility of planning resources. This is something capitalism cannot do, for each firm produces in accordance with its own interest. Vietnam has proposed a Federation of itself with other countries in the region, this is to plan the economies of the countries together for the mutual benefit of all. Capitalism cannot achieve this. This crisis over the devolution measures for Scotland shows the chaos they make whenever they have to face the task of uniting regions. All they offer is devolving certain powers to a regional parliament. Whether devolution is given or not, it will in no way elevate the life of the Scottish people. On the other hand a Socialist Federation of Scotland, together with England, Wales and Ireland will do so. If the economy was nationalised with workers control, the life of the population

THE STEEL CRISIS AND THE NEED FOR A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

The crisis in the steel industry with all the threats of massive sackings of workers, and of an enormous loss of money, of wealth produced by the workers, combined with wholesale reduction in production and the closure of steel mills is an expression of the world crisis of capitalist industry. The crisis is repeated in France, Italy, the USA, Germany and Japan. It is, however, only one aspect of the total and final crisis of the capitalist system. Steel is a basic material for production in a wide range of goods and services for the population as well as that large sector which is not socially useful but which is produced for profit. It is clear that the crisis in the car industry — expressed in Leylands in particular — is directly related to the steel crisis. Cars are made of steel even if the amount used in each car is very small. However steel is also used to manufacture components for the railway system, for refrigerators, and for the construction industry in which ferro-concrete plays a considerable part. In other words the whole capitalist economy is in a state of overproduction produced by competition for profit which results in the anarchy of production and the use of the advances of science and technique not for the benefit of humanity but for profit. Capitalism has no solution to this problem since the problem is the competitive and rapacious nature of the system of private property itself. The solution is already posed in the Workers States, in state ownership, workers control and planning.

In this crisis of the steel industry we see an important aspect of the total crisis of capitalism. The enormous level of overproduction is the direct result of the fact that in order to compete one with the other, the bourgeoisie have used the advances — and objectively they are advances — in science and technique, in automation in order to raise the productivity of labour. It is the same in every industry and this is the nature of capitalism. The result has been the production of a quantity of

steel which the capitalist economy does not know how to use. It doesn't need it. In a previous period there would have been wars, inter-capitalist wars to destroy large amounts of material, for the stronger capitalist sectors to impose on the weaker and then the cycle begins again. We have had two such world inter-capitalist wars this century. At this moment the competition between Japanese capitalism and yankee imperialism is greater now than before the second world war. A Japanese minister has said this. However with the existence of the Soviet Union and the system of the workers State, capitalism cannot afford inter-capitalist wars which would result in only one victor and that would be the workers states and the world socialist revolution. No, capitalism cannot afford to struggle against itself by means of war in this stage of history. At the same time capitalism is losing its world markets, its market contracts because the Workers States exist, and are not a market of any importance for capitalism, and because there are the Revolutionary States which develop largely outside of the capitalist market and economy. In every aspect the workers states compete with capitalism and compete on the basis of a superior economic and social system.

In these circumstances capitalism needs to try to limit competition, to plan, to pose a united face in front of the workers states. Inevitably even in this they fail. The Iron and Steel organisation in capitalist Europe which pre-dates the Common Market by some years was an attempt to limit competition, to plan in a limited way. In reality the best the EEC has been able to do is to allow the stronger of the European capitalist sectors to impose themselves on the weaker ones.

In a sense capitalism can always find a solution, if it is allowed. At this moment it is trying to impose a solution in the wholesale sacking of workers, in capitalist rationalisation with the resulting decline in the level of consumption of the population.

would increase, the proposal of the Federation of all the regions on this basis is the solution to the problem. It is the programme that it is necessary to adopt in opposition to the bourgeois sectors who wish to resist the nationalist demands and to those who propose devolution. Either with devolution or non devolution under capitalism the crisis over the regions is going to continue, it is the planning of the economy on the basis of the Socialist Federation that will finish with this problem.

Any programme which does not go outside the framework of the capitalist system is not going to help the masses. As this discussion over whether to build the British or United States atomic reactor, it has no relevance to the masses, it is just a discussion over which sectors of capitalism will benefit. However, the masses do have the interest in discussing that every country which has broken from capitalism has taken measures to expropriate the economy and to plan it. The elections in France take place soon in which it is necessary to make public statements of support for the victory of the Communists and Socialist, to discuss the programme of nationalisations that the French Communists have proposed to extend. All of Europe is going to the left. It is necessary to go from the statements of support for greater links with the Communist parties towards a conference in Europe of the Communists and Socialists to discuss a joint anti-capitalist programme for Europe. Half of Europe is already a workers state and it is necessary to unite also with the Communist parties in the workers states. It is not possible to talk about the intervention of the United States and the Soviet Union, putting them on the same level, as though they were just two super powers. Yankee imperialism intervenes in the world preparing reactionary forces against the masses. The Soviet Union, in spite of the bureaucracy, supports the masses to go to power. If it were not for the existence of the Soviet Union, Carter would not just have given verbal warnings against the Communists in Italy, he would have sent military forces to prevent the Communists, as in Vietnam. The failure of the Carter trip was because of the workers states that constantly weaken imperialism. We appeal therefore for meetings and discussions with the Communists throughout Europe and for the development of an anti-capitalist programme. For discussions to develop a united front of the Labour party and trade unions on a programme to finish with capitalism.

However the capitalist market is not going to expand and the productivity of labour continues to increase which means that the unemployed workers not needed by capitalist industry, are not going to be reincorporated. In these circumstances they are of no use to capitalism and, even more, a social danger. This produces in capitalism an absolutely assassin mentality. The deaths of workers in industrial accidents is, therefore, not simply negligence but a function of the system. This is vividly expressed in the decision of a bourgeois court to fine the British Steel Corporation £700 for the death of eleven workers in Scunthorpe. It is a decision which expresses the value of life, of the workers life in the eyes of the bourgeoisie and is a positive encouragement for the bourgeois leaders of the industry not to bother too much to protect the lives of workers. This court decision is virtually an incitement for capitalism to continue to kill workers. The most obvious expression of this assassin mentality is, of course the production and deployment of the neutron bomb.

Capitalism attempts to solve its crisis by using the state intervention in industry, and the existing state owned enterprises to subsidise capitalism with the money extracted from the workers and the mass of the population. The steel industry is losing something like £1,000 a minute at the moment. It is a complete lie, and in the nature of the present Labour government, for Callaghan to pose that it is the "government" which is subsidising the workers in Leyland or British Steel. It is, in reality, just the reverse, the wealth of the population is used to subsidise a failing capitalism.

Capitalism now administered by a Labour government, has no solution and one of the fundamental factors in this is that the proletariat, however impeded by its leaderships in this stage of history gives no opportunity for capitalism to recover. It has the consciousness that there is a better economic and social system. This level of consciousness is determined by the fact that the

workers state have overcome these problems posed by capitalism. They are capable of planning the economy, of ensuring full production and improving the level of consumption of the population. What was achieved in the Soviet Union, in China, Germany, Poland or Cuba; what is being achieved now, can be done in this country. The solution to the total crisis, to the problems of capitalism lies, then, in nationalisation, in state control and in planning on this basis. It is true that British Steel is nationalised but it is a state control by — and in the interests of — private property. What is necessary is the nationalisation of the entire economy including the financial structure — the banks and insurance companies — and the land. And this means the construction of a new state, a workers state, since it is the economy, the property relations which decide the character of the state. On this basis the economy can be planned under workers control. The present quarrel between Villiers, as the head of the Steel Board, and Parliament is a farce which simply tries to cover-up the fact that all these administrators of the nationalised industries function in the interests of the system, of the capitalist system. Thus, whilst it is true that you cannot plan steel, or any other industry, in isolation, and that the crisis in the railway system or in Leylands are related to the crisis of steel, it is necessary to impose workers control in all the nationalised industries. The "books" have to be open not to parliament which is a bourgeois institution but to the workers. In the economy either the state or the private sector determines. The famous "mixed economy" in the west is merely the submission of state enterprise to the objectives of capitalist economy.

The government is proposing a 25% reduction in the work force which means 50,000 sackings in the industry. Struggles against such decisions cannot accept the framework of capitalism. The system has nothing to give and there is little to bargain for in the old trade union way.

Turn to page 4

A "UNITED" EUROPE CANNOT BE ANYTHING BUT SOCIALIST

The perspective of the Socialist Europe is not taking shape through any parliament, or the European parliament. It is now becoming increasingly possible and soon, because the Communists in Italy are going to government, in a process which is not electoral, but deeply social. At the same time the Soviet Union shows — as it does in Ethiopia — that it can, and will support the construction of Socialism in the world. Carter's counter revolutionary intervention to prevent the Communists entering governments has failed. No capitalist country has come to the aid of Somalia which shows that it is not capitalism that has the initiative. It is the Communists who have constructed the workers states, who will find the way to resolve the problems of capitalist Europe. The Socialists have to learn from the Communists the programme of nationalisation and the perspective of planning. The Labour and Socialist parties will not resolve anything with their present programmes but yes, with the programme of nationalisation and planning which is Communist. When in the Labour Party, sectors come out, including parliamentary sectors condemning the intervention of Carter and supporting links with the Socialists and Communists of Europe, the conclusion is clear. The objective process of the need to resolve the problems of this stage of history, through the Communist perspective, is imposing itself in Britain, and this by-passes and also in volvesectors of the present left which there is in the Labour Party. Any discussion of the need for a Socialist Europe requires policy and programme. We propose that the comrades of the Labour Party, not just the MPs or ministers discuss the issue of the European Common Market, and that they call for a European Conference of workers parties (Socialist, Communist, Labour) with the trade unions and the workers centres (TUC, CGIL, CGT etc.), for the perspective of the planning of the whole of Europe. This must be then, on an anti-capitalist programme.

At present, the issue of the European parliament has been kept separate from the issue of the EEC and that of the link with the Socialists and Communist of the rest of Europe. In the intervention of the Tribune group of MPs, the issue of the link with the Communists of Western Europe has been very specifically kept aside from the need to link also with the CPSU — the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This historically cannot have a perspective. It is necessary to raise a public discussion in the Labour Party and the trade unions on the need for a European functioning of Socialists, Communists and trade unions, together with those of the USSR and the other workers states of Europe.

THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT IS PART OF THE EEC AND IT IS FOR WAR

The whole issue of 'for' or 'against' direct elections to the European parliament, is contained within the overall acceptance of the structure of European capitalism. The devaluation of the green pound is going to mean dearer imports. But the way to lower the price cannot be done within the Common Market agricultural policy. It is necessary to make an appraisal of the overall intentions of capitalism. Capitalist rationalisation in agriculture will mean further bankruptcy of smaller capitalists, further rationalisation,

further unemployment, whilst the consumer market becomes still narrower. The need to subsidise further agricultural producers for them not to produce, to impede further production in Europe is a norm. Prices increase, because of increased scarcity of the product. It works the same with meat, and it is the same principle with steel. What it is necessary to say then is not: no increase in the green pound, but what is the EEC? For whose interests does it function, and for whose interests does the European parliament work?

Even though the increase in prices from the EEC tends to deepen the crisis of capitalism in this country, the capitalists put up with it. This is because beyond their immediate economic interests, they see the need to defend themselves as a system. This is the phase of history when everything is explained by the fact that we are in the stage of the final settlement of accounts, system against system. The trip of Carter was to impede some capitalists from making agreements with the Communists, like Agnelli in Italy, who said that he would not be against them entering government. It was an attempt by imperialism to draw NATO more closely together to prepare for war against the Soviet Union. Whilst discussions go on interminably and inconclusively in the European parliament, the capitalist system prepares with the functioning of the EEC, in the economy, in production and with arms construction, the war

against the workers states. The European parliament never took a position against the open connivance of key sectors of the Italian bourgeoisie in attempted fascist coups (i.e. the Valporeda affair).

A very good example of where the European parliament stands in all this is to be found in their "non intervention" when Haig proposed that the NATO countries must have the neutron bomb. The European parliament has no great feeling against the neutron bomb and even though British imperialism has admitted tortures in the jails in Ireland, it was the commission of the European parliament that white-washed them and gave them the 'go ahead' to re-imprison those whom they had to let go and go on torturing as before. Where is this democracy that comrades of the Labour Party are so concerned about to be found here? Democracy can mean also the right to assassinate, prepare war, neutron bombs, kill people in production etc. for the sake of the continuation of competition, i.e., the system of private property. Why not discuss this in the Labour Party publically? With the trade unions, in public meetings? Why leave this to the upper strata of parliament, of the state, who have no interest in this discussion?

The concrete reality of the European parliament is that it decides nothing, and if ever it came to raise fundamental questions such as: "why do we kill cows when people cannot afford the price of meat?", "why cannot Italy develop its steel industry?", "why is agricultural production massively destroyed when people need?", and "who has decided the murder of the Baader Meinhoff group in jails?", the bourgeoisie would ignore it.

DEMOCRACY IS RELATIVE TO THE ECONOMY

Parliamentary democracy has not always existed, and already it has been destroyed in two thirds of the world. It is a form of regulation of interests in society, which stem from a given form of economy determined in turn by a specific mode of production: in the case of parliaments, it is the capitalist mode of production, which, through class struggle has led to the constitution of this organism, for the regulation of the interests of the bourgeois class. Today, world history is no longer dominated by German imperialism, or the devaluation of the green pound or even a lack of markets. What is at stake is that the present mode of production has led to the constitution of a new class in history — the proletariat — and its taking power in many countries. That class was the result of the development of the bourgeoisie, and it gave the answer to the contradictions of the bourgeois economy: this is nationalisation and planning.

Today, the class struggle determines that in order to advance in production itself, a new form of property relation has to be established: collective, property so that the potentially enormous productive capacity can be realised. Today, France, Germany and Britain alone could produce for the whole of the countries of Europe put together. The problem is a historic one. This immense productive capacity cannot be utilised because of private ownership which means that this production cannot be consumed. The economy, the means of production demand a superior form of property relations. In turn, the workers states — the USSR in particular — are the material base, which convinces the proletariat and masses of the possibility to actually change the property relations in this country. Parliament, as a political result of the capitalist mode of production, becomes a redundant organism. In front of total crisis, the bourgeoisie increasingly decides through repression, through arms construction and state manoeuvres. Parliament becomes either completely reactionary as in Germany and here, or it is ignored. We invite the comrades of the Labour Party to discuss this process, which is part of marxist education. The ultimate of human progress does not lie in parliament, in abstract democracy but in having control over the economy. This is why in Cuba, in the USSR, in Czechoslovakia, there is infinitely more democracy than here. Parliament is not the summit of democracy, it is an organism created by the bourgeois ruling class, and in the workers state fundamentally, there is no longer a "parliament" even if they continue to call it so. The forms of democracy change with the form of the economy. If you can talk in parliament but cannot prevent the functioning of capitalism — on the contrary, you have to ratify its decisions or leave, as is the case now on every fundamental issue in this country — what democracy is it? But if the economy is planned, if production is for progress and the elevation of the standard of life, what use is there for a parliament? What is required then is soviet democracy. The present Europe is not at all a 'common' one. It is the Europe of the large capitalist concerns. It is the larger capitalists who decide in it against the smaller ones like Belgium and Italy. So it is a domination of the large capitalist over the small ones, and the elimination of the small ones. What is common in this?

If the Communists of Italy and France go to government, their participation in the European parliament, will indeed be a point of 'relationship' with the Labour Party. However, this relationship will either be dominated by the interests of capitalism, or the European parliament will be completely

ignored by the various capitalist class. All that the bourgeoisie will do, which they do already, is to increase the manoeuvres of the state apparatus and the trips of Carter. The method of marxism allows foresight. It is necessary to foresee that the Communists and Socialists will not be able to use the European parliament to resolve the crisis in Europe. So, they will have to look for other forms, which are, the proletariat, the mobilisations of workers, and expropriation of property and finance so as to plan Europe. The same will impose itself on the Labour Party, or the left then developing in it. We propose that this be discussed in the Labour Party. The going of the Communists to government in Italy will not elevate 'pluralism' with the bourgeoisie, but the need to confront the bourgeois class. Already the Italian and French proletariat have imposed on their leaderships what they were not prepared for, and much more still is to come.

LINK WITH THE COMMUNISTS ON AN ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME, AND WITH THE USSR

What decides in history is the class struggle. What moves the class struggle is the development of the productive forces, the mode of production. There is no more any possibility of development of the present mode of production of private ownership. Moreover the forces and the organs of the proletariat exist now to change the property relations. The problems of history do not hinge around 'democracy' but around who owns what.

The relation which has to be made with the Socialists and the Communists of Europe has to be on the basis of the construction of the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe, because if not, it is limited to the confines of bourgeois democracy. Thus it does not allow the proletariat to intervene, the interests of the proletariat to prevail, and then, there is the type of situation which we have now, of 'for' or 'against' direct elections to the European parliament! This is a farce created by capitalism and as long as comrades stay on that stage, they limit themselves to the interests of the bourgeoisie and do not advance to Socialism.

We call for a European conference of Socialist, Communist, Labour parties with the various trade union centres in all the European countries, and with the programme for a United Socialist Europe, which can only be united on the basis of nationalisations and planning. This means the construction of workers states. This is why it is erroneous and politically damaging to ignore the Soviet Communist Party and Soviet trade unions in any discussion on Socialist perspectives for Europe.

THE STEEL CRISIS continued from page 3

To remain at the trade union level of understanding and struggle is, in the end, to accept the bourgeois solution of the contraction of industry, of massive unemployment. It means to propose, as the TUC and sectors of the Labour Left, the Communist Party etc., do, that the solution lies in greater investment. Well we have seen already that investment in capitalist industry is in automation and the raising of the productivity of labour in order to compete, and that means unemployment rises. On the contrary the trade unions

have to pose an anti-capitalist programme and this means to act independently of the present Labour government. The struggle in the next period has to be based on a programme of anti-capitalist demands which have as their centre the nationalisation of all major industry, the banks and insurance companies, and the land without compensation and under workers control but which include also the demand for the shortening of the working week to 32 hours (without loss of pay), the occupation of all factories threatened with closure and that

they be run under workers control pending nationalisation, workers control in all industries already nationalised.

The trade unions have to take on a political function as they are already beginning to do in France. Although trade unions and parties have different functions, in this epoch, they draw closer and cannot exist in separate spheres. The Labour Party/Trade Union United Front on the anti-capitalist programme is a necessity.

The problem in the workers movement, is the lack of programme and perspective, and

hence the lack of preparation to confront problems like the steel industry. There is a necessity for a discussion of this problem in the Labour Party, by the Labour Left but not isolated in the apparatus and structure of the Labour Party. It is necessary to involve the trade unions and the working class directly with the understanding that it is the working class that is the force to impose social transformation. It is not enough for the Left Labour MP's to say "we must limit sackings", or "alternative work must be found", no, there has to be discussions in the workers areas, in the factories and steel

mills in order to formulate an anti-capitalist programme to advance towards the organisms of factory and zonal committees through which the working class can intervene, and discuss all the problems of society and propose its solutions. It is the creative ability of the working class expressed in the Soviet Union, in the workers states and this has to be taken as a support and as an example. The crisis of the steel industry and the inability to confront it in the workers organisations raises all the problems of a much more elevated programme and policy in these organisations.

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

275 Friday 10 March 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

Editorial

DISASSOCIATE THE LABOUR PARTY FROM THE NEUTRON BOMB, WITH A CONSISTENT ANTI CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

The recent declaration of Callaghan in support of the neutron bomb shows that the Labour government is committed to the defence of the overall interests of imperialism, and its war preparations against the Soviet Union and the other Workers States. The intervention of the USSR firmly against the Nicosia provocation and the neutron bomb, shows that the USSR intervenes politically in the world arena and against this preparation of imperialism. The discussion is Czechoslovakia about recentralisation of the planned economy with increased role for the Communist Party, and support for the Soviet Constitution, shows that the discussion to unify the world Communist movement elevates, thus increasing the weight and pressure of ideas for the unification of the world Communist and Socialist movement, including in Britain. The speech of Marchais in France, against the Social Democracy and its past, is going to renew the pressure in the Socialist movement, and the Labour Party, to discuss where does one go, with the programme of capitalism? The answer is simple, demonstrated by the actual Labour government. With Labour, i.e., Social Democracy, the capitalist system is sustained with the blood of the workers, and the neutron bomb is supported. The absence of denunciation by the Labour Party, or the trade union leaderships of the speech of Callaghan, means that the government can then decide what it likes. It comes from a lack of political life, of awareness of the stage we are in, and of consistency in understanding. The Labour and trade union left must adopt a firm, consistent anti capitalist programme. In the absence of this, the Labour Party continues to support Callaghan, the neutron bomb, and the imperialist policies of the government at home and abroad.

THE SPEECH OF CALLAGHAN SHOWS THE NATURE OF THE GOVERNMENT

The crisis of the capitalist system makes it so that there is no policy of reform in this stage. Reforms simply do not exist. To believe that capitalism will recuperate, and bring about some other ameliorations in the life of people is illusion. This is proved now by two thirds of the planet being under regimes of workers states or revolutionary states, and the rest in a process of overthrowing what is left of it. As Labour as we know it today, had meant reform, the very structure of the Labour Party has produced Labour governments for reform. As reform is excluded, the Labour government remains what it has always been, a defender of the capitalist system. Today, to defend the capitalist system means support to the EEC against the Workers States, support to NATO, endorsement of the 'neutron bomb', and war preparations against both the Workers States and the proletariat. This is not due to the ability of the Labour government. It is inherent in the defence of capitalism, becoming increasingly repressive and reactionary as its power is being threatened.

The conclusion for the Labour comrades, is that there is nothing to hope from this Labour government — or any other Labour government — except reaction and repression. The demands for this are not in the good or bad will of the reformists, but in the economy, which demands a furious attack on the masses to attempt to survive in world competition, and politically, in the need of yankee imperialism to prepare for war against the Workers States. The so-called 'diminishing' contribution of the present government into NATO is only a reduction in comparison with what they would have liked, but in actual fact it is a very powerful increase. The support of Callaghan to the neutron bomb, as yet un-denounced by any one including the Communist Party in this country — brings this Labour government to the natural conclusion of its function: In line with the assassins of the world, it prepares to kill workers, masses, so as to try to preserve the dying regime. It cannot be an issue which goes un-noticed in the Labour Party and trade unions, and we call for a rejection of this together with a discussion on an alternative programme of 'out from NATO', 'Down with NATO', full support to the liberation movements and revolutions in Africa, withdrawal from Ireland, and the organisation of the left in the Labour Party.

THE NICOSIA EVENTS SHOW THAT TENSIONS ARE ON THE VERGE OF WAR

The 'Entebbe' type of intervention in Cyprus by Egyptian troops is, in one way or other linked to the CIA and Pentagon, who would like to see the increase of such incidents in the world so as to provoke the Yankee army into going into that part of the world, to bring yankee imperialism and Carter that much closer to war against the Soviet Union and the Workers States. This is the policy Sadat is serving, and in this way, he finds a role — which he can no longer play within the arab camp anymore. In this way, yankee imperialism is preparing for war. Such an explosion shows the very great tensions on a world scale, including in countries less central to the overall interests of the

Turn to page

THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM AND THE ORGANISATION OF THE LEADERSHIP FOR SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

J. Posadas.

In the situation of Britain there are better conditions than in the past for a programmatic discussion, not only on the workers movement, on wages, but a discussion of anti-capitalist programme and objectives, intervention of workers control with the anti-capitalist programme, statification of the ports which are a very great business centre of capitalism, statification of the companies which are profitable, whereas they want to statify Leyland and other enterprises that are collapsing. The government pays and they say we are going to statify. It is an operation for the capitalists. There are better conditions for proposals, discussions in all sectors and the party must be preoccupied with these problems, making a preparation of publication and of selling, to intervene as a tendency in a much more planned way. The objective comes from the fact that the crisis of British capitalism has no solution. Scottish oil which before was the solution now has no importance and the crisis of capitalism continues like that of the rest of capitalism in Europe and there is a continuity of the very big crisis.

An expression of this depth of the crisis of capitalism, is the step which Yankee imperialism has taken in the name of world imperialism in the Sadat-Begin negotiations. They are negotiations aimed to seek an ephemeral and superficial conciliation for what? seeking for what? the development of the economy? to contain the waste of resources in the production of military equipment? It is preparing something more significant, the counter revolution in the Middle East.

The development of the workers state which supports openly the liberation movement of the masses and attacks openly "euro-communism" is a very great influence in Britain. The Soviets have diminished quite a lot the attacks and the description of "reformists" or "agents of capitalism" in relation to the Communist parties and the Socialist parties. It means that they are seeking to influence and impel them.

But in Britain they are still discussing as though unaware of all this, even in these left wings who propose the programme of the Soviet Union. They do not live these experiences. They have diffused in Britain, through the bureaucracy of the Labour party, the conception that what must be discussed about the USSR is that there is no liberty, that thought is being strangled and that people are oppressed not economically, but oppressed.

It's a whole structure of thought. And the Stalinism of the Labour

party is as great as the Stalinism of Stalin. It is Stalinism applied in Britain. It is not the same because Stalinism had a conception and meaning from the experience of the workers states, whereas the bureaucracy of the Labour party comes from the capitalist state. But the objectives are the same, that is bureaucratic layers who live by plundering and are against the workers state. Both have an interest in impeding the revolution, on their respective sides.

It is necessary to intervene developing the discussion, demonstrating where Britain is going and that the USSR is characterised by the progress which it is making, in spite of the stage of Stalin and the bureaucracy.

The economic structure of the workers state allows planning and between the layer which directs the planning and the planning itself it is the latter which determines. The leadership subjects, contains, perverts, but cannot put it on one side.

It is necessary to discuss a great deal on the progress of Britain, on what is it based? It is necessary to discuss the conception Monarchy-Democracy versus Socialism. It is necessary to discuss where is Britain going? the title of the book of Trotsky on Britain. In the epoch of Trotsky wrote other books on the situation in Germany and whither France. The titles corresponded to that stage. Today now, one knows where the world is going. To the same

title "where is Britain going" it is necessary to say that it is going to socialism. Now it is not as in the earlier stage, socialism or barbarism.

It's necessary to help the ability to reason scientifically and dialectically and to aim a greater quantity of texts at sectors of cadres and leaders.

The crisis in the Labour party is important. It is necessary to take it as one of the forms of the maturation of revolutionary progress in Europe and to see the splits in the Communist Party as part of this. Wilson became old and has the face of a tremendous hypocrite and a despot. Moreover they are impotent people, quite incapable. They have a conception of life in accordance with the power of Britain.

The writer Wells wanted to convince Lenin that he could not advance in the way he was going. He wanted to stop Lenin doing the same in Britain as in the Soviet Union. He gave him advice when he was writing the history of the world. The first part of the history when he begins with the origin of the earth is generally not bad, that is when he deals with natural sciences. When he begins with the social process, it is bad. This Wells said to Lenin that Britain was a different country and that Russia was backward.

All these like Wilson believe that capitalism is an immutable thing. If one says, look there are twenty workers states, they do not see what its about. Neither Wilson or Callaghan are intelligent, because intelligence looks at the state of the world but these see the workers states and say "these people are mad, backward types".

It is necessary to see their uselessness and the small intelligence which they have and besides they do not believe in the process. They see the workers states and believe that it is all an accident because they have a fatalistic sentiment of British imperialism.

They are administrators. They

In This Issue:— J. POSADAS ON . . .

- ASPECTS OF THE PROGRESS OF PARTIAL REGENERATION IN THE WORKERS STATES
- THE AGREEMENT SADAT-BEGIN AND THE POLICY OF YANKEE IMPERIALISM

BRITISH CAPITALISM

continued from page 1

are the leadership of a party which is linked to the working class but they are the administrators of private property. They do not have any intellectual preoccupation or any general opinion on art, music, theatre or children. What they do is to celebrate the queen, to pay out or receive money and impede the workers taking power, to save capitalism. They are mules of this stage of history. They are part of the group of mules which leads British imperialism. None of them have any cultural value.

This Wilson when they asked if he had read Marx, when they criticised him in the party said "I got as far as the first eighteen pages, but I did not feel capable of reading the rest". It was a reference to the peasant problem on which Marx made a synthesis.

One has to begin by realising that nothing can be expected of them. They do not have the conception that socialism is inevitable, that it is necessary for the conditions of history, of the economy, of the intelligence of people and this is why there are workers states. They believe in the immutability of the queen. It does not occur to them that the whole of India, Asia and the Middle East which were once British are so no longer. It does not occur to them to see that Russia was one of the allies of British imperialism and today there is the Soviet Union. This means that Russia no longer depends on British or German imperialism. All this is not discussed by Labourism, by any of them. The Labour movement is a movement absent from the progress of history, like all the Socialist parties. Sectors go to the left, but they are insecure and unstable. This is logical because they do not have historic proof. The communists even if mistaken have the workers state, which is the origin of all the Communist parties and they feel themselves part of this and part of the workers states.

Leaders are going to arise who are going to propose a special British way to the workers state. And in the epoch of Marx itself there were those who spoke about "the customs of Britain, the economic development of Britain".

Then it is necessary to influence a new layer, a new marxist layer. Now it is not the epoch of Kautsky. Today it is necessary to see the process in relation to the USSR and the world process. It is a stage superior to the stage of Trotsky. It is another combination and another relation of forces with the revolutionary movement.

Our activity is aimed to influence, in this stage of great concern for political and theoretical problems, which are not apart from practical activity. In the practical activity all the necessary level of the theoretical and political activity is expressed in concentrated form. It is a stage which allows one to discuss and to exchange ideas, which impress and influence the leading cadres, because a process is developing independently of what they think.

A global process is developing, of the advance of the revolution of advance, advance and they have no reply to this process. They do not understand and they fear it. They do not have theoretical and political preparation. They think as an apparatus. They are bureaucrats and have bureaucratic relations. They see the advance of the revolution as a fatalistic

consequence and not as the result of the struggle of the working class. They do not see the progress of the struggle for socialism which is eliminating capitalism constantly throughout the world.

They do not see the result of the struggle of the working class and this spirit and the resolution of the working class as a consequence of the intervention of the Soviet Union and of the workers states and that the crisis of the capitalist system has its essential origin in the workers states. All this influences the militant, the cadre and prevents them programming and remaining satisfied with the programme or remaining to await the result of the programme. It impedes them because the process is very deep and demands the development of the anti capitalist struggle. The depth of the process comes from the fact that the working class of the capitalist countries is intervening with the exploited masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the masses of the workers states. This deprives the bureaucrat, the socialist or communist leader of the security of working arbitrarily. It forces them to think and in the progress of the struggle of the masses, the crisis of capitalism, the impossibility of capitalism responding to this necessity, means that the bureaucrats, the workers states, the communist parties have to progress in the anti capitalist struggle.

Without programming of structuring a programme, they have to fight against the capitalist system. This stimulates within the communist parties discussions, exchanges of ideas, experiences and comparisons because the previous line was to expect that capitalism would become exhausted that conditions would allow a wing to be able to advance in the struggle against capitalism. But it is the world process of the class struggle which advances, advances everywhere throughout the world, even in some countries, where there is no great weight of the working class or an important party of the working class. There are relations of forces already structured and determined. This forces them to discuss and to exchange ideas, to see a reality which means that they are nothing and that they have no weight, no importance and that they contribute nothing, either with ideas, or with positions, or with policy or economically or with programme. On the other hand, there is the advance of the workers states, of the Communist Parties and they advance not on the line of reforms or of relations or alliance with the capitalist system, but they advance against the capitalist system.

This creates within the Communist Party and the Labour party, the need to discuss, to compare with the workers states, to discuss the minute development of the communist party and help it to understand to advance, to understand the necessity for the revolutionary programme and policy. These are the conditions of the development of the class struggle which unites the workers states with the masses of the world. It means that capitalism has to confront the crisis, essentially the workers states, because it is the economy of the workers states, the struggle of the workers states, the support which the workers states give to the struggles of the masses of Asia, Africa and Latin America which is essential factor of the

crisis of the capitalist system.

The process acquires forms which were not in the mind of the British communists. They believed that they were in the party of the working class — they said it — and all at once it is shown that they are not the party of the working class, nor a working class party. They are a petit bourgeois party which does not have an important workers base. It has some important worker leaders, but it has no important workers base. On the other hand and at the same time as this condition, this situation, the development of the struggle of the world is teaching and influencing layers of the Labour party to understand that social transformation is necessary, and in this process all the problems of backwardness, of the queen, of socialist Britain, have to be resolved.

The intervention of Posadism is fundamental in this process because better conditions are opening, conditions so that we may be listened to, so that they read us and that they take us as orientators and organisers.

A condition of the class struggle is developing, of the progress of the socialist revolution or towards socialism which makes necessary the continuity, the homogeneity of the programme, of the policy, of the experience and poses as a consequence, the advance of the workers states that these have to progress. Then a process of anti bureaucratic struggle takes place. There is a very great anti bureaucratic struggle in all the workers states. This with the crisis of the capitalist system and with the progress of the struggle of the masses, allows the creation of better conditions to discuss with the Communists and the Labour sectors. One must discuss not on the minimal problems of Britain, of staying confined to Britain but the problems of the world. Now this is expressed and influences Britain.

Britain is the result of the world relations of capitalism. Then it is necessary to see the influence which Britain receives in this situation. To discuss this with the communists means to discuss also where are the Communist parties going? And the Communists have never discussed what is the function of the communists in Britain. They have never discussed this, we, yes. It is necessary to discuss where is the Communist Party going? What is it doing? what is its objective?

Our British section has to feel that it is necessary to have a political and theoretical preparation which is much better, more profound, more consistent and in an uninterrupted form together, with the usual and normal activity. They have to see the situation as a very good condition for the development of the section. It is not a chance act, a moment, but a progress of the struggle for socialism, advancing in a very combined form, and the crisis of capitalism is part of that.

The process of the class struggle is expressed in the workers states which influences and increases partial regeneration. It is expressed in the various workers states which resolve that capitalism is preparing the war. Before they did not pose it, now yes. At the same time that capitalism is preparing the war, the form of impeding this preparation of the war is by supporting the struggles of the masses of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

They do not do this in a coherent and constant form, uninterrupted but it is their line. This allows a discussion in the communist movement and our

intervention so that we can influence, above all taking into account, that conditions exist to intervene and that the Communist Party does not intervene. Our intervention must be determined by this relation which exists. We do not wish to impose with analysis, with good articles, but articles which do respond to the level relate to the pre-occupation of the militant of the Communist or left Labour leader. It is necessary to see what must be written for them and for this the party has to be much better prepared. It is necessary to live much more intensely, to make an activity to publish much more and to write on Britain, showing that Britain is the result of the relation of the class struggle of the world.

Conditions do not allow the bureaucracy of the workers states, of the Communist parties to conciliate as before with capitalism in a co-ordinated or constant form. It has to attenuate, diminish and confront the capitalist system. All these crises with the dissidents arise because before they had an audience. All the dissidents came from the USSR and represented layers of the bureaucracy. Now there are bases of influence in the workers state which stimulate them to advance in the construction of measures, even if of a general order but of measures towards socialism and to support the struggle of the masses against capitalism. It is not co-ordinated totally, but yes it is a struggle in support of the masses. This is expressed in the Communist parties and in the Labour party

THE INFLUENCE IN BRITAIN OF THE UNINTERRUPTED PROCESS OF THE REVOLUTION

We consider that in Britain a struggle for the left is developing and is going to develop. But it is not fixed or firm with a programme. The base of the British proletariat, the cadres of the British Labour movement are concerned, want to know what is happening, and they make analyses in general which are correct. They are stimulated to want to understand what is happening in the world, and above all what is happening in Britain. Why are there no changes? Why not change Britain? The Labourites, the leadership is closed and does not want anything of this and has an influence on the Labour masses. The left influences the Labour masses a great deal but it has no party and does not know how to reason, does not have any antecedents of revolutionary or class reasoning.

It is necessary to write considering that they are comrades who are hostile or indifferent towards the workers states because they come from the education of the top leadership. And the top leadership was based on the stage of Stalin. All the barbarities of Stalin were used by the Labour leadership.

There is a need to discuss, for example what a Labour leader proposes in support of the Soviet Union or of sympathy with the USSR.

Other labour sectors show that they incline to the Communist party and a great mass of the middle class, republicans, liberals, catholics can be won by the communists.

It is necessary to propose that it is good to win them but with a programme and a policy which does not place in question the freedom of the party that allows it quite a big intervention.

In the workers states also, they discuss all the problems of the construction of the workers states including eurocommunism, Communist Europe, the problem of coffee and the crisis of coffee which is the crisis of capitalism. People take less cafe but are more combative than before i.e. they stop taking coffee to prepare to overthrow the capitalists.

It is necessary to discuss with leading cadres on very elevated problems: the construction of the party of the working class, which

also. It allows better conditions of discussion, of proposals, of programme, of policy and objectives.

Then it allows our influence, because they do not see a group but a small number of very capable militant cadres. For this the section has to be politically mature to be able to do this task.

In the newspaper it is necessary to write much more on all the problems, of where is Britain going? What is the programme to deal with the backwardness of Britain? The trade union programme? what is the programme? It is necessary to show that the programme is the struggle for social transformations. Without awaiting social transformations, it is necessary to stimulate some measures and changes.

Within the Communist parties and the Labour party there is a very great influence of the revolution. And this influences the leaders because it forces them to have to discuss objectively and with us. The process drives them to the understanding that what is happening in the USSR was not foreseen by them but by us, yes. What happened before and what happens now in the USSR was also foreseen by us, not by them.

A better theoretical and political preparation of the section, a better understanding and good conclusions and translations are necessary. There are articles where there are quite a few errors of translation and where Posadas says one thing and something else takes its place.

is the Labour party but it has neither programme nor the leadership of the working class. The working class is concentrated there. What is the solution in Britain? Euro communism? or Communism without the Euro? Thus it is necessary to write to orientate. What is the crisis in the world communist movement? Pluralism what does it mean? and also the problem of Internationalism which they limit to a relation of the leaderships and of the bureaucrats.

All the experiences of the USSR are very valid for Britain. Discuss euro communism. Capitalist Europe, or Socialist Europe. Euro communism means a capitalist Europe or a Europe which is going to incline towards eliminating capitalism which is the Europe of the workers states.

The section should discuss the political and theoretical preparation and more regular publications, better publications and improve the themes with articles which answer to the needs of people. It is necessary to discuss more in the party the problems of the USSR, of the struggle for socialism in Britain and the concrete programme for now, to intervene in the problems like the firemen strike, but together with this intervention, a programme and the discussion which they are making in the Labour party which has more importance, so as to influence layers who are leaders and

BRITISH CAPITALISM

continued from page 2

afterwards decide. Discuss on very elevated problems of the construction of the workers states, not only on the problems of Britain but on the problems of the construction of communism, Eurocommunism, on internationalism, on pluralism, on the European Common market and Socialist Europe, on the United front and the unity of the world communist movement, on measures of preparation for a socialist government with a socialist programme which means anti capitalist, not a Labour government as now with a capitalist programme. It impels a great deal all this discussion of the crisis of the capitalist system. It is necessary to discuss the depth, the nature of the capitalist crisis and also of the crisis of the socialists, because the socialists including the Labourites, as a wing of the world socialist movement, do not have a programme for the economic development of Britain. There cannot be an economic development without a social development. Social development means the intervention of the population in the leadership of the problems of the country not about eating more and employing more.

In Britain this process is elevating, there is a very indirect form expressing this influence on the Labour leaders, in those who speak well of the Soviet Union and the solution or the road towards soviet solutions.

There is a development of a left in the Labour party even very nominally or very generally, which poses a programmatic point which is very profound which is that it is necessary to act as in the Soviet Union. It is an index of a very great preoccupation which exists among labour sectors, leaders and middle cadres. It is not an individual but a general problem. It is possible to discuss with them and it is necessary to analyse with the experience that the workers state is right. It is clear that there is no crisis in the workers states but in the capitalist countries, yes there is a crisis. In the workers states there are no unemployed workers or hunger prisoners because they go on strike or because of factory occupations. There are no unemployed. There is no objection to the support of the struggle of the masses against imperialism and in very important aspects against capitalism. There is a total economic development, while in the capitalist states there is crisis.

It is necessary to discuss what is Euro communism? Is there a place for Euro communism? the possibility for a Euro communism that is different from the communism of Marx? There is no place and it is necessary to discuss that. There are better conditions than before, because the crisis of capitalism pushes all the masses to seek the orientation of the Soviet Union.

It is necessary to understand the stage which the communist and labour movement is living and that they are obliged to discuss, to analyse and to accept opinions favourable to the workers states — dialectical judgements and analysis which before they did not accept — allowing, the development of dialectical judgement. It is through the maturation of the world process, of the class struggle which obliges capitalism, to retreat to open up an infinity of confrontations between them, of inter capitalist competition, while the workers state is homogeneous in its progress.

Together with the progress of the workers state, in the economy, in science, in technology, there is social progress. It supports social movements. This process is in the workers state. The workers states advance, progress politically and programmatically because they have no other solution than progress. It is not because of a better quality of leaders of the workers state. The workers state through its economic structure in order to advance has to eliminate capitalism and support those that eliminate capitalism.

This gives an objective, concrete and precise relation of anti capitalist struggle, limited but it is anti capitalist. At the same time, it impels, orientates and influences, the internal discussion of the Communist Parties, of the workers states to discuss on problems that experience makes them live. Each one lives this experience and thus it is not a question of changing, because it is convenient. They live the experience and learn. They see the experience and the need for anti capitalist struggle. It transforms the base of thought and in the Communist parties, constantly has an influence. Then the Communist party cannot think as before. It still thinks as before in a conciliatory way, not seeing the class struggle but seeing a position to advance. It has to allow the discussion and as a consequence allow our influence, because they discuss on the basis of principles. It is very camouflaged, very hidden but they discuss principles. We have to maintain this discussion and unite it to other problems, to that of the political revolution in the workers states without appealing for the political revolution. It is necessary to make analysis and opinions about Britain, making precise propositions over Britain. From the problem of trade union unity/party, to the struggle for the elimination of the monarchy.

On a world wide scale capitalism has the strength to attack the workers states. The bureaucracy has the strength, but is not organised and fears to act, because it would alter its social interests as a bureaucracy, socially, politically, and economically, which are quite large. But this relation of forces is not going to last, it is going to deteriorate more than now, this is expressed in Angola, in the fact that Cuba intervenes more openly. This gives to the discussion or to the programme, to the objectives of the Communist parties, a perspective which before they did not have and that now they are obliged to discuss and to see. They take from everywhere the judgements, the orientations that are convenient and acceptable to them are class orientations, anti imperialist orientations are convenient. The communist militant is not accustomed to this discussion, but they are going to have to discuss, and discuss all problems, including euro-communism. There is no historic place for euro-communism, there is no historic place for plurality. There is no historic place for the elimination of the dictatorship or the proletariat. On the other hand there is an historic place constantly renewed for all the marxist principles. The worker state now cannot conciliate with capitalism. It has to confront it, because capitalism now is not capable of sustaining its own crisis and tolerating the workers states. The workers states do not support capitalism. There is a constant process of deterioration.

This shows that the discussion is advancing. The leaders have to seek if not now, tomorrow, and although not them, others are going to seek political and programmatic orientations, programmatic objectives, analyses and antecedents.

It is a condition which facilitates our intervention, now within leaderships with better publications, better translations, more frequent bulletins. It is necessary to make a plan or editions, with good translations.

They are discussions in which the historic process, economically, socially, politically and militarily does not allow Euro communism to advance. All our discussions are going to orientate, and educate the cadre, the militant who reads us.

The conditions exist so that we can intervene more audaciously and intervene much more energetically. You have to realise that the Communist party and the Labour left is going to find less and less possibilities to be based in their functioning and objectives, on reformist plans. It has no support, it finds movements which go against them. We are based on this process and this is discussed and is going to be discussed.

Now there are no possibilities for the communists to conciliate with capitalism. No workers state can conciliate with capitalism because it is death for them. The bureaucrats are not going to do it because it would be suicide. If they were in the prisons of capitalist Germany, yes, because there they "commit suicide". They commit suicide while asleep and under anaesthetic and shoot themselves 14 times "sleeping". One of the prisoners in capitalist Germany has 4 bullets in the head and the doctor said it was absurd because the first bullet would have killed him.

It is necessary to consider that they are discussing a great deal about this, in the Communist and the Labour party, and in the trade unions also. They discuss and the conditions develop for us to intervene and to analyse our revolutionary point of view, the consequences of the anti capitalist analysis to be able to influence the Labour and the communist movement.

It is very important to discuss with the communists, to discuss why they have no perspective now as a Communist Party. Tomorrow the Labour movement will be transformed into a Communist Party, through the objectives and the programme in which they struggle. Discuss with them fraternally which is not a criticism that they do nothing on the contrary they have to help this formation which afterwards will be communist.

Our section must prepare to intervene in this discussion, giving analysis, organisational ideas, ideas, ideas because the communists have to discuss now, objectively and they do not have tradition or programme or education. They cannot discuss objectively because the fact that they say "we are the party of the working class" and the working class is in the Labour party, shows that they have no idea. They have no dialectical method. They have an individual method to analyse, although not all are like this. In the recent split the wing which remains with Moscow remains with marxist analysis, limited and bureaucratic, but basically it is marxist. The other sectors went with the bourgeoisie. The wing which remains with Moscow maintains the class struggle, maintains the irreconcilable antagonism between the USSR and capitalism and that

to construct socialism, it is necessary to eliminate capitalism and the capitalist apparatus.

We take support in the objective process and also in our own capacity. But, essentially, we take it from the objective process and perspectives; not just what we can see now, but what is developing, which is an uninterrupted, and at the same time, uncontrollable process of advance. No one can contain it, or interrupt it because already there are world relations of economic, social, and political — also military forces — which are favourable, from every point of view, to the Workers States. The Workers States are those which develop, influence, and organise ideas; everywhere they give confidence to humanity on how to progress, and they do so in spite of the Soviet bureaucracy. It is Soviet bureaucracy, not Stalinism, because, if it is true that it does not work according to the total interest of the Workers State, the Soviet bureaucracy no longer works completely against it either. Not all that it does injures the Workers States. It limits the Workers State, it sets it apart, it contains it, but it does not injure it in any important way. This is because there is the development, each time more, of a centralisation between the Workers State and the bureaucracy itself. It is the bureaucracy which has to do the centralising of the Workers State, and not the other way around with the Workers State at the service of the bureaucracy.

Among other things, it creates the discussion about euro-communism, about Internationalism, about pluralism, on the dictatorship of the proletariat. All these discussions go towards a progress which is favourable to marxism, not favourable to its rejection, or to the liquidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are not favourable either to pluralism or to eurocommunism.

It is necessary to start from the fact that all the parties and groups — be they the Communist parties or the Labour left — who are hoping to make, or are impelled to make a policy of opposition to the left, are not in the same situation as before. Before it was possible to make a left which was superficial and then it would go away again. In this stage, any left which forms itself — in a short time — acquires theoretical, political and organisational, anticapitalist forms, character and structure.

It is because the process progresses and it gives to the masses of the world the experience that it is so. One of the most remarkable things is that in the most backward countries in the world, there are peasants who say: "Now, what are we going to do next?" Before, they used to say: "The land is mine, and it is for me and my wife". Today these peasants say: "It is necessary to take state control, and construct Socialism". Any peasant from the Philippines, France, Britain, from any part of the world, will say to you: "It is necessary to make Socialism".

In the masses there is already experience, capacity and intellectual conviction. It is not theoretical conviction because they have not had the opportunity to make a theoretical preparation, but it corresponds to the theoretical preparation. They have security because they can see this, they can see it in the world. There is a theoretical understanding which is acquired by the persuasion which the process induces. What has been so costly for us, for our masters to accomplish, the peasant masses can now see before their eyes

every day. What our masters foresaw already exists; they led the political leadership to undertake this task.

In Britain, these problems will have to be discussed and there is no room for a large retreat there. The capacity for the game, and the room for the manoeuvres, of the Labourites is, each time, made smaller. Each time it is smaller. Before these things used to be larger, but now they are made smaller, for very simple reasons, reasons which are very evident and conclusive: the economy, capitalism can give no more. Part of this is that the British Empire no longer exists, it has been terminated. Consequently, the room for manoeuvres on the part of the Labour bureaucracy and the trade union bureaucracy, loses its points of support, the bureaucracy goes along narrowing down each time further, and they have now to reject people from their own ranks. At the same time as all this, there advances before the eyes of the population, the demonstration that the Socialist programme is the solution for all the problems, and they see all this. Now they can see backward peoples like in Angola, in Mozambique, who — even if they existed on the map before — did not exist in the knowledge of people. Angola was known through British imperialism, because of the coffee from Angola, the petrol from Angola. This has collapsed. Angola was also known, by the way, for the blacks of Angola. Today, on the contrary, Angola is known because it has routed imperialism, routed capitalism; this is the way everybody has learned about Angola today. The peasant of today has acquired the structure in knowledge, based in the Socialist form of property and in the Socialist relations. In this way the solution to the problems of the peasants has been found. It is certainly not private property which inspires them today!

All these movements have no order, or leadership, or texts from which to draw, in order to learn, and develop. So they have had to change positions, to vary, to make substitutions to their previous positions which were those of believing that capitalism was going to go forward, that the Soviet bureaucracy was going to make a policy of alliance with capitalism etc. Today it is no longer so. On the contrary, it is just the reverse. It is capitalism which gives no more. Therefore it is no longer as in the previous stages, a matter of trying to convince them to wait for these movements to understand. No, the section must now support itself on a process which is going to go on influencing more. For this it is necessary to write much and to publish much, because this supports them in the understanding that neither capitalism, nor the bureaucracy, have the force and the ability to understand, or to defend themselves from this process so as to contain it. Even the bureaucracy, in order to carry on existing, has to eliminate the capitalist system. The bureaucracy certainly does not have any notion of this, but it has to do it just the same. In the previous stages, in order to live, the bureaucracy had to impede the proletariat from taking power. Now, also in order to live itself, it has to act so that the proletariat takes power. It does this at the same time as it wants to regulate and to control it, but it goes to take power. Before, they used to speak about democracy, MPs, etc. Now, they take power, they overthrow the capitalists.

There is already a level reached in which you have to enter; to

BRITISH CAPITALISM

continued from page 3

enter developing the activity, considering that the influence which we have supports itself on the objective process. It does not mean to dedicate time to the same people when they do not progress, when they are showing paralysis, when they are obdurate. But it means to seek how to make contacts and to influence cadres.

It is necessary to prepare oneself to intervene in a much more elevated process, to base oneself in this process of progress for the activity which is each time greater, even if in Britain the progress is less because there is an immense Labour apparatus. But just the same, progress is going to reach Britain. There is no country at all which the influence of the world process does not reach. In North America, the most quiet country of all for capitalism because it has great wealth, strikes of the police are beginning. They are important strikes, which have a fairly big strength.

The process of Partial Regeneration already is having an effect, a very concentrated effect, and each time more elevated, in the Communist parties, in the Socialist parties, in the left movements — the 'leftists'; because the Partial Regeneration increases the anti capitalist attitudes and activity. In the Workers States themselves, there are better conditions, the theoretical and political level elevates. In the Workers States the social relations elevate and also the confidence in the masses increases. It is the forces of the apparatus which diminishes and very much so. On the contrary it is the necessity to discuss, to analyse and reason which elevates. The bureaucracy can no longer rule with impunity. Now it has to reason and so it has to diminish itself in number, in weight and in the function of bureaucracy as such. All this diminishes constantly because the progress of the Workers State demands a constant co-ordination of the dialectical method in the economy, in society, in science, and also in war and in the world policy. This goes towards impelling the necessity for an instrument and it creates a crisis in the bureaucracy. And it raises the bureaucracy to the level of having to get hold of the anti-capitalist struggle and to become part of it.

The bureaucracy does all this, without abandoning its intentions, or its role, or its programme of alliances, co-ordinations and games in the relations which it has with capitalism. It continues to seek to live together with capitalism but history rejects all this. This is why, each time more, you see come out of the Workers States conclusions such as that capitalism is now finished and that Socialism is not. A conclusion they have come out with also has been that the atomic war will be the end of capitalism and not of Socialism.

These actual leaders in Britain are not the representatives of this process. They are the same old ones, who up to yesterday, still used to be at the tail-end of capitalism. It is necessary however to start from the fact that there is a process of elevation, of discussion, and of programme and of objectives. This process is as yet not expressed in the daily life of the Labour Party or of the Communist Party. But it does exist and is developing. The changes which there are in the British Communist Party, like the changes of this leader who said that 'the Communists and the Posadists have a big

contribution to make to the progress of Britain', represents a partial truth. It is partial because, they themselves do not make any contribution to the progress of Britain. But also they accept our orientation in that their function has to be to form the left in the Labour Party and act in such a way so that the Labour Party makes a Socialist policy.

It is necessary to combine the activity with the Communists regarding their own role and their function. Their role and function is not in negating the Communist Party. Their role and function in this stage means that they do not have the conditions, and therefore they do not have the perspective, for the Communist Party to develop itself into a mass party. On the other hand, the Communist masses are already in the Labour Party. So it is the Labour Party itself which has to be won to Communism. This is the function which the Communists must have. This does not have to eliminate them, to suspend or diminish the function of the Communist Party. Rather it means to make it more ample so as to be able to be the leadership of the mass movement tomorrow. It will be the masses who will be won to the ideas, the masses are not won to necessity in itself, but to ideas. The British masses are going to be won therefore to the ideas that Socialism is necessary, and that what they have at present is not Socialism at all, but capitalism. And that just a red flag or Socialism with the queen, is not enough.

Our section must discuss a plan of this intervention and the objectives of the intervention. It must help a tendency which has to see the need to make of the Labour Party a party with an anti-capitalist programme to develop. To raise the function of the working class to the level of being that of the leadership of the Party, is necessary, and to do this, the Party has to have an anti-capitalist programme; otherwise the working class in the leadership but with a capitalist programme turns the leaders into bureaucrats. Thus there has to be both, the class in the leadership and the anti-capitalist programme.

In relation to the Communist Party, the function which this Party must have is to support the formation of the Labour left. It must support the Labour left to constitute itself even with all the limitations which there are at the moment. But this is the task which has to be done.

The process of Britain is ascending. The advantages which the trade union and political bureaucracies, and capitalism itself, used to draw from being able to rest on the conciliatory policy of the Communist and Socialist parties, are ceasing. They have not ceased but they are ceasing. This, in consequence, sharpens the class struggle on a world scale. Even though there is not such a high level of class struggle in Britain at present, nevertheless, there is a high level in the rest of the world, and this is going to influence in Britain. At the same time as the capacity of the bourgeoisie goes diminishes at the same time as its economic, financial and social capacity diminishes, at the same time the bureaucracy diminishes. And it poses each time in a more immediate manner the need for the transformation of the political regime; from the queen to a Socialist Democratic Republic!

There is an objective maturing which means that the economy the social and political struggles progress so that the economy disintegrates in part the capitalist regime and constantly the social and political struggles disintegrate the capitalist apparatus. This impels the Communist parties, and the masses and leadership of the Workers States, into an anti-capitalist struggle. It is done in a limited way, with a limited programme on their part, but it is anti-capitalist. There is no possibility whatever, there are no conditions whatever, for the

exclusion of Britain from this revolutionary process, as if Britain could have such particular conditions, that it could resist and oppose the process of the revolution. This is simply excluded. But, on the other hand, what there is in Britain — and it takes place in a particular form — the organisation of the left. It is taking place in a particular form because there is a powerful Labour apparatus, and an insignificant Communist Party with erroneous positions. It is not a party which is just anti-Soviet, but it is a party with the

posture of adaptation to bourgeois laws and norms. Whilst the first and foremost conditions for any Communist Party is to adapt itself to no law. To defend the democratic rights yes, but to defend democratic rights so as to use democratic rights to transform society. Not to submit to the limits which the bourgeois regime sets on democratic rights.

In Britain, because of the apparatus which exists, because of the Labour leadership which there is, progress is slower, it costs more, it is more complicated. But, all the same, it can be done.

THE AGREEMENT SADAT-BEGIN AND THE POLICY OF YANKEE IMPERIALISM

J. POSADAS

The depth of the crisis of capitalism expresses itself in the step which yankee imperialism has taken — in the name of world imperialism — by promoting these negotiations between Sadat and Begin. These are steps taken so as to seek a conciliation, even if ephemeral and superficial. What is the aim? Looking for what? Are they looking for the development of the economy? Do they try to stop the waste of forces now invested in military activity? Or is it rather that something more significant is being prepared? The objective of all this is the preparation of the counter-revolution in the Middle East, and the war.

This is not to say that the war will be just now, even though it could be. It means that imperialism set-up such plans whilst preparing to face the Soviet Union. The large imperialist countries are all agreed to have a counter-revolutionary centre such as Israel, but they have different interests among themselves. The British (imperialists) used to be the bosses in the Middle East, but now, they have nothing left. The British and the Germans were thrown out and what continues now is the struggle between them. But it is not the dispute or competition between them which guides their steps, their movements and orientations, even if this still goes on. What guides their steps is the agreement which they have among themselves against the Arab masses.

This agreement between Sadat and Begin is aimed at limiting also the interests of the big Arab negotiators, like Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. These countries have also interests in containing the revolution, but some layer of their own population see the possibility of developing the economy, and have some interests which tend to make them lean towards the workers states, towards the development of their own countries, and so, towards conceding some liberties in order to whip up the points of social support necessary against the large oligarchic sectors, and the very big landowners.

The Sadat-Begin initiative are also the expression of a struggle between Carter and the circles of high yankee finances. Carter seeks to make agreements so as to contain the Soviets by obtaining more concessions from the Israelis. But, on the other hand, high finance circles want to have nothing to do with it. In this lies the strength of Israel. If the yankees were to stop giving the Israelis weapons and planes, Israel would soon collapse and be liquidated. The struggle and the internal contradictions which there are, all come, essentially, from the fact that Carter cannot just cease giving them weapons. He cannot cease the arms airlift to Israel, or weaken Israel. What Carter wants is for them to yield just a minimum, so as to increase the function of Israel through Egypt. The interests of Israel, of its leaders and of the Pentagon and the CIA, are all identified in their concern for the need to block the road to the liberation movement of the Arabs. At the same time, they have different interests, among themselves. So, the Soviet Union adopts this discreet position it has of trying to draw advantage from these internal struggles and disputes among them.

The actual struggle in the United States between various tendencies otherwise called "hawks" and "doves", "hard line" and "soft line", expresses the different interests at work. That is to say, high finance and imperialism which want to continue to use Israel as they have done to this day, essentially, as a counter-revolutionary and assassin instrument.

This clashes with Carter's policy which wants to gain time, to establish a support and make a certain form of "detente" to contain the Soviets; whilst preparing the war and trying to re-animate the capitalist economy at the same time. All these are wrong calculations. But the divergencies which there are over Israel are not a parody, they are very real.

Whilst the world process is led by the Soviet Union and the yankees, one sees small countries come onto the scene with a force and capacity, an influence which is decisive. It is however not an influence which they possess in reality. These small countries form part of a very delicate, explosive process, in which it is the yanks, in the main, who are frightened of the war right now. It is a situation which advances to the limit of the patience of capitalism. The cause for this is not their economic crisis. Capitalism can still hold this. But what it sees is a situation which goes increasingly out of its hands. It can no longer contain the process in the Middle East, it cannot even impede Polisario which is a very small movement and has no great weight in history. Israel and Egypt have also no historic weight either, but when small countries and small movements can determine such openings, this shows a mature situation.

The yanks launch themselves overtly in support of the Sadat initiatives, even though they can intervene very little in Egypt itself. It shows that the bases of yankee support in the Middle East remain as always Israel and not Egypt, they do not trust Egypt. But even in Israel there is an internal crisis and opposition which is fairly important; this opposition does not just come from the Communists there, but also from the Socialist left. The protests are on the increase, the strikes spread and the salaries constantly lose value. Just consider that Israel is an imported country; it is not a developed one. Israel was just set up to contain the revolution. In the beginning it did not have the perspective to do what it does today, but today it is quite obvious. In 1948, it was the yankees who supported the setting up of Israel, they were already in search for a point of support in the Middle East.

There is a very elevated situation of the crisis of capitalism. One of its aspects has to be measured just by what is taking place in the small countries. Imperialism makes agreements counting that if it goes wrong, it will not have a very serious consequences. Whilst if it went wrong between the large countries, this could be the war. The Soviet Union see more and more that it is a matter of a class against class problem. It does not see it in all aspects, but historically yes it does and it sees it as class against class.

Yankee imperialism as such is not looking for markets to invest. It seeks to eliminate its historic enemy and the other imperialists like the French, the Germans, must simply follow behind.

The attitude of the Soviets in the case of Sadat, as in the case of Ethiopia, is important. It shows that partial regeneration progresses. There is still not a programme for it, there is still not a precise political orientation. But the whole of the previous attitude of the Soviets of submitting to imperialism is simply finished. So, inevitably, now they have to support the revolutionary struggle. They do not always do it in all circumstances, but they can no longer, as before, just abandon important revolutions. They may still negotiate a surrender here or there in a small country, or concerning a small movement, but they can no longer do this when important and decisive matters are at stake.

J. POSADAS 16.12.77

THE UNIVERSITY MOVEMENT AND THE TASKS OF THE SECTION

The university movement in Britain means a whole aristocratic selection, and the trade union organisation is practically none existent: The bourgeoisie arranges free courses to be given to the workers, after work. They go to the universities and for nothing. This has the objective of attracting the workers, and to draw a base of the proletariat, to domesticate them within the discipline of capitalist interest.

British imperialism can do this successfully still, because it has its bases in a previous structure. And moreover, it can still do this today because neither the trade unions nor the Labour Party do anything against this. On the contrary they support it. It is not so much the strength of capitalism as the workers movement which facilitates this. Capitalism has no force to attract, or to corrupt them. It is the workers movement itself which does this work.

Capitalism can offer them jobs, because it bases itself on what is a structural layer in the workers aristocracy. At the same time as it bases itself on this, capitalism also bases itself in a more restricted layer of the workers aristocracy which counts on another layer, a layer of very well paid workers who do this task.

None of this is done because capitalism has the ability to attract the workers. It is because they are all selected from the workers aristocracy, or the sons of the workers aristocracy, and very well paid workers. This is to try to create, or to maintain, or to extend, or even replace the aristocrats of the workers movement who are going, or who lose strength for various reasons. But capitalism itself does not have the force to do such things, just the reverse in fact. When it has to do this, it is because it feels that its power is diminishing. All this costs capitalism a great deal. So, when it makes such an investment it is because it feels that the normal organs, those of the common workers aristocracy, do not have the ability to continue to play such a role themselves.

The conditions in the university movement in Britain are very complicated. First, they have something like four supposed nationalities, which clash, which have attitudes of resistance to each other and attitudes of confrontation, of suspicion, of language divisions — not racial divisions — which capitalism can use, or it foments others, in order to maintain a means of domination.

Where you can see these things best is in the university movement. It shows too in the workers movement, but less. The proletariat has a better understanding and it unifies itself in the class struggle.

It is a problem which exists and it has a bearing on the development of the struggle for the progress of Socialism in Britain. It is necessary to intervene, analysing that this small weight of the universities is due to the policy of the bureaucracy of the trade unions, of the workers parties, of the Labour Party and the trade unions.

The petit bourgeoisie after the war, since 1945, and for a whole period, made a very good activity. They occupied houses, and this means we are not facing an inevitable or an insurmountable consequence. These are simply the consequences which stem from previous relations. It is necessary to intervene to stimulate the university movement so that it intervenes in the workers movement. There is a large weight of foreign students, above all those from Asia (much less from the Middle East — these have small weight and, moreover, they are constantly threatened with expulsion). British imperialism utilises all these forces for itself. The foreign students of India, those of Bangladesh, of Pakistan, do not see from the Labour Party and the trade unions a policy directed towards them. They see nothing and feel left alone. This diminishes the possibility of influencing them. But, on the other hand, on a world scale,

imperialism makes selections.

The process in Britain is going to go to the left and the leaders which there are in the Labour Party are going to have also to go to the left. There is no room for the persistence of a conciliatory tendency which could have the perspectives because it would receive no food to maintain itself. And at the same time, history removes every possibility from it. On the other hand, history feeds the left. The Labour government, and the Labour bureaucracy have, each time less, the possibility to maintain themselves. There is such a crisis and they make this meeting and another. They manage to maintain the numerical or electoral superiority in the Congresses of Labour because of all the frauds which they make. Their superiority is a fiction. The votes by which the Labour leaders are chosen — and those in which the trade unions leaders are chosen — are fictions. They in no way represent the will of the working class. They simply act like the bourgeoisie, through the parliamentary structure and in this way, they receive 'millions' of votes. Thus one of them can 'represent' a million votes.

Even though the Labour Party and the trade unions are behind the impulse which comes from Europe, soon there is going to be a left developing in Britain. This is because British imperialism no longer has the necessary conditions. It is necessary to develop the activity in order to influence in the inevitable left which has to be formed in the Labour Party.

For the development of the activity, we base ourselves in a process which is going to extend, develop and concentrate itself. Therefore, it is going to demand an industriousness, and a consistent, regular policy, that is to say, an anti-capitalist one.

This will influence all the tendencies, from all the groups, to the Parties, and it is going to create a centre of differentiations and internal struggles in the Parties. Our British section must base itself on this perspective so as to be seen resolved to intervene, publishing a great deal, because these parties have neither theoretical capacity, not decision or audacity. The masses are audacious, but not them.

In the constitution of a new society, audacity is an irreplaceable element. Audacity does not mean having courage, resolution and human value. Audacity means to know how to understand the union there is between forces which are dispersed — dispersed because of the existence of other forces which have no contact amongst themselves — but which form part of a single centre, and that all what is needed is a centre which attracts them and organises them. This is the essential basis of what audacity is. It is a small number which demands from itself the resolution which there is in an immense number. Already, the immense number exists (the mass Party) but what there is not inside this number is capacity, resolution, understanding and security. And this is precisely what we have.

In Britain, there is a stage of changes from the old conciliatory leadership, the old pacifist adaptators to all and any fluctuation of the bourgeoisie. Leaderships have less and less conditions in which to play this function; and this stage will demand conditions of conscious tendencies, organisers of the programme of social transformations.

One fact, which is very notable in Britain is that in the students there are no movements like the

big ones the students made after the war. This is gone.

A new world movement, a new May for example in France, (or in other countries), is going to have a very great influence in Britain and create a new leadership or the new base for a leadership, or the new base for the leftist trend which later will develop itself into leadership.

The process in Britain is a process already in movement, already developing. There are no global conditions, whatsoever, which make this process retreat now. It is a process also of the maturing of the Labour left, and of the formation of a new left there. The way you measure the new left is with its programme, not with the cries of: "Viva the Soviet Union", or simply by declarations that Socialism is necessary in Great Britain from people who go back to sleep because the queen is already in bed at 10 p.m.

The new left, or the left which will start from the existing one, or can be a part of it, will be measured by its programme. This has to be the programme for the sliding scale of salaries, the sliding scale of working hours to face unemployment, and also a programme to face up to the subsidies which the government just pours out. Inflation is not the result of wage levels but of these subsidies and, on top of this, it is the workers who pay them. And, on top of this, the subsidy had to be discounted all the more when one considers that it creates more inflation. Just the fact that millions and millions are handed over like this, is inflationary.

In Britain, the same as anywhere else, the previous gains are being retaken and such things as health services and dental treatment are removed. Each time more, the subsidies to the health service are eliminated. Whilst, on the other hand, millions and millions are just poured over private industries, the same as they do in Italy where Andreotti proposes a tortuous path to end up discounting the first three days of illness from compensation. This is to eliminate 70% of the sick workers. But trillions and trillions of units of money are handed out to the firms which pretend that they are making losses, and who simply export the money. All that happens then is that they have the money they need to keep open and recreate capitalism. In front of this it is necessary to pose the sliding scale of wages, and of working hours, workers control of the banks, a plan of investments from the State for the development of the economy. The State must invest where it is necessary under workers control. This is a measure which can be started within capitalism. This is to say that it can be posed, but that for it to be really done capitalism must no longer govern. Because if capitalism goes on governing it will impose its own interests. In Britain, soon, such conditions are going to arise. The conditions in Britain — like those in North America — are more favourable to capitalism, because of the more solid structure of the Labour apparatus. It is not a solid apparatus because it is made of people who are firm. It is solid because all the policy of Stalin allowed for all this bureaucratic apparatus to structure itself.

And to these measures of sliding scale it is necessary to add a series of democratic and socialist measures and the struggle against the monarchy, for a Democratic Socialist Republic. It is necessary to prepare oneself for a stage in which there will be discussions of a process in which Communists

and Labour will have to progress politically, programmatically and objectively. Now the historic base which British imperialism found in the refuge of being able to ensnare and isolate the proletariat can no longer just be concealed. This has broken down and it is just a matter of time for this process to be completed. Even though in Britain this is not yet completed it is being done in other parts of the world, it is going to come later in Britain, but be very rapid. It is not going to happen just in the next stage because there is still a whole, very solid structure made up of bureaucracy which is something like 200 years old. But, on the other hand, there are the conditions for the rupture of the domination of this bureaucratic structure. Such conditions reside in the fact that capitalism has the means to prevent the bureaucracy from making demands.

All these plans of the capitalists like giving unemployment pay is a constant source of enormous inflation. Whether they manufacture money, or lend to the firms in this way, amounts to the same thing because it does not create commodities. Commodity production is what gives a meaning to prices. But money which circulates, and has no equivalent in production, creates inflation. At the same time, it creates maladjustments and disequilibrium within the functioning of the capitalist system and it sharpens the crisis. In front of the crisis and inflation there is an uninterrupted progress of the revolution in all the world, and particularly that of the Workers States. All the process impels the Labour left and the Communists to go further to the left. This means it impels them towards a consistent reasoning, reasoning according to the need for anti-capitalist struggle. This need for consistency is going to develop in the whole world.

It is necessary to consider that the process is going to elevate still more, and this will further deepen the social and economic crisis, and the progress of the Workers States. The dynamic class relations are going to become sharper and the conditions will elevate for the lefts to be formed. This is seen, from the construction of the Workers States now, from the present phase of the workers states, from the consequences which these have on the rest of the capitalist world, how all this is moved by the advance of the Workers States and that therefore, euro-communism, the Common Market and the Socialist European Common Market, the Socialist United States of Europe have to be discussed together with a whole series of discussions directed towards the Communist and Socialist parties. To do this, we base ourselves in that we are in conditions to influence — and to influence quite notably — in the Communist and Socialist leaderships. This does not just mean to influence occasionally, but to influence in a very profound form. Consider that in the discussions with the Communists, Socialists, have many examples from all sides show that we are not rejected by them.

We want to give confidence to these comrades (Labour, Communists) that we are not launching an appeal or making a resolution for ourselves to make an incorporation with any of them. But it is for them to intervene in a process so as to make the process itself mature. It is, however, also a process which is going to last some little time, but there is no room for any historic retreat and this recent

BRITISH CAPITALISM

continued from page 5

agreement of Ethiopia with Sudan means that Sudan is adapting itself to a process of progress in order to contain its own internal crisis, which is impelled in Sudan because of the advance of Ethiopia.

In the Sudan, this man called Neimery killed a lot of Communists and many revolutionaries too, and in his own army there was a coup d'etat against him. The treaty he makes with Ethiopia is not because he now understands the truth, but because he wants to avoid ending up on the gallows.

It has to be understood that it is not a process which we have created and which is going to culminate with us. But it is a process which is unfolding, developing and that there are no conditions whatever for the retrocession of such a process. It is a process of the maturing of the Labour left, and in the formation of a new left. The measure of the new left is to be found in the programme which it will have, and not in the cries of 'Viva the USSR' or in the declarations that Socialism is necessary in Great Britain, and then just sleep. The new left is going to be seen by its programme.

The section must make an activity of intervention in all the groups and the Labour Party and also if they participate in a Trade Union Congress, to pose what activity to make. It is necessary to raise a programme of better progress, like workers control, the elimination of the monarchy, democratic and socialist measures and the struggle for the Democratic Socialist Republic. And pose problems of principles and seek to co-ordinate the activity with the various leaders of the trade unions who can be influenced. This intervention which you make in the Labour Party is very important because it allows a possibility of development of an authority. If they allow our comrades to act like this with them, it is because they hope to win them over and put them in leading positions in order to contain them. This also takes place because there is a left which wants to go farther. It is necessary to make a preparation for a stage of discussions, in a process in which the Communists, the Socialists and the Labourites have to progress politically, programmatically and objectively. They cannot just seek a hide-out because the historic base of refuge for British imperialism — capturing the proletariat and maintaining it isolated — now has collapsed.

We congratulate the comrades of the section for the activity which they make and the support they give to the International. This is very resolute on their part, and it shows that we are going to function more dynamically still, concentrating ourselves in exercising influence, in leaderships and ourselves forming part of these leaderships. There is not much influence in the Communist Party because it is a very backward Party. It does not occur to them to discuss against the monarchy in Britain. We think that it is going to be the beginning of a much more elevated stage of the action of the British section, of its relations with the leadership of the International. But a vital centre for the section must be to grow and to improve the publications, and the translations. If it means this, one has to suppress a mountain of activities and just make a

two world systems. When Egypt finds such a level of antagonism with a country like Cyprus which is not the most characteristic or the most advanced of countries towards Socialism, how much more antagonism must there be between the Soviet Union and the United States? The Nicosia episode shows the very great explosiveness of the world tensions, and the nearness of world war. At the same time, it shows to the Labour Party and trade union left in this country, the very great urgency to deal with the positions of the government over the neutron bomb. It is not as if we were discussing distant problems, to be resolved in a generation of time. We are in a situation of war preparations, and the Labour and trade union vanguard cannot simply ignore what the government is doing about it, as if it was of no relevancy. At the same time, it is necessary to discuss that this war which is being prepared, like the repressions in Britain which are being prepared, are the only solution capitalism can give to its dying social, economic, and political authority. It is the Soviet Union and the Workers States who, with the mass Communist International, are going to triumph from the war which imperialism is preparing.

THE DISCUSSION ABOUT 'CLASS STRUGGLE' IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Czechoslovak Communist Party is proposing increasing the participation of the workers in the running of the economy, increase in planning, centralisation of production and increase in the leading role of the Party. This confirms the analysis of comrade Posadas on the Soviet Constitution, that the Workers State, to defend itself against world capitalism has to increase its struggle against it, and therefore the struggle internally against the sector of the bureaucracy most linked to world capitalist interests, or the interests of private property. This forces the bureaucracy to conduct a clearance — however bureaucratically — which goes against even their own interests in the end, because it removes political support even from the sectors of the bureaucracy who accomplish the clearance. This permits the elevation of the discussion of ideas and perspectives on how to construct Socialism, how to think objectively and dialectically.

The same Communist Party has intervened on the need to be based on the class struggle. This is very important because it shows that an appraisal along dialectical lines is being made: the Workers State is not perfect, it is an inter-relationship of contrary forces, with a form of 'class struggle'. But it is those which defend private property — like the dissidents — who have to leave and it is those who support Angola, Ethiopia, soon Zimbabwe and South Africa, who stay and fight against what is left of the bureaucracy. This means that norms of understanding are developing not just in Czechoslovakia, but centrally in the Soviet Union, on the nature of the Chinese Workers State, and how to deal with it. It is necessary to see that there is a diminished form of class struggle in the Workers States, which means — with the extension of the Workers State to the whole world — the elimination of all the contrary forces to Socialism internally, in the Workers State itself. This is a very simple and very profound conclusion, the application of it is going to be the elevation of the unity of the world Communist movement, and the elevation of the discussion of the Communists towards the Socialist parties.

THE DECLARATION OF MARCHAIS AGAINST SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Comrade Marchais in France, has intervened against the 'social democrats' of France, who always played the role of supporting the system. He has warned against the Soares type of solution in France, and said that what these 'democrats' of the socialist movement are, is simply people with the interest of sustaining capitalism. This has already created much discussion in the Socialist Party of France. The coming of the elections is less decisive there than the preparation, of the French Communist Party not to submit all their principles to it. This has

synthesis giving much more attention to the translations. And for the extracts which they publish (from us), it is necessary to make a study so as to publish the best. If not they appear very limited. One of the bases for the growth of the section resides in the improvement of the translations. And in this precise stage, it is necessary to intervene with texts, on all the problems.

I believe that this disappearance of Brezhnev is the result of some

disease which he has, I think he must have had a heart attack according to the medical conduct which he has. The papers tell us that he has a heart disease. But this, in depth, expresses a very great struggle going on in the top layers there, and which are also reflected in the Soviet Constitution. In the Soviet Constitution, these struggles appear less visible, less obvious and less directly. The fact, however, that Brezhnev is now the President, and also the

Editorial

continued from page 1

to be — and will be, discussed in the Labour Party. The great democrat Soares, has simply allowed the bourgeoisie to retake some strength quite unnecessarily. The conclusion of the dialectical process of history must be drawn by both Labour and the Communist Party. It is erroneous to hope as the Communists do, that another "Labour government of the left" will be any different from the present one. The prospect is just the opposite. If capitalism is not overthrown or on the way to be overthrown, it will simply use Labour for the requirements of world competition and war. This is the nature of capitalism. When the Communist comrades come out with the British Road to Socialism, containing bows to the Constitution — such as it is, in any event it is a bourgeois one — and to the present state apparatus, it cannot have a historical function. The series of Labour governments projected there, each time more to the left, is incorrect. If there is such a process, then it will be within the development of Socialist governments, and against the actual state apparatus which has been structured through and through by private property. The Communist Party has to make an analysis of the neutron bomb, using marxism. Posadas said: "A social counter-revolutionary weapon". The conclusion of this is that it is just for murder of the proletariat and masses in each capitalist country, and in so far as it goes a weapon for the assassins. Why not say this? In this way, one educates the Labour base in seeing the dialectical process of history. All the talk on 'racialism' and 'fascism' is pure diversion from this fact and confuses because we are not in 1930 any more. In 1930 there was only the USSR, today, the whole world is going to socialism. It is necessary to discuss in the Labour and Communist Parties the declaration of Marchais, and not just to talk about 'class collaboration'. A principle stems from this declaration: Social Democracy and reform, means assistance to the murderers. So it has been against the revolutionaries Rosa Luxemburg and Liebnicht, and nothing has changed in this respect since then.

CONSISTENCY IN ANALYSIS AND POLITICAL LIFE IN THE LABOUR PARTY

Only a consistent study and preoccupation for this world process can help the Labour and the trade union left come out of its confusion. There is an enormous economic crisis, dealt with by the government in the same manner internally, as it deals with Ireland, South Africa or the Seychelles. It is purely and simply counter revolutionary. The comrades have to discuss so as to draw general principles from the functioning of the capitalist economy. It does not ameliorate itself and it has to show its true colours in abject lack of interest for human life when it sacks workers, humiliates immigrants, shoots the masses in Ireland, enacts laws against the right of the workers won in previous times and makes the neutron bomb. The conclusion has to be the need for a consistent opposition to the government. It is necessary to respond to the call made by the Soviets against the neutron bomb, by organising a campaign which does not limitate itself to trade union leaderships and to 'delegate conferences'. It has to be conducted in the factories and the trade unions, where the real intentions and nature of capitalism are best understood by every worker in his daily relation with the boss. It is necessary to see that the Soviet Union does not lead to neutron bombs, but to the contrary, its progress leads it towards greater soviet democracy. Whilst capitalism is war, Socialism is peace. One is interested in the violent brutal interests of a few, the other is for the development of humanity. The slogan of "Out from Nato" must be raised and linked with a programme for a Socialist unification of Europe, a United Front of the Socialists and Communists and the trade union movement, with the Soviet Union in the centre of it all, starting with a campaign against the neutron bomb, allied to the programme of nationalisations, workers control and planning of the economy. This government has to be fought against and replaced by a Socialist government and this means a consistent work of organisation of the left, with marxist dialectical understanding in the Labour Party. We, the Posadists are prepared to help this process, with analysis and concrete proposals, with the world conception and the dialectical preparation which comes from the fact that we are the Trotskyist-Posadist wing of the world Communist movement.

Secretary of the Party — this is a combination of posts — is because Brezhnev represents a final medium to placate others. It is like this, or it is that Brezhnev has indeed much power. But if it is that he simply has a great deal of power, he does not display it very much. This shows that he is a balancing force between two tendencies and that this is not going to last much longer.

This forms part of the process

of Partial Regeneration in which publications in English weigh not just in a rather limited British public but in the rest of the world, and in the Workers States. It is necessary to make a plan and to publish. To publish, to sell, to put the publications in bookshops, and make the section grow and intervene in the organisation of the Labour left, and to elevate the theoretical and political preparation of the section.

J. POSADAS 16.12.77

There is a process of development and ascent of the class struggle on a world scale which is of discussion of ideas, of principles. What is being discussed as a fundamental question, is not to make one or other strike, to go to elections. This is being discussed as a practical activity, but what is being discussed as a centre, which develops each time in a more elevated form, elevated in number and scope, is the preoccupation of all the cadres, all the militants of the various parties on the following: how to finish with capitalism. This is the rhythm within which the whole of humanity moves. How to finish with capitalism. Capitalism is on the defensive every day. Each time more it is made to back down and to defend itself. The capitalist system does not even confront the workers states by trying to say: "Look, we are better than them, we are superior to them". All that they do is to use the weaknesses of the workers states, of their leaderships. Whilst these are still insufficiently developed in comparison with the scientific, economic and productive capacity which they already have, capitalism cannot make any social human comparison between them and itself. This is a fundamental argument.

The capitalist regime has behind itself two thousand years (of private property), and the workers state hardly have 60 years of existence. Also from this, you have to discount the stage of Stalin which was one of the most backward stages in history, of the most obnoxious. The workers state was just stopped in its ascent. Its leadership — Stalin — made a retreat from the programmatic objectives, and so he retreated in the method of interpretation, he perverted the intelligence which humanity had acquired through the workers state. And even this being so, it is Stalin who was finished with and it is capitalism which is being finished with; it is the injurious bureaucratic method which is now being done away with. And the workers state, advances. That is to say the workers state is a necessity of history, and had it not been so, it would have not triumphed. When the workers state is shown to be a necessity of history, a part of this necessity of history itself is based, finds its points of support, and develops in the intelligence of people. It is not a problem determined by leaders. Socialism triumphs because from the child to the grown up man, intelligence generalises itself in humanity, all are elevating towards Socialism. Socialism is a necessity of history, and marxism is a necessity as the instrument for this history, and we form part of this instrument.

At the same time, there develops, in the World Communist Movement, the need to return to principles, to respond to the advances which can only be accomplished now through principles and not just through manoeuvres, or numbers. It has to be done with principles and, in general, principles mean marxism. It is this which later determines the consistency and the continuous qualification of progress itself. We, ourselves, are part of the actual progress towards a new world leadership. The demonstration that we are part of this, is to be found in the programme of the workers states, and in this last declaration made by the Soviet Union; that is, by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (PCUS), the government, the trade unions, and the Komsomol (Young Communist League). They have just called for the 'extention of Socialist incentives'.

We have already proposed that in the Soviet Union it should be possible to distribute to 'each according to needs'. Brejnev himself has spoken publically of this which indicates that he aims at a base which has a very large authority in the Party. Even in the outcome of this, which was that he had to satisfy other tendencies, the discussion is not closed. Now they return to the basic principle of 'to each one according to his needs', which is that "Socialist incentives" are. This is the basis for the principle to 'each according to needs'. The Chinese, for their part, are going backward over this, they return to 'to each according to capacity'. And moreover the incentive is now the whip and the stick which is a "material stimulus"! The whip and the stick! Anyway, if you have a material stimulus of any sort, there must be a whip and a stick. Today, in the Soviet Union, they respond to all this by abandoning the whip and the stick. The dissidents take no account of such things; however such a small detail demonstrates the immense progress of principles being made, and we have been the only ones who have upheld such principles.

The progress of the world Communist movement resides in that it already discusses, as a whole, in the global structure of the revolutionary movements of the world, and it discusses principles. And the preoccupation of the Communist parties and of the Socialists of the left, of the leftist movement itself, — the leftists in a lesser extent — is to discuss principles, not just if "eurocommunism" is right or not, but to discuss the experiences of the Soviet Union. They now take these experiences as a centre for reference, as a centre for consistent organisation, and they do not just mention them as if they were only casual examples of the process, or just better examples. They take them now as a unifying centre from which all the other experiences surge. The experience of the Soviet Union is not, as yet, a complete one however. But in three decisive aspects, yes it is complete. These aspects are the centralisation of property and the planning (of the economy), and the intervention of the workers movement, and the preparation to combat the capitalist

system, in a confrontation of final settlement of accounts. This, in fact, decides all the rest. Therefore we are part of this discussion. It is no longer a question to discuss how we intervene, how we make a strike, how we go to an election — we also intervene in these aspects in accordance with what we can do — but at this moment we intervene with a power, a security and a force which are enormous in the discussion of ideas, of principles, of orientations of programme.

We do this task because it is a necessity of history, and it has to be done; someone had to do this. Had it been accomplished by a movement superior to ourselves, we simply would have gone with them, this is why we went to the IV International of Pablo. When this was done, then, we constituted this movement of ours. There is a verification of all this in the decisive way, in a way which is not insecure or unstable, expressed on a world scale and, among others, there is one of the greatest events: the partial regeneration is expressed in a very elevated form in this resolution in the USSR for 'Socialist incentives'. This means that it is preparing for a decisive confrontation with the capitalist regime and with the 'Socialist incentive'. This is to say that it is a just principle. The advance of the workers state with material incentives is insecure. Because it allows the development of internal forces, which, in any case, are linked to private interests and through them, to capitalism. On the other hand, the development of Socialist incentives develops the link with the objective necessity of Socialism and not the necessity of each 'Russian' or each 'Soviet' person, but the necessity of Socialism.

For our part, we have developed with the foresight, with the security of foresight that this is a process which cannot be substituted for. Even though Socialism is a necessity for history, for the development of the economy, of science, of human intelligence, it has nevertheless now a secure minimum base to spread the world over in a short time. This process of advance to Socialism is also expressed in the internal life and struggle for Socialism which there is. Now it is no longer backward things which are being discussed but the most elevated forms which, themselves, are discussed in a backward way, on a very small scale. Now what is being discussed is programme, policy, experiences which are those of the first seven years (of the Soviet Union). The seven first years are returning, returning. These are the conditions which determine that we have such an authority. We have reason, we have the force to develop and already we have advanced much in being considered — as we are already being considered — as a part of the leadership of the world Communist movement. Already we are considered to be so, we are not just one more group.

All those who were in the old Trotskyist movement, went. There is not one movement outside of ourselves which represents the thought and the objectives which Trotsky had. The thought and objectives of Trotsky were identical, but the thought was determined by a limitation in the perspectives and possibilities of his time. They were to defend the Soviet Union, to extend the Soviet Union, and we, ourselves, follow this. Outside of us no one is doing this task. And now it is clear that we are part of the leadership of the world Communist movement, which has such a task of responsibility of analyses, of conclusions, of scientific purity, but this we do it in order to give concrete programmes. We do not do this in order to make literary constructions, but to give concrete programmes for action. We are doing this.

The International is a force which is necessary in history. It is necessary, as it was in Trotsky's time. It is not so because of the need for numbers, but because of the need for quality which it represents by being able to analyse, to draw conclusions, and to give orientations. Because of the very structure of the world Communist movement itself, this function is necessary. Had the Soviet Union continued to develop itself with Lenin, there would be no need to stress this. Lenin did it and so did the Bolshevik Party. As the Bolshevik Party did not continue, then the USSR has developed solely because of its historic structure of state owned property but it has not developed or had the necessary influence because it lacked a leadership. Today, the Soviets have the necessary influence but in a movement which itself has developed with distrust in the Soviet bureaucracy; and has developed itself parallel to it. They have developed with methods and forms which rested on the Soviet bureaucracy. The new workers states, moreover, have not elevated the development in the world Communist movement because there has been so many years of harmful policy on the part of the Soviet bureaucracy. This is why there is room for this function which we play, and if there was no such room, we just would not exist. We are not critics of the Soviet leadership hoping for its downfall and for the creation of a new movement, but we accompany the evolution of ascent of this new leadership.

This is one of the most delicate tasks, perhaps the most delicate in history after that which Trotsky fulfilled. The most delicate because it demands the security of working, not as a group, but in function of the objective need of humanity, as the best marxists.

J. POSADAS 16.1.78

FASCIST MOVEMENT....

continued from page 8

brought to the surface. The state apparatus is involved in active nuclear preparations against the workers states. This is where the threat to the workers movement

comes, not from a mass fascist movement. The standard of life of the masses goes down, the repression in Ireland continues, the fascists are defended in the streets by the police, the prevention of Terrorism Act was brought in, who did all this? Capitalism did

it, the Labour Government did it, not the fascists! Who assassinates the prisoners in Germany? Capitalism did it, via the state apparatus under a social democratic government! These are fascist methods indeed! Then the way to combat fascism is to

combat the state apparatus which gives support to the fascists. The way to combat fascism is to discuss the fundamental question of how to end capitalism. Ending the regime of private property is the most effective way to end the fascists and to smash the state

apparatus is the best way to end the fascist methods which the regime employs to defend itself. What is required therefore, is a discussion on an alternative programme to private property — that is, the nationalised, planned economy.

THE SOVIET INTERVENTION IN ETHIOPIA — A TRIUMPH OF THE PROCESS OF PERMANENT REVOLUTION

The Ethiopian-Somali war has demonstrated very clearly the character of the world revolutionary process and the balance of forces which overwhelmingly favour the workers states led by the Soviet Union (the "socialist countries"). The forces who seek in the British Labour party to advance in their comprehension of what is happening in the world and to develop a consistent left with an anti capitalist programme, have to take account of the Ethiopian experience in all its aspects as an example of human progress in this epoch.

On one plane the intervention of the soviets and Cubans in Ethiopia has brought out the level of concentration of the historic process and the change in world relations since Vietnam. There Yankee imperialism intervened massively and directly over a series of years to try to contain the world revolution. It was concerned to stop the formation of new workers states in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos which would act as further examples for South East Asia. They tried to smash the Vietnamese masses into extinction and they failed completely. On the other hand the Soviet Union and China intervened in support of Vietnam but in general indirectly with supplies etc. Clearly Vietnam could not have survived without the support of all the other workers states but compared with the insolent direct intervention of Yankee imperialism, the intervention of the Soviet Union was restrained. Now in Ethiopia, it is clear that the Soviet Union had acted in a much more audacious way and Yankee imperialism does not feel it has the strength to intervene directly in opposition. World imperialism, the United States, Germany and Great Britain certainly assist an indirect intervention via Somalia with military aid from Saudia Arabia but they dare not send Yankee troops directly to

break the Ethiopian revolution. This is the continuation of the debacle which led to the loss of Angola and Mozambique. Yankee imperialism feels that to intervene would be to confront its own people. But the Soviet Union and Cuba send in troops and supplies without any conflict with their own people because the masses of the socialist block support the struggles of the peoples of the world against capitalist and feudal enslavement.

It is true that the leadership of the Soviet Union delayed somewhat its intervention largely because they had not grasped the reactionary character of the leadership of the Somalia revolutionary state (it is possible for the masses to progress in some measures against imperialism and capitalism but the leadership may well not represent that process and the Somali leadership is an example of this). But once it was totally clear that Barr was acting in the general interests of world imperialism the soviets took swift action to aid the Ethiopian revolution. The Soviet Union is the continual basis of the progress of the world revolution.

THE SOVIET UNION IS OBLIGED TO SUSTAIN ALL THE STRUGGLES AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND CAPITALISM

The imperialists try to interpret soviet intentions as concern with military bases. There is no such "militarism" for its own sake. Soviet intervention to support Ethiopia is the logical extension of the workers states. It is the logic of 1917, the logic of Stalingrad and the extension of the number of workers states after the end of the second world war. For the workers states to develop and expand to advance to socialism, their

logic is to extend throughout the world. Only in the world free of private property is it possible to advance to socialism. That is the logic of the Soviet intervention towards Ethiopia and it is inevitable that this is part of the steadily accumulating process towards the final convulsion of capitalism, its liquidation by humanity in the course of the final encounter between capitalism and the workers states. Ethiopia is the continuation of 1917 and coming as it does from unbelievable backwardness, it is the proof that human progress inevitably goes towards communism, that humanity is not smashed by the imperialist intimidation of nuclear weapons and that as Cde Posadas said "the world is ready for communism".

ETHIOPIA HAS THE PROGRAMME OF NATIONALISATIONS, PLANNING, THE SMASHING OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE APPARATUS AND THE COLLECTIVISATION OF THE LAND

A most important feature of the Ethiopian revolution which has to be reflected upon by the sectors of the left in the Labour party, is that it shows that humanity has transcended being dominated by the economy as the basis for advance.

The Ethiopian army which proved to be the vehicle for social change, which played the role of a leadership was originally trained for a purely counter revolutionary role. But the total incapacity of capitalism to develop Ethiopia to raise it from the dark ages and the advance of the world revolution especially reflected through Vietnam, promoted intelligent thought in this army to break from its bourgeois role and play an

objectively necessary role to transform Ethiopia on the basis of a socialist programme. It is necessary to see this transformation not as the result of an orientation from the Soviet leadership but yes as an orientation whose roots lie in the existence of the Soviet Union and the other workers states which are based on the nationalisation of industry, planning, expropriation of the land and monopoly of foreign trade. In other words such a country with an enormously backward peasantry suffering from illiteracy, lack of modern machines and without many means of communication, is influenced by the most advanced experiences of world history. To this extent Ethiopia is economically far more backward than Britain, socially is far more advanced. The revolution has eliminated the monarchy, as in Britain, representative of all that is most archaic, unthinking and reactionary. The principle exploiters, the landowners, the few who appropriated the wealth produced by the many, have been shot or thrown out. Ethiopia has gone beyond the limits of private interest and property. In this epoch the most backward can become the most advanced because they can reach the level of superior social relations and even with problems of scarcity are not dominated by conceptions of private accumulation and exploiting others. The British left has to appreciate this, not with the view that nevertheless this has nothing to do with Britain but realising that Ethiopia is the result of world political and social relations and is not an isolated phenomena. Ethiopia represents the current of human history not the preposterous and medieval institution of monarchy and the lying farce of "British democracy". Ethiopia with its mass committees involved in the running of a whole range of social and police functions, where the wealthy and the power

based on that can no longer weigh, where the old apparatus of the bourgeois state is being smashed, is infinitely more democratic than anything in Britain. Ethiopia has put into practice — out with the monarchy, in with the socialist republic.

THE OGADEN AND THE NATIONALITY PROBLEM

The dispute between Ethiopia and Somalia was essentially invented by imperialism, and stimulated by Somalia, and stimulated by imperialism, because its backward leadership thought in terms not of social advance and collaboration with Ethiopia but in terms of backward national expansionism. This localist mentality is convenient to imperialism. It has been used as has tribalism to disturb and "balkanise" Africa. Imperialism has tried to use the Eritrean movement in this way and doubtless inevitable limitations resultings from the inexperience of the Ethiopian military team has facilitated this but the process has brought out again that imperialism has an interest in utilising local, national interests to hinder the centralisation of forces tending towards a socialist solution. Local interests are used similarly in Scotland, Wales and Ireland. A socialist federation of Ethiopia, Eritrea and Somalia is a necessary solution as is the socialist federation of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland on the basis of a nationalised and planned economy.

The force of the October revolution of 1917 has reappeared in Ethiopia. It is a valuable contribution to history from which the left in Britain has to learn.

THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MASS FASCIST MOVEMENT IN BRITAIN

The danger of a fascist movement developing and threatening 'democracy' is a current discussion in the labour movement at the present time. The bourgeoisie are encouraging this discussion by trying to imply that fascism is on the upsurge. A systematic campaign is being waged by the bourgeoisie, be it through the newspapers, television and radio, giving maximum publicity to the fascist groups, deliberately making it appear that these groups are strong and gathering momentum. The social democratic leadership make speeches as if they were worried about a fascist threat to 'democracy', yet despite their demagogy, they continue to repress in Ireland and Bermuda, they continue to carry out the capitalist policy of reduction in the living standards of the population, they continue to intervene externally on behalf of British imperialism. It seems strange therefore that such a leadership should be involved with a campaign for democracy

against the fascists and racists. In reality, this leadership has the interests of the bourgeoisie at heart which are, to divert attention from the really fundamental issue — how to end capitalism? The capitalist system, based on private property can develop no more, it is in a total crisis, therefore how to end private property? This is the discussion which is being raised in every capitalist country. The world communist movement is debating, how to go towards socialism? As the capitalist crisis is world wide, Britain cannot be isolated from it, and the problems of the decomposition of the system are as pressing as ever. What the bourgeoisie most fear is a discussion on the solution to all the problems, such as unemployment, the reduction in the standard of living, pollution and all the social problems. All sorts of smokescreens are invented, like the dissidents in the Soviet Union as a way to hide the superiority of the nationalised,

planned economy, and the campaign against fascism and racism falls into the same category, — a campaign to give the impression of a fascist danger, by giving the fascists a strength and force which they simply do not have, as the basis to prevent discussion on the most fundamental issue, 'where is Britain going?' Certainly not in the direction of capitalism!

Another aspect to this campaign is that it tends to stimulate these fascist groups in their policy of intimidation and violence, encouraging the terrorisation of the population, the beating up of left militants. It forms part of the repression which the ruling class requires to defend the system of private property. Big business, unlike the time of Hitler, are not pouring money into the coffers of the fascists, because they do not see any perspective of fascism developing as a mass movement. The perspective of capital is increasingly to repress directly using the state apparatus which they have built up over centuries to defend their interests. The danger comes not from the possibility of a mass fascist movement being able to develop, it comes from the state apparatus itself, the police, the army, the courts, all exist to prevent the left from organising against the capitalist system. Thus, the Prevention of Terrorism Act, the ban on marches in Ilford, mass police activity to defend the

fascists, severely curtail democratic rights, setting the pattern for future repression as the class struggle between the working class and the bourgeoisie becomes more intensified. The ruling class can encourage sectors to develop fascist methods, to throw a bomb here or there, but had they the perspective of actively preparing a mass fascist movement to confront the workers movement, they would have done so before.

There are not the conditions in society prerequisite for a fascist solution to the crisis of the capitalist system. Reaction was world wide in the epoch of Hitler, Stalinism was part of this, helping the conciliation of the workers parties with the bourgeoisie in each country. Sectors of the petty bourgeoisie saw no counter force of attraction to Hitler, who seemed as if he had a strong policy which would solve the problems. Without the existence of Stalinism, Hitler could not have come to power. Today, none of these previous conditions can be fulfilled. Above all, the revolution is world wide and the workers states are extending and gaining increasing authority and influence. The fascist groups which exist, are not increasing but are rapidly declining, numerically and in social support, even in countries which had a history of fascism previously, like Italy. Despite all the collusion of the state

apparatus, giving support to the fascists, such as the long discussion between Webster and the police recently, the fascists still find themselves vastly outnumbered by police protection squads. Their tendency is to disintegrate, not to grow. How is it possible to say, therefore, that fascism as a mass movement can develop in the next stage? This would mean a reversal of all these trends. In what conditions could this occur? Fascism means the confrontation of capital with the workers movement. But what is happening is that capitalism does not have the initiative, the workers states have! The bourgeoisie in Britain are always reluctant to confront the workers movement politically in any major strike and the workers movement is never crushed. To succeed, fascism would have to smash the workers movement, suppress the trade unions, uniting the country socially on that basis. It is impossible for them to do it.

The 'fascism' of this epoch is the nuclear war. Imperialism prepares to confront the workers states by nuclear means. This is the confrontation of capitalism and the workers movement on a world scale which does show the criminal nature of the capitalist system. The neutron bomb is part of this military preparation and the Prime Minister of Britain openly supports it. Surely this is a discussion which should be

Turn to page 7

Editorial

THE POWER OF THE ANTI CAPITALIST PROGRAMME IS CONFIRMED IN THE FRENCH ELECTIONS

The elections in France have resulted in a big increase in votes for the parties of the left. The bourgeois parties have maintained an electoral majority of seats due to the fraud of the parliamentary system, with the number of seats, totally unrepresentative of the votes gained. The Union of the left gained nearly half the votes but the result gave the right far more seats. The votes of the right are made up of whole sectors of the rich and their allies who contribute nothing and just live off the wealth created by the workers. The votes of the left on the other hand consist of the fundamental parts of the population, the proletariat and radical sectors of the petty bourgeoisie. The Communists and Socialists have attracted the important sectors while the right has maintained its electoral lead by mustering all its own forces.

The Communist party represents the most important vote, for it most clearly represented the programme of the Union of the left. Throughout the campaign the discussion was about this programme, why was this so? In Britain in the elections there is talk about the parties, the leaders or the opinion polls but no such interest over the political programme. The concern of the bourgeoisie about the French elections was that the parties of the left had a programme that had a series of measures that were against capitalism. If the Labour party in Britain wins an election it has importance for it shows the will of the masses to concentrate themselves around the party to create a left, but it does not have a direct result of allowing steps to be taken towards the construction of socialism, as there are no measures put forward by the party that threaten capitalism. In France the Common Programme had included in it a substantial number of nationalisations. This was not just to take over bankrupt sectors of the economy, such as a Leyland, but to nationalise substantial parts of the economy. The polemic between the Socialist and Communist parties was over the central issue of how much to nationalise. The importance of the discussion is that the extent of the nationalisations means the amount of advance. To nationalise means to progress, not to do so leaves the economy in the continual crisis of capitalism.

The French Communist party campaigned in the polemics about the Common Programme to extend the measures of nationalisations because, in spite of the leadership's previous declarations in support of Euro Communism, the origin of the Communist party is the existence of the Soviet Union. In the Socialist party there is the development of the left but the process is slower as there is not the same historical origin of the party. The workers states are the example of how to end capitalism. In the workers states there exists a bureaucracy but along with this every day, the life of the population advances. "Dissidents" there are also, very few of them and very stupid ones. The fact that Sakharov is not allowed to make a demonstration is not lack of freedom of the Soviet people, but the stopping of someone who was openly campaigning for Israeli imperialism that was massacring the Palestinian masses. For capitalism those who support the killings of imperialism are "defenders of human rights". There is a need for the population to be able to intervene more, their intervention is not like Sakharov, but it is to impel further forward the leadership of the workers states in their support to countries like Ethiopia. Also in France the left would have advanced more if the discussions between the Communists and Socialists had allowed a much greater intervention of the workers, rather than the discussions being more limited to the leadership of the parties.

The acceptance by the Scottish Conference of the Labour party of resolutions which called for nationalisations illustrates that the conditions exist for developing a left in the Labour party. There are sectors that support measures of nationalisations and from this it is necessary to construct a tendency in the party that comes together to consistently campaign for an anti-capitalist programme. The British Communist party in its Open Letter to the Labour Movement proposes an immediate strategy to deal with the immediate problems and then a long term strategy for Socialism. Capitalism is in total crisis and the whole situation in the world is dominated by the final confrontation between masses of the world, represented in the most advance way by the workers states, against capitalism led by Yankee imperialism. Imperialism makes certain interventions like in Lebanon, but they are socially very weak as is seen by the crisis provoked in Israel. It is the Soviet Union that has the initiative everywhere and this allows no possibility for capitalism to have strength in Britain. A Tory government could be elected which on one particular issue might take a different tactic than the Callaghan government, but it would be purely a change of tactic not of essence. The question is not Labour or Conservative government but of how to develop a left in the Labour party that openly intervenes as a tendency.

The Labour left will be constructed with a programme that is against capitalism. That is a programme of nationalisations under workers control. There is no perspective for a programme that seeks to ameliorate the extent of the present crisis. British capitalism has no more force to recover. The Scottish oil will not make it go any faster, it is in decay. When school

Turn to page 3

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

276 Friday 7 April 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ELECTIONS IN FRANCE

26.2.78

J. POSADAS

Elections do not resolve the problem of the crisis of the political leadership in France. There are two great worker political parties and they do not have a single centre of leadership. It is a crisis of leadership. The crisis is caused essentially through the lack of previous programme and policy. Then it is necessary to seek to influence the masses with a programme and policy, in the factories and the workers areas through meetings at the base, not just resolving problems at the summits. It is necessary to discuss at the summits, but also below so that the weight of the masses orientates its leadership with an objective. It is not a question of saying simply "we want unity" but "we want a programme and a policy". Hence it is necessary to educate the party in the anti capitalist conception. There is no solution to the problems by the capitalist road.

The problems between the socialist party and the communist party are not the problems as Marchais or Mitterand describe them or what they are going to do — in this case the greater part of reason is on the side of Marchais and of the French communist party — but what is the programme, the objective to apply. The crisis in France is not because there is a bad administration. It is true that there is a bad administration, but what determines the issue is that capitalism is in crisis and that it is aggravated by the problem of bad administration. But the problem is not bad administration. Then the problem is not to change the administration. Mitterand must not believe that by changing the administration and that of the government, the situation is going to change. No, no. The problem is the programme. Capitalism is not going to introduce changes. Any government which is formed is either going to administer in the interest of capitalism and as a consequence be opposed to the improvements in the conditions of life of the proletariat and the provision of work for the great majority of the unemployed or establishes a programme at the cost of the interest of capitalism, not of the country and of production. Then production can continue to develop and the country lives and elevates.

The masses have to see that it is a problem of programme, of objectives and of leadership. It is not a question of saying that it is necessary to make a political leadership to resolve the problems of France, but to pose a programme to resolve the problems that capitalism has created, putting the country in a cul de sac without exit.

These are the problems which have to be discussed and which although they are not resolved with the creation of a united front, are going to weigh and the line of the solution of these problems, lies in the rest of the struggles of the masses and of the workers states. The solution is the workers states. There is no solution within the capitalist system. This is the conclusion.

The communists and the socialists must make a united front on the basis of the programme which the Communist party proposes which being limited, is not incorrect. It is necessary to extend it. It is necessary to resolve upon besides, a united front of communists and socialists with the trade unions for the application of this proposed programme and extending it. The masses must intervene, with the organisation of discussions, meetings, in the factories. Let the polemic continue between the parties, but let the masses give their opinion. Politics is not a laboratory controlled only by those inside. Everybody has to intervene, otherwise only

the policy of the leadership is applied and imposed on the masses, but the masses have the experience taken from the progress of Vietnam, from the workers states and they generalise it. In such a way that they are not subjected to the limitation and reduction of the policy which the leadership wants to carry out, as Mitterand wants.

Let the communist and socialist masses discuss with the communist and socialists leaders publically. Discuss and take conclusions from the progress of the workers states. How is France going to progress if it remains in the capitalist system?. The crisis is not through bad administration. It is the crisis of the capitalist system. A decisive proof is that in general the rhythm of production has now recovered and unemployment is continuing to increase because capitalism restructures production, improving technology and in this way eliminates employment, owners and workers. It concentrates production but there is no market for consumption.

The essential basis of the crisis of the capitalist system is the existence of the workers states which compete economically against the capitalist system and socially show their superiority. The whole campaign which capitalism has launched against the workers states utilising the so called dissidents to create doubts and rejection of the workers states has failed, i.e. utilising them as an attack against political leadership. It was in reality an attack against the workers state, against the socialist structure of the workers state. The workers state has impressed everyone. On the other hand all the capitalist countries are in crisis. This is what has to be discussed. In the workers state there is no economic crisis. But yes it exists in the capitalist countries.

Whatever the electoral result in France, the revolutionary process is going to continue because the crisis of French capitalism and world capitalism has no solution. If there is a socialist administration with the support of sectors of the bourgeoisie and of Giscard d Estaing this is going to lead to a deepening, a much greater deepening of the crisis and is going to lead to an explosion in the socialist party. There is no solution within the margins of the capitalist system, because it is not a problem of the administration but one of programme and policy. If the programme consists in continuing to produce to compete with the rest of the capitalist countries — this is a problem of the bosses, of capitalism — the crisis is going to continue. But if they satisfy, it is not in competition with the other capitalist countries and it will stimulate the level of life of the population. It eliminates capitalists but it elevates the standard of life of the population and there is no paralysis of the economy.

It is possible that capitalism will threaten to withdraw funds but they did this also in other countries which today are workers states. There are twenty workers states. They withdrew capital and it was no use. The currency was changed and the old money repudiated. In front of the threat of the capitalists, it is necessary to say "we will change the currency" we will change the French franc and instead of the head of Richelieu, we will replace it with the head of Karl Marx". Money it is true is a creation of private property and accepted by it, but it can be replaced very easily with another new currency which reflects the strength of the economy. The world is not now strictly determined by capitalist relations. It is the workers states which determine. There are some workers states which do

turn to page 4

THE FAILURE OF THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY OBJECTIVES OF THE TRIP OF CARTER

5.1.78

J. Posadas

INTRODUCTION

We are publishing this text of Cde Posadas although written two months ago because it provides the theoretical background to understand the real nature of the Sadat—Begin talks and the policy of Yankee imperialism. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the attempted Egyptian commando raid in Cyprus and the seizure of Moro in Italy are all linked to the sinister, counter revolutionary policy of Yankee imperialism. Carter's trip failed to unite the Middle East bourgeoisie, Arab and Israel, against the masses and against the Soviet Union, but the trip and its consequences show that imperialism is determined on war. It is a process of system against system, the final encounter between capitalism and the forces of socialism.

The trip of Carter is a failure. Carter sought to encourage the bourgeoisie of the Arab countries, particularly Egypt and to put an end to the clashes and divergencies which are inter-bourgeois, that is the competition between the rival bourgeoisie. He went to show them that there was no real important economic divergencies between them and that those which exist, are simply due to social divergencies, coming from the masses of Egypt; but not of Israel, where there is no pressure. All this is a lie, because there is also a social pressure in Israel. The attitude of the Israeli Communist Party shows this. It is difficult to see the depth of the process in Israel, but the colour on top indicates what there is below. The Communists have supported Polisario, they defend the Palestinians, and they say openly that the Palestinians must have a country of their own. This is very deep, and they are going to receive a very great support.

As Israel is an imported country, it has a bourgeois base which does not correspond to its economic and social development. Half the economy is simply paid for by imperialism through all manner of loans, to make Israel play the function of policeman in the Middle East.

But when this policeman no longer suffices and now Egypt has become necessary, it is because the rebellion of the masses, is very profound. This rebellion is not only expressed in Egypt, where there are strikes, mobilisations, and the idiot Sadat was met by solitude. They say that a million of people came to welcome him! But no, only solitude came. There were some youth of 14, 16 and 18 and nothing more, and besides they had been paid. It is the same thing as the 'referendum' of Pinochet.

The manoeuvre of Sadat in not appearing to confront or be opposed to the Palestinians, indicates a very great internal opposition, which is social, military, political and comes from the masses. All the movement of opposition to Sadat in Egypt, the strikes, the demonstrations in defence of the nationalisations and in defence of Nasser, shows that there is a very large popular petit bourgeois and peasant opposition. It is the apparatus of a part of the bourgeoisie and the army, which supports Sadat. On this basis, they try to create a whole mystique. But the policy remains a resolution taken by the apparatus in which the population does not intervene.

There is a marxist movement of importance. But the popular resistance is not expressed because there is no freedom, no democratic rights and there are repressions, massacres, imprisonments. What Sadat is after can be seen by his actions in Egypt itself. He kills, assassinates, condemns, and allows no expression of democracy or liberty.

The Palestinians and Polisario show with their little struggle that they have such an ambience, such courage, such combative resolution that Tal El Zatar resulted, which corresponds to Vietnam.

When there is such a decision to struggle and the struggle goes on without being crushed, without being terrorised or discouraged, when the Palestinians unify their struggle with that of

Socialism, and when divisions develop even in Israel, this indicates the line which characterises the Middle East. This is what imperialism comes to try to curtail. It seeks to cut short the influence of two movements which geographically are very small, but which express and reflect the will for social transformations of the masses of the whole of the Middle East.

Imperialism also wants to contain the contradictions of the bourgeoisie in the Middle East which has meant that they have not been able to unite against the masses. Hence the instability of Syria, because they cannot unite, because they clash with the will for transformations which come from the Syrian masses, the Egyptian masses, the Libyan masses and the whole of the Middle East. This is not expressed in such an elevated manner in Saudi Arabia or in Kuwait, but is expressed in Iraq.

In the Arab Emirates there is nothing, there is no life, or means of expression, but in all these countries nevertheless, there are movements against the Emirs. Thus Carter comes along to seek to contain this process and bring the Emirs his support. However he cannot offer them much, because imperialism itself is in crisis and full of contradictions. And he cannot manage much money, because the dollar is falling. It is not falling through manoeuvres only, but it really is the case that imperialism is falling apart. In part, yes it is a manoeuvre, to compete, but partly imperialism has nothing else to offer. When they have to 'manoeuvre' in the sense of money devaluation, it is because there is a real basis for it. Capitalist Germany could also have 'manoeuvred' in this way, but has not done so.

It must be realised that yankee imperialism went to the rescue of the Arab bourgeoisies together with Israel, asking them to make a pact together, at the expense of the revolutionary and social progress of the Middle East. Even then, the pact cannot be but superficial because the contradictions and the disputes between the Arab bourgeoisies and Israel are immense, and go back many years.

Israel has economic interests in the occupied territories. They have discovered oil wells there. They are not going to give them back. They have built these

wells for themselves. They now have made a calculation that the latest discovery will cover three quarters of the needs of Israel. There is now Jewish bourgeoisie with local interests which has the tendency to imperialist expansion, and the Yanks support this. But also, formally, the Yanks require that the Israeli appear to yield.

But it is not a question of form, but of content. The content decides the form. The form is not going to contain the content!

Carter goes to contain the inter-bourgeois dispute in the Middle East to channel it towards a later confrontation with the revolution, and to put out two fires which stimulate the revolution, which are the struggle of the masses of the Middle East against Israel and at the same time the inter-bourgeois dispute.

When movements such as Polisario, and the Palestinians with Tal El Zatar, occur — it is because they express a will for social transformation. It has been now one and a half years since the events of Tal Al Zatar. Since then, there has been a change in that movement, which now poses openly the need for social transformations, unification through social transformations. There is now a current which prevails in the Arab movement and which seeks social transformations. This current is also in alliance with the Soviet Union.

Imperialism seeks to contain this process so that the Arab bourgeoisie ally with Israel to crush the revolution. The function of Israel, as policeman, is now no use for imperialism. It is a policeman, without the means to act, without the vehicle for moving about. The vehicle of reaction is no good any more. There are more and more clashes between Israel and the bourgeoisie for example that is forming in Saudi Arabia. It is a very real clash, because the Saudi bourgeoisie has its own interests. In allying itself to Israel, it has to submit its own interests for the sake of the alliance against the masses, but they hope nonetheless to act on their own account. The same applies to the bourgeoisie of Kuwait, and of Syria. There are very real contradictions between them. They all have an interest in concealing the masses, but for their own individual interest. They are not yet culturally, theoretically, politically, even socially, formed, so they are all unstable.

Imperialism comes to substitute for this lack of firm formation in the bourgeoisie. In Egypt and in Israel, they are secure, but in Saudi Arabia, a big power, there is a national bourgeoisie which has interests in economic development, but this policy of Carter, in the last instance, forces it to submit to Israel. There is the contradiction, so imperialism cannot reach any permanent arrangement. Yes, it reaches an agreement with top leaderships and these last 3 hours. After having made all these arrangements with Sadat, Carter in his new trip had to stay 2 more hours in Egypt — even though this was not planned — so as not to create rumours.

Carter went on this trip so as to encourage capitalism and to weigh on Egypt — which is one of the decisive centres in the

Middle East. He took Schmidt with him, who has nothing to do with it. Carter does this to apply pressure, and to give security from the economic and social support of the German bourgeoisie. There we see the function of the German social democracy. Besides the support of Schmidt to Egypt, there are also the plans of imperialism for Europe. As Carter is competing with the European bourgeoisies, he seeks to tie the European

bourgeoisie to a programme which is going to involve economically also the bourgeoisie.

Germany has bought or rented about a fourth of the territory of Zaire, to install and develop there a counter-revolutionary base of atomic weapons etc., to confront Africa. Imperialism is not preparing to develop the Middle East or Africa economically, but to confront militarily the development of the revolution there.

PEACE MUST BE BASED ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS OF THE WHOLE MIDDLE EAST, INCLUDING ISRAEL

The Socialist leaders and militant comrades, must feel that this is so. Schmidt went to support yankee imperialism in this miserable perspective and this programme of atomic war, against the revolution in the Middle East and against the masses of the world. But to develop Africa it is necessary to develop its economy. Imperialism cannot do it, it is just incapable and besides it is not convenient for it to do so. It is simply outside all the calculations of the development and existence of capitalism. At the same time the process shows the intervention of the Soviet Union in all these countries. It intervenes with resolution and force. This should be considered by all the so called 'dissidents' in making a judgement about the Soviet Union. Not one dissident has opened his mouth against the installation in Zaire of counter revolutionary atomic bases. It is an area of country a quarter of Zaire, larger than the whole of Germany! Not a word against the function of imperialism in this. On the contrary behind all these dissidents, there is an opposition, an antagonism, and a rejection of the Workers State as such. It was the duty — including those who have divergences with the Soviet Union — to support the present policy of the Soviets in Africa, because it supports objectively the revolution.

Fidel Castro and Podgorny went to support the revolution, whilst imperialism goes to Africa to crush it. What have the dissidents to say about this? What is their position? What is their line? These dissidents and all the so-called Trotskyist groups or dissident Communists have a policy opposed to all this. They objectively support the policy of imperialism. They support the criticisms against the line of the Soviet Union which is purely progressive and favourable to the development of the anti capitalist struggle and the progress of history.

It is necessary to appeal to the Arab movement to discuss and make appeals for the unification of the struggle to expel imperialism, to oppose the lie of 'peace', and the negotiations and the agreements between Sadat and Israel which is at the cost of the revolution. It is necessary to pose: We want peace, and to have it, the American power has to be broken by military means. Peace cannot be achieved in the present political and social situation prevailing both in Egypt and in Israel. The top layer of the Egyptian bourgeoisie and the landed bourgeoisie basically makes a pact with the Israeli bourgeoisie against the progress of the revolution. This peace which they say they are going to make is not peace at all. It is an agreement of the top bourgeoisie against the masses of these countries to contain the revolutionary process. It is to prepare the war against the masses of the Middle East and against the Soviet Union. Such is the objective of Carter's trip.

It is necessary to appeal to the Palestinian masses, to the Polisario masses, to those of Israel, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, to make a movement based on a programme for the progress of the Middle East and to include Israel in it. Progress of the Middle East means social and economic development. To do this, it is necessary to start inevitably with the social transformation of agriculture and oil, the use of natural riches to be able to transform them.

An alliance is necessary, of all the countries of the Middle East, of the masses with the right of self-determination of Israel and the right of Israel to remain within a unification of the

Socialist Federation of the Middle East to develop the economy. Israel's technology capacity and science must be used with the science, the capacity for work, the social weight and the social will for transformations of the masses of the Middle East. This means a Socialist Federation with the right to self-determination and the existence of Palestine. The solution to the crisis resides in the elimination of the capitalist system, the elimination of imperialism, the construction of a Socialist Federation of the Middle East, including Israel and appealing to the masses of Israel to overthrow the capitalist system.

Look at the fundamental role which Algeria is playing as a bridge and centre for the development of part of the struggle in the Middle East against imperialism and against its allies such as Morocco and Tunisia, who are the principal and strongest allies of imperialism. Algeria stimulates the struggle against them. To defend itself Algeria has no other resort than to impel these movements. Algeria is in process of passing from the self-defence policy which it has had to this day, and of impelling the revolution, to a conscious stage of a direct defence of the revolution to impel its own revolution. It influences the Middle East, and the trip of Carter is powerless and incapable of stopping this, because the process comes from the experience of the Arab masses, which they did not have before. In Egypt also the masses show that they have the experience to develop the revolution, but they lack leadership. All the old previous system of parties and trade unions prevent the masses from mobilising and developing. Hence all this struggle is now freeing itself from the old submission, to the apparatuses, the mystical life of the parties, and advancing towards a Party living for ideas, and for revolutionary social anti-capitalist discussions. All this is going to be stimulated.

FOR A FEDERATION IN THE HORN OF AFRICA WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF THE WORKERS STATES

It is necessary to call on the Workers States to elevate their intervention, and also to intervene on the process of Ethiopia, which forms part of this situation. The war in Ethiopia is a war invented by imperialism. But it is also previous social and political backwardness that created these conditions. To resolve this problem, the movement for the liberation of Eritrea the FELP which wants the liberation of Eritrea, and which wants also its independence from capitalism, must be called upon to seek to unify with Somalia, Ogaden, and Ethiopia in a Federation. Within this they can plan the economy, whilst maintaining their cultural independence, seeking economic concentration and later, scientific development will promote the need for a cultural concentration. This is the historic and progressive way to resolve the problems of the country. To maintain the division into national stratas and ethnic divisions divides the social, economic and cultural forces.

None of these countries has any cultural tradition. The previous cultural tradition of the Arab movement is already lost. After the Arab movement there was a whole historical process which included the development of science and technology under the capitalist regime. One has to start from these facts, and not go backwards. There is no need to sit on top of camels any more to cross the desert, when a plane can do it in 3 minutes. In the same way there is no need to go back to Mahomed to resolve problems which Marx resolved in 2 minutes. We say this with full respect for the religious creeds. But a discussion has to be called on this basis, with all the movements and the Communist parties to intervene on this line and also with the Workers States, for example, with the Soviet Union which is in the process of intervening and very well. The Soviet Union must be called on to intervene by launching appeals under this form, so that the Ethiopians call on the masses of the Ogaden to draw such conclusions. They already do this in part. I believe that the Ethiopians are limited in their search to influence this movement, because constantly reports appear from this movement of tendencies which show they are looking for an agreement.

It is necessary to discuss that it is not a question of resolving ethnically by a process of turning inwards, but in the evolution of the process. Thus in the Soviet Union the most backward countries have structured themselves and have advanced in centralisation in one country. In China also. And on the way every form of country is eliminated. So, its necessary to discuss that they have to intervene to resolve such problems by appealing to the masses of Somalia and their government, for discussion. Instead of resorting to war, launching a war against Ethiopia, it is necessary to make a discussion on the problem of Federation. What is needed is a Federation of the countries in that zone of Africa and of all the countries of Africa with the help of the Workers States, for the economic and social progress of these countries. Then any ethnic or racial and cultural problem can be resolved in the course of the process itself. On the march, does not mean to weaken, to contain or abandon the process. But it means that the essential basis for its overcoming resides in the development of the economy. The fragmentation of countries leads to the economic development of only a few bourgeois nuclei, of the feudal landlords, who dominate and make the alliance with capitalism and imperialism. Whilst Federation allows the concentration of the capacity of production, and of planning and eliminates all these sectors by elevating the population to the level of leadership. Thus the mass of the population is elevated. Discussion like this is necessary to be able to resolve the problems posed by history. It is necessary to appeal to the Workers States

and to the Communist parties to intervene on this line. It is not a question only of the formal aspects of the independence of the Ogaden, of Ethiopia, or of Eritrea but historical conclusions of progress for each country, which is what has determined the course of history.

History has not been determined on the basis of the interest of one or the other country, but on the basis of the need for social historic progress, which elevates the population. The fragmenting of countries is a retreat and backwardness and allows the domination of imperialism, of the capitalist powers and of the bourgeois sectors, feudal and large landlords. Thus it is necessary to appeal for the drawing of such conclusions to resolve problems which cannot be resolved within the capitalist system, and to prepare to resolve them together with the struggle against the capitalist system and imperialism.

The problems of Ethiopia are an inheritance from the past, when the country was divided into many fragments, ethnic zones and tribes. Today, the capitalists use this, as they do in Ogaden, where sectors which sought social development make a front with capitalist sectors against the objective progress of the revolution. There is no logic in this movement of Ogaden which aspires to social anti capitalist progress and is allied to the large feudal lords and the imperialists. So, a discussion has to be conducted. The situation in Ethiopia exists in Algeria and in other countries. So, comparisons are necessary. The Soviets again, are those who support Ethiopia and Vietnam. This has to be discussed. This shows that they have no interest in usurping or dominating, but really that of stimulating the anti imperialist and anti capitalist class struggle. It is leaderships like those of Ogaden, which act with a very great ethnic, social and cultural backwardness.

There is no such thing as an 'Ethiopian' culture. What has the 'Ethiopian' culture incorporated in history? Ogaden like Ethiopia, has not made a single defence of historic interests, or traditions, as a country, civilisation, economy or in science. Ogaden has nothing of this, just nothing. There are backward tribal interests and mystical ones, which the sectors linked to private property exploit. They exploit this ethnic sentiment which is historically backward, for the benefit of capitalism. But, the interests who think, who want to develop life and civilisation, fuse with the development of history, that is to say, the Workers States. And the form of developing this lies through centralised planning, with the right to self determination, ethnic and cultural self determination etc., if necessary.

Indochina shows this. The USSR supported Indochina in the same way as it now supports Ethiopia. The USSR which supported Cuba, now sustains Ethiopia and the struggle against

imperialism. As for those who accuse the Cubans and the Soviets of supporting these movements, take a look at these movements. The Soviet Union supports all the movements which are anti-capitalist! This is what has to be said. This is no longer the stage of Stalin. Stalinism is no more! There is a bureaucracy which in order to develop the Soviet Union must impel the revolution and the Soviet Union is linked to the development of the anti capitalist struggle.

We call on the Ogaden comrades, the Eritrean comrades to make this discussion and to break from allies who are bourgeois and who just use them, as Sudan, Saudi Arabia and Somalia are using them.

We call also on the leadership of Somalia to discuss the conclusions of the historic backwardness represented by the alliance they have with such countries as Iran which is linked to imperialism, against a country realising and putting forward profound social transformations. Ethiopia forms Soviets which shows clearly that the intention of that country is not to create a regime of imperialist oppression or of invasion, but of a social and economic progressive development towards Socialism. All these tendencies like those in Somalia, Ogaden or Cambodia, which oppose either Ethiopia or Vietnam who seek to break the centralisation of progress, express forces which have local

and national interests without being necessarily imperialist themselves. But they end up linked with imperialism because local interest reflects backwardness and not the progress of history.

The progress of history can be measured very simply. Ogaden like Somalia needs to develop its economy in order to advance. There is no possible progress on the basis of a fragmentation into local interests. Culture is not something which can expand under a fragmented form, but is the already existing base of scientific and cultural knowledge — which is the Workers States. The Workers States represent the most elevated form of social cultural and scientific capacity. Such is the base for the development of the country.

The Ethiopians made Soviets, and organised the masses. This is not done to defend local interests, or interests of property, but to defend objective interests and impel the struggle for social and economic progress. This has to be discussed. When Somalia adopts this attitude of opposition to Ethiopia, it is because they fear that the progress of the revolution will influence Somalia, including the organs of Soviet power to break the stagnation of Somalia. In Somalia now, there is no political life, there is no trade union organisation which has a political life. In Ethiopia, on the other hand, the trade unions have organised Soviets where people gather, discuss and participate.

REPLY TO THE COUNTER REVOLUTIONARY TRIP OF CARTER WITH AN ANTI-CAPITALIST STRUGGLE

The trip of Carter was to affirm the bourgeoisie, in its defence against this process. Carter also tried to affirm the French bourgeoisie against the Communist and Socialist parties and against the Popular Union. This trip is not fortuitous. It was prepared. It had the aim of defending the capitalist system. It was not a courtesy trip, but one of political treachery. But when the President of the United States in person has to go to the Middle East, it means that he has no force or authority and that he does not feel capable of deciding as he wants by crushing the revolutionary movements, because of the existence of the Workers States. Then the countries of the Middle East have to feel that one of the essential bases of their strength is the existence of the Soviet Union of Yugoslavia, of Rumania, of Cuba, of China, even China, which is allied to reactionary, counter revolutionary sectors.

Carter comes to re-inforce the bourgeoisie of Europe and of the Middle East and prepare them for the confrontation with the Communist and Socialist movement on the road towards social transformations in Europe and Africa. He comes to prepare war against the Workers States. This is the aim of Carter. He goes to France now in the middle of electoral preparations. Such things do not occur anywhere normally. What do these people who keep on about non interference in other countries' affairs say about this visit then? Carter went to France in the middle of an electoral campaign. It is a direct support to the bourgeoisie. He came to make a pact in the middle of the struggle of the Egyptian masses who are defending their independence from Israeli imperialism. But this is interference. Moreover he intervenes in the affairs of other countries and certainly not with the aim of impelling them forward, but solely to crush them!

The trip of Carter has the same counter-revolutionary conclusion as the neutron bomb, and this trip just comes after the announcement that the neutron bomb was being made. The trip is a governmental one, neutron bomb, one already dispersing through the rest of the world. The aim of the trip is this. Equally it shows however the weakness of the capitalist system and of yankee imperialism. Carter has to go everywhere in person! These things used to be done through ambassadors or the secretaries of embassies in the past.

Carter has to go to try to influence the countries of Africa and the Middle East to give them confidence in imperialism in general but also to give security to yankee imperialism itself, confidence in its own capacity and initiative. This shows all the weakness, the fear and the insecurity of yankee imperialism.

It is necessary to call on the Workers States, the trade unions of the Workers States, the workers centres of the Soviet Union, Cuba, Poland, China, Yugoslavia, Korea, and all the

make their own, intervening in this form. The Workers States could for example, make the trip which Castro and Podgorny made. The trip of Carter is a reply to that of Castro and Podgorny. He went to show that imperialism does not abandon its allies. This shows how weak imperialism is and it shows also that it has to be overthrown.

Carter comes to stimulate the counter revolution. The visit of Castro and Podgorny was to impel the revolution. This is what they all came for. But when imperialism has to go in person, it is because it has no strength.

In the Middle East a programme of progress for the Palestinians, and Polisario, must be made, to allow them to constitute their own countries. Its necessary to appeal for the formation of a Federation against the capitalist system, against imperialism, with an appeal for the revolutionary unification of the movement with a programme for social transformations and a call to the trade unions and the workers centres of the world to support them against the capitalist system and to develop a programme of social transformations addressed to the Arab masses, to the masses of Israel, to the Communist Party of Israel. We call on them to make a still more audacious intervention, showing that the struggle against capitalism, against the Israeli-Egypt agreement which is against the progress of the Middle East can only be done by calling for the destruction of the bourgeoisie of both Israel and Egypt and going forward to a Federation which includes self determination for countries like Israel, Palestine, and Western Sahara. The perspective is not in an agreement with the United Nations, but an agreement arms in hand. The United Nations are absent from any of the large problems of history. Now no one remembers that they are still around, or if there are Nations and even less if they are United. The agreements and conventions are always resolved by force.

At the same time the world crisis of the capitalist system is evident and its powerlessness to resolve even the problems of capitalist countries as in the Middle East. And it does not have the military security to intervene. It only tries to gain time. Had imperialism a military confidence, it would have intervened directly by now. This is why it prepares the war. But the confidence of the Soviet Union in intervening is clear. The Soviet Union gives a direct aid to stimulate the revolutionary process, to impel the struggle against imperialism, and in the final analysis, against the Arab bourgeoisie.

We call on the trade unions and the Communist parties in the Workers States, those in the Soviet Union, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, China, Korea, Vietnam, etc. to

Turn to page 3

Editorial

continued from page 1

children openly support their teachers including making a march from one school to another to gain support, it shows that capitalism does not have authority any more. When the Prime Minister has to spend his time denouncing the school children and the teachers it shows capitalism already feels very insecure sensing its whole structure is beginning to disintegrate. The developing left is a response to sectors seeing this breakup of the system that can give no more and the example of the workers states that show the alternative. The programme needed for the left is one that responds to this, proposing that it is not just Princess Margaret that is of no value but the whole lot of them. The monarchy contribute nothing, so out with them. A republic cannot be a bourgeois one as capitalism is collapsing, so it has to be a Democratic Socialist Republic. Together with this there needs to be the programme of nationalisations under workers control as this is the way to construct it. The only way out of the crisis is to develop that programme, which is also the way to construct a tendency of the left capable of developing a workers state in Britain.

For the unification of the Soviet Union and China

The Sino-Soviet dispute is an element that weighs considerably against the uninterrupted advance of the world vanguard in its political and theoretical comprehension. The Soviet Union is seen to be intervening in support of the world revolution. It gives aid to anti imperialist, anti capitalist movements such as those in Ethiopia or the PLO or Polisario while the Chinese leadership makes agreements directly with imperialism, accepts Pinochet and has supported the most reactionary sectors whether in Angola or Somalia.

How has this come about? Why is it that the Chinese workers state, an example of a planned economy which has succeeded in feeding its people who formerly starved and elevating the whole economy, produces a leadership which spends its time attacking the Soviet Union and associating with Yankee imperialism?

The root causes of this aberration has nothing to do with the structure or programme of the workers state i.e. nationalisations, planning and monopoly of foreign trade. But it has a great deal to do with the limitations of the Chinese communist party, its absence of political life and absence of marxist method. The Soviet Union gains its strength precisely because its roots lie in the October revolution and the triumph of the Bolshevik party. It has a tradition and the most historically powerful proletariat which proved the foundations of the workers state against Nazi Germany and the 60 years proof of building an immense economy based on nationalisations and planning. But the Chinese

revolution is of an entirely different colouration.

For one thing the Chinese communist party came to power totally empirically, not until 1947 did it finally call for the overthrow of Chiang Kai Shek, although the regime was disintegrating long before this. It has no cadres trained in a marxist Bolshevik tradition. What education existed was largely of a stalinist variety with all the baggage of revolution by stages, conciliation with the bourgeoisie, socialism in one country and above all an administrative conception of the revolution and government after the revolution. Fundamentally the force which allowed the Chinese CP to prevail was not its own initiative but the advance of the whole world revolution following the Soviet defeat of the Nazis.

The Chinese party particularly after the annihilation of the first Chinese revolution in 1927 through the massacres of Chiang Kai Shek became turned towards the peasantry and its links with the proletariat hardly existed. Its Red Army was largely peasant and petit bourgeois. All this allied to the backward process of Stalinism in the USSR meant the development of a whole series of conceptions of leadership which put all the weight of decision not on a life with the masses, with the importance of mass organs independent of the party, and the army, but on the life of a political and military apparatus. The proletariat was subordinated in the taking of power. A whole series of conciliations was carried out with bourgeois and rich peasant sectors, before and after the taking of power. The links

were never fundamentally broken with bourgeois sectors in China.

The Chinese workers state has existed for thirty years during which time the "cultural revolution" took place. The latter was a form of advance of the workers state, a searching for a political revolution to remove internal obstacles, bourgeois and proto bourgeois sectors from the apparatus. It was a demonstration of the advance of the workers state, but it was also controlled by the apparatus and as there were no continuously functioning mass organs involving the workers and peasant able to discuss everything, it was the apparatus which decided when to call a halt.

The absence of continually functioning organs means that in the course of the continually expanding Chinese economy, a stratum is bound to arise which seeks to make a usufruct of the workers state. After all if the masses cannot decide on all questions of the economy and society, who can govern decisions over wages and material gains? — only the planners and the administrators linked to their allies in the government and the army. Thus a whole layer is cemented in the conception that the workers state is theirs. With the massive advance of the world revolution, the force and decision of the Soviet Union, Vietnam etc, this sector becomes more and more terrified of a process which undermines its interests. Thus it uses the party to try to extend its relations in the economy. It proposes profit as the criterion of the economy and material interests generally, it begins to select in the educational process

to promote individual interest. It produces lunatic schemes to "modernise" China as a rival to the "super powers". All this is a form of Stalinism but it is not and cannot become Stalinism because the total structure of the world gives it no room to develop.

Certainly some of its features have Stalinist elements, the continual purging of sectors and even the use of violence but these features are very attenuated compared with the ferocity of Stalinism. This is because China cannot be isolated in the same way from the world as happened in the Soviet Union. The world revolution develops with enormous velocity, world capitalism is immeasurably weaker compared with capitalism in the 1930s and the number of workers and revolutionary states is constantly increasing. This does not allow the Chinese leadership to justify itself with any force. It enters into conflict with the workers state structure when the latter is objectively favoured by world history. The present advance of the Soviet Union is particularly alarming for the Chinese leadership. Khrushchev and peaceful co-existence is one thing, Brezhnev and the decision to confront imperialism is another.

The difficulty for the Chinese masses is that their own organs have very little political life and there is no deep marxist tradition in China. Much therefore depends on the elevation of the intervention of the Soviet Union to stimulate discussion and to consistently propose a unification of China and the Soviet Union on the basis of a common anti imperialist and

anti capitalist programme, and for the elevation of the masses in the workers states to generate a real soviet democracy. The unification of the Soviet Union and China is a fundamental basis for the harmonious advance of the world revolution to communism.

More and more as the process develops, it is impossible to separate the taking of power from the construction of communism.

It is impossible to conceive now of a process of a "deformed" workers state. There is no basis for it. The taking of power involves the mobilisation of the masses. For the workers state to advance harmoniously likewise involves the constant intervention of the masses. The development of an anti capitalist programme can only satisfactorily arise and be developed on the widest possible basis in the factories, as well as the trade unions and the party. Socialism is for the benefit of the masses — how come then it is not discussed with the workers in the factories?

Those hostile to the Soviet Union constantly refer to the anti socialist "dissidents", but no words about the left dissidents in China who do not accept the line of the present leadership. This shows the need for a more objective discussion about China and the Soviet Union in the left in this country.

The experience of China is not the deciding experience in world history. It is completely surpassed by the experience of 1917 and the present course of the Soviet Union, but a discussion of the experience of the Sino Soviet conflict contains rich experiences for the cadres in the Labour party.

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION IN AFRICA AND THE NECESSITY TO OPPOSE THE BOURGEOIS LABOUR GOVERNMENT WITH THE ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

One fact is obvious in all the frantic diplomatic activity by imperialism regarding the process in Zimbabwe, that all of it is done to defend the interests of imperialism. The role of Owen in all this is clear, he seeks to find a "solution" which will keep Rhodesia as part of what is left of imperialism and he works on behalf of yankee imperialism. The "internal" settlement and the "Anglo/American plan" are very little different except that imperialism, which has a little wider vision than Smith, seeks to incorporate the leadership of the Patriotic Front into the attempt to create a bourgeois state with a black face. Smith, on the other hand, reacts to his own local interests. In the end, of course, the decisive factor for imperialism is that it is preparing war and seeks to create the best possible conditions for it. But the world balance of social forces does not allow this. The Labour government may try to disassociate itself from the murderous attacks of the Rhodesian army against the masses in Mozambique and Zambia but it supports this, as it supports the neutron bomb, NATO and the preparation for the war. It is an indication of a great backwardness in the Labour Movement, in the Labour Party in this country that the left does not denounce the attempts of the Labour Government to maintain imperialism in Africa and does not associate itself fully with the intervention of the Soviets, of the Cuban and the whole system of the Workers States in support of the revolution in Africa.

There is a differentiation in the nationalist movement between those who seek some form of "democracy" whilst maintaining the system of private property and those who advance to Socialism. That differentiation has already taken place in the Zimbabwean Nationalist Movement with Sithole and company determined to defend private property and Mugabe saying that formal democracy means nothing if the state remains in the hands of capitalism. In other words even before the final expulsion of imperialism from Rhodesia the leadership of the Patriotic Front is posing the necessity for Socialism. This is so because, before Mugabe spoke about the necessity of taking state power, of destroying the bourgeois state, he and his movement had already adopted a programme for the nationalisation of the land, the mines and industry. Is this not the

permanent revolution? And the process in South Africa which is one of the last bastions of imperialism in Africa is going to be even swifter.

The Patriotic Front have made full use of the divisions which exist in imperialism at this stage of history, in discussions and negotiations. This is correct but it takes second place to the necessity to pose the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist programme for the advance of the revolution in Rhodesia. The fact that the process is not confined simply to Rhodesia has to be taken into account; it is a world process and it is a process in Southern Africa. The structure of South Africa, in its economy and in its division of Labour, is the creation of imperialism. The economy of Angola, Mozambique, Zambia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, Namibia and the rest are all inter-dependent. No one country is self-sufficient and, therefore, the purely nationalist perspective, even if anti-imperialist, has no future. Indeed it is imperialism which now seeks to use nationalism as a means of dividing and confusing the forces of the revolution. It is imperialism which uses separatism in Spain, Belgium, Ethiopia and in this country. The Bantustans in South Africa are the crudest example of this separatism, it is an obvious device of the South African bourgeois to divide and separate the masses. What is necessary in Southern Africa — as it is in Ethiopia and in this country — is a programme for the Socialist Federation of Southern Africa.

Imperialism uses all the manoeuvres it can, it uses talks, discussions, proposals for "democracy" and separatism because it has nothing else beyond the launching of the war. It is a sign of the immense social, political and economic weakness of imperialism, of the world capitalist system that it acts in this way. And the depth of this is the social weakness which it has; it cannot use the United Nations any longer in the way it did in the Congo or Korea for example. Imperialism created this instrument and now it is forced to vote against its own interest in

the United Nations. This is a measure of the world balance of social forces which is against imperialism. In the same way that Africa, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia are expressions of the world confrontation which exist, a system against system confrontation. It is not a question of a revolution here and a crisis there. No, it is system against system, the Socialist revolution with the Workers States at the centre, against imperialism and the system of private property and exploitation. It is the stage of the final settlement of accounts. It is, therefore, not possible to discuss, or to intervene in the struggle in Rhodesia without seeing it as part of the world process in the stage of the final settlement of accounts by humanity with the system of private property.

We can denounce Owen and the Labour Government over its defences of imperialism in Africa — and this should be done — but they defend imperialism everywhere including in Ireland and in this country.

THE HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ELECTIONS IN FRANCE

not have anything but nevertheless they are developing. Mozambique, Angola have nothing and they are developing. What is important about Angola, Mozambique and the USSR is not that there are dissidents. There are dissidents who have social interests and it is a small layer, but there are no dissidents in the working class. No one is hungry, impoverished, or crushed and they show that under the satisfied economy, there is a development of the social, economic and cultural life of the population.

These are the problems in discussion. It is necessary to reach a united front before 12th March, even making some concessions to achieve a united front to increase this discussion the objective is the social transformation of France. Capitalism does not have the strength to oppose either materially, economically or militarily. If it had, such strength it would have been used.

It is necessary to increase planning which the

The Labour left has to take this into consideration. It has to come out openly to disassociate itself from the government. Not in one or other aspect but the Labour Government as an ultra-capitalist government and to confront it with the anti-capitalist programme. This is not to say that Africa does not weigh in this country. It does, very much so, and, because of the old structure of imperialism, because of the investment of British imperialism in Southern Africa, the advance of the revolution in Rhodesia and South Africa accelerates the total crisis of British imperialism.

The problem facing humanity is not racism, or even fascism but the capitalist system. And the capitalist system is not only in Africa, it is in this country. The struggle of the proletariat, of the masses in this country is the same — it takes different forms but it is the same — as that of the masses of Rhodesia. The enemy is the same and the process is one of a frantic, rapid, tumultuous confrontation of two social systems which cannot co-exist. In such a situation it is not

possible for the Labour Left, for the Trade Unions and the movement in general not to denounce the Labour Government and not to support the intervention of the workers states in the process of the permanent revolution. Above all it means to raise a programme for social transformations, for nationalisations, workers control, the end of the monarchy — which symbolises bloody repressive nature of imperialism — and the Socialist Republic. It means to put forward an anti-capitalist programme which incorporates within it full support for the anti-imperialist struggle in the colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. This is what the Soviet Constitution contains and, even before the actual taking of power, the Labour Left can take an example from it.

communists propose and discuss that it is necessary for the development of the economy and that capitalism is impotent. Together with this it is necessary to develop workers control, creating factory committees so that the economy is run for the benefit of the population, not that of the enterprise so that it can sell cheaply and continue to exploit the workers. Let all the population intervene through the factory councils and workers area committees, so that they control the economy and participate in the leadership, in the discussion of price, of cost, of what to produce. Let them form factory councils, workers area and school committees for this discussion. This elevates the level of the culture of the population. The better the culture, the more the population can participate in the economy and the more it can weigh to impede a bureaucratic development and the economy being run for the benefit of a minority.

These are the problems which have to be discussed.

continued from page 3

CARTER'S TRIP launch direct appeals as Communist parties, as Workers Centres, as trade unions, to the masses of the whole world for the overthrow of the capitalist system, to reply to the trip of Carter by means of an anti-capitalist struggle.

J. POSADAS 5.1.78.

J. POSADAS. 26.2.78

THE MONARCHY IS AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF THE MASSES

**OUT WITH THE MONARCHY!
FOR A SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!**

The recent scandal over the behaviour of Princess Margaret expresses the enfeeblement and decomposition of bourgeois authority as linked to the "sacred" institution of monarchy. But as with the annual hiccups over the vastness of the income bestowed by the "nation" to royalty, every effort is made to confine discussion and to prevent the questioning of the need for monarchy in the first place. The fact that the Labour party Young Socialists have declared for the abolition of the monarchy shows however, that conditions are developing where the slogan of "out with the monarchy, in with the Socialist Republic" will gain a wider reception in the Labour party, despite strenuous resistance from sectors of the apparatus most linked to capitalism.

What is the logic for the existence of monarchy? There is none. There is no possible reason for the continued existence of the institution on the basis of reason. What is the basis for the continuation of the "changing of the guard?" What is the function of all this mumbo-jumbo of court protocol, royal progresses and ritual of "Head of state" receiving new or resigning Prime Ministers? The reasons do not lie in objective needs but only in the subjective necessities of the ruling class. The British bourgeoisie were among the first bourgeoisie to become conservative because they were the first to feel the development of the proletariat, to feel the need to contain this class. Hence the preservation of the monarchy when in most countries of the world it has long been thrown out. The retention of the monarchy is an example of the irrelevance of class society to the needs of the development of humanity. In the epoch of laser beams, molecular biology and the development of atomic energy, how antiquated and absurd the existence of the monarchy, whose origins lie in the backwardness and repressions of slave and feudal society.

THE MONARCHY SANCTIONS THE BOURGEOIS STATE

The reasons for the retention of monarchy lie fundamentally in the desire of the ruling class to maintain a political mystique. The idea of the monarchy is to suggest that it stands above "party prejudices" above "class" and embodies the "nation". With the emergence of bourgeois parliamentary "democracy" and universal suffrage, a policy was pursued of "domesticating" the monarchy, bringing it "into the home" to establish a relation with the petit bourgeoisie and in this way to intervene against the proletariat. Moreover the alliance with the aristocracy of labour to contain the masses was sealed with the acceptance of the monarchy as outside discussion.

The monarchy is linked to the church, the army, the police and MPs take the oath of allegiance. The monarchy sanctions the bourgeois state, the law and the coercive organs of the state. It is not above and cannot be above the functioning of capitalist society. But it is used as a cloak to influence the petit bourgeoisie, to pretend that the monarchy stands for the values of home and gardens, as opposed to the real battle of the classes.

THE MONARCHY IS USELESS

As an objective use for the further progress of society, what value has the monarchy? If we take a look at the recent reigning monarchs in Britain what value have they had? Edward VII had a certain role from the point of view of bourgeois diplomacy in preparing for the First World War, i.e. against the interests of the masses, but all the rest did not even possess that modest capacity. They were total figureheads who were nothing and contributed nothing to the progress of Britain. It is true that this is nothing particularly new. For centuries now monarchy has been in its decadence. Trotsky gave a definitive view of monarchy in his history of the Russian Revolution, where he showed the utter incapacity of monarchs faced with revolutionary change, whether in seventeenth century Britain, eighteenth century France or twentieth century Russia. The monarchy chokes intelligence. The "mystery" of monarchy is quite simply "the void". In times of crisis the mystique of "service" and "devotion" to duty becomes difficult to sustain. Edward VIII abdicated his "devotion" and "duty" in favour of Mrs. Simpson and Princess Margaret cannot be persuaded to do anything but pursue a useless existence. The value of the monarchy for the bourgeoisie is purely propaganda. It is in the service of totally redundant and conservative notions. The first steps of social change in the world of today is to dispose of the monarchy. It was the weight of the revolutions that threw out the monarchies in Germany and Russia. The German bourgeoisie would have kept the monarchy, it was the force of the proletariat which imposed its abandonment. Similarly at the end of the Second World War, it was the will of the masses which threw out the Italian monarchy, not the decision of the Italian bourgeoisie.

There is much talk about democracy in Britain. The fiction is spread about on all sides by the bourgeoisie that Britain is so rare because it is a democracy, as opposed to the terrors of the

Turn to page 6

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

277 Friday 5 May 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:-

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

The Only Solution To The Crisis Of Capitalism In Britain Is A Programme Of Social Transformations

Editorial

The recent printers strike in West Germany has dealt a profound blow at the bourgeoisie. The workers declared that they were not against the introduction of new machinery but that this had not to be used against them and that they should remain in work. They won the strike and have forced the bosses to keep them in work. Germany is the Israel of Europe, a military centre against the workers states created artificially by imperialism to stem the tide of revolution throughout Europe. The Social Democracy has an enormous apparatus, there is a powerful trade union aristocracy and yet the masses won a big political victory. The German bourgeoisie did not want to concede to the printers demands because it reduces their ability to compete with other capitalist countries. Yet despite all the wealth of the German bourgeoisie, they were unable to prevent the triumph of the workers. Why are the bourgeoisie so weak in face of the working class, when they have the apparatuses of the workers movement which contains the true force of the workers being utilised? It is because they fear the constant influence of the Soviet Union and other workers states which are impelling the workers in every country to intervene against capitalism. The bourgeoisie concede on this issue because they fear that if they don't, events will move much faster against them and against the apparatuses of the trade unions and the Social Democracy.

The reaffirmation of the Soviet leadership of "all out support" for the African revolution illustrates the changed situation from the epoch of Stalinism. Now the Soviet leadership are maintaining a more consistent position in which they cannot allow any country to retreat from advances made towards socialism. Before, the Stalinists would carry out policies of negotiation with capitalism which would not be in the interests of the workers state or the working class. Now, however, Vance goes to Moscow, and just before he arrives, statements are made which indicate clearly that the Soviets are not going to allow any negotiations with the Yanks

which do not correspond to the interests of the workers states. Yankee imperialism feels this changed situation, and knows that it can no longer use the policies of Stalinism for its own benefit. Meanwhile, the world is a changed place for imperialism too. The British Empire has disappeared, Africa is in the midst of a tumult of social change, Indo-China has thrown out the Yanks. Why do the bourgeoisie have little security? Because everywhere the workers states are extending, and imperialism is being thrown out! Panama, for example. This creates divisions within the heart of Yankee imperialism over what policy to pursue. Carter the president of United States, himself, makes trips round the world to try and draw together the bourgeoisie, albeit in a shaky alliance, but to confront the workers states. He wants to gain time for the preparation for war against them. Another sector would prefer a more direct policy of confrontation. As a class the bourgeoisie have no alternative but war against another system which cannot coexist with capitalism. Socialism is extending throughout the world — it cannot just remain stagnant at a certain point of development — and when the bourgeoisie feel threatened as a system, they prepare war against their antagonist. Meanwhile the Soviets are taking advantage of the divisions inside Yankee imperialism, to advance, even with all the limitations of a bureaucratic policy.

THE CRISIS OF BRITAIN IS A CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The crisis in Britain has all the features of the crises in other capitalist countries. High unemployment, with the perspective of a continuous increase, gigantic subsidies to firms which are about to go bankrupt, but the workers don't receive the benefit of these subsidies, they are just constantly thrown out of work. Corruption is widespread, demoralisation in the army is apparent. They are symptoms of all countries which

are based on private property. Yet, take any country based on nationalisations and planning, and none of these events occur. The smallest country whose economy is planned finds no problem in developing. Yet the largest capitalist countries who concentrate all the wealth in the world can find no way out of their crisis. For example, in relation to unemployment; in the capitalist economy, unemployment is a permanent feature. Due to the expansion of the workers states, markets where capitalism can invest are constantly lost. However profits determine the functioning under capitalism, and so productivity at home has to be increased in order to compete abroad. The development of science and technology serve only to automate the factories, which means unemployment. There is plenty of wealth in the capitalist countries, there is plenty of profit to be made for the big firms. The problem of capitalism solving its crisis does not depend on the amount of wealth there is, to be given to the workers. In the least rich of the workers states, nevertheless every worker has the right to employment, to decent housing, welfare rights and does not starve. Before, these countries had nothing and the workers suffered. For the worker under capitalism, the amount of wealth in the country is meaningless, it is the way that wealth is used which is of interest. If capitalism has such a crisis, why does it not try to get out of it? It is having to take away concessions which were gained before, and this is alienating whole sectors away from the support of capitalism. Loss of authority is not in the interest of capitalism. Why are they not giving concessions which would try to prevent the steady increase of disillusionment with the system? This points to a lack of ability of capitalism to recover. They were forced to give higher redundancy pay to BSC workers only as a way to avoid even more confrontation. In no way does this solve the problems of the population because higher unemployment results. The only solution lies in the transformation of society, social changes which mean a completely different

Turn to page 6

In This Issue:—

MANIFESTO OF THE FIRST OF MAY 1978 of the International Secretariat of the POSADIST IV. INTERNATIONAL.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PALESTINIAN STATE AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

19-2-78 **J. Posadas.**

The proposal to make a Palestinian state — even if very small — would be no problem if it was just on the issue of making a small state to advance afterwards. The problem is that they are proposing to form a little state so that it does not advance. The big bourgeoisie will dominate, organise, and negate it.

What is happening is that they are posing the Palestinian problem in a new form. Now it is not just the previous problem which still goes on, that Jews and Palestinians have equal rights. Now it is posed in the context of the class struggle. The Palestinians have to confront at the same time the Arabs and the Jews unified in a reactionary form to prevent the progress of history. It's not the same as before. The attitude of the Syrians is unstable. Assad was as reactionary as Begin and it is not excluded that he repeats his previous policy. They are all stimulated in the tendency to unite before the objective danger of being bypassed by the revolutionary struggle, less in the case of Assad, much more with an appalling capitalist like Sadat. But they all have something in common as they had something in common before. Hence these countries break diplomatic relations at eight o'clock at night and resume them at seven in the morning. They withdraw a new ambassador before the old one has left. It's straight out of the Marx brothers. In a week they can withdraw the ambassador and resume relations six times.

The problem then is not posed as before. They count on the nationalist bourgeois tendencies and quite left sectors in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. It is true we count on this also, we agree. But the Palestinian state is not the way to resolve the problem. A small Palestinian state has to have as a minimum the right to self determination, to democratic liberties and to be aimed at the Jewish masses. Then the present stage is to unite the Palestinians and Jewish masses with the Arab masses. This must be called for and there must be the patience to wait, otherwise they will be crushed.

The Middle East has become what the Balkans were previously, with the historic difference that the Balkans belonged to the epoch of royalty. It was a type of struggle which capitalism manipulated so that no one dominated, no one had a great country. But now the workers states are there. What a change! Any progress say of Ethiopia, they would have dealt with some time ago, but now they cannot. They would have dealt with Iraq some time ago, and the Shah of Iran would have murdered most of Iran. Now he cannot. He has to salute the soviets. Even if he does it like the serpent, he has to salute the soviets.

This case of the poets is not a side issue, it's the form of political life through poetry, as they have no other form. But when it reaches this level in Iran, it is because there is quite a force against the system. Sectors see that the country can develop which is what we propose. It's necessary to intervene there. How to proceed with the perspective of a workers state? This is a stage in the process and the soviets are supporting these sectors. The Shah sees the

competition of them all. To continue he has to leave alone the principle nationalised sectors which are steel, iron, petrol, minerals. It is a country rich in minerals.

We propose a Palestinian state but at the same time an appeal to the masses of Israel and to the masses of the rest of the Arab world showing that a Palestinian state is totally unstable. It is necessary to pose the problem now in a much more elevated and more extended form. Now the Palestinians have to face the Arab reactionary forces and the unification of the Arab with the Zionist reactionaries of Israel. The small movement of Arafat can be smashed and there won't be a field of activity. It's deceiving the Palestinian masses to believe that there can be a solution in a special state. Thus it's necessary to discuss with the Palestinians.

This is united to the struggle for the liberation from zionism, imperialism and the Arab bourgeoisie. It is not possible to be submitted to just waiting for changes, but what are the conditions in which the Palestinian state is going to live? It can be a centre, we are in agreement. In this case then this centre has to be united to Algeria, above all Algeria. Also it can be united to other Arab countries, including Syria but countries that allow the development of the struggles for progress, otherwise it's dead. A new state for a Palestinian nation that does not have as an objective to eliminate capitalism in the Middle East, has no objectives nor transcendence nor possibility of surviving.

It is necessary to discuss these conclusions. Polisario, what is the objective of Polisario? To make a great country? To do this, it would have to develop economically and compete with the other countries, and economically they have no perspective. The birth of these countries in the final stages of the downfall of the capitalist system is not as before, but is united to the historic condition that the war is quite near. The war is coming and provides the condition so that they can unite and develop as workers states. Thus the organisation of an independent state must serve this objective. Then it's necessary to create a current that can have the political capacity to organise for this end, not making a new fatherland. This has no historic sense, no objective, no conditions to develop either economically or socially, or linguistically. I believe that this is very important, above all taking into account that capitalism is moving to prepare the war.

In various pronouncements of the Palestinians, the patriotic, local, territorial motive dominates, not the historic consideration that surpasses all the territorial or linguistic or religious conditions or interests Jewish or Arab. This is because what we propose are the problems of this stage of history which are not as they were posed before. Then it is necessary to discuss with the comrades, to elevate them in the conviction that the political leaderships abbreviate, limit, avoid this discussion and the fatherland, the destiny and the country. We say in what conditions are we going to make a country. For

what? It is convenient from one point of view because it can make it difficult for the capitalist system to intervene. But on the other hand all the Arab bourgeoisie proceed to strengthen and create a bourgeois layer which crushes all the others. But there is no possibility for any development, either of Palestine or Jordan or Libya or Syria. There is no possibility for independent countries as units, no need or possibility. It is necessary to develop the analysis, the texts, leading to the character of the stage in which the process is developing, otherwise it means finding support in the religious, patriotic or Arab nationalist sentiment which is a dead end. Now is not the stage of the historic function of the nation. The nation had a function in history, but what function has this? Thus it's necessary to make a discussion on this theme. There can be a stage of a Palestinian country but there has to be a leadership to unify the process on an economic basis to allow the development of the country, otherwise they are going to live in poverty and in these conditions a small bourgeois nucleus dominates everything completely. It is necessary to discuss the elevation of the culture of the masses and the direct intervention, not the culture and afterwards to intervene, but culture and intervention! It's necessary to see that the masses have the time to intervene and to develop currents and tendencies preoccupied with this problem.

The Palestinian nation is for what? To satisfy seventy two Palestinians or a thousand or to elevate the life of the Palestinians? If the life of the Palestinians is not elevated, it's no use. That is to say more or less the problem of the Quecha or Aymara languages. It is not the same but more or less the same.

There is no place for a Quecha or Aymara nationality. Then we take into account and develop the language as a means for a later stage. That is to say as the Bolsheviks did in the first stage. By unifying thirty two languages, they made one — the Soviet Union. Anyone can speak a language but what communicated and transmits the necessity of progress was the soviet language.

These are new problems which it is necessary to discuss and to deepen but this is the line. There can be differences over tactics but this is the line. Kuwait for example has forty eight people and the bosses amount to four. They import water into Kuwait, whereas with their wealth, they could transform the ocean into drinking water. Instead they have cars where you press a button and it serves coffee, meals, everything, but people lack water. This should be discussed, not on the basis of envy but because it is illogical. It is necessary to develop a current for this.

We are not against the Palestinian state, but it's necessary to explain what use it is. To make a great "fatherland" now has no sense, particularly from the desert, where they will have the worst conditions there are. But it can be utilised even so, as a means to develop a centre of unity of the Arab masses to seek the unification with the Israeli masses against the capitalist system. But this cannot be done

by just making the Palestinian state. It has to take into account the other Arab countries. Then this has to be clear. There will be resistance because Habash himself and Hawatme speak with a patriotic sentiment completely without sense, as if it was the nation which was going to resolve the problems. The nation has nothing, they will give them nothing, it's an "Arizona". If they go ahead they have to install a country, live and depend on Arab contributions. The result will be an Arab government, a leadership, a movement, a police, but not theirs to serve as an intermediary with the Arab countries.

The war in Ethiopia shows that the bourgeoisie is going to use everything its got to impede any structure, any process which develops in revolutionary conditions or in social struggles for transformations. Then it's not possible to make an issue any more of independence, of countries, of fatherland, of population without posing this, whether it's Mauritania or Morocco. The crisis of Tunisia is an upheaval in the understanding, and the decision of the proletariat which is going to have repercussions enormously in the rest of Africa. The government made a massacre but progress is not measured by the dead but by the will of the worker masses to advance. When it reaches the level of an uprising, it is because the workers rebel against their own leadership. This is going to continue and will impel the

Tunisian Communist party which is a small party.

But the uprising in Tunisia or the situation in Palestine or that in Angola shows that there is a whole process which is not only Palestine or Tunis but encompasses the whole of Africa. This is going to continue and to impel Algeria also.

The experience of Tunis has not finished. It was contained with a massacre but now there is an elevated development of the struggle of the proletariat and an internal struggle in bourgeois layers. But the pressure, when it reaches such a sphere, it is because the pressure and the maturity of the process is very elevated. This shows that the pro-zionist Arab bourgeoisie and imperialism cannot sustain a liberation movement which is transformed socially. It cannot sustain it. There is no place for any small country to go through a stage of bourgeois development. It is necessary to propose the form of federation, of integration and after, of confederations, taking into account also the roots of these countries. For example, Polisario speaks in Spanish and in Arabic. The others speak in Arab and in French, that is, there are no common languages and no common destiny. But there is the common experience of the masses in seeing that Vietnam emerged from backwardness into nationalisation to develop the economy.

J. POSADAS. 19.2.78

THE NECESSITY OF THE MARXIST SOVIET DEMOCRATIC LIFE OF THE PARTY

J. Posadas

14-2-78

If the life of the party is dialectical there is no place for the creation of bureaucrats. The base of the differentiation lies in what is done. The organ functions bureaucratically not through customs but the functioning of the leadership which is bureaucratic.

The programme on which the party develops, what is the programme? An anti capitalist programme of nationalisations, centralised functioning, this is good, but the political leadership is not good. It is bureaucratic. Then it reduces notably the levels of centralised property and planning.

The errors, deformations, arrogance, bureaucratisation comes from the lack of scientific leadership in the party. As there is a bureaucratic conception, the bureaucracy had a field to develop itself. They try to defend themselves, as Khrushchev did before they threw him out, because of the excesses of the bureaucracy as it went against planning. Similarly in Rumania they threw out eight ministers, but when they threw out eight ministers, it is because there was room for them. The problem is not to discuss who went downhill, but if they went to the bad what is the ambience which promoted this. What is the polluting agency, what is the ambience? It is a lack of political life and of programme, of marxist objectives and in North Korea it is the same.

This discussion in North Korea is of pro soviet or pro Chinese tendencies or for an agreement with South Korea at the cost of the workers state, as there is in

the German workers state now. These tendencies exist because they were created through the absence of marxist democratic soviet life of the party, absence of programme, of objectives, of functioning of the dialectical party and a party to defend these conquests.

None of them express the passion of the Bolsheviks. The passion was the form of expressing Bolshevik objectivity. They complain of difficulties on the way but in reality they are not inconvenient. They are making repairs when it is a question of making a new roof.

Hence Lenin is not of the "centre" as the Italians say, speaking of their own problems in Korea, or Vietnam or Germany. Also an important factor to develop North Korea, as in any other workers state, to develop it with all its power, to develop the power which is not developed now, it is necessary to educate the masses, to orientate the party, to develop the party in the planning of all the workers states. On the other hand, in their way, a development superior to capitalism is made, but very limitedly because they do it locally. In the Soviet Union infinitely more could be done through the richness of the USSR, through the enormous vastness of the means. Essentially if all these means had not been led by Lenin and the Bolshevik party, it would have been more or less like China.

In the workers state the character, the form and the development of the party based

Turn to page 5

On Bureaucratic Planning

J. POSADAS 23 December 1977

All these declarations which various workers states have published like Rumania, that it is necessary to increase production is aimed at the bureaucrats who make a plan of production and control production, with half for them. When they say that "it is necessary to increase production", showing that production is insufficient, they do not want to say that it is for bureaucratic consumption. Thus in the measures they propose "it is necessary to plan and to control production much more". That is to say this is against the bureaucrat who diverts production for the bureaucratic black market as was done in the great factories of the Soviet Union and China. In China there must be a very extensive black market.

Now this is not the same as in the epoch of Stalin where "to increase production" meant an attack, like the Chinese, directed at consumption. But in certain workers states it means a measure whose objective is against the bureaucracy. If there is workers control, the intervention of the factory committee is now against the bureaucracy.

On The Conception Of The "Class Struggle In Socialism"

J. POSADAS

23-12-77

The cultural revolution was terminated but already another conception had made its appearance. The Chinese leadership proposed "the contradictions can last a thousand years" . . . the class struggle is intensifying under socialism". We have been the only ones who have written on this, posing that if the class struggle intensifies under socialism, then it is not socialism, and cannot be called socialism. Socialism means simplification of the class struggle, which means now that the means of the previous struggle are much reduced in scope. If socialism is not capable of winning people — including the will of people, freeing them from capitalism, disintegrating and disarming the capitalists, because the structure of capitalism is disintegrating — then it is not socialism.

Part of the leftist groups believe that it is necessary to destroy the bourgeois class. Marx said this, but for them to destroy is to smash. It is not like this. We are going to win a very great part of the capitalists, not that we are going to win them just like that but they are going to see that socialism is life, not the way they live. But according to the structure of these groups "it is necessary to destroy the bourgeoisie". We win a part of the capitalists. A proof is the immense number of young people who are on the side of social transformations including a very great number, a very great weight of the bourgeois camp of sectors from the bourgeois camp.

In the socialist organisation of society internally the contradictions attenuate. Without totally disappearing, those that remain are attenuated. They do not have the virulent character of the stage of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In the stage of the bourgeoisie versus proletariat, the bourgeoisie to sustain itself only has the material means of imposition, sabotage, intimidation and assassinations. The workers state unites the armament, armed measures to defend itself with persuasion to win, giving way to society. If the workers state takes power and revenges itself against the others it develops in society and sentiment of vengeance. Its necessary to say to society "these people have to be suppressed because they cannot be permitted to act like this, but it is also necessary to win them".

This should be done without depending on whether they are won or not. Then society prepares to persuade, even with arms it persuades. It is not a question of killing and assassinating but a question of suppressing forces that prevent the persuading of others. If all could be persuaded, it would be better.

What the Indo Chinese are doing, the Bolsheviks did before. The Bolsheviks eliminated the prisons of the Soviet Union. They eliminated the prisoners, and many of the prisoners became leaders of the Communist party. That is to say socialism does not triumph through military imposition supporting economic superiority which determines social relations but by persuasion. The objective is not to kill the other but to progress their continuation with capitalism is inconvenient and it is necessary to overcome it.

Imperialism is making war because to live it has to do this. Then it is a lie when the Chinese say "that the class struggle intensifies under socialism". They say it because they are defending interests which are going to go against them.

The class struggle is intensifying on a world scale but the level is diminishing and is centralised. Centralisation for capitalism is the inferiority of capitalism. Not all centralisation expresses superiority. It can be fear that centralises them, not escaping but protecting themselves, mutually or sustaining themselves praying together to see if the Gods can save them. As they do not have any hold either on the mind or in the consciousness or in society, they resort to inventions of history like religion. But at the same time as the levels of struggle diminish the process is centralised and their power diminishes. Every centralisation does not mean that power increases but their power is diminished enormously. All their contradictions are united and they lose contact, authority and strength in front of the population. They do not have means of communication with the population. This is going to demoralise them internally and progress demolishes them. The child of eight with the rifle demolishes the bases of bourgeois security, because although they speak of the child as an enemy, in their mind they see the child of eight. They are all elements which develop conditions of collective madness in capitalist society.

Socialism is not vengeful, it does not triumph to take revenge but because it is a necessity for the progress of humanity. It is not a necessity of the proletariat but of humanity. The proletariat expresses this necessity. On the other hand the capitalist regime — like all the other regimes which succeeded each other, expressed a necessity which was expressed for progress but which a class could do for itself. As this class could not limit progress to itself, because of the scientific consequences which progress meant, it has to develop progress in spite of itself. The proletariat does this but not in spite of itself. The base to do it has to be this, to develop human intelligence. The proletariat will be revolutionary or it will be nothing". It is the antagonism of the class function in history.

The Future For Britain Is A Communist One

The economic crisis in Britain is not a superficial problem that will shortly go away. The unemployed are going to stay unemployed and will be joined by many other workers. The massive lay offs like those at the Speke car factory are going to continue. The greater need of the bourgeoisie to compete in the market is going to result in an increase of the pressure to rationalise production. The economic crisis is a symptom of a process of breakup of the whole functioning of the structure of capitalism in Britain. The economic aspect which is often the most apparent, is just one element in the degeneration of the system.

During the dispute of the police with the government last year they demanded the right to be in a trade union and to be able to strike. Whole sectors openly expressed their rebellion. The police are for capitalism an essential part of their state apparatus and they expressed their dissatisfaction. It was not an isolated occurrence but a disintegration that is going on all the time. At times it shows itself more clearly but it is always developing. It is a breakup of all the organisation of capitalism. In the British armed forces the soldiers, sailors and the airmen spend their time not discussing how to develop their military strength, but that they need more pay. The problems of the economy are all connected to this general collapse, so one or other measure which seeks to improve the economy is not going to work, there have to be measures that make social transformations. The ideas of Social Democracy do not provide any proposals or examples of how to make these necessary changes. On the other hand the Communist Movement does. It is a movement originating from the experience of the construction of the Soviet Union where for the first time capitalism was overthrown. In Britain today, the same problem of how to get rid of capitalism is raised. It is necessary to look to the experiences of the Communist Movement of the construction of the first workers state to learn from this experience.

EUROCOMMUNISM IS NO SOLUTION

During the time of Stalin there was a retreat of the leadership from the principles that enabled the Bolsheviks to take power. Now there is a discussion in the World Communist Movement which involves a return to the ideas that allow the construction of communism. The newspapers try and convey that there is a retreat in the European Communist parties away from the communist principles and that it includes them breaking from the Soviet Union. What is happening in reality, is that the Communist parties are having to change and the communist masses are intervening to make their parties confront capitalism. This provokes the beginnings of a discussion in the leaderships. As they are leaders without previous preparation they express their lack of security. However the discussions are not part of a retreat but of progress. The Spanish Communist leadership which has been the strongest supporter of Eurocommunism, is not going to retreat from the aim of making a communist society. The discussion in the Communist parties of France, Italy and Spain is not about whether they want to make communism but what is the road to achieve it.

The French Communist party has the programme of nationalisations and in the recent elections received the support of the French workers. Sectors of intellectuals in and around the party are discussing that the Popular Union did not win the election because the Communists directed themselves too much towards the exploited sectors of the population and not enough to the middle classes. Ellenstein has said he thinks the party should reject the Soviet Union as a model as to how to change society. These are only small sectors of the party and they do not represent the direction that the Communist parties are going. The Communist parties are linked to the workers states as it is there that their origin lies. The leaderships of the parties may try all sorts of tactics to advance in cautious ways but the mass Communist parties are not going to betray.

Eurocommunism comes from the idea of advancing but allowing the bourgeoisie to intervene. Eurocommunism has no future, for it is impossible to advance in this way. Capitalism and Communism cannot coexist. Capitalism everyday piles up armaments against the revolutionary forces. It will not let itself be superseded peacefully.

All this must be discussed by the communist comrades. They do not discuss this because they do not know. It is the first time after Marx, Engels and the Bolsheviks that there is discussion. These are marxist conclusions applied to now. This should be discussed in the communist parties. Then they would win more generals than they do now.

They win not but a few. If they had this conception they would win half the generals. Without the need to appeal to them, they would come. The communists do not realise that the progress of science wins people who are involved in science. Even the war has scientific aspects. Hence the most essential aspects of war are controlled by the capitalist high command, and none can be influenced. If capitalism had been destroyed in 1945, the war would not have taken place, either in Angola, Vietnam, Rhodesia or Latin America. As a whole they are major wars. The people who say "there are no wars" are cynical. They do not add up those who have died.

J. POSADAS. 23 12 1977

The Eurocommunists speak less and less of Eurocommunism because it is a concept with no validity. The road of constructing human progress with equal rights for the capitalist to intervene does not exist. Eurocommunism is conciliation with capitalism, and the Communist parties in capitalist Europe are continually facing the need to develop a policy to end capitalism. What is required is to make a new society and the mass Communist parties are the instrument of the masses to achieve this. It is the ideas of the construction of communism that grow, not Eurocommunism.

FOR DISCUSSIONS ON THE PROGRAMME TO TRANSFORM BRITAIN

British capitalism, like capitalism in the rest of the world has nothing more to offer. It is full of internal crisis, it does not respond to the needs of the population. However much money it is given by the state in the form of subsidies, it will not recover. If capitalism runs the industry it results in less workers, worse products and measures to make them invest more do not solve this basic problem. There is a need to discuss how to start developing a programme that is capable of obtaining the necessary transformations. Together with this to discuss how this is to be achieved. The road of Social Democracy is closed and Eurocommunism is finished. To progress it means to seek the way that the Communist parties are going, which is to deal with the breaking of the bourgeois state.

British capitalism through its previous power in the world, has been able to build up a big state apparatus. However, it is in a process of disintegration. Whole sectors of the police and army can be won over, the authority capitalism once had over them is much diminished. It is necessary to take advantage of all the peaceful means of progressing, such as parliament, but discussing that there is a limit to how far that will go. Eventually the situation of confronting the state will occur. This is why the consideration of what the Communist Movement is discussing is important. It is a discussion about what tactic is the correct one to change society. This is a vital issue for the left in Britain.

LIFE OF THE PARTY

on the marxist programme is fundamental. When in the Communist party they say "we are not blood donors" it is because there are quite a few reasons to lead them to be blood donors but it's not going to occur to anyone that they are.

In all the workers states after the war, throughout the first period for thirty years, everything was done under the leadership, the imposition or the interference of Stalin, that is to say of Stalinism and apparatuses developed the same as in the Soviet Union.

14-2-78

J. POSADAS

workers states, where everybody is employed and enjoy a constant advance in the standard of life. The lie to this talk of democracy is given by the existence of the monarchy which proclaims a totally anti-democratic conception of life. What is all this bowing and scraping in front of royalty? What is the point of all this luxurious pomposity? What does it have to do with life or progress? What is the point of all the uniforms? Who elected these people? Who can sack them? What have they contributed to the enlightenment of society? All that has ever come from the Duke of Edinburgh is a succession of complaints from the point of view of the bourgeoisie. All that the royal family represents is the maintenance of private property, the dictatorship of capital disguised in the trappings of feudal mysticism. What have they to say on the way forward for Britain? Nothing. They represent the dead hand of the past. During the Jubilee the queen visited Northern Ireland and yes, she represented the repression of British imperialism — terrorism, execution, assassination, the repression of the masses.

Paradoxically the monarchy, which is of little use in itself from the point of view of ideas or capacity, must be defended strenuously by the bourgeoisie at this stage. The reasons for this are not far to seek. If capitalism had the interest or capacity to develop the economy, if it was an expansive force with a historic future instead of living from day to day, it would discard the monarchy and win layers of social support on the basis of its growth and development, but now the massive proletariat exists in a world dominated by the planned economies of the workers states. Capitalism is torn by a ferocious inter-capitalist competition. This makes the bourgeoisie extremely defensive. It finds it very difficult to give a rationale for monarchy, so it tries to stifle discussion about it altogether.

Capitalism feels frail, vulnerable and precarious. To pose now the ending of monarchy is totally against its interests, because it raises the issue, what sort of a regime to replace it? If a Republic, what sort of a Republic? One like France with all the usual problems of decomposing capitalism or a Soviet Republic based on nationalisations and the planned economy? Thus the slogan calling for the end of monarchy is very important at this stage. It breaks the links uniting the bourgeoisie with other, particularly petit bourgeois layers of the population. Furthermore the downfall of monarchy means the exercise of reason and once reason is exercised, it discusses all forms of life and social existence including the sacred role of private property.

British capitalism is immensely conservative and reactionary. An MP has to take an oath of allegiance to the monarchy. He is rebuked if using "derogatory epithets" in relation to the royal family. The previous functioning of the Labour party has been instrumental in sustaining this type of respect for capitalist authority. For example in the Jubilee celebrations, where did any sectors linked to the Labour party, in the factories, or the unions or the workers areas, attack or repudiate the monarchy? What Labour councillors? Basically there was acquiescence because to confront the monarchy in Britain means to confront capitalism, and means to have the security and the will to act to overthrow the system as a whole. The Jubilee was a failure from the capitalist point of view. Backward sectors of the masses were influenced by it, but the reception was tepid among quite large sectors of the population. The publication of some letters by school children in the New Statesman showed another Britain, which has no time for the stupidity and arrogance of an institution which is hostile to the advance of the masses, which has no interest in the solution of the problems of Britain and which is part and parcel of all the reactionary plans of British imperialism to resist the construction of a workers state in Britain. The monarchy is part of the world of NATO, the neutron bomb and the maintenance of British capitalism.

The Labour party should take note of the call of the Young Socialists for the abolition of the monarchy. To abolish the House of Lords is very limited in comparison with appealing for the removal of monarchy and waging a campaign for its removal in the factories and the workers areas. Such a slogan, calling for the liquidation of the monarchy and its replacement by a democratic, leading to Socialist Republic, would give confidence also to large sectors of the petit bourgeoisie that the Labour party was determined on fundamental social changes.

Editorial continued from page 1

organisation of the economy. There is no country which has progressed other than the road of nationalisations and planning. It means that Britain, even with all its traditions and heritage of imperialism, can only develop on the basis of these principles.

Capitalism cannot give any more reforms and this is why the system cannot recover. For a long time now, the economy has been unable to develop but the colonies still gave a certain amount of wealth and this was used to buy off sectors in the labour movement, to contain and shackle the workers fight against the system. The Social Democracy developed on the basis of administering capitalism so that some concessions were given to the population. But what is the role of this Labour Government now? Reforms? Concessions? No. They take away concessions. They aren't able to give reforms. The economy stagnates and it

erodes the dominion of the Labour and trade union leaderships. When capitalism isn't able to give more material benefits and privileges to its armed forces which were created to defend private property, it shows a state of crisis which is not limited only to unemployment, but which extends to all aspects of life under capitalism. To solve the crisis therefore cannot be done just by remedies to alleviate unemployment, because this is only one problem to be faced. What about the disintegration in education, the lack of housing, the bad transport, the adulteration of food, pollution? It is a total crisis for which there is only one answer — transform the economy so that all these symptoms of the decay of capitalism will disappear. The logical necessity is to formulate an alternative programme of nationalisations, under workers control and the planning of the economy, which needs to be consistently campaigned for.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE ECOLOGICAL MOVEMENTS, THE YOUTH MOVEMENTS AND THE MOVEMENTS FOR WOMEN'S RIGHTS

12-2-78

J. Posadas

The ecological movements are going to increase because to the extent that capitalism creates problems — the preparation of the war, capitalist competition, the type of production which leads to the reduction of time and the use of cheaper raw materials leading to flooding and infection — the need for defence against capitalism increases. Then as there are no movements which respond to the struggle against these problems, separate movements are created. Neither the communists nor the socialists nor the trade unions have the strength nor are preoccupied or dedicated to combat these problems.

The trade unions, the workers parties are concerned but very superficially and they do not have a solution if considered in itself. It is necessary to overthrow the capitalist system, because capitalism cannot tolerate that they break down the form of chemical production, in which they compete with the workers states and between themselves and which allows greater profit and surplus value, to be able to confront the greater demand of the workers movement and the costs of the preparation of the war. Thus these movements are created and the movements of the women on the problems of abortion, youth and work are going to increase. They are all problems created in this epoch of the agony of capitalism which capitalism cannot impose because they do not have the strength to do it. The working class of the countries of the world, the workers centres, the communist and socialist parties based on the force of the workers states — which is the true force which contains capitalism — allows the containing of capitalism but not the solution of the problems.

The development of the problem of women is artificial, but created because there is no political answer destined to resolve it. The problem exists, and is expounded not artificially but inadequately, because the communist parties and trade unions do not resolve the problems and there is no solution within capitalism. It is not a problem of equalising rights, which in general they have, but of overthrowing capitalism because then the woman can resolve the same as the man. This is going to weigh much more on the workers states to advance towards the historic solution of the problems of women, of men and of youth and of ecology.

The problems of ecology, of the youth, of the women which occur, arise through the necessity to eliminate the capitalist system, because there is no individual solution to any of these problems. There is no particular nor general solution within the capitalist system. To resolve these problems capitalism has to be overthrown. These are the essential problems joined to those of the class

struggle.

The force, the impulse of the youth, of the women, of the proletariat, comes from the existence of the workers states which defeat capitalism constantly.

For example a very evident fact, decisive and notorious is the intervention of the Soviet Union, of Cuba, in defence of Ethiopia, which is the defence of a socialist state that organises the people into militia, a peasant people, one of the most backward in history and organises them to construct socialism. It organises them and makes the population intervene. It makes them intervene in a war which could be dangerous because if the population does not have political understanding, it would turn its back on them and sell to the highest bidder. This indicates an elevated preparation and influence on the peasant masses in Ethiopia. Certainly if they do not have political understanding they would retreat. But they were not organised and in a short time they organised an army. Before it was not like this, all the army was of imperialism. They had to create a new army. This is a country which demonstrates a lower culture from every point of view of knowledge, of knowledge of history, of science and has an enormous backwardness and now is organising forms of organisation close to the soviets. It is a country which is absolutely peasant and one of the most backward in history! The peasant accepted the collective organisation, showing the elevated immense progress for the whole world, showing the way from feudalism to socialism. This is the permanent revolution.

The force of Cuba is this, Cuba can be smashed yet it intervenes in Ethiopia. Yankee imperialism threatened to intervene in Ethiopia if they went outside Ethiopian territories. And why did it not intervene in Cuba? The effect of the existence of Cuba can now be seen in the position of Peres, of the Columbians, Equadorians, Mexicans and Panama. This shows a very great maturity to eliminate capitalism, even with the risk of the atomic war and with the atomic war which cannot be avoided, because imperialism is going to launch it. This is to see how populations hurl themselves into the overthrow of capitalism and even without the economic means, they resolve social problems by means of political leadership. In this way they hope to find the economic means to resolve social problems. This is to say that they have confidence in the theoretical and political understanding, in social understanding and in social influence.

J. POSADAS 12.2.78

THE BOMBING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY HEADQUARTERS IS THE WORK OF THE CIA

It is important to understand the significance of the recent bombing of the British Communist Party headquarters and also the attack on the left groups. These actions were not just the work of any fascist. They take place within the context of increasing repression throughout Europe. The bourgeoisie are not secure or stable; the talk in the barracks in Britain is not anti-communist or against the workers, but about the bad material conditions. Compared to the workers states, who all have armies willing to defend the workers states whatever the cost, the armies of capitalism are in threads. Discussion is developing in the world communist movement which is on what road to go to socialism. High finance feels that it will be expropriated eventually, and it cannot rely on the armies to unite solidly in their defence. But it resists expropriation all the same. A sector of Yankee imperialism thus has an interest in organising trained squads of assassins to impede the development of the workers movement.

The kidnapping of Moro, in Italy was done by a very expertly trained group who had experience

in shooting, they had money, contacts, places to go. The fascists don't have such expertise that only one of the bodyguards of Moro could get to his gun to shoot back! But the CIA does. It has been used as a context to search houses, cars and a way to arrest sectors of the movement there. This action has been used against the workers. In Britain, the bombing was an attempt to intimidate the workers movement. It wasn't a serious attempt to blow up the headquarters, just a trial run, organised by lower sectors of the CIA, who as yet are not consistently or efficiently organised. A discussion is beginning in the Labour party which will not favour capitalism, it is this which the bourgeoisie fear. The Communist party becomes a target for intimidation to try and prevent it from playing any role towards the development of marxist principles in the Labour party. It is quite a desperate action by the bourgeoisie, one without any perspective, and which reflects their weakness that they have no one who will defend the system, no social support. Even their own army cannot be held together by the social status once afforded to the soldiers, which compensated for any material deficiencies in the army.

The situation in Britain allows the possibility for a whole discussion to develop, of all the forces of the left, on a programme of social transformations. The attitude of the German printers was one of much political maturity and showed they were not afraid to confront the capitalist class. This is an example of what will also happen in Britain in the future. Underneath all the wealth of the German bourgeoisie, the workers came out to deal a blow against the system. The repression throughout Europe will increase as it is the only way the bourgeoisie have to respond to a situation they do not control. To respond to their actions requires a political programme, thus dealing with the root cause of all the problems of society. To adjust and remedy different aspects of the crisis of capitalism cannot work because the period of reforms is over. On the other hand, if the left in the workers movement puts forward an alternative programme at every possible opportunity — at factory occupations and meetings, trade union and Labour party meetings, in the workers areas, schools and universities, with a consistent campaign of explanations it is possible to attract and convince sectors of the need to transform society and thus end all the problems of capitalism.

MANIFESTO OF THE FIRST OF MAY 1978

of the International Secretariat of the POSADIST IV. INTERNATIONAL

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS' PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)



- TO THE EXPLOITED MASSES OF THE WORLD
- TO THE WORKERS STATES (SOCIALIST COUNTRIES),
- TO THE REVOLUTIONARY COUNTRIES AND GOVERNMENTS OF AFRICA, ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA

The process of the crisis of capitalism is profoundly deepening. A cultural, moral, scientific and social crisis is added on to the economic crisis itself. This is further impelled by a total crisis in which all the forces of capitalism, all its preoccupations, are turned to preparing the final settlement of accounts against the Workers States. All its efforts are directed at defending itself against the advance of the revolution, trying to contain it, to pervert it. All it does is to try to impede the ascent and development of revolutionary forces and movements which tend to impel the process of social transformations. It does all this against the Socialists, the Communists, the trade union and the revolutionary Nationalist movements which advance with anti-capitalist measures.

The whole of capitalism concentrates its will and force, all its preoccupation, to resist this process of history. As it does not have either logical or economic, or social and political forces, it falls back on its military force. This is why the capitalist system – led by Yankee imperialism – seeks to contain the process of the revolution in Africa, Asia and Latin America, using concessions as a means to do this. In this way, it seeks to compromise the revolutionary movements, it seeks to allow the infiltration of elements who intend to create, increase and sustain bourgeois remnants in these movements: it seeks to support potential elements which do not have any historic force whatsoever to progress.

There is not one progress of capitalism, either in science, in technique or in the economy, that one may point to. The progresses which the capitalist system make in the economy are made from having to compete against the other capitalists, particularly against the Yankee imperialists, but also having to compete against Japanese, German, French, British imperialisms, and finally, all these having to compete against the Workers States (Socialist countries). Now the development and growth of science and technology are dedicated to war preparations and to make weapons such as the neutron bomb. This means that the use of science and technology is being put at the service of crushing humanity.

When the peoples of the world are elevating their will to live as they are now, their ability as they are, which demonstrates the will of progress which they have, imperialism responds with the preparation of atomic weapons. This is to contain and try to crush, to confront the progress of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Capitalism is impotent, it is incapable of any growth or progress whatever. It develops with constant crises, with the movement of the Youth, the Old People, the Women, the Children. Capitalism develops a plague of assassinations and crimes, like the kidnapping of Moro in Italy and the murder of five bodyguards. In the whole world, capitalism has developed forces and bases to contain the process of advance of history by means of crimes, murders and wars. The peoples of the world, on the other hand, are constantly progressing in direct or indirect alliances with the Workers States, progressing with objective alliances with the Workers States (Socialist countries).

There is a constant and permanent progress inside the Socialist countries, and this is so in spite of the difficulties created there by bureaucratic leaderships. But in spite of all the limitations and lack of public and world-wide intervention of the trade unions there, in spite of a similar limitation of the Communist parties and of the Workers States as such, there is a constant and inexorable progress in the Socialist countries. There is economic, cultural and scientific progress there, and they progress too in the support which they give to the peoples who struggle for independence and against imperialism. They support the peoples who enter the objective, economic, social, cultural and scientific life for the first time in history. Angola, Mozambique, Vietnam, Cuba, Ethiopia are among these peoples. Entire populations rise against the domination of capitalism and imperialism, shaking all the power of imperialism. All the oppressed peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, like Ethiopia, are delivering profound blows at the power of the capitalist system and they win over entire armies. The army, as an institution, is now being won over to the progress of history, and the military now feel that its function must not be to serve the capitalist class against the masses of different countries in their struggles for national and social liberation. Rather, it feels that its function must be to serve economic and social progress.

Such events are the result of the world relation of forces, a relation which stems from the enormous economic power of the Workers States. And, in particular, the power of the Soviet Union: it feeds, stimulates and raises the will of whole countries, armies, movements. Nationalist, Catholic movements, movements of all sorts which start from any base at all, arrive at the understanding that they have a world support. This results in an objective alliance between the progress of history and that of the Workers States, because it is a process which tends to integrate the necessity of the development of the Socialist countries with the necessity to eliminate the capitalist system. All this is so, in spite of a process which is led by bureaucratic leaderships in the Socialist countries. These leaderships limit the

perspective of progress but, in spite of this, they have to act according to this policy of progress. In the meantime, in the capitalist countries, there is a constant deepening of crises, of errors, of catastrophes, murder of people, poisoning of the environment, pollution with the by-products and atomic waste. There is a constant polluting of the waters, the surroundings, there is a constant poisoning of food. There are ecological disasters like those that we saw in Italy, France, Sweden, Germany.

The resistance of the masses, of the peoples, against the installation and construction of nuclear power stations is not against progress. It is because they are against the use of atomic energy for military ends and for killing people through the wastes which kill those who produce them. This is why there are movements: they are a reaction to, and an awareness of, the environment. This means that the desire increases to see to it that science and technology must be used to benefit the population and not against it. Imperialism uses the development of atomic energy as a means of economic competition and for military preparations. To be able to do all this, it poisons people, threatens them with radiations, and to the risk of leaks. Against this, the masses and population oppose their resistance; the atomic energy must be a benefit for the development of humanity, and of use to it. In the hands of capitalism, it only means war preparations, an increase in economic competition, and the pollution of the whole surroundings, the air, production and the poisoning of people.

An infinity of countries are won over to the process of national and social liberation. From Algeria to Lebanon, Polisario and the Palestinians, they are movements with no economic or social forces yet. But what they have is an irresistible will for progress, and they take the path of progress with Socialist measures. These are examples. In the meantime, capitalism stifles and crushes peoples. This makes it that those who are born, grow up with such a will to struggle.

Because of this, there are elements of retreat in the process, there are some movements, or countries like Cambodia and China, who retreat whilst engaged on the path of the Socialist revolution. But these are isolated and partial aspects which have no basis or perspectives to transcend or continue doing this. These aspects do not represent the progress of history. It has already been proved that the progress of history is shown by Vietnam, and not by Cambodia. It is Vietnam and the Soviet Union which show this progress, and not the Chinese leadership. The Soviet Union got rid of Stalin; the world balance of forces permitted the Soviet Union to get rid of Stalin. And so, however much there is still the need for elevation of Soviet Democracy in the Soviet Union, there is already a progress in this direction; and it is in China that there is a retrogression. It is here that there are bureaucratic sectors which would like to make the progress of the revolution retreat and would like a retreat in the world relations of forces. This exists also in Cambodia.

Capitalism sustains itself, in part and quite fundamentally, on the policy of China and Cambodia, and quite particularly on the policy of China. It is a policy of objective support to imperialism and the world capitalist system. The interests of China and of imperialism are not interests that can really be coordinated, because they are deeply counterposed and antagonistic to each other. It is the policy of this Chinese leadership to make a conciliation between these two systems, and all this goes against the world progress of the revolution.

The whole world workers movement is in constant advance and not a single capitalist country has managed to overcome or to supercede the crisis of the capitalist system. The masses of the capitalist countries are in full revolt. The military dictatorships, from that of Pinochet in Chile to that of Brazil, Bolivia, Argentina, and in Africa and Asia, are in retreat; not a single one of them has managed to develop the economy, society, culture, science or technology. The disintegration of all such movements is due to the fact that they do not respond to the need of history. In order to be justified, to respond to the necessity of history – which has to be the progress of the economy, science and technology – it is not enough simply to have military power. The progress of the economy, science and technique are the foundation for the development and elevation of human relations. The Workers States and the Revolutionary States such as Algeria, Polisario, Vietnam, Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia, show that this is the real basis for the progress of history. None of these countries has failed, whilst all these dictatorships have failed economically, socially, culturally and politically. In Latin America, the only country which has advanced and progressed is Cuba, and that is a Workers State. The masses of the world see this process and feel that it is the way forward. They feel that Cuba is a measure of the progress of history.

In this stage, the Workers States have to intervene more. The Communist, Socialist parties and the trade unions must make a direct intervention calling for the anti-capitalist struggle. An anti-capitalist programme which gives an orientation and a perspective to the struggle of the masses is necessary.

The recent (not complete) triumph of the Popular Union in France is not due to the discussions which took place between the Communist and Socialist parties. It is due to the lack of an objective discussion, a lack of scientific discussion. What

happened is that the problem of the transformation of the country has not been discussed objectively. The direct intervention of the working class towards the population, and for the working class to be the leadership of society, has not been discussed. A programme for social transformations, starting from the most remote places, the workers areas, the houses, the factory workshops, the trade unions, has to be discussed all the way to the large parties. The absence of the massive intervention of the proletariat has meant that a large petty bourgeois sector has not been drawn. But this does not mean defeat for the Popular Union. It has been an experience which shows that it is necessary to win over the petty bourgeoisie, or an important layer of it, to show the way forward to supercede the capitalist system and for social transformations of the present capitalist system. In the meantime, the crisis of the capitalist system - and in this period after the elections in France - has deepened still further. Just after the elections, you could already see the increased dispute among the capitalists.

The kidnapping of Moro in Italy is an attempt by the CIA to try to provoke a reaction and a military movement to re-impose a dictatorship in Italy. When capitalism has to resort to such things it is because it has no social or economic authority to maintain itself over the petty bourgeoisie. It is the CIA and reactionary groups of the high command of the army, of the police, which have prepared these coups, and which go on making such coups. But these things have neither force nor transcendancy. This stage is not the stage of fascism or of reaction. The progress of history which already sees 20 Workers States and 20 Revolutionary States, show to the whole world, to the petty bourgeoisie, to the peasants and to the masses, what the road to progress is - They see that in all the Socialist countries there is a constant progress, in spite of the 'dissidents' and in spite of the lack of a sufficient development in Soviet Democracy. They see that there is a sufficient economic base there and a sufficient social development for a further development of these countries, a development to include also, in part, an internal democratic progress which is already taking place, and which is superior to all the capitalist system. The most backward countries, such as Cuba, have shown that this is the road for the progress of humanity.

All this has established a world relationship of forces in which capitalism finds no more means to organise the reaction, to crush the revolutionary movements and to prevent small countries from rising up to progress, taking roads to Socialism. The world balance of forces meant by 20 Workers States and 20 Revolutionary States, together with the revolutionary impetus of the masses of Italy, France, Japan, Germany, Britain, are what decides the balance of forces today, stimulating any movement to take the anti-capitalist roads.

The greater weight of this process has to be elevated still further. Capitalism prepares the war. The neutron bomb is not an accidental weapon, neither is it part of the war arsenal as such. It is an essentially counter-revolutionary weapon, directed against demonstrations, mass movements, and it is posed against the masses directly, against the masses of the large capitalist countries in particular. It is for use against the masses of North America, of Japan, of Germany, of France; and this, within the inter-capitalist competition, intimidation, inter-relations of inter-capitalist competition.

Capitalism develops all its forces in the preparations of atomic weapons. But it does not do so for economic, social or political development. This is why we are neither in the epoch of fascism, nor in that of the retreat of history. You can have a retreat here or there, but it is compensated by the advance of the world process. Polisario shows this. The Palestinians also. And the masses of the world, of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, show this. Ethiopia too. There, an army of peasants has been won over and passes directly to exercising the proletarian function. This shows that it has in its consciousness, its will, its programme and its objectives, the assimilation of the influence and the structure of the Workers State, which has won them over to the proletarian conception - with all the limitations which such movements also have - but with all the progress which such movements are capable of. The historic resulting line is that of serving the cause of impelling the liberation of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

It is necessary to influence the masses of North America who intervene little in this process at the moment. However, they are an essential factor for this activity. It is necessary to influence them and on this First of May to direct oneself to them. The Workers States, the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, as well as the masses of the trade unions of various countries, must turn themselves directly towards the North American masses. They must do so, as what they are, i.e. trade unions, workers centres, Communist parties in each country, and direct themselves to these masses calling on them to overcome the capitalist system. An economic programme for economic development, to overcome the crisis of the capitalist system and to overcome the complete ecological poisoning of humanity, has to be proposed to them. The North American masses must be called upon to take example from the Socialist countries. They must also see the masses of the Soviet Union, of China, of Cuba, themselves engaged in a public discussion on the progress of history in which they are seen to intervene, to participate and to elevate their participation as the leadership of society. This problem is a fundamental one.

It is also necessary that the Socialist countries launch an appeal to China, Cambodia, for the unification of the world Communist movement. This unification has to be discussed, and all this necessity has to be discussed objectively. In this, the North American, Japanese, German, French and British masses will see the masses of the Workers States intervening directly in the leadership. They will see a better participation of the masses of the Workers States in the economic and social distribution of the Workers State. This is fundamental and it is part of the means of preparation for the anti-capitalist struggle.

The discussion in the world Communist movement on eurocommunism, demonstrates that such an idea has no place in history. Neither eurocommunism nor pluralism has any place in it. Socialism cannot be constructed with a diversity of methods, various means and roads. Social transformation means the expropriation of capitalism. Planning is that which is needed in order to supercede capitalist society. Any movement which doesn't have security in planning, in programme and objectives for this, cannot inspire the confidence and security of the masses, and it cannot attract the petty bourgeoisie either. All this does is develop doubts.

A discussion - a scientific and objective one - is needed in the world Communist movement on programme, policy and objectives, in order to achieve social transformations and to discuss objectively the experiences of history. The Soviet Union, the Workers States, have to contribute to this discussion in such a way as

to be able to stimulate and raise the Communist and Socialist movement, the Catholic, the liberation and nationalist movements of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. This will be so that they take the road of the construction of the Workers States and supercede the present economies.

The failure of all the military dictatorships in Latin America resides in that they have all stifled the economy and crushed both economic and social development. They have thus demonstrated that dictatorship as such is not a means of progress, that it creates internal difficulties and social and economic retreat. Whilst the country which has taken the road of the Workers State, Cuba, shows that it is the most advanced in spite of having started from the most backward. This is the example of this stage of history.

The unification of the world Communist movement, of China, of USSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the German Workers State, Yugoslavia, is necessary. And, in turn, the discussion to unify the struggles for the progress of humanity is necessary. The Workers States are the most directly responsible element for progress and for the future of humanity. They have to make this essential appeal for the unification of the world Communist movement, all the Communist parties, the Socialist, Communist, Nationalist, Catholic United Front. This United Front is necessary with a programme of struggle for social progress. At the same time and without abandoning the programme for social transformations in the Socialist and Communist movements, it is necessary to make a united Front as a means to progress, to educate and attract the Catholic, the Democratic and petty bourgeois masses of America, Asia and Africa and those of the large capitalist countries of Europe. This is in order to draw them into the struggle for social transformations.

The masses of the most backward countries like Ethiopia, Cuba, Angola, Mozambique and Vietnam, are incorporating themselves rapidly into history. In a few years they have gained cultural and economic experience and the experience of fraternal, social relations which have resulted in immense progress and which have allowed science and technology to progress also. Whilst in the capitalist countries, with private property, it is private interest developed within competition, the interest for the accumulation of capital, which has impeded the objective development of the economy, society, culture and science.

The world trade union movement has to have a programme of demands, conditions of work, the shortening of working hours, protection against pollution, elimination of poisoning factors which drug, poison and infect the population. For the elimination of all this in the factories, in the workers areas, in the waters, everywhere! Such conclusions have to be a demand of humanity. Scientific and technological progress must improve human life, whilst on the other hand in the capitalist system this progress means the increase in the capacity of capitalist competition, against hygiene, health in the population. In the Workers States - even with the limitations which there are - it is all to the opposite of this. It is necessary to pose as an essential demand that any scientific or technological progress must serve the population, and it is necessary to pose that this cannot be done under the capitalist system. So, this demand has to be combined with the struggle against the capitalist system.

The whole world movement of feminists, youth, old people, shows the will of the whole population to intervene, organise itself and to lead itself. It shows that it wants to intervene and to participate in the progress of history. It is necessary to give this world movement the opportunity to develop, unifying the struggle for social transformations with the anti-capitalist struggle. Therefore, there is room for all the initiatives, the capacity and the development of intelligence of the youth, the children, the old people, the women. All the problems of the women and the youth will be resolved in the struggle against the capitalist system.

Humanity demonstrates that it is ready for Communism. Movements such as Ethiopia, which start from the lowest economic levels and social conditions, go directly to the Socialist transformation of their society. Peasant masses which had no other choice but to die on their land, who had nothing to eat, no shelter, who could not progress, now develop and they lead society. Countries like Angola, Vietnam, Mozambique, go from the most complete economic, social and scientific backwardness to the most advanced forms of will and reach the most elevated level even of economy and science; they do this with the intervention of the masses. Capitalism prepares the war; the retreat of humanity with the atomic massacre. The neutron bomb shows it. The struggle for Socialism incorporates the masses into progress. The greater the progress of the struggle - the more the hands of capitalism will be tied, and the more the damage it will inflict by the war will be limited.

For this, the intervention of all the masses is needed, and a policy must be adopted to make the masses intervene in public and open discussions on all the experiences. This will give confidence to the youth; they will feel their capacity and their possibilities to contribute to thought, to the elaboration of programme, policy and leadership. The same goes for the women, the children and the old people. The struggle for Socialism unifies all the will of the human being because it is for a common objective, and this is the objective development of humanity. All the Communist, Socialist, left-wing Catholic and Revolutionary Nationalist leaderships have to feel this, so as to contribute to the progress of history. Such initiatives must also come from the Workers States in particular. They must hold public assemblies, discussions, in the Communist parties, the Trade Unions, the Workers Centres, on all the problems of humanity such as ecology, production, science, technology and human relations in order to develop a more equitable process of 'to each according to his needs'. This will have an immense effect of experience for, and a power of attraction over, humanity. This is the way to progress! Let it be known that the use of atomic energy is a progress for humanity in the hands of Socialism, but that it is for war preparations, for massacres, for war and retreat of humanity in the hands of capitalism.

A furious world inter-capitalist competition is developing now; but over and above the world inter-capitalist competition there is the world concentration of all the capitalist system in war preparation, to confront the Workers States. But this, like the economic reprisals of imperialism, does not intimidate the masses of the world. Any country which wants to progress in history takes the road to Socialism. Any retreat leads to the sort of policy like that of Soarez in Portugal. Whilst in Ethiopia there is an immense progress of history. At the same time, it shows that it is the measures towards Socialism which resolve the problems of the backwardness of history. It resolves them through concentration, centralisation, developing culture, science and technology, without eliminating in any way the incorporation of the previous cultures, the previous scientific and technological developments.

This is the appeal of the Secretariat of the POSADIST IV International. April 1978.

Editorial

DOWN WITH THE MILITARY PREPARATIONS OF NATO AGAINST THE MASSES OF EUROPE!

For nationalisations, workers control and planning in Britain!

The intervention of French imperialism in Zaire and the meeting of the NATO powers in Washington has laid bare again the sinister intentions of world imperialism and their preparations for the final encounter against the workers states. Imperialism makes a great play of the Orlov trial in the Soviet Union while setting up a massacre in Zaire in order to intervene against the African revolution and sustain the regime of Mobutu, that well known assassin of the African masses. French troops intervene against the masses of Chad and the most reactionary states send aid to the Eritrean forces fighting against the socialist regime of Ethiopia as part of the efforts of imperialism to contain the advance of the African revolution, but imperialism is unable to deepen its intervention in Africa, because it lacks social support at home. This is the great weakness of world imperialism. However much they want to intervene against the world revolution and attack the Soviet Union, they are impeded by the anti war, anti militarist, anti capitalist aspirations of the worker and petit bourgeois masses in the capitalist countries linked to the growing authority of the Soviet Union.

The limitations of the Soviet leadership exist from a revolutionary standpoint but throughout the last period, they have intervened with great firmness against world imperialism. Brezhnev in Germany intervened against the policy of the Yanks to make use of the contradictions of Yankee and German imperialism. They have intervened denouncing without qualification the efforts of sectors in the Carter administration to frighten the Soviet Union with talk of the breakdown of the disarmament talks. At the same time they have unequivocally denounced the invasion of Zaire and reaffirmed their support for the African revolution. The Soviet Union has the initiative and acts with decision whereas the camp of imperialism in the last period has shown all its inner insecurity, its isolation from the masses and the struggle of tendencies within its own camp.

WORLD IMPERIALISM PREPARES WAR

Helpless in Africa, Carter threatens the Soviets in Europe, saying in so many words, we will not allow workers parties to take power in Europe. At the same time the policy of Carter does not correspond to the immediate interests of the central sectors of Yankee financial and military power which is why his policy gives the impression of indecision punctuated with outbursts of aggressiveness. His policy is to gain time for imperialism but this limits the desire for more direct and brutal action on the part of the Pentagon. Hence the internal wrangle within imperialism over the utilisation of the neutron bomb. Hence also the shifting actions of Callaghan. Terrified of precipitate action on the part of the most resolute sectors of Yankee imperialism and incapable of imposing a more resolute policy on the part of Britain, because of the hostility of the British masses to any imperialist adventures, Callaghan nevertheless reaffirms the anti-Soviet Union attitude of British imperialism, and support of NATO. In the final analysis as the Soviets have said, British imperialism is an instrument of Yankee imperialism. Imperialist powers cannot appear with all the force of their hatred of the workers states and desire to extinguish them, because in their own countries they do not have social support for such a line, hence they have to be clandestine and prepare the war secretly. All the campaign over the 'dissidents' in the USSR is justification for their real objectives, preparation of war against the advance of socialism throughout the world and the preventing of any objective discussion of the workers states in Britain, particularly in the Labour party.

THE LEFT IN THE LP HAS TO DISCUSS MORE PROFOUNDLY WHERE IS BRITAIN GOING?

The discussion and preparation of a general election in Britain takes place under the shadow of NATO meetings, the orchestrated campaign of anti Sovietism and the total incapacity of British capitalism to provide any solutions to the problems of life and society in Britain. Capitalism wishes to readjust the electoral situation, to repaint the governmental facade and to take advantage of the absence of a mature left to affirm its policies and impose discussions only of problems of interest to the bourgeoisie i.e. "Law and order", how to deal with the unions" — i.e. the working class, how to reduce the

Turn to page 3

In This Issue:—

J. Posadas

19-4-78

On the declaration of the Soviets on the kidnapping of Moro

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

278 Friday 16th June 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE WORLD BALANCE OF FORCES DECIDES THE PROCESS IN ITALY

22-4-78

J. POSADAS

(Title of the Editorial Board)

In this situation, it is not a question of being active or passive, one or the other winning, the government or the 'Red Brigades', but it's a question of the balance of world relations. The kidnapping of Moro is part of a tactic, of a policy of world imperialism to contain the advance of the Communist Party to government. When they do this, it is because they feel in the government — however much the Communists swear that they accept eurocommunism and pluralism, and however democratic they show themselves in the bourgeois pluralist sense — although the Communists make declarations which are in no way bourgeois, in general they try to conciliate — imperialism feels it is not like this.

It's a question of a problem of the world relation of forces. The intervention of the Soviet Union actively, constantly, exerting a pressure, saying this is imperialism shows that there is a world relation of forces and a world confrontation of system against system. The events occur in Italy, but the sense is this.

If the USSR had not intervened and manifested this position, the 'Red Brigade' would have gone further; that is to say imperialism, would have gone much further than it did. It is Soviet intervention which immediately said, 'This is imperialism. We first of all, and the Soviet Union after, are the only ones who have given an exact physiognomy of the events: 'This is imperialism and was done to prevent the Communist Party going to government.

In spite of the conciliatory 'eurocommunist' pluralist declaration of the Communist Party, imperialism feels that what decides are not these declarations, but the masses of the CP and the Christian Democratic masses of the left. They feel this and they do not have the strength to make a coup d'etat because it is not just a question of Italy only, but of the world and the Soviets. As the Soviets are not going to permit a coup in Italy, then they have to resort to this, otherwise they would have organised fascism and made the coup. NATO also

does not intervene because of the Soviets. The Soviets are not very far from Italy. They are in the horn of Africa and Soviet missiles can reach any moment anywhere, otherwise the Yanks would already have exerted a pressure to eliminate the Communists.

The fear of the Communists because of NATO is incorrect. It is the fear by NATO of the Communists which has to be considered. The fear by NATO of the Communists means the Soviet Union, and the Communists have to rely openly on Soviet support; not to be submitted to the policy of the Soviet Union but to count upon the fact that they are participants in a process.

The strength of the Communist Party, what is it? The Italian proletariat, the base of the Italian population, but without Soviet support, this force would not have the necessary capacity to develop, because then the Yanks would intervene.

It is important to conceive, to understand, to interpret this process as the relation of world forces. It happens in Italy, but it expresses the relation of world forces. Already the Yanks have intervened as much as they could. The trip of Carter went as far as Liberia, which has no real existence as it is a Yankee deposit. But there is a liberation movement and a sector of the left came out which says, 'We are agents of imperialism, but we have nothing and we want to progress'. Imperialism wants to undertake the task which is impossible to do, that is to contain the progress of history. It wants to contain it socially, but scientifically in production it has to advance, advance, advance, and it believes that the rest of humanity is going to let itself be smashed. These are historic problems and the contradictions of the capitalist system with the necessity of humanity.

It is necessary to denounce this coup as originating with imperialism, and it is necessary to aim at the Christian Democracy. This comes from the CIA and the declaration of de Carolis and of Montanelli

makes clear they prefer the fascists to the Communists. As regards the assassination of di Cataldo, warden of the cell, who has an interest in killing him? He's of the left and his son is in 'Lotta Continua'. Who has an interest in killing him? The interest in killing him stems from those who want to prevent the left having an impact and to eliminate people of the left. To eliminate him is simply an act of impotence to maintain the decision to continue the assassinations by this team, so that they do not feel alarmed nor intimidated. They killed him for this. He was of the left but he did not harm them.

It is imperialism which has done this, together with the Christian Democratic right. It is an event on which the Communist Party avoids declaring its position and the Socialists also, because Andreotti has not said a word about who is doing this. The government, as government, does not say a word. When the government does not say anything, it is because it fears to get involved in complications and fears to impel the discovery of who is organising this affair and fears a small coup. It does not get involved because it fears to stimulate further the contradictions of the Christian Democracy, but also they are afraid because they do not have a policy to respond to this. In front of the right, the policy which the government has is the solidarity of the Socialists and the Communists to contain the right so that they cannot operate legally. The government has no policy to answer to this, neither denunciation or analysis. They all lie, deceive, divert, threaten and utilise all this to make repressive laws.

It is necessary to discuss the situation in this way. It is not possible to make any serious and constant progress, because this is always submitted to the weakness and to the limitations of the Christian Democracy. It is necessary to take into account the Christian Democracy. It is not possible to ignore that the Christian Democracy has great strength and that it is a centre of the whole of the bourgeoisie. Even the fascists are going

Turn to page 2

to vote for the Christian Democracy, against the Communists to maintain the Christian Democrat power. It's a question of the fact that there is no solution in fascism. Fascism has no perspective, it is not a question of them wanting to give a coup but what of the historic conditions? There are twenty Workers States, twenty Revolutionary States. There are other countries which are advancing and the dictatorships are disintegrating: Rhodesia, Chile, Bolivia, Brazil, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and there is no affirmation of the dictatorships.

This is not only through economic and social questions. Economically they have no base to act, save in a way which destroys the economy and this is only convenient to a more elevated sector of the bourgeoisie. Socially it has no logic. There is the social resistance of the masses. Taking this into account, it is necessary to provide a programme, not of defence against the coup, but one of eliminating the causes which give rise to the coup. The causes are the secret services of the army, the navy, the police, which are in combination with imperialism and with the bourgeoisie. Imperialism organises them, but they have no strength to intervene. It has strength to invade Italy, but the Soviet Union also has strength to prevent the invasion of Italy.

It is necessary to discuss in the ICP a more resolved programme to denounce that all this stems from imperialism. It is necessary to clean up the secret services, the present administration. It is necessary to push forward now the democratic reform of the army, to eliminate the secret service which does not alter in any way military security. If now papers appear which say that the affair was arranged in the high office of the police, they knew this before. But now, there is a sector which wants, through this, to annul and to intimidate the culprits so that they cease. But, at the same time, they want changes, to use the opportunity to change the police services. It is absurd to believe the type who is involved with this just leaves and disappears. There is a sector which wants to stop, to contain or to free itself from this denunciation but, at the same time, it is very dangerous because this implies an orientation that it is necessary to 'investigate who did this', like the secret services, thus suggesting that top leaders are involved.

The ICP has to discuss a better political life, a life which discusses integrally everything including the relation of world forces which it does not discuss. And it is necessary to discuss that if the Soviet Union had not intervened showing support to the ICP, imperialism would have intervened much more profoundly. It's the Soviet intervention which contained all of them. Thus our expositions have confirmed a long time since that the Soviet Union cannot allow a retreat, either in France or Italy and not even in Germany. Hence Brezhnev goes to Germany, goes to stimulate even there so that they do not yield to the Yanks, to offer more trade with the German Workers State and also to try to contain Yankee dominion in capitalist Germany.

It is necessary to discuss also that it is necessary to reason on the class aspects of the process, to

develop that it's not possible to analyse in the form of ideals and ideal ideas, idealist presumption and mystically. It is not mythological, because mythology has a certain reason. Hence the mystic comes after the mythological. Mythology has an historic reason, mysticism has no historic reason. Hence all the mythologies are right with nature, with the life, with anything, including Bacchus.

The Communist Party has to analyse from the class point of view. This does not annul alliances or united fronts, agreements with the Christian Democracy. It cannot say 'Christian Democracy is finished'. The CD has 37% of the votes and possibly will increase its votes and the Communists also are going to increase and quite a lot. The Republicans can maintain themselves, but a sector of the Social Democrats and, above all, the Fascists who are split, are going to vote for the Christian Democracy to sustain them.

The kidnapping of Moro is not only from the groups. It can involve workers and leaders, just as there have been Communists who became Fascists, but whoever leads and carries this out does not come from the groups, nor are they groups excited by violence that are responsible. This is planned by those who have power in the state apparatus which allows killing and assassination without anyone seeing it. It means the organisation of a minimum 200 people, like the kidnapping of Moro, and they have not found one. They were prohibited from finding him. On the other hand, until now they have found all sorts of suspicious people that they have had to release two hours after detaining them because there is no evidence.

The CP must discuss all this and, if it is not discussed, it leaves the militant with doubts over the capacity of the Party. It has to be discussed in the Party. All this shows that there is no interest in analysing and no interest in describing, but these are measures substituted for Fascism, because capitalism cannot make Fascism and neither can they succeed with this. The next advance must be not to seek the causes in the groups of violence, but the violence of the fascist state that calls itself 'democratic' but which has quite a strong fascist wing which can do all this.

They are not points which defend Fascism but allow the functioning of the police and the army as in Fascism to do all this. The democratic state must impede this, but bourgeois democracy has limits. It cannot pass from certain norms just like that because it would be disorganised.

There is no democratic state. There are democratic liberties. It is the same democratic state which killed the policeman guarding the cell. It is the same democratic state which allowed this kidnapping to be undertaken. There are democratic liberties secured through the resistance but more than through the resistance, through the triumph of the Soviet Union, otherwise there would have been no triumph of the resistance. If the Soviet Union had lost the war, there would have been no resistance. Resistance came from the end of 1943 which was when

the Soviet Union smashed the Nazis. That was when the resistance really began. It wasn't because the Nazis advanced or the Yanks organised the resistance. They were against.

It was the stimulus of the defence of the Soviet people, of the Soviet Workers State which stimulated the resistance. It was towards the end that the resistance began. The strike of 1943 in Italy was after 300,000 soldiers and German generals were surrounded at Stalingrad. From there began the reaction throughout the world. This was the impulse to the resistance to Nazism. There was the Polish resistance to the Nazis, the Yugoslav resistance to the Nazis when the Communist Party of Tito gave a tremendous blow to the Nazis in Yugoslavia. It is not necessary to make an idealisation of the democratic state, but this was the result of the guerrillas in Italy without this, it would not have come about, nor without the Italian proletariat either. It was the product neither of the bourgeoisie nor of the Christian Democracy. On the contrary, the Christian Democracy was opposed to the movement. Afterwards it blocked it, to impede it being canalised as in the Soviet Union, because they saw that in Italy, as in France, the objective was the same as in Yugoslavia, the same as Rumania, the same as Germany, as in Czechoslovakia, the same, identical, identical. De Gasperi put the Communists in the government and two years afterwards threw them out.

It is necessary to defend the democratic conquests, but the state has a series of monstrous fascist laws which allowed them to do what they are doing. A better development is necessary of interventions of the trade unions of the workers centres, in alliance with the workers parties, to develop the democratic conquests together with the economic and social development of the country. There isn't any because they have paralysed the country. It is necessary to maintain economic development, the social, economic and trade union conquests, and a united front of trade unions and parties to push forward this fight.

At the Congress of the Youth half the time they discussed the democratic state, and this is not correct. The Congress of the Youth did not discuss the problems of the country, but the democratic character of the state, to defend it or not. It's erroneous to discuss this. It is not possible to discuss the character of a state without discussing which class controls, otherwise it's completely anti-scientific. It is to believe that the state is an accident of history and that the first who wakes up has the position of leadership. The relation of the economy with society is inseparable and society without the state is inseparable.

Youth has to intervene with the same objective as the others, to transform society and progress in the transformation of society and defend the democratic conquests, and increase them while struggling to maintain the force to transform society or to proceed to transform it to the extent that it is politicised. The social division of labour cannot be overcome if youth is not integrated in the forms of work. Youth

in capitalist society, if the Party does not integrate it, remains a marginal aspect of society, the child also. The child shows - in Angola, Mozambique and Polisario - that it forms an active part of the construction of society. In Italy, no, but in Angola and Mozambique, yes, and in Vietnam also. In Italy the child forms part of production and of the construction of the wealth for capitalism not for society but for capitalism.

The discussion on the democratic state is a false and anti-scientific one. One never discusses the character of the state without discussing who leads this state, what class of economy and of property. The bourgeoisie has private property, competes with world capitalism and to think it is going to give the state to the proletariat to overthrow capitalism is totally absurd.

It is necessary to see the very resolved attitude of the Soviet Union together with the bureaucratic policy of not going very far. It is a most open attitude of defence and of intervention in the world process in Angola, Ethiopia and in Italy.

The declaration of the Soviets is not one of simple formulations of its presence, but of intervention. It is not going to allow Italy to retreat and, as in our judgement, the Soviets have made three decisive declarations, saying 'This is the CIA', with the left groups which could be involved. They are not groups linked to the workers movement or which depend on the workers movement. They can be ultra left groups, but unlinked with the workers movement. Hence the CIA leads and organises this and these people do nothing more than execute what they are told.

The right of the Christian Democracy is going to procure the organisation of uprisings and the kidnapping of Moro increases the crisis in the Christian Democracy, because to the right, co-existence with a left which wants to yield, is going to be intolerable. This shows that it is a success of the Communists because these would have yielded. At the same time de Carolis and Montanelli went to North America so that it would exert a pressure in Italy.

Youth forms part of all the exploited masses. The youth is not special, with a particular activity. It forms part of the exploited masses. The division of labour between intellectual and manual labour, and the formation of the human race as a society which acts in this way, is a product of private property. It was not a design of capitalism or of private property which said this, but an objective conclusion of the development of the economy under private property. It develops this work, this form of the division of labour, essentially for the interest of private property.

It is not possible to surpass this conclusion without overthrowing the system which produces it, because this is not the product of bad political leadership, whether in Italy or the Workers States, but a conclusion of the forms of production. And in the Workers State it is still the necessary form to confront the capitalist system, intensified by the bureaucracy, but there are logical historic reasons for the system of production and, in consequence, of the functioning of society.

It is not society which determines the function of the economy.

The economy determines the function of society. In the advanced Workers State, it is society which determines the economy, but in Italy we are in capitalist society in which it is the capitalist system which determines the character of the work which everyone must do, including the university, the intellectuals, intellectual work, artistic work, the work of the writer, of the scientist: all the product of society divided into classes. This cannot be superseded without a superior form of society, eliminating capitalism.

In the capitalist system, this can be overcome by means of the Party and of the trade unions, in which these trade unions and parties are attenuated, or the principle of the superior form of society of the future. Of the future, not of tomorrow. It is not an imposition because one or another wants this, or lack of capacity of leadership, nor could Stalin have impeded this. It is an imposition which comes from the backward form of production, which is the capitalist system.

The system of capacity of productivity in the capitalist system is very advanced, but the form of social production acts so that people live as miserably as before, and the others are as rich as before. People eat better and live better, they have more social conquests, but in toto there are fifteen million unemployed. What does that mean? They correspond to what was formerly dying of hunger. They cannot die because there are the Workers States, hence the capitalists pay the subsidy so that the workers do not go to the Soviet Union or the Communist Party. The democratic state is not a present, it is an arrangement that they make to contain the political influence of the solution: the Workers State.

The solution of manual work or intellectual work which the youth propose, and the role of the youth, amounts to the fact that the youth has no problems nor a life different from the adult. The child is no different from the adult. The child has a functioning in life which is different, first physiologically, and secondly from the fact that he still does not contribute to the economy; but he is not a world apart or a system apart and a conclusion apart, nor is the youth. He does not live all the life that is lived, then it is necessary to incorporate him in all the activity as Polisario does, and as did the Soviet Union before every other revolution and as the French Revolution did and the Commune of Paris. The children, the youth and the women intervene with the same right, with the same capacity, with the same decision as the men, adults and the old people. The problem lies in the programme and the objective to change society. For example, the youth, with a life apart, what problems do they have? To live a life of youth, what is a life of the youth? To live preoccupied with the problem of youth, but the problem of youth is what exists in society, in the economy and in wages and war. The problem of the drug addict is not the problem of youth. It's not possible to say that the youth lives for drugs. The youth that votes for the Communists and Socialists, that makes strikes and paralyses the country, how say they are addicts. It's absurd, a false characterisation.

There are many youth of the left which amount to a million and 300,000. It is not a harmful thing, a peculiarity of the youth. They can intervene and weigh and decide and take this path. It is good

because they do not favour the bourgeoisie. Candidates are elected, for example the radicals, that are unstable, insecure and conciliatory, in part the dominant power, yes. But a current is created which is determined by the absence of youth, the fact that they do not give the youth a place in society. The evidence is that the youth are treated as a life apart: the university, the youth, the Party, the trade unions - but they share the same problems.

They are exploited. They have the same intention and the need to be freed from capitalist oppression. They have a need for culture, the need to construct the world, what life apart do they have? The youth is not terrorist. The youth does not employ violence except when it is necessary. Why a separate role for youth? Youth forms part of the whole country. It is not a separate problem.

The conquests in Italy are not the democratic state, the conclusion of the masses is through the class struggle, during the resistance and after the resistance, and now. They are not conquests that the state yields, but the bourgeoisie has to allow them. It has no other solution than to answer with fascism and with repression and reaction. When the soldiers and the police say, 'It is necessary to change society', 'it is necessary to transform society', this shows that capitalism is weakening, but not because the bourgeoisie yields. The proletariat makes conquests and advances, but conquests have a limit. Hence this effort which they have made now with the kidnapping of Moro, and they are going to continue with others.

And the fact that NATO does not intervene because the Soviet Union exists, does not mean that it is the Soviet Union by itself which impedes them. It is the Italian proletariat and the Communist Party which have the strength, but without the support of the Soviet Union, NATO would have intervened in Italy and France.

France has just finished intervening in Chad and before, they intervened in Mauretania. If they did not go further, it is not because Polisario is strong but because of Algeria, and the Soviet Union is behind Algeria and all the countries of Africa which make progress. It is necessary to understand the relation of world forces which does not diminish in any way the importance of the Communist Party and of the Italian proletariat which is fundamental and without their existence the Soviet Union would not have the forces to support itself.

And why do not they intervene in Ethiopia? They cannot play their games because the Soviets are playing there. The kidnapping of Moro in Italy is a big and profound blow of the right. It will not finish like that. It is a very advanced process which does not end with the killing or liberation of Moro. It is a process which shows that the right seeks to take the initiative in Italy to contain the process of the anti-capitalist solution. It's the same in France with different measures, levels, stages, the same in a certain measure in Spain. The process is going to intensify and is going to deepen its levels, and its economic, social and political objectives.

22 April 1978

J. POSADAS

Editorial continued from page 1

standard of living, and how to confront the influence of the Soviet Union and the world revolution by systematic anti Sovietism. That is all. The return of a Labour government of the inevitable Callaghan model is the return of a pro imperialist government and changes nothing. The Tory party is deeply divided and its role is essentially to maintain all the discussions well within the framework of capitalism.

All the propaganda of capitalism is dedicated to talking about the "successes" of "Uncle Jim" as for example in the Hamilton by-election, where the Labour candidate won and the SNP suffered a defeat. However it would be truly absurd to imagine that the electors vote for Callaghan's policy of reduction of living standards, increases in military expenditure, NATO, the repression of Northern Ireland and the life of stagnation and cultural stupidity which characterises British imperialism. The workers and petit bourgeoisie who vote for the Labour party do this to concentrate their class will and to stimulate changes in the Labour party, to resist the policies of capitalism. If there is an enormous difference between the intentions of the masses and the intentions of the Labour government and the apparatus of the Labour party that is a result of history, a contradiction which was present in the time of Lenin.

It is essential therefore that irrespective of the electoral situation, the forces of the left in Britain undertake a serious discussion on where is Britain going, how does it relate to what has happened in Zaire, what is the balance of the experience of the workers states? Such an analysis has to be based on the conceptions of the class struggle. When imperialism becomes preoccupied with the Orlov trial in the Soviet Union what is the motive for this - a disinterested humanitarian interest? Then why are they unconcerned about pollution of the environment and industrial injuries? Why don't they protest against the Sadat repression in Egypt which has been going on for a considerable time, why don't their soft hearts bleed for the "gang of four" in China. The answer is quite simple class interest dictates their "humanitarianism" - they have no objection to Sadat arresting the left, nor the gang of four being imprisoned because they are of the left. But they do object to Orlov being arrested because he never criticises capitalism and always attacks the Soviet Union i.e. he is of the right.

Orlov and the other dissidents are reactionary sectors

In the capitalist countries including Britain there have been campaigns in support of Orlov. It is claimed that his trial shows how there are no rights in the Soviet Union and the people are not allowed to speak. The 'dissidents' are not representatives of the Soviet people, on the contrary they are people linked with the old most backward sectors of the bureaucracy. In the workers states there are limitations in the functioning as the bureaucracy has privileges such as special shops where they can buy luxuries. The 'dissidents' have had a life benefiting from this and now that there is a process of reduction of the worst aspects of bureaucracy, they feel their way of life is threatened. Solzhenitsyn lived a life with great material wealth and ended up appealing to capitalism to attack the Soviet Union.

These sectors ask for 'human rights', in reality they mean the right to live a life with privileges. They are not speaking for the Soviet masses. The masses in all the workers states support the aid given to Angola and Mozambique. There is no protest in any of the factories against part of the wealth they produce going to support revolutionary movements. None of the dissidents make any statement supporting Vietnam, Ethiopia or any of the advances of the masses of the world. The population in Africa is liberating itself from repressive regimes and developing towards socialism. They are gaining real 'human rights'. The Soviet Union is actively supporting them achieve this. The dissidents are against these movements and their own state that aids this. So what does their 'human rights'

campaign amount to? They are in reality very small sectors of artists and scientists who are protesting that the Soviet Union is improving its internal functioning and having a more direct policy against capitalism. Sectors like Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia appear now because they feel their positions threatened by the improvements in the workers states.

The Labour government, the Tories and the capitalist made great displays of indignation against the trial of Orlov. 'Poor Orlov' they all said is being ill-treated. They never show the same concern for the one and a half million British workers that are unemployed. They have no rights but there is silence about that. In Ireland the masses live under the repression from the army but that is ignored. The question of Orlov interests capitalism because he is of the right whereas the fate of millions of workers in capitalist countries is of no interest to it. They hope to try and use the dissidents as a campaign against the workers states. It is not a principled stand on the rights for the Soviet people. It is necessary for the Soviet population to speak more. For them to have a Soviet life of meetings in the factories. This is not what Orlov means by 'human rights', for the more the masses intervene the more the aspects of bureaucracy will be reduced. They will discuss to push forward the policy of the Soviet Union to aid all the movements of progress.

The picture is given of the Soviet Union being a place where everyone is oppressed by the police. The cry of the dissidents is that they are ill-treated. In fact

THE SOVIET UNION REPRESENTS A NEW AND SUPERIOR SOCIAL SYSTEM. IT IS NOT A "SUPER POWER"

The recent public discussions in the Labour party have been very limited. Some sectors in retreat, argue we must not be concerned with nationalisations but rather with co-operatives and participation. This is a very backward discussion. It ignores the experience of the workers states in nationalisations and planning and substitutes modifications that accept the market economy and capitalist profit. Why should one hundred million pounds be given to Fords to build here? Socialism has nothing to do with subsidising capitalism. Co-operative functioning is pure evasion of the problem and is simply based on giving an incentive to small bodies of workers to try to gain advantage from the existing conditions. It is total utopia like pretending the hope for "Britain" lies in encouraging small businesses. Capitalism rejected the Bullock proposals and takes no delight either in the latest government proposals over worker representation on boards of directors. As these last are pure facade, it is absurd to think capitalism has any interest in participation, not even of the feeblest kind. It cannot tolerate the slightest suggestion of interference in its functioning, just as it cannot give any economic concessions and develop new areas of social support because the whole world economy is in crisis and its capacity to develop has ceased.

It is quite wrong to put the Soviet Union and the United States on the same platform as super powers. Their social systems are totally distinct. To develop itself the Soviet Union has to liberate and develop other countries, but the United States and other capitalist powers can only develop on the basis of smashing other powers, in the endless struggle for market and inter capitalist competition. When the Soviets intervene towards Africa it means to establish nationalised property, a workers state which advances by means of planning, using all the resources of the country. When imperialism intervenes it is on behalf of assassins like Mobutu who ignores the masses and seeks only more foreign investment.

We call upon the labour left to conduct public discussions on the Zaire episode and on the NATO discussions, condemning all these militarist actions and preparations. OUT OF NATO! DOWN WITH THE ANTI SOVIET PROVOCATIONS OF CALLAGHAN! OUT WITH THE MONARCHY! DOWN WITH THE ANTI SOVIET SPEECH OF THE QUEEN IN BERLIN! FOR THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC AND THE PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS, NATIONALISATIONS OF ALL THE KEY INDUSTRIES AND THE BANKS UNDER WORKERS CONTROL. FOR THE COMPLETE PLANNING OF THE ECONOMY WITHOUT THE CAPITALISTS.

Sakarov attacked the police outside the trial and received a small fine. Compare that with the treatment of left wing militant in Britain. At the Grunwick mass lobby people were arrested in a brutal way when they had done nothing. One left wing journalist was threatened by the police that things could happen to his family. It is in Britain where the repression exists not in the Soviet Union. In all capitalist countries it is the same that capitalism has rights for itself but the workers have to accept the consequences of the system. In capitalist Germany they have the law banning communists and people on the left from holding public office, where you are excluded for having left wing ideas. This is capitalist democracy.

Stalinism no longer exists in the Soviet Union. It was just one stage in the ebb of the progress of the workers state. At that time the leadership had a reactionary policy of hindering the revolutionary progress in the world. Today it is the reverse. There is still a bureaucracy but the Soviet Union and the other workers states are a constant support to all the liberation movements. It is possible to see all the limitations in the way it acts, but also the essential role it is playing must be understood. When criticising these limitations it needs to be with the aim of improving the revolutionary life inside the workers states. To assist it to be able to intervene even more consistently in support of the anti-capitalist movements. The 'dissidents' criticise in order to damage the workers states. They appeal to capitalism against the workers states. It is not possible to give any support to

them. Some of them have publicly called for the overthrow of the Soviet Union by force. This is why capitalism is interested in them. If they were making justified criticisms they would support the foreign policy of the workers states but say it is necessary to have more discussion on how to develop the soviet life inside the factories and among the population in order that they could express their support to the anti-capitalist policy.

In China the 'gang of four' are locked up so that the Chinese leadership can carry out a policy of conciliating with capitalism. They were locked up without a trial and yet no capitalist newspaper wrote even one article calling for their release. For capitalism it is all a matter of what suits their class interest. The left needs to take a similar class position of campaigning against the lack of democratic rights for the workers movement in capitalist countries. To condemn the lack of rights for people to hold public employment in capitalist Germany, but also the repression by the British state. To reply to their campaign over the dissidents by accusing capitalism of the murders they are making in Ireland. Showing how in the Soviet Union there is no unemployment whereas in Britain everyday workers are thrown out of work without any regard for their rights. That it is in capitalism where the lack of rights exist and the way to change this is to get rid of capitalism. The left in the Labour party needs to disassociate itself from the anti Soviet sectors in the party who are using the 'dissidents' to attack the workers states.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE, NUCLEAR ENERGY AND WAR

The sentiment of the sectors who struggle against the Windscale site where atomic energy is being produced from imported uranium waste for re-processing, is anti-capitalist. The concentration of public attention on Windscale, and whether the Public Enquiry there was 'democratic' is symptomatic of popular concern. The struggles there have to be linked with the whole struggle against the neutron bomb and the use of nuclear weapons.

The process of history develops in the form of the class struggle. No ruling class leaves the scene of history voluntarily. The progress of humanity demands the removal by force of the ruling classes when they have exhausted any possibility of progress. The removal by force however, can only succeed permanently, if the new ruling class defends progress. So, however much a class may be equipped with superior weapons, it will only establish its power on the basis that it represents the progress of history. Progress is verified in the economy, the means of production — to produce cheaper, more and for everyone — so that the human being may dedicate less time to exist and more time to develop social relations and the knowledge of the universe. Control of energy, as such is part of the advance of production for humanity. In the same way, the steam-engine was an advance of humanity. The workers as they have done in the past, will use the advance in technology to demand less working hours, more pay, all the means to elevate their life as human beings, not as now when all life is dedicated to have to work so as to eat.

ELEVATE THE WORKERS AND LABOUR PARTY PARTICIPATION ON THIS ISSUE

The composition of the movement against Windscale, and the large demonstration in London recently of young people against nuclear energy, is largely petit bourgeois. It shows that the petit bourgeoisie in this country is not influenced so much by the individual interests to which capitalism would like to confine it but that it is influenced by the world process of the Revolution in Africa, the continuous struggle of the masses of Ireland and the Communist conduct of the masses and leadership of Cuba. It is influenced by the weight of the Soviet Union, and by seeing that the Soviets support Cuba, and are those who impel Cuba. This means that the British proletariat in spite of the apparatus of the Labour Party and trade unions, attracts the petit bourgeoisie in this country. This is why in the Windscale opposition movement, there is a sector of trade unions involved. This has to be extended much more, allowing the workers to speak, organising meetings at the factory gates, seeking to draw all the protest movement onto the plane of opposition to the neutron bomb and the war which imperialism is preparing. In this process, the question of the political leadership of Labour will inevitably be raised and a healthy denunciation of the actual government will ensue. As long as the movement remains petit bourgeois essentially in character, it is limited. Capitalism cares about profits not about pollution from oil slicks or radioactive waste or gas explosions. It is the workers who have the experience of struggling against the assassin mentality of capitalism. They know that coal has to be dug out, but they know

too that capitalism will not give them the necessary protection against explosions, floodings or collapses unless the worker constantly keeps the fight for safety. This is not the experience of the petit bourgeois. Therefore, the latter cannot be blamed for not knowing how to distinguish between the progressiveness of production and the danger that lies in who owns the means of production. The workers have such experience. It is in the Labour Party, in the trade unions that such a discussion against the use of nuclear energy has to be raised, whilst maintaining the present movement of the 'Friends of the Earth' and other movements, but elevating these.

The workers of Germany have recently declared in the printers and engineering strikes, that they were not opposed to computers or all forms of technology, but that they should benefit from it. The interesting thing about this is that they won wage increases, less hours and no sackings, when German capitalism more than any has to keep its market competitive on the world arena. This is a tremendous victory against capitalism and is going to impel further leftwards sectors in the Social Democracy. This has to be discussed in the Labour Party and trade unions, to elevate workers control, energy in the hands of the proletariat, starting with a left Labour and trade union campaign on this issue.

CAPITALISM IS WAR

The organisation of production in capitalism is for profits, and a great quantity that is produced in capitalism is not necessary. The production of cars has the same murderous blind cause. Capitalism does not have any other base for existence but that which it derives from production, where it functions purely in pursuit of its economic interests. Outside this, capitalism does not have an independent will. Its will is entirely dependent on economic interest, and therefore its culture is minimal, and all its inventions have been for the defence of the very same interests. Its museums show us the discovery of the compass, the measurement of time, and position, as means of military conquests. Capitalism does not have any interest outside that in profit making and competition. This finds its highest expression in production where the worker counts for nothing, but the sale of the commodity for everything. So, in production, the worker is murdered either directly or slowly. The conclusion has to be therefore, that to think that capitalism would close Windscale is a naivety. If it closes it will re-open somewhere else. If not in this country then, in some other place, and the same problems will continue here. But capitalism cannot have any other interest, cannot conceive anything else but the need to compete. However, the largest part of the world is

under a new system, of nationalised and planned economy. Capitalism will not take another road but war preparation, because this is the only way to try to maintain its life. It cannot be convinced of anything else because it cannot ratify its own death. So, it is necessary to conclude: Capitalism is war.

It is clear that the Soviet Union does not need the neutron bomb. The neutron bomb is for use against the masses, against mass meetings, factory occupations, revolutionary uprisings*. The Soviets have no need for this, because they need a world system of nationalised planned economies. In capitalism, property is all, and the human being nothing. In the Soviet Union it is exactly the opposite. Imperialism prepares war. If there has been no war over the setting up of revolutionary Angola and Mozambique, it is because the Soviet Union is there. If Cuba exists it is for the same reason. So, arming itself has been a necessity of history for the Soviet Union. And it is thanks to it that today we have the possibility of developing a revolutionary left in the trade unions and Labour Party; those who accuse the Soviets of being just another 'military bloc' are making a great mistake. The Soviets are the guarantee for our continued progress. The nuclear war is the culmination of world contradictions in which what will decide the outcome, is the superiority of the Workers State not just in production — by use of all forms of energy — but fundamentally in the new social relations based on not having to be dependent on the economy and production any more. The planned economy frees the human being, enlarges its

intelligence and changes the functioning of the brain. Capitalism is war, the Soviet Union wants peace, and it is capitalism which wants war. We propose that this discussion be raised, and that it be brought in the factories, the trade unions, the Labour Party allowing all the groups and organisations of the left to intervene. The workers know what to take from them, and what to reject. And this will impel the Labour Party and trade union movement to adopt not the idealistic mystical and empirical notions of British imperialism, but the scientific conclusions of Engels on the process of history, and the inevitability of Communism. Posadas said and we say with him: Communism is a necessity of history. This is proven by the process of the class struggle. These are conclusions of immense importance which the Communists must raise here, and not the illusion of pacifism like "disarmament". We propose that the opposition to the nuclear sites be elevated to the slogans:

down with capitalism,
for immediate discussions
without waiting in the factories
and the trade unions, in public
meetings and public debates
where all the masses discuss:
Down with the neutron bomb,
for the expropriation of all
yankee bases, out of NATO, all
profits of automation for the
workers, full support to the
Soviet Union, China and the
other Workers States against the
war which imperialism is
preparing against them and us.

*Read J. Posadas: "The social counter revolutionary nature of the neutron bomb"

ON THE DECLARATION OF THE SOVIETS ON THE KIDNAPPING OF MORO

19-4-78

J. Posadas

The Soviet Union cannot allow a retreat either in Italy or France. This declaration of the Soviets accusing imperialism being the one of organising the kidnapping of Moro, expresses it. This declaration is directed to it. . . We are the only ones that forswore this attitude of the Soviet Union, which had to intervene because it cannot allow Italy to retreat. We measured the world relation of forces, which is how the understanding of this is expressed on the part of the Soviets, on the part of the camp of the Workers States. Not totally, but quite elevated.

The Soviets cannot allow a retreat, nor can they allow it in Angola, and they are sending a large quantity of arms to Rhodesia also. In order to do this, no Workers State that carries out such an activity can have a reactionary internal policy, when the foreign policy responds to the necessity of history. If the foreign policy corresponds to the necessity of history and the internal one does not, it is easily put right. That is to say that there is a differentiation between the internal leadership and the foreign policy, and this will resolve itself, but this occurs in few cases. Normally the internal policy determines the foreign policy. When the foreign

policy persists, not being a continuation of the internal policy, it is the foreign policy that determines the internal one.

They are not changes of historic strategy or conclusions of history, but they are changes of relations of forces, that as a result, alter the relations of forces between the internal and foreign policy, as also the relations are altered, i.e. consciousness determines existence.

The declaration of the Soviets clearly affirms, 'It is imperialism is working in Italy'. To defend themselves and to hide, they speak of the ultra left groups. What they are referring to in general is not bad, but it is not precise. On the other hand, when they attack they say, 'It is imperialism which organises and directs all this'. When the Soviet Union says all this it is saying to imperialism, 'We will intervene, beware!' When such a thing happens, it means an objective maturation of the world process, a very objective maturation.

When the Soviet Union draws such a conclusion and intervenes directly accusing imperialism, 'You put

yourself in Europe', it is in the Europe of NATO and the neutron bomb; (but that is going to be neutralised by the process of history). The neutron bomb has a limited effect, it kills people, right! But what imperialism cannot understand, what cannot be assimilated by imperialism, is that he who handles the neutron bomb is also a human being who is also going to be influenced, and half of them will not launch them against the Soviets, they will launch them against imperialism. This is a rational conclusion of history. Hence they seek to make a professional army. Many more than half of them who are going to launch the neutron bomb will launch it against imperialism or else will not do so at all.

If, in the previous war, a large number of the members of the army went over to the Allies from the Nazis — not from the leaders, but the lower ones — in this war, where there are twenty Workers States, twenty Revolutionary States, and there is a conviction that it is possible to live without the necessity of war, half of the imperialist army is going to desert. There are entire armies, as that of Ethiopia, that have been won over.

J. POSADAS 19.4.78

Editorial

DEMOCRACY HAS TO BE THE INSTRUMENT TO SERVE THE ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

All the events of the last period, in this country and on a world scale, point to one inescapable conclusion and that is that the capitalist system is in its final and total crisis. This fact manifests itself in the crisis of the steel industry, in the car industry, in rising unemployment and in the general collapse of the social services. Nobody tries to hide the fact that the health service is in a state of collapse and completely incapable of fulfilling the needs of the population. At the same time, the system of private property puts forwards no perspective for improvement and nobody even pretends that it has anything to give the masses except a constantly lowering of the standard of living, repression, terrorism and war. Callaghan, faced with the certainty of an election in a short period, would have at least made some promises of improvement if the Labour government was returned but all he can say is that the standard of living will have to continue to fall and the mass of the population will have to accept a lowering of the standard of life. What else can he say when it is obvious that the system no longer serves to advance anything and in circumstances where nobody would believe him if he said otherwise? The speech of Callaghan is, in reality, a declaration of war on the masses and the statement of someone who is prepared to defend capitalism whatever the cost to humanity. The shootings and assassinations launched by the "Red Brigades" in Italy and the bombing of "Peace News" in this country are part of a world campaign of terrorism by imperialism against the masses.

Callaghan reflects the fact that capitalism is preparing for war and that we are in the final stages of the existence of world capitalism. Each struggle, each local conflict is now part of a world confrontation system against system. In Lebanon Israeli imperialism makes it clear, in word and deed, that it is prepared to support the fascist sections and behind Syria in the struggle with the "maronite" fascists lies the Soviet Union. In the whole of Africa, the two systems confront each other and it is the same in Yemen. The advance of Yemen towards Socialism, in the construction of the Workers State necessitated the clearance of some of the more backward and conciliatory sectors of the leadership. This clearance has led to a confrontation between South Yemen and all the most reactionary Arab bourgeoisies - supported by imperialism. And who can doubt that the Soviet Union is intervening to support and defend South Yemen which is an extension of the world system of the Workers States.

The reaction of the Labour Government to all this is to draw close to the policy of Yankee imperialism, strengthen NATO by giving more finance. With regard to Rhodesia, Callaghan, Owen and company follow the policy of Carter which is to manoeuvre in order to gain time before the war. When the Labour MP Faulds says that the assassination of the British missionaries in Rhodesia is the work of the forces of Smith he is right but he says it in the sense of a support for the policy of Owen, of trying to weigh on the weakest elements in the Patriotic Front, and to try to obtain some support for a policy of defending private property and the investment of British imperialism in Rhodesia. It is clear that behind all the equivocation of the Labour government there lurks the wish to intervene in Rhodesia as the French did in Zaire. If they do not, it is because they fear the Workers State and they fear the reaction of the masses in this country. They see that the Belgium government collapsed a few days after the intervention of Zaire.

THE LABOUR LEFT DEFENDS ITSELF AGAINST ANTI-CAPITALIST CONCLUSIONS

In all this process, the Labour left - and the left sectors in the trade unions - have less and less to say. At best they simply propose reforms of a system, capitalism, which cannot be reformed and they ignore the fact that the masses are losing even the gains, like that of the health service, which were made in a previous period. The problem is that this left - both in the Party and in Parliament - have no other experience outside parliamentary reforms and this means that they are not prepared to face this stage of history. And this stage of history is that of the total crisis of capitalism and the final encounter between the two systems which now hold the world stage. The one which is going, capitalism, and the one which represents the road to human progress, the Workers States. In these circumstances the Labour left seeks to defend itself from the conclusion that the system of private property has to be overthrown, that there have to be social transformations - not least the end of the monarchy - in order to advance. This resistance is expressed, in a concentrated form, in the support for the "dissidents" in the Soviet Union and for "free" trade unions. In fact they are supporting a campaign against the Workers States on the basis of a defence of bourgeois democracy. It is an idealism which takes no account of the fact that democracy has to be for the advance of humanity but the sector which really decides is pro-imperialist. This campaign is organised by imperialism which uses the idealism and lack of understanding of large elements to the left, including in the groups and the Communist Party. In reality this anti-Sovietism is a defence against anti-capitalist conclusions because to reject the Soviet Union, the Workers States is to reject the anti-capitalist

Turn to page 2

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

279 Friday 21st July 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE EXPERIENCE OF CHILE, THE PETIT BOURGEOISIE AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ASSASSIN JUNTA OF PINOCHET

21.5.78

J. POSADAS

The present discussion over Chile, on the aspects of the coup and the entry in government is based on very empirical discussions. The attempts at pressure on the government are made on very false bases because they always finish by saying, 'Chile was too hasty'. They are only declarations. There is no example of the behaviour of people or of the classes, but they say simply: 'It was too hasty'. With the same criterion, with absence of justification, analysis, experience and historic foresight, one could say: 'It was not really quick enough'. It is necessary to see the behaviour of the classes, including the petit bourgeoisie. The discussion expresses a whole fear of taking the road of confrontation with the capitalist system. Hence they hide things and deceive over Chile, so now the Communists propose: 'It is necessary to go back with the Christian Democracy, to pose a front with them'.

We also fight for a front with the Christian Democracy, but not a betrayal or capitulation before the Christian Democracy, because the present policy which the Communists propose - including over Chile - is a capitulation to the leadership, the policy and the objectives of the Christian Democracy, which yields in the minimal things because it has no other remedy because that's the way it is. For them to go to power to defend the capitalist sector which they represent and to confront Pinochet, they need to confront the masses or to seek an agreement with Pinochet to impede the advance of the Communists and Socialists and through them of the trade unions. Thus, the analysis is made falsely. There is no scientific criterion of analysis, simply: 'It was too hasty'. Why was it too hasty? How make the analysis to see that it was too hasty? Who was it necessary to win in the popular front? The Chilean bourgeoisie in the Christian Democracy? No, the petit bourgeoisie. Well, what is the method, the historic experience which shows the method to win the petit bourgeoisie? They discuss nothing of this.

We pose the example of the popular Unity which triumphed with 36% of the votes and finished with 44%. That is to say, they won in a matter of months. When the petit bourgeoisie saw that the government of

Allende was disposed to advance, they went towards it. When they saw it indecisive, they now lost interest. This animated the sectors of the army to feel strong, because they saw the isolation from the population. If Allende had made the policy of confrontation, of organising workers control, workers councils in factories and workers areas, for workers control, he would have won a part of the army. Besides the army was against the coup and broke the decision of the high command. When there were reports that the army was going to intervene, people said, 'Not likely!' When in Italy they say there is need for military secrecy, people say, 'When there is military secrecy it is against the government.' This means it is necessary to develop in the population, among the soldiers, a denunciation of all this movement for a coup, that they have to see them as preparations of movements which are blows against the government. Besides one has to promote the political life in the army, to discuss programme, policy and organisation also, so it is evident that it is NATO or progress, not NATO and the USSR but NATO or progress. The USSR supports progress, NATO supports death. Then it is necessary to discuss this, but there is no discussion.

It is necessary to make experiences. The Communists take empirical decisions, based on impressions and fear. It's from their own fear that they judge people. People have no fear of the war of imperialism or of NATO. Besides, to advance, Italy has to confront imperialism, NATO and war. Then imperialism to conceal its intentions in Africa has to intervene to Mobutu, as if it was he who was doing everything, because they realise otherwise the peoples of Africa revolt. The African masses are the natural ally of Africa and, as the natural ally, it is necessary to realise that they are going to work against imperialism, but if there are no appeals, anti-imperialist mobilisations and appeals, the masses cannot move. If, on the other hand, the Communist and Socialist parties and the trade unions of Italy and France mobilised against the intervention of imperialism in Zaire, then they would mobilise and elevate the political capacity of the Italian masses and communicate with the masses of the Workers States, of

Zaire and Chile. On the other hand, this way it's a case of agreements at the top that advance, progress or determine in accordance with the state of understanding, of fear, of limitation, and who judge what the state of the masses is. They say: 'We warn the masses because a coup is on the agenda', but the masses show that they are not afraid.

In the guerrilla movement in Italy, what did the masses do? There were many NATOs but nevertheless the masses overthrew fascism and confronted the nazis who had ten times the strength of NATO. In proportion to their strength and danger, it was the same as ten NATOs, but the guerrillas won. The masses do not have the fears and the timidity of the leaders. The leaders do not take account of this. They take their own understanding and, if they so judge afterwards, they say to the masses: 'Take care!' But the masses show that they are not afraid. The leaders appear as protectors of the masses, which is false. 'Take care, NATO can organise a coup'. It comes from their own indecision, their own fear and lack of theoretical and political capacity, because there is no theoretical and political basis to say: 'In Chile, it was too quick'. Thus, all this is false, because they do not say what was said by a part of the world Communist movement which met in Cuba and determined that 'it was very slow', taking the text of Posadas integrally. Hence, these leaders demand eurocommunism and plurality for everyone to hold his own opinion in accordance with the circumstances of local relations with the bourgeoisie.

It's false that the petit bourgeoisie is afraid. They are ready to advance. The present petit bourgeois base, the petit bourgeois sector which is replacing the proletariat in the role of production through automation and electronics, does not have the petit bourgeois mentality. This is not the epoch of the advance of capitalism. It is the epoch of its decline and death in which the petit bourgeoisie is won to the revolution. This is shown by all the semi-colonial and colonial countries. There is not a single country where the petit bourgeoisie supports imperialism or the national bourgeoisie. They are small sectors which are

Turn to page 2

maintained by force as in Zaire. They are maintained by armed force, not through fear of the petit bourgeoisie to advance, but through armed force.

The petit bourgeoisie receives the influence of the progress of the world through the proletariat, and is influenced and elevates its social and political understanding. They take the petit bourgeoisie as if it was as immobile as a thousand years ago. It is no longer the petit bourgeoisie of the epoch of Marx and Lenin because, during that time, there was the fluctuation between capitalism and the advance of the struggle of the masses and the petit bourgeoisie was involved in production and socially between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Today there continues to be a layer between the proletariat and bourgeoisie but the immense majority lies in the proletariat. Its role in production pushes it towards the proletariat and the development of its consciousness also, because it sees that the immense advance of science and technology resolves the problems of social needs. It is against the system and cannot make a career any more. There is no career for the petit bourgeoisie. It is simply the equivalent of what used to be the workers aristocracy, or the privileged sectors of the proletariat. Now it is the privileged sector in production, but not socially, because the bourgeoisie has nothing to give it. The leaderships are not based on a social analysis, but on the

limitation of their capacity of interpretation, lack of application of Marxism. Hence they react immediately against Marxism, against Lenin and the International, i.e. all those aspects which unify the struggle of the world, because they unify the understanding and historic experience like science and technology and culture and art. Art, science, culture and technology, what are they? They are the superstructural expressions of the development of society.

It is necessary to intervene profoundly in all this discussion in which they are preparing a new Chile and a new Pinochet. There is no place objectively for a new Pinochet. They do not have the strength, but the Communists are delaying the process and are allowing imperialism among other things, to intervene in Zaire. That is to say, a centre of killing of an immense number of Africans. They have allowed the policy of blocking and concealing and not of confronting or overthrowing capitalism. These are the consequences. These are the consequences of Israel, not only of Israel but of Zaire and also of Egypt. That is to say, imperialism is based on the fears of this bourgeoisie, so that they make centres against the progress of history. The Communists say nothing, as if it was the natural thing. It is in no way natural. This has happened because they did not take the power. If they had taken power, this would not have happened. If the Italian Communist Party, the Spanish and French parties, mobilised and appealed for a mobilisation against the intervention of imperialism in Africa, it would have an immense effect - not against the Soviets or Cuba, because it is not the same. One stimulates liberty, the other goes to crush liberty. One pushes forward the expressive form

of liberty which is the social, economic, scientific and cultural development of the masses. Imperialism crushes. How put them on the same plane? Liberty is not an object. It is an instrument of progress. Then how does this instrument develop? Culture is also an instrument to allow to generalise the levels of progress in the form of culture. But culture without science is a limited, local culture. It is backward culture. On the other hand, all culture demonstrates that to advance it is necessary to stify, to plan and to overthrow imperialism. They conceal this. They are frightened and they do not have the necessary experience. They are not concerned with developing experience and they have developed, on the contrary, the isolation of nationalism, a form of nationalism which leads them to isolation.

To isolate themselves by saying that there is 'no longer dictatorship of the proletariat, internationalism', is isolation from history, isolation from science. This all comes from Stalin, from the epoch of Stalin which liquidated the instrument of the preparation of the Communist parties and developed the leaderships with this individualist conception and local conception. They agree one with another for a necessity of mutual support, not as a logical necessity of the science of a new society of history. The proletariat is the constructor. It is the class which leads the new society. It is the class with a class interest, but its class interest is to destroy every class interest, to develop Socialism. That is to say, it eliminates itself as a class. Thus, it does not develop a social economic and cultural and social interest for itself, but eliminates every form of appropriation of interest and property, and develops human fraternity through the elimination of every form of exploitation. They do not discuss this. They discuss only distantly. Hence the attack which they are making on internationalism is stupid. It is lacking scientific and cultural sense. They pose proletarian internationalism as an heroic necessity or resolution to support. It is a scientific necessity of science, as the science of Pasteur had a transcendent effect throughout the world. Science is a necessity and proletarian internationalism is a science.

To construct the new society which eliminates capitalism, internationalism is necessary, not afterwards but now, to develop the capacity to construct and to organise scientific understanding. Rousseau then, and now Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, were the ones who generalised intelligence through culture, science and art. They generalised it. It was developed, but not generalised. Thus they gave it a world centre. Art, culture and science can arise anywhere, but culture is elaborated. It cannot arise anywhere. The cultural process is elaborated. Hence the bases of culture are not born in the most backward country, but the most advanced which takes from the most backward, all the principles and all the progress made. It collects and unites them in the most elevated knowledge. Then, how ignore that the Workers States are the basis of culture and the science of today? But now what do they see? They

see the tail of the Workers States, 'look at the dissidents'.

We are not against an agreement with the Christian Democracy, but agreements with programme, with independence of action and with objectives of progress for democracy which has to advance accompanied by social transformations, otherwise there is no progress. Experience shows that the dictatorship of Chile did not occur because it was an enemy of democracy, but to defend private property and the most powerful sectors. The Christian Democracy proceeds to defend private property, supported by the Socialists and the Communists, because now Pinochet cannot defend it. Pinochet is collapsing and for the world plans of capitalism, Pinochet is no use, because if there is a rebellion, the first thing they will do will be against him. Imperialism sees, thus, that Pinochet is now no use. Imperialism has an interest in Pinochet, not in the Communists or the Socialists, but Pinochet is no use because he means a crushed country, crushed completely. In the collapse which is occurring, the pretensions of the Chilean bourgeoisie are developing and this complicates still further the problems of imperialism, which is the effort to make use of Bolivia and, in part, of Peru. The local interests, the robbers of the Chilean bourgeoisie, complicate and make more difficult the chief plans of imperialism which needs Chile, not for this but to resist the masses to prepare the war.

A new front with the Christian Democracy which does not include democracy, democratic rights, with factory councils, workers area councils, with expropriation, nationalisation, workers control, has no value. The conditions are again prepared for another coup, and expropriation of the masses. This is the world relation of forces which broke Pinochet, not the policy of the Communists, the Socialists or the Christian Democrats. It is the world relation of forces, including the decision of Cuba, which even if it cannot achieve any great thing in Latin America, intervenes quite a lot in Latin America. Cuba is a centre of attack on the junta of assassins, and the relation of forces of progress of the revolutionary struggle of the masses against imperialism is the relation of forces including Ethiopia. It is not the Christian Democracy which has succeeded in doing this. It is the relation of world forces which breaks Pinochet and the junta of assassins. Imperialism, through the Christian Democracy aims to contain an advance of Socialists and Communists and then it advances with the Christian Democracy. Hence the imperialist assassins who killed Kennedy and Allende now denounce those who assassinated them. They are no longer of any use and Bosch is no use to them either.

These are relations of forces which change in the world, and imperialism feels that Pinochet is no longer any use, like Israel. Israel is no use and imperialism has to support itself on Egypt. To utilise the weakness of imperialism and the incapacity of the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to weaken and disorganise their petit bourgeois base and win it. The petty bourgeoisie has to see the proletariat ready

to transform society, to take the leadership of society, not in the name of the proletariat, the Socialist and Communist parties to go to the government, but the programme and the intervention in the form of workers councils for the leadership of the economy, of society, of the army and the police. Otherwise, it's the same apparatus as before, the same instrument and administrative functioning. Then the proletariat cannot intervene and does not appear before the petit bourgeoisie as a leader of society, because to be a leader of society does not mean to say what policy to make but what social and economic measures to take. In this way the proletariat is seen before the petit bourgeoisie. In this way the petit bourgeoisie judges. It does not judge simply because they say, 'It is necessary to do this'. Then the petit bourgeoisie is not going to follow. The petit bourgeoisie cannot follow it by political determinants, but through social determinants and conclusions of expropriation, of the leadership of the economy. Then it sees that the proletariat is ready to transform society. The petit bourgeoisie knows that it is necessary to transform society. It feels and sees this. Hence capitalism does not any more win the petit bourgeoisie and the development of the economy, on the contrary, eliminates its influence among the petit bourgeoisie. With the increase of electronic production in production, the petit bourgeoisie plays the role of the proletariat, it's the same as the proletariat. It is an electronics proletariat. Capitalism does not win them, and in the relation of world forces it is the proletariat which influences, expressed in the fact that the petit bourgeoisie seeks social solutions because it sees that in the world the proletariat takes this road. The proof lies in any part of Africa where there are uprisings. They immediately take 'proletarian norms' which means the norms of the Russian Revolution, not of the Communist parties but of the Russian Revolution: expropriation, factory council, worker leaders, planning of production, support to the movements of liberation. Then the petit bourgeoisie sees these movements and it's won. Then, if it sees the proletariat making the same economy as capitalism, seeking to be purer in administration, more objective, it does not influence anything because however pure and objective the proletariat, capitalist administration has a limit a limit which goes from 0 to minus 0 because there is no means of regulation.

It is not the problem of the administration and of purity, because it is the capitalist system which has to be completely changed. Capitalism can do nothing. Its whole structure is corrupted, completely corrupted. When they make a Water-gate in the United States, it is

because capitalism is in total putrefaction, and how believe that if it is rotten in its political and social relations in the economy, it is going to be good and is going to negotiate. No, there is nothing to negotiate over. The more stages are gained, the less time has capitalism to cause greater damage. If they had overthrown capitalism twenty years ago, there would not have been the atomic bomb, neutron bomb, Zaire. This is the conclusion. But the Communists say, 'Thirty years of peace'. Lies! What a peace! The preparation of the neutron bomb shows that there is no peace, the assassinations of millions who have been killed, is not peace.

The problem of the left groups in Chile is not fundamental, but the experience of the population led by them shows that they eliminated tobacco, prostitution, and the women they gave up for lost showed that they were excellent militants. They won them as militants. They eliminated the drunks. Allende was himself moved once when he saw it and said it was clearly a good thing. There were no drunks. In Chile, not to have drunks in a poor area is an immense progress! Doctors gave free medical treatment and prescriptions. Children learned about medicine in a month what usually took a year in the faculty. It was the Communist right, the Socialist right, which tended to smash and weaken them. It is necessary to propose this as an example. But the leftist groups have less and less importance, because the process is going to be decided on the Spanish model: that is to say, the groups are going to have less weight and importance. Now with the experience of the masses, with the concentration of the process which allows the rapid transmission of experience and decisions, the groups have less importance. On the other hand, it is necessary to see that the groups are going to attract people that are most opposed to every type of discipline. A characteristic of the groups, is their lack of discipline and enormous empiricism. The individualism, the decentralisation of the groups is an empirical reply to the lack of a Party which can win them. If it wins them, it would not be like this. It corresponds to the nihilist movement, and the former anarchists. What has to be emphasised in Chile is not the experience of the groups - although it is an important experience - but that the masses demonstrated that they were capable of influencing the Christian Democracy. From one election to another, they increased by 8%. This was an enormous advance in a short time. They reached 44% in a few months. It shows the capacity of attraction on the petit bourgeoisie. All this is going to be discussed.

J. POSADAS 21.5.1978

Editorial continued from page 1

struggle. There is no other way - and history demonstrates this fact - to advance to Socialism but through the stage of the Workers State which means to overthrow private property, and the bourgeois state.

It is important then, that the Soviets now intervene both to the TUC and to the Labour Party pointing out the fact that they are supporting an anti-Soviet campaign and, by so doing, are putting themselves in direct alliance with Yankee imperialism. This is the result of the lack in the Labour Party, of marxism, of the dialectical materialist method. It is an idealism which seeks the "middle road" and it does not exist. Either you are on one side or the other. Progress or reaction. This is why the discussion in the Labour Party - and in the trade unions in as much as there is much discussion - concentrates on the question of the nature and role of the Soviet Union and the system of the Workers States. The intervention of the Soviets,

FOR A DEMOCRATIC FUNCTIONING IN THE TRADE UNIONS BASED ON AN ANTI-CAPITALIST STRUGGLE

which is correct but limited, is to impel the Labour left and the left in general towards anti-capitalist conclusions. This is the significance of the campaign by the Soviets against the Neutron bomb; a weapon which has no other use but to kill people and which characterises the nature of capitalism. It means that there is a process of a return to marxism in the Soviet Union and that is going to effect the development of the anti-capitalist left, the marxist left in this country.

THE LABOUR LEFT AND THE TRADE UNIONS HAVE TO TAKE POSITIONS IN SUPPORT OF THE SOVIETS

The question of the Soviet Union, as a force for progress in the world and as an example of the fact that the road of Socialism goes through the nationalised planned economy, is a conclusion which the Left has to draw. With this conclusion comes the conclusion of the necessity for the anti-capitalist programme and policy. What is the Labour Left going to do in the electoral campaign which is already beginning? It is going to say "vote Labour", "Labour is better than the Tories". No, what the left has to do is to use the elections as a platform to raise an anti-capitalist programme which is based on the fact that there is a necessity to plan the economy so that it serves the interests of the population and that the economy cannot be planned except on the foundation of nationalisations under workers control. In other words it has to raise a perspective of the construction of the Workers State, the Socialist Republic in this country.

The European parliament is nothing but an attempt by capitalism to try to limit their own inter-capitalist problems. It has no perspective since the Common Market, on which it is based, agrees on nothing. The latest proposals to solve the problems of the European currency is attempted by the French and German bourgeoisies to compete with and to defend themselves against Yankee imperialism. The system is competitive and they can agree on nothing except to prepare for the war. This is why there is a crisis about the entry of Spain into the EEC. On the other hand, and the Left have to draw conclusions from this, comecon advances towards the planning of a system of Workers States which now includes Vietnam and Cuba, and which has Laos and Jamaica, among other countries, associated with it. The Workers States can do this, and support with military and other aid, half of humanity in its struggle against capitalism, because it is based on a nationalised economy. The Labour left, the comrades of the CP and the groups have to take this example and not that of a few "dissidents" who are the tatty remains of the old Stalinist regime and the remnants of private property in the Workers States. These people are more at home with the fascists than with any left-wing movement.

DEMOCRACY IS THE MEANS FOR PROGRESS, FOR THE ADVANCE OF THE ANTI-CAPITALIST STRUGGLE

The coming elections are not the centre of anything but they are an opportunity for the Left to intervene. There is already a basis in the struggles which are developing against the government's "incomes policy", against the neutron bomb and for the 35 hour week. The Labour left and the trade unions have to extend these demands to include the demands for all wages to rise with the cost of living, so that all profits of automation go directly to the workers, that any factory threatened with closure - like the London Docks or the steel foundries - are run under workers control. In an earlier period - after the electoral defeat of the Labour Party in 1970 - the Labour Party raised the programme of 25 points which was anti-capitalist. What happened to it? Why not bring it out, elevate it and campaign on it? Why not discuss it with the workers, with the population?

However, as the 25 points shows, anti-capitalist proposals, in themselves, are not enough. There is the necessity to impose them and it is clear that little of this can be done through parliament. The force which has to come to play is that of the working class and it has to function independently as a leadership in society. There is a discussion in the NUM conference, in other trade unions and in the Labour Party on the question of "democracy". It reflects the pressure of the working class on its existing leadership but it is not a pressure for "democracy" in abstract or because the present system is "unfair" but because the class seeks organisms, leaderships which express its essentially anti-capitalist nature. Organisms and leaderships which allow the class to intervene and to advance in the anti-capitalist struggle. It is clear then that a discussion in the Labour Party on how MP's are selected serves nothing except to contain the struggle and preoccupation of the masses. Therefore, the Labour Left, the Communists, the left in general has to discuss the question of democracy in the Soviet Union in relationship to the workers movement in this country and with the understanding that democracy is the means to advance the anti-capitalist struggle, for social transformations, for the end of the monarchy and for the construction of the Workers State. The Soviet Union and the Workers State serve this end and "Labour" does not. This is the discussion which is necessary.

The recent world-wide discussion ensuing over the campaign for "free" trade unions in the Soviet Union represents the same type of discussion as over the dissidents. Essentially the character of such a discussion is supposed to be the question of democracy. However its motivation is not a genuine one in search of democracy. If this were so, the proposal for "free" trade unions would never have been suggested. In order to clarify what are democratic trade unions, it is fundamental to look at their role, and structure and functioning.

Trade unions have been organised and developed by the working class because the workers require a means of fighting against the employers who have the state apparatus on their side. The trade unions were forged directly in the class struggle and represent a necessity of the working class to protect themselves. On every important political issue, the trade unions find themselves confronting the state apparatus. The capitalist state functions in the interest of private property, this is what it is there to defend. The workers state is not based on private property, it is characterised by a nationalised planned economy. The trade unions in a workers state do not find themselves combatting the state because the workers state functions in the interest of the population. The workers state can be relied upon to guarantee an ever increasing standard of life which capitalism simply cannot do. Under capitalism, the quality of life diminishes. The trade unions in a capitalist state find, therefore, that now they come more and more into conflict with the capitalist state, if they are to protect the living standards of the population. But with the expansion of the workers state, the continual planning, the surpassing of state plans which is generally the norm, the trade unions play a role, not of struggling against the state, but of supporting the state to elevate the standard of life. In this sense, the trade unions in the Soviet Union develop infinitely more "democracy" than in Britain, because they are far more effective in responding to the needs of the population. It is because they are structured on the workers state that they are more democratic. Thus the function of a trade union cannot be isolated from the state. In order to make the trade unions in Britain more democratic, it requires a campaign by the trade unions to change the capitalist state, and to propose a workers state here.

We propose that a way to make the trade unions in the Soviet Union more democratic would be for the trade unions to function independently of the state. This is because it is necessary for the workers to be protected from bureaucratic elements who usurp the state for their own interests and hence the workers require protection from the bureaucracy.

The trade unions in the workers state have a dualistic function. Being based on a nationalised planned economy, they are involved and have an interest in developing and planning the production of the state, of ensuring the fulfillment

of plans for the benefit of the population. However, the workers state still does not have socialist distribution. Inequalities in all aspects of life exist because there is a bureaucracy which usurps that state. The Soviet trade unions have to protect the worker from the interests of the bureaucracy which run counter to those of the worker. This is why the trade unions have to function independently from the state, from the point of view of correcting bureaucratic distribution and inefficiencies, eliminating inequalities by impelling socialist distribution. This functioning includes the right to strike.

The limitations which exist in the Soviet trade unions are that there is not sufficient political life, there are not enough appeals and initiatives taken by the trade unions to intervene politically to the workers in other countries. Proposing "free" trade unions does not lead to increased democracy, but is equivalent to proposing to set up new trade unions in Britain, independent from all the existing trade unions. The trade unions are an acquisition of the Soviet working class in the same way as are the British trade unions; no proposal has been put forward to bypass the latter, but in respect to the Soviet Union this been put forward as a way to make the trade unions more free.

Why is there no campaign about the gangsterism which exists in the American trade unions, where they are directed by an oligarchy and contracts are taken out to murder people who are in the way of the top leadership? If democracy in the trade unions is to be spoken of, then a campaign for full representation of women both in the trade unions and in conferences and positions should be a priority in Britain. All these aspects are ignored not through oversight but because a hostility to the Soviet Union is the prime motivation behind the proposal for "free" trade unions. Lack of rights in the Soviet Union only becomes the centre when there is a conscious, not mistaken, policy against the workers states. For the trade union bureaucrat in Britain, his conception of "free" trade unions means free to collaborate with capitalism. The proposal arises when these sectors want to protect themselves from the constantly increasing influence of the workers states. It is a carefully orchestrated campaign but all to no avail, because the Soviet Union has an ever widening sphere of influence which cannot be stopped.

DEMOCRACY IN THE BRITISH TRADE UNIONS

It is important to consider the question of democracy in the Soviet trade unions, for example, the need for 'the right to strike' should be incorporated into the Soviet constitution. Nevertheless the role that the Soviet trade unions are playing is a progressive one. Recently, the Soviet trade unions made an appeal to the North American masses against the production of the neutron bomb. This is something that never has occurred from the British trade unions. The campaign launched in support of the dissident trade unions has many ludicrous aspects to it, because these so called free trade unions do not even exist in the

Soviet Union. A few dissidents can make a lot of noise when it is the bourgeoisie in the West which gives them a megaphone! But from the rest of the three hundred million and more people who live in the Soviet Union, not a single demand is to be heard calling for "free" trade unions.

How can the trade unions in Britain function more democratically to respond to the needs of the population? When capitalism can provide for the needs of the people less than ever before, yet science and technology are developing rapidly, it characterises a regime which has no 'humanitarian' interest. It becomes more and more obvious that capitalism cannot even give certain limited demands, when its crisis is so acute. The trade unions require a political functioning which centres on anti-capitalist objectives. Otherwise they become purely instruments to acquire wage demands which constantly diminish. It is necessary to develop factory meetings which allow the workers and the population to discuss how to increase the quality of life in Britain. This type of functioning should be the norm, to make the trade unions "free" here. Let the working class put forward their ideas and initiatives and discuss them all together, rather than voting without discussion in some secret ballot. Delegates to union conferences should be elected, after such discussions, on a programme containing proposals to take Britain out of a declining economic and social system. In the trade union conferences at this moment, nothing could be further from "democracy". A vote is taken on an issue, in which they say, such and such was rejected by three and a half million votes to one and a half million votes. The disparity between the number of delegates compared to the number of workers represented is gigantic. But the workers have not been incorporated into any discussion in the factories. Who votes for the leadership in the unions? With very large abstentions in all the union elections, the union leadership certainly is not representative of the workers in the union. Who do these leaderships represent then? They represent the block vote at the Labour Party conferences and TUC where one man can cast millions of votes, they represent the union presidents who have dismissed certain progressive proposals just like that, they represent themselves, the union bosses.

The Soviet trade unions are based on a state that has the capacity for constant economic expansion with all the benefits that this entails for the people. In Britain, the trade union leaderships collaborate with the same state that is taking away any democratic gains made previously, and hence reducing the standard of life of the people. The conclusion to draw therefore is not that "free" trade unions should be constructed in the Soviet Union, but that the trade unions in Britain should be playing as progressive a role as those in the Soviet Union, by campaigning systematically for an anti-capitalist programme.

The Labour government is the instrument that capitalism uses to apply a capitalist programme in Britain. The government in many ways finds this an easier task than a Tory government would, because being based on an alliance with the labour aristocracy, it can attempt to

prevent direct confrontation between the working class and capitalism. The Labour aristocracy plays the role of shackling the independent function of the working class, and by means of the Labour party and trade union apparatuses, stifles any

discussions of an alternative programme to capitalism. The coming general election already has provided an excuse for further calls of unity around the Labour government in case of a reactionary Tory return to power. The present Labour government is an ultra-capitalist government. There is not one single progressive measure that it has taken. Callaghan has openly declared war against the masses with his calls for further

wage restraint. This is not a government that can somehow be persuaded to eventually adopting a socialist programme, no matter how much pressure is put on it. In face of pressure of the world bourgeoisie, this, and every other Labour government before this one has decided on allegiance with the capitalist system, not with socialism. It is not a mistaken policy, it supports the neutron bomb, NATO, further increase in armament spending, cuts in living standards. The trade unions therefore have to be independent from the Labour government, and carry out a discussion and campaign on 'Where is Britain going?' throughout the country. This provides the basis for really making the trade unions "free" in this country. Freedom from the imposition of a Labour government which says that the decline in the quality of life is inevitable. To be independent from the government means

putting forward a programme which is opposed to the capitalist programme of the government. Whether Labour or Tory government, the result is the same, no socialist policy is applied which could solve all the problems of unemployment, housing, pollution etc. The development of true democracy in the British trade unions flows directly from the question of democracy for what?

At present the whole structure of the unions is undemocratic, because it is not a structure which serves the anti-capitalist struggle. Democracy has to mean a programme for social transformation to elevate the standard of life of the population. If this is the objective of the British trade unions, it is necessary to campaign consistently on this issue, as part of the role of the trade unions to impel an anti-capitalist tendency in the Labour Party.

THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFORMING THE CHARACTER OF PRODUCTION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF CAPITALISM

We are in agreement with the aim of changing the arms industry into production of socially useful goods. The British masses are short of many of the basic necessities of life and production needs to be made to meet their needs. The Labour party is discussing the idea of the reconversion of the arms industry. The question is how to achieve this reconversion of industry. Over the years there have been demonstrations and resolutions against nuclear weapons, but the amount of weapons increases. This is because capitalism needs these arms for its existence.

The economic crisis increases with all sectors of industry affected. The only exception is the armaments industry where there is a constant expansion. The exports of arms is expected to rise to £1000 million for the year. Whereas there is a decline in major industries, like the production of cars, there is no shortage of opportunities for capitalism to find markets for armaments. The reliance on arms production is not just something special to the British economy, it is general to the whole of capitalism, with in France twenty five percent of the armament production being for export. It is a very lucrative business with high profits therefore the big firms have an interest in this field. How is it possible to make them give up this production in favour of products that the population requires? If there are millions of pounds to be made in guns which of them is going to forgo that for the sake of machines for hospitals?

It is a problem that cannot be solved by convincing one capitalist or another of the logic of one sort of production over another. It is the way that capitalism functions that is the cause. If one capitalist stopped the most profitable production, another would start it, profiting enough to liquidate the others. It is important for the trade unions to have plans of production for the benefit of the population. The question is how to get the plans applied. The Lucas plan for alternative production has existed for a number of years but the management have constantly rejected it. This is not because in this particular firm the boss is less open to reasoned arguments or because the ideas have not been explained sufficiently. It is rather that the system of private property is based on profits and it is this that decides. There is no perspective to convince the firms to act otherwise.

To apply the plan of production requires the workers

to impose it. The private firm will not and cannot do it. This being so it is necessary to expropriate the firms and to impose a plan of production by workers control. Then it is possible to discuss with the population the use of the factory for beneficial purposes. The boss is not receptive to reason but the population is. To be able to allow the population to discuss and decide, the boss must be got rid of. The scientists feel that most of the scientific research is dominated by the needs of the armed forces. The knowledge they have is not directed into logical directions; increasingly the scientists and technicians feel this. It is necessary to reason with them on the need for changes, but with the capitalist it is different, he is not open to persuasion.

In relation to the products for war the state plays the role of purchaser and guarantees a ready made market. With other products there has to be a buyer who consumes the car or clothes. With armaments the government is the purchaser. There is a continual increase in the demand for arms and the government pays. There is no corresponding market for other goods. The population cannot afford to buy them so within the market economy there is no possibility to change the production. Capitalism as a system produces ruthless competition leading to wars. The world wars were over competition over markets between the big capitalist powers. Capitalism is warlike in its competition and this state of relations is reflected in dispute and wars. The armaments it has are there for this reason. It's very nature is warlike and the weapons are for this reason. Today it is not able to make open wars between itself because it faces the fact that if it did do so it would be immediately finished by the revolution. Therefore its war preparations are directed against the Soviet Union and the other workers states. The same competition between the capitalist countries exists, as is seen by the continual disputes in the Common Market between the different countries, but they are obliged to keep the disputes from breaking out into armed conflict. Whenever the bourgeoisie now talk of 'defending Britain' they never refer to 'saving the country' from capitalist Germany or Italy as they used to do in the past. Now they make the enemy the workers states. They hate the other capitalist countries the same as before, but they fear the Soviet Union therefore their main concern is to build up

armaments against it.

Capitalism requires the armaments to oppose the workers states. However much it is asked it will not give up the production of armaments in order to allow its factories to make hospital equipment. It cannot change the way it acts and it will not allow the liquidation of its means of defending itself on a voluntary basis. Capitalism constantly prepares war and it is necessary to take measures against its preparation. Supporting demands for trade union rights in the army and police and making political appeals to the army. Capitalism knows the population does not support it and therefore more and more of its concentration goes on arms expenditure. This is why the Labour government after discussions in Nato has accepted the increase in arms expenditure of three percent. Proposals for partial state intervention in these armament industries is not the solution. The state is the purchaser of the arms. The intervention of the state has therefore to be in the form of nationalisation of the firms, but nationalisation under workers control. For the workers to decide the plans for production not as at present where the representatives of the government in the form of high paid bourgeois managers make the decisions. These heads of state industries run them in the interest of capitalism not of the workers and the population. It is not socially useful production that concerns them but the continuation of the system of private property.

The struggle against the armaments has to be seen as part of the overall struggle for socialism. The armaments that the Vietnamese masses used to defeat yankee imperialism served for progress. The arms the Americans used were to try and halt the progress towards socialism. In the same way the British armed forces develops its weapons to defend private property, whereas the Soviet Union and Cuba use weapons to assist the masses of Africa to liberate themselves from imperialism. The opposition to the armaments of British capitalism has to be seen as part of the attack on private property. To be really in a position to make decisions about altering the production of the factories requires an end to this anarchy of the system of private property. To develop plans for changing production but at the same time a programme for achieving it by imposing the plans by nationalisation with the intervention of the workers by workers control.

ON THE POLEMIC OF ALTHUSSER WITH THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

30.4.1978

J. Posadas.

The intervention of Althusser is very superficial. It deals with very abstract problems but defines some things well, i.e. 'there is no political life, Marxism has been abandoned'. But all that he says does not show this. There is not one living event. In this type of polemic the fundamental aspect is to show life going on. This is not a theoretical discussion, but a precise conclusion of the lack of life in the Party. Thus a very superficial polemic is conducted. It is not possible to educate even saying a very few correct opinions. In the rest he concurs. But why did he not say it before? Then it is a discussion between leaders who have abandoned Marxism.

The single fact that he refers to the Russian Revolution and does not speak of the assassinations by Stalin of the Bolshevik leadership, and the retreat was due to the elimination of the leadership of the Party, is an abandonment of Marxism. He makes a series of criticisms which, in a general sense, are aimed at a layer of the intellectuals who commence also to lose confidence in Marxism, beginning not in the general method but in aspects. They see the process of the world in an inexplicable form, what is the situation? what is happening? Then they want to seek the explanation, 'Marx has been insufficient'. This is the depth of all this.

The leadership of the French Communist Party eliminated the discussion in a drastic form and gave no conclusion, but neither did Althusser. According to him, 30% of the working class voted for the Communist Party; and it's not like this, it has got at least 70%. His polemic is not contemptuous of the leadership, but it is important that he decided to write and resort to the bourgeois press to force the Party to write. In this case, resorting to the bourgeois press, he must explain why he is going to the bourgeois press and what he seeks from the bourgeois press. He has to explain. The

bourgeois press wants this material and publishes it to influence the lack of confidence in the Communist Party and in Marxism.

He says he is a Marxist, but the analysis is not Marxist. He makes good criticisms on the problem of the state, because the leadership of the Party proposes, 'it is enough to change the leadership of the state'. On the other hand, Althusser says, 'No, the state continues being the state it was before'. This is good. But it is superficial, not profound, even being right in this. It is not a discussion which is on the basis of cadres with sufficient theoretical and practical preparation. It's lack of preparation. It indicates the lack of political life in the Communist Party and of themselves because Althusser would have to ask, 'And why do we allow this?' In the books that he wrote, he speaks of Stalin, condemns Stalin, but justifies him with 'Socialism in a single country'.

When the Communist Party abbreviates discussion immediately, it is because it feels that behind Althusser others will go further than him, not to the right but to the left. This is the impression that the Party gives when it cuts short the discussion immediately. Althusser proposed that the Communist Party is responsible for not having triumphed in the elections. He is not right in this. On the contrary, the Communist Party did very well in discussing the programme, it had to bring this into the light. The CP was insufficient and superficial. It did not make anyone intervene, but now it's going further.

Althusser discusses at the summits of the leaderships, hence he resorts to Le Monde. At the same time, he gives to Le Monde the credit for being a liberal, open paper which does not fear ideas. It is a discussion at the summits.

J. POSADAS

30.4.1978

Editorial

ESTABLISH NEW RELATIONS BETWEEN THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE TRADE UNIONS ON AN ANTI CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

The way in which Chrysler has dealt with the government, just taking the subsidies and then, selling itself to Peugeot, shows the way in which capitalism uses the Labour government to continue its process of rationalisation, concentration, sackings, and concentration against the masses and the Workers States. It shows that capitalism has nothing to give and that the Labour leadership as it stands has nothing to give either to the Labour base, ie. the working class. In Portugal, the workers did not rise to support Soarez. There is the need for a new leadership, prepared to nationalise and plan the economy.

The recent call for the nationalisation of Chrysler by the AUEW and the Linwood shop stewards, is correct but who is going to carry out this nationalisation and all the others which are necessary to plan the economy? Certainly not this government. The problem is the construction of a new leadership in the Labour Party; The actions of the workers in the Polaris bases, show that the workers themselves are prepared to put the interests of the working class before those of NATO or of war preparation in defence of imperialism. The rejection by the trade unions of the new pay policy and the rejection by the TUC of the call for 'free trade unions' in the Soviet Union, show that there is a political elevation of the role of the trade unions, and an increased intervention of the working class directly against the war preparations of British imperialism. The Labour left has to elevate its links with the trade unions, starting with immediate support to the call for nationalisation of Chrysler, but this having to be under workers control. And elevating this programme to a United Front with the Trade Unions, so as to impose such solutions, and extend the anti-capitalist programme. It is necessary to call for the closure of the Polaris bases, expulsion of NATO out of Britain, the struggle against the EEC/NATO and the war preparations. An immediate step which the Labour left must take is to call for the independent functioning of the trade unions from the Labour government. And to oppose the present link between the Labour government and the trade union bureaucracy seeking to give another lease of time to the present Labour leadership through 'The Trade Unions for Labour'. The solution to the problems of the Polaris workers, of the dictatorship of the multinationals, the war preparations, is not electoral. It lies in the elevation of the Labour left/trade union united front and this has to be called for also during an electoral campaign.

The trade unions have to break the links which unite them at present to the present Labour government. This government has nothing to give because capitalism is in total crisis. It has to raise a political programme, to include the nationalisation of Chrysler under workers control, the rejection of the new pay policy and the construction of new links with the Labour Party on the basis of an anti-capitalist programme.

NATIONALISATION HAS TO BE UNDER WORKERS CONTROL

Chrysler had made 'planning agreements' with the government. But capitalism does not function thanks to the permission of governments but through the absolute dictates of private property. In front of the competition of the Workers States which is immense and not just socially, but also economically, the capitalist world concentrates. It is not true that the monopolies represent a strength of capitalism. They represent its total crisis of mortal agony in front of the spread of

Turn to page 2

In This Issue:-

- PORTUGAL, THE FALL OF SOAREZ AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF REFORMING CAPITALISM. page 3
- THE DISSIDENTS AND THE CHANGES IN THE SOVIET UNION. page 4
- **The mobilisations and protest in the university in China** 5.4.78 **J. POSADAS** page 4

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

280 Friday 25 August 1978

PRICE 10p

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE SITUATION IN BRITAIN

31.3.78

J POSADAS

It is necessary to realise that just as all the leaderships in the Workers States and the Communist parties which have tried to oppose or have opposed the progress of history have been smashed, so there is no possibility for British labourism or North American trade unionism preventing the elevation of the masses. They are great impediments but they have no historic justification. The intelligence of humanity has seen that in order to live, it is necessary to eliminate private property and to eliminate war. Humanity knows this as do the North American masses and also the British masses.

The British masses have an advantage in that they have a tradition of a hundred and sixty years of trade unionism in which they have constantly maintained security in the aspiration of human progress. Therefore, it is necessary to consider that the present situation of the Labour Party is not an expression of the strength of the Labour Party apparatus but of the world relations which still allow the Labour leadership to maintain its authority. This stems not only from a certain economic security - which deteriorates all the time - but from the mistakes of the Communist parties and essentially the errors and mistakes of the Workers States which do not present themselves before the masses and North American masses as the objective leadership of progress from every point of view. Economically and socially the masses see progress, because they see that in the Workers States they are living better, but they do not see the participation in society of the Soviet or the Chinese masses, or the Cuban masses. They do not see them participate, thus they cannot be influenced. The masses see the superiority of the Workers State but they do not see the intervention of the Workers States masses which should be the basis of this superiority. Then they do not see the necessity for an immediate transformation. It is the mistake of the Workers State which comes from the epoch of Stalin but, at the same time, there is no tranquility in the Labour Party or among the Labour masses.

Compared with the position five years ago, there is an increase of discussions on where is Britain

going. Now it's no longer just the title of Trotsky's book. Now the tendencies and efforts of the British masses to progress, nationalising, statifying a series of enterprises like the ports and car factories are apparent. The bureaucracy has stimulated a tendency for the state to take the responsibility to pay the factory deficits to save the factory, so that statification does not take place but a subsidy for private enterprise which has failed. This was the policy of the government of the Labour bureaucracy and the trade union bureaucracy, but not of the masses. The masses will not see in this a salvation of the capitalist system, but the means of a superior relation. The effort at nationalisation of the ports was very profound, and this indicates that the British masses had a base of understanding that nationalisation is necessary. Still this understanding is limited, but there is a progress. There are a series of tendencies which discuss and speak constantly. They are not lying; it is not a manoeuvre. It is a very limited expression of the possibilities which exist.

The Grant tendency is the principle basis of the youth and the Labour Party has to allow it as the least evil for them, because they cannot throw them out. It is the same situation in Germany, but there they threw them out because Germany has a more powerful apparatus and more of a bureaucratic base, better economic conditions, and has four million foreign workers who work in Germany but who do not weigh socially, electorally or on the trade union level. But, in Britain, there are fewer foreign workers in comparison with Germany. In the latter there are four million, so the relation of forces between capitalism and the working class is unjust, because the foreign workers do not weigh. They work, but they do not express themselves either socially or electorally. Within a few years, Germany is going to change. It is slow, but the printers strike has an immense importance. Their victory has a social significance infinitely superior to the wage increases, because they have fought to maintain their jobs and their human dignity. They have discussed with capitalism, telling them, 'We agree with techno-

logical progress but not at the expense of our life, because then it's not progress. If there is an improvement in technology which makes printing unnecessary, this is good; but we must be given the equivalent work with the same wage'. This is new. The Italians began this in a very limited form, but the German event is very elevated because it imposes on society an orientation on how to resolve the problems which arise from the process of technology, of science and the needs of society. No Communist Party has done this as, for example, the German Communist Party which is very backward. The only people who proposed this was ourselves.

We propose that technology is good but not at the expense of humanity. The Italian and French Communists say this, but they have had the attitude of the German workers. The German experience is not new. Lipp in France is an example, when they went on strike against the closure, the workers said, 'No, we maintain this conquest of a very successful watch factory and we have work'. Also, in Italy, there have been factories managed for a year by women, and they function very well - which shows that there is a tendency which advances from the occupation of the factory towards making production in order to maintain the wage, but which also shows that to sustain this triumph it's necessary to overthrow the capitalist system. The triumph of the German workers is very elevated, because it unites a development of technology, of science in production, with the human need to live well, or at least as well as before. Thus it is necessary to propose: 'Which is more important, the workers, technology or capitalism?' Technology is good, the workers have to live; but the capitalists are a small group.

This incorporates in the world class struggle a series of principles which are going to elevate the scientific level of the struggle. It comes from Germany in which the youth who wanted to give a timidly anti-capitalist programme were thrown out. Brandt and Schmidt, who twice were able to throw out the leaders of the youth, why did not they throw out the trade unions?

Turn to page 2

THE SITUATION IN BRITAIN . . .

continued from page 1

This means that the working class and petit bourgeoisie supports itself in the trade unions. It is not the trade union which resolves, it is the Party, but the trade union is the point of departure.

The same process is going to occur in Britain. Then it's necessary to persist in the activity to write, to publish and to intervene, giving ideas and winning positions and increasing the scientific ability to explain. This is going to help the vanguard of the youth, the Party and the trade unions in the understanding of the need for social transformations. Hence the need for the publication of all the texts on the Workers States, the analysis on the historic function of the Workers States, and the fact that the Workers State cannot be measured by the leaderships which are transitory, but through the function of the Workers State which the experience of Stalin showed. Stalin disappeared and the Workers State developed and influenced the world. What has to be discussed is how to elevate the life of the masses and the British population. It is a pack of lies that Britain progresses. There is progress of some capitalist layers - fewer and more concentrated as the process develops - but the British population suffers more and more a deterioration in the standard of living. The increase in wages is less than the increase in the cost of living, and it is necessary to consider these two aspects: the concrete price of commodities and the actual conditions of life. There is a great deterioration in the environment, increased poisoning of the environment, of the water and of the food. There is an increase at the same time in the poisoning of raw materials which afterwards are used to produce chickens, fabrics etc. This is part of the standard of living and it is getting worse.

Although they may maintain wages to meet the cost of food or accommodation, the level is low because conditions of the environment are worsening, while from the scientific progress which is immense in production - the only aspect in which capitalism advances - the proletariat receives no benefit. Everything is in the service of the concentration of capital. The number of capitalists is reduced and the standard of living constantly falls. This must be discussed; not discussing only the support to Ethiopia or the programme for Ethiopia as Grant does, but the conditions of life in Britain.

There is an immense increase in scientific capacity. The Soviets have an expedition that has been in space for three months and it's one of the greatest achievements in history. The space-ships meet. The crew go outside, chuck out the rubbish and go back in. This shows the quality of human ability, the conditions which exist to eliminate poverty on the earth, to eliminate shortage of food and any other needs. Humanity, including the British masses, see all this. The British masses see that, when humanity is capable of this achievement of the Soviets of maintaining a space-ship in orbit for three months, it means that it has the ability to resolve all the problems. Hence

the capitalist press is terrorised because the workers vanguard and the intellectuals see this. They see and assess that it is superior because the Soviets, who have been in space for three months, help Ethiopia, Angola and Mozambique. Thus the power of the most advanced science helps the most backward areas of the earth. The earth and the sky are united through science and Socialism and the gods look out and say, 'They are throwing us out of history'.

The bureaucracy, the bourgeois leadership of the Labour Party, are not stronger than Stalin. Stalin was the stronger. They possess conditions which allowed them to continue and, above all, it was because of the false policy of the Communist parties.

We value the progress made through capitalism, through capitalist science, or through the science of the capitalists for the capitalists. We see it as a contribution to the progress of knowledge and of certain forms of social relation, but also the limitation of this progress. At the same time that the British created their warships for the accumulation of capital, they killed children in the factories, killed the sheep of the peasants to drive them into the factories. Thus capitalism showed an historic antagonism with progress, the historic contradictions between its own progress and the progress of humanity. Our function is to understand that this is what happened in history, but in this stage it is not the same situation. The Workers State, in order to elevate science, has to make it universal and develop society. It cannot develop science as a means of exploitation of society for profit, it has to develop it to elevate human relations.

It's been shown that Stalin, who had the most complete form of control in history and the most complete apparatus and state, was smashed by the progress of history and, in Britain, the same thing will happen. There is no tradition or knowledge of the Marxist life. It does not exist in Britain. The British Empire was able to impede the penetration of Marxism in the Labour Party, but not because it was capable or through its economic power. Comparatively, Germany in 1930 was more powerful. The Communists and Socialists had half the popular vote. Then why did Hitler win? Was it through the capacity of Hitler? No, it was through the bestiality of Stalinism. In Britain the perspective of capitalism is for an ever greater deterioration in living conditions, and this creates a more receptive quantity of scientists and intellectuals. It creates the conditions for a greater diffusion of our publications and activity.

The pragmatism of British imperialism is based on the wealth of imperialism but, at the same time, on the errors and the capitulationist policy of the alliance with capitalism of Stalinism which lasted until 1960. If in 1945 Stalin had to allow the overthrow of capitalism in ten European countries, it was because it was imposed on him, but the policy of Stalin lasted because he created the most frightful bureau-

cracies. A proof of this is Czechoslovakia, where he created a bourgeois leadership allied with a centrist leadership, and he did this also in Poland and Hungary. These were the leaderships of Stalin. Afterwards they were liquidated by the uprisings of the masses, which showed that they wanted to eliminate the bureaucratic power allied to capitalism, but without damaging the Workers State as the Rumanian masses have just done. If the proletariat in these countries has such a conduct, how is it possible to doubt that the British and German proletariat cannot get shot of their leaderships? It's necessary to intervene, while expecting this process. But not waiting in inactivity, but with the intervention to help the scientific thought of the process of history in which British capitalism has fewer possibilities. It has less conditions to try to maintain the disorientation of the masses and the bureaucratic apparatus. The internal crises of Labourism increase with the constant appearance of anti-capitalist tendencies. Even though they appear in a limited way, they are anti-capitalist. A consistent programme does not exist, but capitalism is constantly weakening and this is going to continue in successive stages because British and German capitalism have no perspective for development.

British imperialism has succeeded in maintaining itself on the plane of capitalist society through the trade unions and the Labour Party, through the bureaucratic apparatus but constantly in the trade unions and in the Labour Party there is an advance towards anti-capitalist positions and programme, and constantly a resistance to the action of British imperialism. The appearance of groups and the development of groups is not a sporadic or circumstantial action, but it expresses a need to give ideas which respond to the combative will of the masses and the youth. At the same time, it demonstrates that when this will and programme is not consistent it collapses. But the persistence of Grant is because he combines an adaptation to the Labour Party with this programme over Ethiopia. It is combined, but it does not have a future. The experience of the masses is going to go much further than them. It is a stage of history in which Vietnam and Laos are closely associated. The principle leader of Laos records that in 1930 Ho Chi Minh had already proposed the need for the Federation of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. Why didn't he say it before? But it is important because he comes to support Vietnam against Cambodia and the reaction of Cambodia is like that of a bureaucratic apparatus, which is the same as Stalin. It is not with the same political position of Stalin, that is, it is worse or equally bad, but it is defending an interest. It is the same social interest, the social bureaucratic interest of a camarilla, allied to capitalism, which is afraid of the progress of the revolution where Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia represent progress. We were the only ones who proposed this, we proposed it four years ago. The progress of South East Asia cannot be done without a Federation.

This is going to weigh in the world Communist movement and even in the British Communist Party which is one of the most backward of all the Communist parties in the

world. It has no idea about anything. It does not understand its function because it has no notion of history. It has the petulance, the pride of saying, 'We are Communists, they have to come here'; but the masses go past them. History goes ahead of them. Even this Communist Party cannot continue in this way. The Soviet Workers State is going to intervene because it has an interest in intervening and the masses are going to correct it. We are seeking how to influence.

What is clear and conclusive is to see that the present situation in the Labour Party, of the dominion of the bureaucratic apparatus, is transitory. This is part of the relation of world forces in which as a relation of world forces it is necessary to see the erroneous conduct and policy of the alliance with capitalism which the Communist parties pushed forward, the weakness of the Communist parties, including that of Britain; and the absence of an organised opposition of importance, corruption and disintegration of the old Trotskyist movement. Even today, they continue calling themselves Trotskyist, like Grant does. Today it is not the stage of Trotsky. It is a different process from the stage of Trotsky. The principles of Trotsky are valid, but it is necessary to combine them with an interpretation of this stage of history which Trotsky could not provide, just as neither Lenin nor Marx could provide it. Hence, in spite of a certain approximation to our analysis over Ethiopia, the Grant group is far from understanding all this because it combines good conclusions with fatal errors; for example, when they speak of 'freedom to Eritrea and Ogaden', 'make Soviets', 'out with the military'. Thus, it is an analysis on the basis of a process already finished, not on a process which it is necessary to develop, and they use slogans which are not valid for today. The slogan is not that the army should go, but that it should remain because the army has the correct position, the correct resolution and force. The problem

is not to give independence, self-determination to Eritrea and Ogaden, but first to unify to determine the self-determination which is not separation; that is to say, they propose in a routinist way the conception of the programme. It is not a scientific analysis. Hence they combine correct and incorrect positions, with very contradictory results. First they say, 'It is a degenerated Workers State'. Why degenerated? How is the Workers State constituted? What is the basis of the existence of the Workers State? If there is a Workers State in an economically most backward part of the world, it is because there is a political leadership which has understood this. They reverse everything.

This is an example to see that when these comrades of 'Militant' take this position, it is because within their group there are currents which are in agreement with this process, and this is our direct influence. At the same time, they do not feel secure and they feel the pressure of the Labour petit bourgeois wing, they then combine positions recognising the Workers State, but with 'Out with the army'.

In Britain, the standard of living of the masses has declined with the environmental conditions. It is not only that the telephones do not function, but the railway stations are filthy, completely neglected and disordered. This is not only the case in Britain, but also in Germany, France and North America. There is a retreat in the environmental conditions of life which is very marked. The Pakistanis and the Indians, but also the British, live in bad conditions. It is necessary also to combine discussions on the programme and the policy with concrete examples, examples that show the need for the planned structure of production and taking all the measures and examples necessary to carry this out.

J. POSADAS

31.3.78

Editorial

continued from page 1

Communism, planned economies and centralised economies in the world. Chrysler made planning agreements, but there was no one to force them to obey them. The force for the planning of the economy is the proletariat. The workers in this country have been those who imposed a national health service, substantial nationalisations, and reforms. It is they who now tackle imperialism and its war preparations directly in the Polaris submarine bases. For all the pious talk in the Labour Party Conferences of 'Getting rid of nuclear installations', not a voice of support has publically come from the Labour Party to the action of the workers. However, it is the workers who took the houses after the war, and housed themselves. It is them who occupied the Clyde and imposed that there should not be the sackings which capitalism wished to make. And it is them again who foresee that the Chrysler/Peugeot merger is for rationalisation, concentration of capitalism, and sackings. In front of the crisis of agony of capitalism, the workers are those who know, foresee and struggle for nationalisation. They see capitalism mortally wounded preparing war with the nuclear submarine and neutron bomb against them and they are those who take action. It is them and only them who can impose nationalisation under workers control. The AUEW has called for the nationalisation of Chrysler. But what is needed is nationalisation under workers control. The reason why the Labour government does not embark on this road is first that it is not interested, and secondly that this would have in this stage, the effect of taking Labour onto the path of wholesale structural changes in ownership, control, and state. This is what the left of the Labour Party has to discuss.

CAPITALISM HAS NO SOCIAL SUPPORT

The action of the workers at the nuclear submarines, shows that

PORTUGAL, THE FALL OF SOAREZ AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF REFORMING CAPITALISM

they do not think that the bourgeois 'nation' has to be defended at their own expense against the 'russians'. This is the objectivity of the proletariat, raised at this level by the world balance of forces, by the intervention of the Soviet Union in Angola and Mozambique. When Cuba intervenes in Africa, the British proletariat creates all manner of difficulties to British imperialism. It is because in a diffused but profound way, they also defend Angola. And it is natural that it should be so. This means that the total crisis of capitalism is not just economic, — it will not re-employ the unemployed for example — it is social because the masses are not smashed by the prospect of war and struggles, including nuclear. The proof is in the Polaris strikes. The workers have not made a single demonstration against Angola, or for troops to go to Rhodesia, or against the Soviet Union. There has not been a single demonstration in the streets supported by trade unionists, or otherwise, in support of the dissidents. But yes, there has been the intervention of the Polaris workers, who are not vanguard sectors of the proletariat far from it. When it is so, it is because the vanguard itself is already prepared to support the Soviet Union, and the trade union bureaucracy knows it, and dreads it. This is why the AUEW leadership comes out against the Soviet Union.

TRADE UNION DEMOCRACY FOR WORKERS CONTROL

The crisis in the French Socialist Party comes from the fact that the bourgeoisie seeks to pressurise the Radicals and the right wing Socialists to support it. The campaign for the dissidents and against the Soviet Union is in part for this. To carry on existing as a progressive party, the Socialists have to propose the nationalisation of the economy, and this brings them into alliance with the Communists and the Soviet Union. Portugal shows that if a Socialist Party does not ally itself to the Communists, its right wing brings the whole Party into the defence of capitalism which after having used them, then destroys them. This is the nature of the crisis of all the Socialist parties. The alliance with the Communists — however eurocommunist the Communists may be — mean to envisage the struggle for nationalisations through workers control and not through 'planning agreements' and the bourgeois constitution. The Labour Party, suffers precisely from this. But the total crisis continues, as exemplified now by Chrysler, the collapse of the Health Service, A long term solution to the crisis has to be found and we are witnessing the collapse of all the short term solutions. 'Planning agreements', 'imports control', This is why sectors of the AUEW leadership now talk about nationalisation, and national Shop Stewards Conferences.

The break of the AUEW leadership from the Soviet Union is because the Soviet Union is more and more anti-capitalist. The Trade Union base will now seek fresh links on a new basis, to resolve the problems posed by capitalism. In fact it was only 3 people in the so called "democratic" AUEW who have broken from the Soviet Union. But the Soviet embassy in London has received many delegations of trade union leaders who came to greet the Soviets, whilst we have not seen a single substantial mobilisation of workers against the Soviet union. On the contrary, even the TUC leadership, has refused to support the campaign for 'free trade unions in the Soviet Union'! This shows the actual support which the Stalinist bureaucracy of the trade unions actually receives. On the other hand, the workers of this country intervene against the nuclear manoeuvres of NATO, and impede the functioning of nuclear missiles. This shows how worried of the 'russians' they are.

The Labour left, the Communists and the groups must base themselves on this reality. Democratic rights is the right to have houses, employment, to have industry functioning for needs, to stop the immense pollution, poisoning of the atmosphere, decrease in quality and health of the food, increase of chemical injections into foods to keep them sellable, dumping of Asbestos and nuclear wastages in the waters and in the air, etc. The Labour left have to campaign for these democratic rights. It will have in the proletariat, in the base of the trade unions, in the technicians, the women, the masses, an immense support for these things. The Labour comrades must come out in the electoral campaign with such things, concluding: Out with the Polaris bases, with the nuclear danger over us, out with the war preparations, out from NATO, down with NATO! This does not mean to support Labour governments but to support progress. And to unify the trade unions with Labour against capitalism which provokes all this.

The miners who die in accidents, the workers in the Chrysler factories, the mothers of the Thalidomide children all know that the capitalists cannot be more humane. It is also necessary to elevate the discussion of all this in the trade unions and to seek to unify the trade unions nationally with an anti-nuclear, anti-capitalist, programme, demanding nationalisations under workers control and that Labour supports it. Down with the nuclear missiles, with the nuclear installations, for actions to be spread over the whole country to throw NATO out, to impose that arms expenditures be changed to expenditure on hospitals, houses, better quality of food, protection against nuclear wastage, the transformation of nuclear energy, human labour, and technology like the microtechnology for the infinite betterment of the life of the population. For that, one has to make a Labour left with an anti-capitalist programme and prepared to apply it by means of mobilisations and workers control. We call for this to be discussed in the Labour Party, the trade unions and the Communist Party.

The sacking of Soarez as the prime minister of Portugal and his replacement in that post by a more direct representative of the bourgeoisie, da Costa, is not a defeat for the Portuguese revolution. Neither does it mean that the capitalist system has any strength or perspective, nor that there is "a danger of a return to fascism". The process of history, the world balance of forces which is in favour of the revolution, the existence and advances of the system of the Workers States and the consciousness and struggle of the world masses ensures that capitalism cannot turn the tide of history back. In reality what has been defeated in Portugal in these last days has been the policy of trying to reform capitalism, of trying to develop the economy on the basis of private property. It is a defeat parliamentary, reformist "road to Socialism". It is a proof — if further proof is needed — that "eurocommunism" bears no relation to the reality of the class struggle which is the motive force of history. The reality is that capitalism, the system of private property cannot develop the economy, cannot fulfil even the basic needs of the masses of the population. Capitalism is in total crisis and the gains of a previous period in housing, education, employment and wages are being eroded. It is the system of the Workers States which is advancing in every aspect.

The fall of Soarez and his government is matched by a crisis and a series of divisions and resignations in the Socialist Party of Portugal. In a very real sense that Socialist Party of Soarez was an invention after the overthrow of fascism in 1974, an invention which was intended to maintain capitalism on the basis of the "mixed economy", on trying to reform capitalism and to give it a new lease of life once Portugal was free from both the moribund fascist regime and the colonies in Africa. The hope was to be able to develop the national bourgeoisie and the internal capitalist economy in Portugal. Demonstrably this policy has failed, as it is failing everywhere else — not least in this country — and the Socialist leadership, in its present form, has reached the end of the road. In the same way "Labourism" in this country has no perspective. If it still maintains itself it is because the Labour Party apparatus, and bourgeois structure and conceptions had a longer period in which to develop and were based on a certain strength of British capitalism. The Portuguese Socialist Party had none of this which is why its rise and fall is much more rapid.

We have to take into consideration that the lack of previous formation, the lack of the marxist method in the Communist Party of Portugal was a contributory factor in this process. After the overthrow of Caetano in 1974, at its first Congress, the Portuguese CP dropped the dictatorship of the proletariat from its constitution and it was among the

most vocal in insisting on parliamentary elections. In other words it failed to understand what "time of day" it was. The submission to the elections — which was by no means complete — meant that the Communists did not take full advantage of the fact that they were the leadership of the trade unions, of the proletariat which is about 17% of the population, they did not base themselves fully on the occupations of the factories, of the banks, of the steel foundaries and shipyards. Above all they did not fully take advantage of the fact that the army had been won to the revolution completely. The soldiers had organised the SUV's which were a soviet form of organisation and the army had given independence to the colonies in Africa, to Mozambique and Angola. And this, as Comrade Posadas analyses, was not determined by Portugal but by the world process. And if the army can be affected in this way, what possibility is there of a return to fascism? And the Communist leadership did not have the means to take this favourable world balance of social forces — determined fundamentally by the Workers States — into account. It is true that Cunhal and the Portuguese CP have taken very good positions, are in support of the Soviet Union in general but they did not fully understand that the direct intervention of the proletariat as a leadership in society weigh much more than its votes in elections. But, at the same time, the Portuguese CP has advanced in the sense that it has defended revolutionary positions as opposed to "eurocommunism". In reality it supports the dictatorship of the proletariat even if it is not in the party constitution and even if it does not express itself fully in the form of an anti-capitalist programme and strategy for Portugal.

The overthrow of Soarez is a logical conclusion of all this policy, in the sense that the more he tried to develop the capitalist economy, the more he was submitted to the bourgeoisie directly and the more his base of support — such as it was — in the masses was destroyed. And the more the Socialist Party disintegrated. On the other hand, despite the fact that some capitalist property was restored, factories were handed back, there is no possibility of going the whole way back. The proof of this is that the crisis which finally brought the removal of Soarez was on the question of the demand for the sacking of Luis Saiaes, the minister of agriculture, and the restoration to private ownership of the land expropriated by the peasants and agrarian workers. This the government of Soarez could not do without a direct confrontation with the masses, with the trade unions and the proletariat, and the left in his own party. Also for the development of the economy the problem of a backward agriculture had to be solved.

It is stage of history capitalism had to tackle and solve this problem. Now it is not capable and the collectivisation of the land is, in fact, the only solution. And Soarez has discovered that between the interests of private property and the development of the economy there is a very large chasm, down which he has now fallen.

It is impossible to avoid making the comparison between Portugal and Mozambique and Angola. In the period since 1974, it is Mozambique and Angola which have advanced in the process of the construction of the Workers State much more rapidly than Portugal; and these ex-colonies of Portugal had a very backward economy and a very small proletariat. They also have to face the armed intervention of imperialism but they have leaderships which did not carry over the conciliatory, reformist conceptions of a previous period in history. And they were open to the intervention of the Workers States, of Cuba and the Soviet Union. The Communists and the Socialists have to draw conclusions from this.

Another non-perspective, non-policy which is clearly revealed in these last days in Portugal is that which they call pluralism. Portugal is not another Chile, nor is it going to be but it is a similar process in which the bourgeois have removed one government and substituted another without the bother of elections. Indeed they are not at all certain that they would win an election. It was easier to throw Soarez out and bring in da Costa who is more directly representative of the bourgeois interest but the threat which the bourgeoisie makes of "accept da Costa or fascism will return" is a wish of the bourgeois than a possibility and, even if the army could be used in the interest of the bourgeoisie, it would only be for a short, transitional phase. However the basic analysis remains that in the process of the class struggle if you leave the bourgeois state and private ownership intact then the bourgeois will use every means to impose its control and it is not submitted to the electoral process or to the constitution of the country.

The Communist comrades and the Labour left have to analyse and draw conclusions from this process in Portugal which forms part of the world process of the revolution and weighs in this country. It is not enough to simply see a parliamentary struggle or to say that da Costa is better than the return of fascism, or that we have, at all costs, to avoid the return of fascism. It is precisely this policy which has led to the present crisis in Portugal. No, the conclusion is that we participate in elections but that it is an inferior method of intervention compared with the direct intervention, on the basis of a programme of nationalisations and workers control, of the proletariat and the mass of the population.

Out Shortly

European Marxist Review Publication

**The crisis of capitalism,
Eurocommunism,
and the
objective necessity of the
Communist Society.**

PRICE 15p

19.10.77

J. Posadas.

The "Dissidents" and the Changes in the Soviet Union

Led by Yankee imperialism, world capitalism has orchestrated a whole campaign against the Soviet Union on the question of the trial of the so called "dissidents". It's a means of appearing to be "democratic" in front of the petit bourgeois masses, while the preparation for war against the workers states continues clandestinely because capitalism does not have the means to justify such a war.

The objective of the campaign is a vain effort to discredit the Soviet Union as "Stalinist". It has already failed because the conditions of the world process do not allow an organised world opinion against the Soviet Union. It's not possible to organise any mass support for such a campaign. It remains purely at the level of the bourgeois organs of opinion, press, television, journalism. The workers organisations in Britain, as also in part the big communist parties in France and Italy, have leant themselves to this campaign. There is no formed left in the Labour party. What exists has been permitted by capitalism and fear of the gigantic shadow of the Soviet Union, fear of the disintegration of capitalism, leads some sectors of the "left" to ally themselves directly and consciously with imperialism. They speak in the category of bourgeois democracy as opposed to the "totalitarianism" of the Soviet Union and the other workers states.

It is important to see the objectives of capitalism in the campaign that it is launching, but at the same time it's fundamental to analyse the character of these "dissidents" because it is essential for any progress of the Labour left to free themselves from the crassly simplistic analysis of the Soviet Union that makes it "Stalinist" full stop. The Soviet Union is certainly led by a highly privileged bureaucracy with art and science submitted to it, but this bureaucracy has to respond to the needs of the nationalised economy, the structure of the workers state. Stalinism in essence was a regime of collaboration with imperialism based on smashing revolutions abroad and assassinating the revolutionary forces within the Soviet Union. The "dissidents" come from this structure. Stalin was the arbiter of the bureaucracy but the enormous increase in the number of the workers states following on the crushing of the nazis turned the relation of world forces to favour the structure of the workers state and to disfavour the bureaucracy. (defined elsewhere by Cde Posadas as partial regeneration). This has led to a permanent disequilibrium in the bureaucratic strata of the Soviet Union. The process is not completed, and it is very empirical because the bureaucracy of itself cannot think consistently. A whole series of struggles take place in the army, the party bureaucracy, the factory and trade union

administration.

Contrary to the crude conceptions of the bourgeoisie adopted by their apologists in the Labour party, the Soviet Union and the other workers states are very dynamic societies in full collision with the limitations of bureaucratic functioning. At the same time the differentiation in the bureaucracy is profound and prepares the ground for the re-acceptance of marxist method in the world communist movement.

The Stalin regime was an extremely perilous stage for the workers state. The policy of Stalin opened the way for tendencies whose logic would have led to the restoration of capitalism. Only the masses and their sense of the historic acquisition of the workers state saved the Soviet Union from destruction at the hands of the nazis. During the period of great purges the bureaucracy made its peace with elements originally hostile to the revolution. Even so the purges involved smashing all elements of opposition to the bureaucracy and its precarious balancing between world capitalism and the world revolution. The empirical and cannibalistic nature of the Stalinist bureaucracy mean left, right, centre even pro Stalin elements found themselves in the great camps.

The complete change in the world balance of forces which favoured the workers state liquidated the bases of Stalinism although not the bases of the bureaucracy. The destalinisation of Khrushchev was an attempt to establish new balances in the bureaucracy but also the rightward drift of the regime-selling of tractor stations to the collective farms, break with China, climb down over Cuba-prepared new crises for the bureaucracy. It was a transitory regime which showed that much more profound external and internal changes were necessary. More and more the security in the world revolutionary process affected the relations between bureaucracy and masses. Sectors of the bureaucracy began to conciliate with the masses. Ineluctably the new world conditions meant that the inevitable collision course between the two systems of property, nationalised and private could not be contained. This means a series of internal crises which are continuing. Sectors of the bureaucracy wedded simply to the inert regime of usufruct, conservative, and localistic enter into conflict with the more aggressive foreign policy of the Soviet Union and also with the more and more pressing needs for a national use of the resources of the economy particularly, as predicted by Trotsky, over questions of the quality of production which cannot be solved with a bureaucratic functioning. In this process lies the grievances of the dissidents, who belong essentially to the Stalin period. They are sectors of the

right who enter into conflict with the new stage in the Soviet Union. Sakharov is a good example of this sector. They are from the bureaucracy but they do not correspond to the new stage in the Soviet Union. Sakharov as revealed in his writings confirms the character of the dissidents. Some are ultra right and openly against Socialism to the extent of allying directly with capitalism to overthrow the Soviet Union. Sakharov does not take such direct positions. Nonetheless his preoccupations shows the conservative face of sectors of the bureaucracy and their desire to change the Soviet Union not in a revolutionary soviet direction, but in what he regards as the Khrushchev position of the "liberalisation of the regime".

His essays published as "Progress, co-existence and intellectual freedom" are characterised by a total fear of the nuclear war and the need at all costs for an agreement with the United States. This of course cannot be described as the present position of the Soviet Union whose intervention in Africa to aid the construction of new workers states is not dominated by fear of Yankee imperialism and the nuclear war. He is in favour of the "correct system of market process" in other words combining "socialism" with the capitalist market. Naturally he is against the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia and believes there is no need for a revolution in the United States. According to him capitalism has proved that it has the means to improve the standard of living of the masses. In toto this expression of the dissidents comes from the heart of a bureaucracy developed under Stalin but one which now disintegrates under the pressures of the structure of the workers state. A sharp differentiation in the bureaucracy, takes place between those who adapt themselves to the situation and in part recover a communist consciousness and others who reject the new conditions and try to maintain the old policies of collaboration with capitalism and internal plundering of the workers state. Now it takes the form of "civil rights" in which no constructive ideas are offered to transform the workers state save those of the right-"liberalism", market economy, peace with capitalism.

In the period prior to the process of partial regeneration, Trotsky described the sectors who exploited the workers state for their own objectives as an excrescence on the workers state. The dissidents are the expression of this. Now the structure of the workers states in open rebellion against the bureaucracy promotes the disintegration of the old united front of the bureaucracy-party, army, trade union. Thus layers of the bureaucracy most sensitive to the new pressures launch struggles against a whole range of interests that are obstacles to the advance of the workers states.

Historically the dissidents are of no importance. They find no response in the masses of the workers states, for the simple reason they have nothing good to say about the workers states.

THE MOBILISATIONS AND PROTEST IN THE UNIVERSITY IN CHINA

5.4.78

J. POSADAS

The discussion going on in China is whether progress should advance to Socialism or towards political and economic measures which develop a layer of bureaucrats, as in the epoch of Stalin. This is what the discussion is about. It is very important that there has been such a reaction against this regime after the repression in which they have shot many people. It also indicates that there is the will to oppose the measures of conciliation of bureaucratic tendencies allied to capitalism that exist in China and outside China.

The events in China are most important in order to understand the world process and the effects it will have in relation to the world class struggle, although these will not be directly or immediately felt. The process in China forms part of the relation of forces in the world. It favours capitalism and, at a certain moment, favours it considerably - but it does not have the strength to decide. The reactions in China indicate that the situation profoundly affects sectors linked to the leadership of the Party, the state, the army and the workers. The students are not separate; they are part of the strength of the revolutionary leadership which does not have the capacity or the means to oppose the reformist development of this leadership in China.

The leadership of the economy is reformist and their policy is counter-revolutionary. Even if their policy supports some aspects of the revolution it is counter-revolutionary. It is allied to world capitalism against the USSR, and it prevents the development of support in China for the revolution of Angola, Mozambique and the other countries in revolution. For it is important that, in spite of the iron leadership that represses all attempts at a revolutionary policy, there are reactions. It means that there are forces which are against what is happening, and that the present leadership of China does not have all the means, or the leadership, or the authority, in order to impose this policy on the population; which is a policy of alliance with capitalism, whether economically or socially.

For a few days there was a protest in the form of large letter posters, but also of circulars and articles which were against the programme of university studies. This leadership eliminated the regulation imposed by the Cultural Revolution, that 40% of the students must be of worker origin and consequently the state had to support and finance them and give them facilities so that they could study. This regulation did not mean a retreat of culture or learning, in any way. But the workers who did not have time to dedicate to study were enabled to do so because the state supported them and, at the same time, maintained their political activity. Thus they developed the understanding that the university study had the political aim of developing Socialism. This leadership has overthrown all this, which is a reactionary and counter-revolutionary act. It is making a selection of students which is not determined by better intelligence or capacity, but a selection on the basis of who is able to study; in other words, those who have the means. That is the bureaucrats, the functionaries of the state apparatus, this is how it is. It is not an impelling of those who are intelligent or who study. No. It is a support to the apparatus against the intervention of the workers who study and develop university studies, and who come from the families, the centres, the life and activity that impels the revolution and the world revolution. Study and politics were for this. Now they have eliminated politics and study. This does not add anything, it does not facilitate, or develop ability.

On the contrary, it diminishes the scientific and technical capacity, because it makes careerists who function determined by individual interests. Then the capacity to think, to reason and to be useful by studying is determined by the interest that the student has. On the other hand, with the intervention of the workers, study is determined by the necessity of the Workers State, the development of the world revolution, the support for the world revolution, as was done, in its time, by China. This is not the case now. Now, there are sectors who are dedicated to study. It means that they do not see beyond study, which does not mean that others do not study but that these selected sectors have the means, because they come from the bureaucratic layer. They develop the interest of the leading caste in study, which later on is expressed in the organisation of the economy, of study, politics, the army and planning.

This reaction is very important, therefore, because it indicates that it is necessary to expect new struggles and that this bureaucratic counter-revolutionary sector has not succeeded in crushing the opposition. This is also indicated by the struggle between Hua Kuo Feng and Teng Peng. There is a struggle between them in which the educational struggle forms part of the indirect support to Hua Kuo Feng. It is necessary to follow these discussions in order to be able to understand and dominate the course of the process.

J. POSADAS 5/4/78

They are closer to capitalism. We do not idealise the present structure of the Soviet Union nor the character of its bureaucracy but the Soviet Union is advancing. The

dissidents are excluded from history because they are against communism and against constructive criticism of the Soviet Union.

Editorial

FOR A FULL DISCUSSION ON THE NEED FOR THE PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN BRITAIN

The decision to postpone the elections, after the TUC conference had rejected the government proposed wage freeze, has brought out again the precarious social, political and economic situation of British imperialism. Fundamental sectors of British capitalism have no great desire for an election as they have no marked enthusiasm for the policies of the Tory party, which although corresponding to some interests of the capitalist class, could precipitate profounder conflicts with the mass of the population. They prefer to utilise the relationship of the Labour government with the trade union leaderships and the workers aristocracy to mitigate the class struggle, to prevent dispute going beyond the control of the union leaderships. After all, the Callaghan government has carried out in budgets and foreign policy, the policy of capitalism. After the trade union congress they still hope for a Labour government to contain the process.

The working class has notorious difficulties in expressing its thought and aspirations in Britain. The Labour party is resistant to systematic thinking outside electoral preparation and the trade unions have a structure completely undemocratic, in which "millions" apparently sanction policies never discussed on a mass basis. Nevertheless the decomposition of capitalist authority and its inability to improve, but only reduce the standard of life gives rise now to tensions in the trade unions and begins to pose problems on the relationship with the Labour government and rejection of control of wages. This last TUC brought out the contradictory pressures at work, even if this is expressed in a very limited way.

The issue which the TUC systematically ignored was any realistic and objective discussion about where is Britain going? What is the perspective of capitalism? Is there not a need for social transformations?

THERE MUST BE A DISCUSSION OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

In practice, the conference was dominated by the need to return a Labour government at the next elections. This was the traditional line of sustaining one of the pillars of capitalism because it is "better" than the Tories. More profoundly, it is a desire for continued collaboration with the capitalist system, "not to rock the boat of our great country" (if alas now without an empire!). Thus on the basis of a fundamental principle of support for the Labour government, any discussion of the reality of Britain and the need to challenge capitalism as a system was avoided. All the evils of capitalism, lowering of the standard of living, pollution, inadequate social services, incapacity of capitalist industry, unemployment, alliance with Yankee imperialism, all these continue and get worse under a Labour government. The trade union leaderships still hope to "influence" capitalism in their favour. On the other hand they could not sustain the policy of wage freeze and thus the 5% wage limit was rejected and the 35 hours accepted as a demand. This is a rift which anticipates further and profounder clashes in the future relationship between the unions and capitalism because all the crises of capitalism on the economic plane are inexorably going to lead to an ever greater deterioration in the conditions of life and the unions will be obliged to oppose this and confront capitalism.

THE CAMPAIGN TO SUPPORT THE DISSIDENTS FAILS

Another issue which reflects the crisis of the links of capitalism in the trade unions was the failure to develop a real anti-Soviet campaign. Chappell found no backers for his characterisations of the leadership of the Soviet Union. The trade union leaderships refuse to develop an objective discussion about the need for social transformations, but they have to respect the Soviet Union partly to defend their own authority by associating with the Soviet Union but also because the Soviet Union weighs more and more in Britain. Despite all the campaign over the dissidents, capitalism registered a defeat in this conference, which shows the weight of the trade unions in Britain and how their role could be vastly more elevated on the basis of a profounder discussion of policy and programme to meet the needs of Britain. The decision to remove nationalisations from the programme of the TUC is an example not of the strength of bourgeois public opinion, but of a crisis in the apparatus who fear objective discussion and fear that future discussion will be more rigorous on the need for a serious programme and policy to apply.

MUCH MORE DISCUSSION IS NECESSARY

The principal feature of the political discussion in Britain at this moment is the reluctance to discuss any fundamental

Turn to page 4

• On the rehabilitation of Trotsky 1-8-78

• On the activity in Sweden 7-4-78

J. POSADAS

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

281 Friday 22 September 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE CONGRESS OF THE YUGOSLAVIAN COMMUNIST PARTY, SELF MANAGEMENT AND THE NEED FOR CENTRALISATION

23-6-78

(Title of the Editorial Board)

J. Posadas.

These conclusions of Dolanc in the Congress of the Yugoslav Communist Party eliminate the classes but also express them in the internal discussion on self-management and in the criticism which he makes of countries which, he says, through the policy of centralisation provoke a retreat in the economy. This is part of a discussion which is going to be generalised, with the conclusion that the Soviet experience is suitable for the whole world. From the Soviet experience, principles develop which are suitable for the whole world. The specific conditions of each country require a tactic of different stages and rhythms, but programme and tactic are universal because classes exist, and where is the retreat of the USSR or China or Vietnam? Hence of China they say nothing, because they would have to attack it.

What the Yugoslavs are trying to do is to organise a programme to justify their bureaucratic function against historic experience, which shows that centralisation is necessary for the development of the economy, not for power. If, together with centralisation of the economy, there is a centralisation of power, and this is against people, it must be expressed in the economy. If this is expressed in the economy, makes difficulties, blocks, creates obstacles and impedes a great development, what has to be corrected is the political leadership, not the economic centralisation of power. These are discussions of a social democratic character, corresponding in their epoch to the social democracy. They are not discussions which are based on actual experience in which it was demonstrated that, even under Stalin, the economy did not stagnate. The Workers State surpassed the capitalist regime. Outside Trotsky no one saw this, nor Dolanc. How explain that, even under Stalin, the economy developed and survived the nazis?

And how did the proletariat put

up with Stalin? on the basis of what? If there had been a catastrophe, Hitler would have had a point of support. There was a catastrophe, which was the political leadership of the USSR which impeded the greater development of the economy, but the proletariat had acquired the consciousness that the economy was right.

It is necessary to measure the Soviet Union through historic proofs. How are these measured? Through the so-called 'dissidents', through Stalin, through superpower or great power analogies, or through a country which has passed through the most decisive proofs of history — the Stalinist counter-revolutionary reaction, the invasion of Hitler, the conduct of the Soviet people which could only have fought with a very elevated understanding of the historic significance of the USSR, otherwise it would have been smashed.

The conduct of the Soviet army, even in the worst conditions, was never defeatist — only one general went over to the other side, no one followed him and even his dog has to denounce him. If what happened to the Soviet army had happened to other armies, including that of Hitler, they would have fallen apart. In the Soviet Union none fell apart, and they won. In the worst conditions the Soviet people collected food to give to the soldiers, and the workers made the katusha rocket and the tanks that were produced underground and with these they defeated the Germans. From there came the advance which liquidated Stalin, because Stalin was killed. They shot him, and that was that. The advance of the Soviet Union comes from that time, and the elevation of all the peoples and all the economic and social advance. What did imperialism do? What did capitalism do? They do not reason in this way. Now recently, as with the Belgian Communists, there is a great progress. They say all that we say integrally, but they say there is no democracy in the Soviet Union, there are 'dissidents'. They make

judgements according to the 'dissidents'. They do not reason in accordance with what determines the course of history, but what they determine.

With respect to Cuba and the Soviet Union, who intervene in Africa, the Yugoslavs say, 'Let the peoples speak, so that they determine and struggle for their freedom'. Yes, let imperialism smash all the peoples, capitalism says Africa for the Africans, and to say this Carter dresses up like a negro.

As part of this, they try to weigh with a dream which is the 'third world' which they have created. The third world does not exist. This third world is not a geographical designation, it is political, social and economic. There is a third world to advance to Socialism. What third world? Capitalism is one thing; the Workers States, the Socialist countries are two. These theoreticians are creating and inventing, as in the epoch of the social democracy, a programme to avoid the centralisation of the Workers States. They are not afraid to centralise themselves around the Workers States because it is incorrect, but because their bureaucratic interest is eliminated. They say 'The Soviet Union had Stalin'. Well, enough of this, and in Yugoslavia they had five hundred capitalists. This shows that Soviet centralisation gave support to eliminate these people, while the Yugoslav leadership did not eliminate them.

The maintenance of self-management is the defence of the centralised power of the bureaucracy which fears the competition of the workers; hence, in self-management the layers of worker leaders now have to be more flexible, to give opportunity to more people. It is a policy which has to yield to the capacity of the population, while in the Soviet Union — which was the mother of the bureaucracy, of every type of self-management — Stakhanovism

Turn to page 2

The growth of repression, the social crisis of capitalism and the need for social transformations

The events surrounding the armed attack on the employees of the Israeli airline "El Al" in London recently show the relationship between these acts of terrorism organised by imperialism and the use of the repressive state apparatus of capitalism. And this use of state repression by capitalism is co-ordinated — in as much as the system is capable of any co-ordination; this is what was discussed at the Bremen meeting of the major capitalist states. They spoke of "co-ordinating action against terrorism", but, in reality, it was the co-ordination of the repressive apparatus that was under discussion. What followed this incident in London was, once again, the army and tanks at London Airport and — a relatively new twist this — the deployment of the SAS which are, as the experience of Ireland shows us, nothing more than groups of assassins. Over a period of a few years there has been an intensification of bombings in London — and the rest of the capitalist world — organised by imperialism and of the repression of the population. Now half the "unarmed" British police are actually armed, or can be armed quickly and the "temporary" "prevention of terrorism act" has virtually suppressed one of the basic pillars of British "justice" the right of "habeus corpus", the right not to be imprisoned without trial. It is true that many of these actions like those of the bombs at the Communist Party headquarters and left-wing bookshop are organised by groups which are not central to the apparatus of the state. Much of the terrorism in Europe, like for example, the assassination of Moro, the actions of GRAPO in Spain, the killings of leading bourgeois figures in capitalist Germany are the work of groups organised by the Pentagon. However, they work in collusion with the police and military apparatus of capitalism. The "Red Brigades" in Italy could not have held Moro in the centre of Rome during a whole period when, apparently, the police were turning the place upside down without the collusion of the police apparatus itself. In Germany "terrorists" have been released from prison with great ease, rather like the release of the old German fascist murderer from a Rome prison. And we have that notorious imperialist invention "The jackal" always just being missed, or nearly arrested. Now it is revealed that the West German Federal Criminal police managed to lose three "terrorists" they had been following because, apparently, the head of the BKA (federal criminal office) decided that three "terrorists" would not be seen in public together.

Imperialism seeks to create an atmosphere of killing and terror as part of the preparation for the war and this means the war against the Workers States and the civil war which is part of the process revolution-war-revolution of this stage of history. At the same time it is also a process of the disintegration of the structure of capitalism and imperialism, part of the "death agony" of the system of private property. The proof of this is that much of this terrorism organised by imperialism is directed against the bourgeois itself. This is true of the assassination of Moro in Italy and possibly Hans Martin Schleyer in Germany. Hardly a day goes by without the head of one capitalist enterprise or another in Italy being shot. These actions, which are organised by yankee imperialism, by the Pentagon are directed at stimulating sectors of the bourgeoisie into action. And they need stimulating because they see no perspective for capitalism, because whole sectors are becoming more and more pessimistic. What capitalism needs, more than ever before, is fascism, a mass movement to use against the workers and popular movements, to confront the revolution directly. However the system does not have any social support for this. The petit bourgeois and lumpen proletariat which formed the basis of the fascist movement in the 1930's no longer exists. The evidence for this lies in the fact that the Liberal Party which, in 1920, could form a government now is virtually eliminated and this was the party with a large electoral base in the petit bourgeoisie, of the small shopkeepers, farmers, landowners and the like. On the other hand the trade unions are gaining half a million members a year at a time when, numerically, the traditional, industrial proletariat is diminishing. There is no basis for fascism in these circumstances. Indeed, on the contrary, it was possible to mobilise tens of thousands of people in London recently on an anti-fascist demonstration. Scientists show constantly that they do not believe that capitalism can use the advance of science for the progress of humanity and no important sector of the population can now be mobilised to defend the system of private property.

Lacking social support the capitalist system turns more and more to repression and, in so doing, alienates even further sectors of the population which, in a previous stage of history, would have been a social support for it. A case in point is the recent occupation of a block of flats in London by 160 people (including 30 children) which was crushed by force, by the police and bulldozers. And this at a time when between 25,000 and 30,000 people are living in expropriated property in London and many of them with the agreement of the GLC. These agreements are, to some extent, useful to the bourgeoisie in as much as they allow them to shift the responsibility for maintenance and repair onto the shoulders of the people. Then why attack this small group of "squatters" with such brutality? A leader of the GLC gave the reason when he said these people "were politically motivated". And this is true even if not in the programmatic sense or with any great authority. However, they did raise the slogan "a home is a human right" which meant that they weighed in the discussion over the Soviet Union, the "dissidents" and "human rights" and demonstrated, in a very simple way, that capitalism cannot give the basic human right of somewhere to live. And capitalism answered them in the only way it can, with repression. Thus the social support for capitalism is ever diminishing.

None of this is lost on the population and not least on sectors of the bourgeoisie. This is shown by the editorial of the "Daily Mirror" which called for the withdrawal of British troops from Ireland. It is an expression of a profound pessimism, a fear of the reaction of the masses in general and the working class in particular to the continued repression, assassination and terrorism of British imperialism in Ireland. It is a process which serves as a warning to the British masses that imperialism is preparing for war both against the Workers States and against the population. Indeed it is already engaged in a war. The owners of the "Mirror" are not "liberals" or "humanitarians" but bourgeois engaged in a discussion, an inter-bourgeois discussion on whether it is better to launch a repression — or on a world scale the war — immediately and face the certainty of being destroyed in the process, or whether to play for time, to give concessions, to withdraw the troops in the hope that the system can, in this way, survive a little longer. It is the same discussion, the same crisis as that which exists between the

Turn to page 4

ON THE REHABILITATION OF TROTSKY

J POSADAS

1-8-78

The demand for the rehabilitation of Trotsky and Bukharin, above all of Trotsky, has to be taken together with the intensification of the very acute crisis in the world Communist movement. This can be seen in the polemic of the Spanish Communist Party, and in the general sense, the polemic between the French, Spanish and Italian Communist parties. In this, the Italian Party is the one which has a much more coherent and better position, and the French Communist Party also in some aspects. They have to discuss problems which they cannot avoid, which does not mean that they take just and necessary conclusions. They have to discuss Trotsky, because the question cannot be concealed and because he is an instrument to defend themselves from the Soviet Union. Historic necessity imposes the confrontation of system against system and that backward countries can only advance if they adopt Soviet forms. Countries dismembered through the empirical, tribal development sustained by capitalism in order to advance have to unify, and become integrated in a very elevated process like Ethiopia. Capitalism has no reply to all of this. The dissidents have no answer, nor do these issues interest them because they are against the process, and nor do the Communist parties have an answer; in general nor do the Soviets. Now they are beginning to find it.

What does the rehabilitation of Trotsky, urged by some of the Communist parties, mean? What process does it relate to? To the advance of the process or to use Trotsky as a decoy to try to divert, disintegrate the unity of this process which is going to Sovietism? The process is not going towards the bureaucracy. It is going to Soviet forms of the progress of humanity, of society. They seek to contain this and also because, within the ranks of the bourgeoisie, there is an intellectual disquiet, an interest in knowing the truth, itself a principle of wanting to advance. There is also the weakness of the capitalist system which has nothing to oppose but atomic and electronic arms. It has nothing else, so it tries to seek a response to this process as Carter does with the Middle East. The reactionary countries as Saudi Arabia have done so in the meeting of the non-aligned countries where they have to accept the intervention and participation of Cuba in the world, and that Cuba openly intervenes with troops to impel the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggle. Then the "rebirth" of the concern with Trotsky to what does it correspond? There is an intellectual concern, a very great current within and outside the Communist parties which has an

intellectual concern. It still does not have political understanding, but yes, intellectual concern as also the petit bourgeoisie. There is not one problem, even one of average importance, which capitalism is able to resolve. None! But the Soviet Union, yes, it solves them.

This process is acquiring a very great and consistent volume. Trotsky is discussed in the Communist countries and many leaders come out in his defence. But in defence of Trotsky in a symbolic way, not Trotsky as an organiser. Ellenstein also defended Trotsky, to support Trotsky in order to smash Trotsky and smash Marxism. As there is no place for social democracy, neither is there any place to utilise Trotsky for the benefit of the bureaucracy of the Workers States, of the Communist parties, of the social democracy and of capitalism. Just as all these attempts failed, this also is going to fail, because the economy is decisive and social development is decisive. In order to progress, any country has to adopt Soviet form, not 'Soviet bureaucracy' but Soviet forms. The political leadership can be backward in relation to this need, but it has to adopt this form of economic structure to maintain itself. Capitalism is impotent to resolve any problem. There are two recent facts which reaffirm this in a profound form; that is the meeting of the non-aligned countries and the killing of the people in Mozambique made by the Rhodesians. Both have the same sense, that is to say, they cannot contain the situation and they assassinate. Assassination has never contained the progress of history from the massacre of St Bartholomew up to now.

Cuba is discussed in an open and decisive form, a country that is minute from the geographical point of view, but represents the progress of history and it acts as having an immense power. Many leaders say that Cuba does this because of the Soviet Union. Why don't the Yanks with so much strength overpower Cuba? Because of the Soviet Union. Why don't they invade the Soviet Union? The forms of progress acquire diverse forms. The most decisive aspect is when a small country like Cuba intervenes in Africa, Asia and Latin America, impelling the anti-capitalist struggle.

It's at this moment that the rehabilitation of Trotsky is raised, at the same time as the discussion of Posadism throughout the world. Then we must intervene in this process, because we have a great authority. We have to see that there is a process of progress in the theoretical

and political discussion, but on the basis of practical experiences. Cuba went to the meeting of the non-aligned nations and all aligned behind Cuba, not following Cuba but, yes, behind Cuba. Yugoslavia had to shut up, and not because it was afraid of Cuba and the Soviet Union but because, within Yugoslavia there was opposition. If another position had been taken, there would have been a crisis within Yugoslavia.

It is necessary to intervene in this process and to explain also the intervention of these 'old Trotskyists' like Mandel, who goes to make conferences in one of the citadels of capitalism, that is, Germany, against the Soviet Union and the process of Permanent Revolution. For him, the process of the Permanent Revolution is to defend immobility and the non-existent like the dissidents. For them to defend the progress of humanity is to defend someone because he is not allowed to speak, because he is stopped from speaking stupidities. But he says nothing of Angola.

The process of the advance of the world revolution has many aspects. With the existence of twenty Workers States and twenty Revolutionary States this process acquires more and more a precise form, but it also develops in a very indirect way which now poses the elimination of culture and political backwardness which is Stalinism. The rehabilitation of Trotsky is not simply a manoeuvre, it is a necessity; and many people who make this rehabilitation are honest people. A Mexican Communist has just written a book on the assassination of Trotsky and is repentant for having killed him. They did it believing it was right. Trotsky himself said, 'The one who is going to kill me or wants to kill me believes that he is doing good for Socialism'. Hence, it's very important, Berlinguer's statement that 'Zinoviev was against the revolution and afterwards Lenin won him'. The proposal of the Mexican Communist leader, Campos, is important. Campos has origins that go back some way. He has been generally of the Left, although mistaken in the conclusion, and he has maintained himself entirely within the Communist movement. When he posed the case of Trotsky it is not just him alone. If he was isolated or segregated he would not have the concern to bring out the issue of Trotsky. When he does this, it is not all manoeuvre, but a necessity. The truth has to come out. Communism means honesty and purity before history.

J. POSADAS

1 8.78

The Congress of the Yugoslavian Communist Party continued from page 1

has been liquidated. Now the bureaucracy cannot base itself on this. It has to be based on the policy of confrontation with the capitalist system. The development of the USSR and also a certain level of consciousness reached by the Soviet leadership, cannot retreat. It

must be based on the policy of confrontation with the capitalist system. Without the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia could not exist. The relation of world forces has a centre. It is not empirical nor occasional, nor by chance. It has an economic, political and military centre.

We let the third world liberate itself, and what economy? Imperialism is going to say, 'It's good that this people frees itself; let them. They will do well for capitalism'. The report of Dolanc is aimed at nationalist tendencies and tendencies linked to the Soviet Union, and

The Congress of the Yugoslavian Communist Party continued from page 2

secondly to tendencies to which they hope to give greater participation so as to confront the tendencies that want a much more pro-Soviet policy.

The world is structured through the economy and policy on the class struggle, based on the two world centres: the Workers States and capitalism. Intermediate countries from Africa to Latin America, do not play a determining function, but on occasions, in particular circumstances, develop a determining function in small steps - as, for example, Angola and Mozambique.

In this way, the defence of the small countries, the Cuba of Fidel Castro, play an immense function, while these non-aligned people reduce them. In the so-called Third World, it is not. It has less and less importance and, besides, they do it also to defend themselves. They are seeking association with reactionary tendencies, Cambodia and

China. They do not represent an experience which adds to what exists but already they reject the experiences from which to learn and advance. How can science be constructed without the experience of what is living with respect to the Soviet Union? Where is the retreat of the Soviet Union? Where is the retreat of Czechoslovakia? Where is the retreat of Vietnam? Dolanc speaks in abstractions which, in part, are aimed at imperialism but, in part, also at the Soviet Union, from the bureaucratic layer which he represents. Not everything is representative of the bureaucratic layer, revolutionary interests are present. Hence they belong to what they call the 'non-aligned', but their policy is not consistent and these declarations which they made orientate attention against the Soviet Union. There is no one word about China, which is a Workers State which supports the junta of assassins which is allied to imperialism against the Soviet Union.

This shows blindness because, if the Soviet Union fell, China would not last three minutes.

They take conscious political measures without achieving a real alliance. They see what the British are doing. In seeking agreements with the Chinese military, they are seeking support. It is necessary to condemn this. One measures the Soviet Union by its function in history, which is helping to liberate countries from capitalism and, at the same time, combining this with an activity for a greater Soviet democracy. It is not just a centre. The economy decides with the military political function of the Soviet Union, without which the world does not advance. It is not the Soviet Union which threatens Yugoslavia. It is the capitalist system which threatens Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslavs propose self-management outside social relations and they have to affirm that there are people who are opposed to this, and there are struggles, but they do not say who or how. With the Soviet Union, they accept that they must

have relations, that they must meet with the other Communist parties, that they all have things in common, but every one must respect each other's independence. As the position of the Yugoslavs is one which does not correspond to the progress of history, then they have to invent a political theory, as they cannot speak openly against the Soviets, as the Chinese do, they have to negotiate to make this appeal. The contradictions and antagonisms are part of these relations. They are the expression of a policy and a programme which has no perspective, which is self-management. Hence there is not one relation or real experience of self-management. Not one! The Soviets give an answer, and they make constant progress.

Secondly, they cannot ignore that they have to intervene on a world scale. They have to criticise imperialism and the bourgeoisie, but what of the Chinese? Hence they do not criticise the bourgeoisie, nor imperialism, and they make a reference which is totally superficial to the 'hegemony of the superpowers'. It is aimed at imperialism, but they

do not speak of imperialism. They should say, 'Imperialism does this'. This is their policy of conciliation with the capitalist system, not so much in historic perspectives, but they are carrying out a political conciliation.

Yugoslavia plays quite an important role because, politically, it is a centre which can interpret the relation of indecisive forces of all the countries of Asia, Latin America and Africa with capitalism, but not through its strength, politically, socially or on a trade union level.

In the accusations against Cuba they do not take into account the relation of forces which exist. It is not a question of one country, although it may be a Workers State, but of an objective which comes from relations of world forces and the one with the political, social and military strength is the Soviet Union.

J. POSADAS 23.6.1978

7-4-78

ON THE ACTIVITY IN SWEDEN J. Posadas

The discussion in Sweden, the planning of the discussion, has never been a programmatic one to socially transform Sweden, it has been a discussion about particular points but never about a programme, showing that Sweden has stagnated and that it cannot advance any more. Sweden is going to retreat more and more. Every progress in the workers movement in Sweden, such as increases of wages, better conditions of work, general improvements in working hours, sickness, housing, food; every new gain must be accompanied by the struggle for anti-capitalist progress, because capitalism has no further means of conciliating with the trade union and political bureaucracy, with the workers aristocracy and workers movement. The scope and environment of economic and political conciliation of capitalism with the working class and with the bureaucracy of the workers movement, is reduced more and more. At the same time, the world effect of the process in the Soviet Union also influences Sweden, not through the neighbouring areas but through the social and economic effects which are going to increase. In the proletarian vanguard, there is a concern to discuss this, but it is not discussed. They continue discussing about improvements, the return of the Social Democracy to the government, but not about the stage that we are in, the social and political relations on a world scale, their social effects, and the conditions of Swedish capitalism. Therefore, it is necessary to intervene, developing a current which discusses and which is concerned to elevate its theoretical and political capacity, combining it with the struggle for the advance of social, economic and political anti-capitalist demands in Sweden. Discussion must be developed, showing that a new government, even with a more elevated programme of demands for the masses, is a very, very, very limited advance. This is

because capitalism does not have the strength or economy and, as a result, social or political capacity and cannot raise the standard of living of the Swedish masses. The influence of the world process impels the petit bourgeoisie to be won over by the proletariat. Therefore it is necessary to direct oneself towards an important sector of the petit bourgeoisie, giving explanations and analyses. Directing oneself not only to the petit bourgeoisie but also to the working class. By making political, theoretical and programmatic analyses, it is possible to help a whole sector of the petit bourgeoisie to understand and it helps it to advance in political understanding with the next crises. It is not just a question of criticising capitalism but of making persuasive, very persuasive, very profound analyses, as well as criticising the Socialists and Communists. These should be persuasive criticisms, showing that the policy of adaptation to the capitalist system is responsible for the stagnation of the struggle in Sweden. It is not their responsibility, but that of the first stage of the Soviet Union in the epoch of Stalin. Afterwards, it was the responsibility of the Socialist Party and also of Palme, because they have made a number of improvements and concessions but, as the least evil. Olaf Palme has maintained capitalist power completely and has not damaged the capitalist system in any way. In order to progress, Sweden has to satisfy and to plan. Thus it is necessary to prepare it.

At the same time, it is necessary to analyse the world and to develop in them the clarity that the whole world process is helping to influence the Swedish petit bourgeoisie. They must be helped to see progress and that progress is anti-capitalist, not capitalist. But, if the Socialist and Communist parties do not discuss, they will remain stuck in the void. At the same time, if the pro-Soviet

Communists, and also other sectors, continue to act confined within the trade union struggle and do not generalise and extend the struggle, combining it with the political struggle of social transformation - although they may not have an immediate success - progress will be very small. It will be simply in accordance with trade union needs. It is necessary to discuss on the need to develop a tendency in Sweden which discusses objectively. It does not exist at the moment, whether in the Communist or Socialist Party and it is necessary to discuss Sweden as part of the world.

Sweden is a small country which cannot determine, cannot pass judgement and impel the rest of the world. Sweden is the result of the world which influences Sweden. The economy, the economic, social and political strength of Sweden is minimal, that is to say, it does not have the capacity to influence the rest of the world. But the influences of the world come from the struggle of the proletariat, of the great capitalist countries, of the countries of Africa, Asia; in part of Latin America, as Cuba essentially, and of the Workers States. Then it is necessary to be based on this influence, to develop a current which is not submitted to the Soviets but is based on support to the Soviet Union: a policy based on the programme that the progress of Sweden can only be made under Socialism.

Thus, the present progress of Sweden is minimal. Swedish capitalism has made a minimal concession to maintain power in Sweden. Then it is necessary to develop, but to understand, what tactic, programme and policy to develop, to discuss the conclusions of an analysis of the world and its influence on Sweden. A great deal should be discussed, showing that Sweden does not determine the course of the world

process: Britain, Germany, France and Italy partly do. Sweden does not. None of these countries - France, Britain and Italy in a separated form - are the ones which determine the course of the process. But they are very elevated parts of the strength which determines the course. Essentially this is determined by the Workers States. It is very important that the comrades have this discussion.

The course of the world and its rhythm is no longer determined by any capitalist country or any capitalist party. It is the Workers States which decide. It is capitalism which has to follow the Workers States and the policy of the Workers States. Between Workers States, Africa, Asia and Latin America, there is a constant process of drawing closer, of alliance, of integration through common needs and objective interests to progress, in Madagascar, Angola, Ethiopia, but also in Polisario and the Sahara. Then it is necessary to discuss that this is not a manoeuvre of the bureaucracy, but a policy which it must develop to be able to elevate the anti-capitalist front. Even conciliating with capitalism the bureaucracy has to make this policy. It does not push forward a consistent line with all the means that are possible to bring out and impel the revolutionary struggle. However, the economic development of the Soviet Union obliges it politically to make a world alliance with every anti-capitalist movement, if this movement has some importance and does not affect seriously the alliance and the agreements in a policy useful to confront the Yanks, as, for example, over Cape Verde. That is a small movement which has no weight. It is just mountains, land and people. But the importance of Cape Verde is not geographical, it is political - because very good political leaders have come from there. But the Soviets resolved not to support the inde-

pendence movement in order not to break with Spain. It was convenient to confront Spain over the Sahara and to confront capitalism in this way. It is a policy of conciliation of the bureaucracy, but aimed to seek to impel a greater front against capitalism. These are the insecure attitudes of the bureaucracy. It was necessary to support Cape Verde. It is necessary to support it, but also not giving support is not a betrayal but a political calculation, because the Soviet Union supports Polisario and all the other movements.

This is the activity which has to be developed now. It is necessary to prepare conferences on the problems of the world crisis of capitalism, on the process of the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, the crisis in the Communist parties, and the advance of the struggle throughout the world, which are not the same but which are going to have repercussions in Sweden. It is necessary to prepare for the next stages in Sweden, to develop tendencies based on the anti-capitalist programme. Many subjects must be discussed, and it depends on the people involved as to what subjects to discuss. But, above all, whatever the subject of discussion, it must be very, very didactic. The objective is to give consciousness, to clarify and to elevate the capacity for understanding of the Swedish comrades or the Swedish militants, so that they increase their understanding. This is the essential objective which can allow the creation of relations to reach the highest intellectual layers. This is the general programme. 7.4.1978 J. POSADAS

CORRECTION TO RED FLAG NUMBER 280

In the article 'The Labour party and the situation in Britain' J. Posadas 31.3.78 page 1. 5th paragraph should read: - 'The Italian and French Communists say this, but they have not had the attitude of the German workers'. 3

POLLUTION IS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

Every day that passes brings reports of new explosions of chemicals, leaks of oil into the sea, poisoning of the environment. It is a part of the deterioration in the standard and quality of life which the population is facing in all the capitalist countries. The British population is no exception. The escape of a lethal poison cloud in the Midlands, the barbaric conditions in the asbestos factories, reports of lead poisoning affecting school children are just some of the recent examples which are mentioned in passing by the bourgeois media. The constantly increasing pollution comes from the nature of the capitalist system, based on competition, not from the advance of science and technology. Capitalism has never been concerned by pollution and at all stages of its development it has been poisoning the atmosphere, but in this stage of the decay and total crisis of the system, it reaches new and drastic levels, where vast numbers of people are just wiped out in one explosion. This is because the means of production become more powerful and concentrated and for the functioning of the system, increasing the poisoning of the environment is a logical necessity.

Capitalism functions for one objective, the accumulation of capital. Its behaviour is determined by this. If further profits can be gained by adding chemical substitutes to food and textiles, the capitalist will do it. But why is it that the poisoning of food and all other commodities is increasing now? It is because the competition between different capitalist concerns attains a new ferocity due to the existence of the workers states. The workers states are taking whole areas which previously were the markets for capitalism thus decreasing the possibilities of places for investment. The remaining markets are fought over even more viciously and the result is greater concentration into fewer and fewer hands. As the capitalist system has no other way to function but through competition, the capitalist who can beat another competitor by producing a cheaper product will liquidate the other. By adulterating commodities, the capitalist is able to produce a cheaper product. Chemicals are often easier to manufacture than the original material and so substitutes are made. Foodstuffs can be made to ripen or ripening can be held back according to the interests of the market, so that the foods come onto the market when prices are high. Even radioactive rays are now being used to treat potatoes. This is a situation which is inherent to the capitalist system because the accumulation of capital is the motive force behind its functioning. Controls on pollution and poisoning of food thus are not wanted by capitalism, in fact it has a vested interest against them, because they create obstacles to the search for profits. For this reason, in situations like the asbestos factories, infrequent inspections take place and resulting fines of erring employers are farcically low and then the factory continues as before. It is not possible to expect capitalism to do something about pollution. It has no concern about pollution because of its own interests. It is the role of the trade unions and workers parties to take up the

campaign for the protection of the standard of living of the population. The question of the environmental deterioration is never referred to, but because of the total crisis of the system affecting all aspects of life, it is a fundamental issue to raise.

There have been many movements against the poisoning of the environment by nuclear means, which have involved whole sectors of the petit-bourgeoisie. The workers parties and trade unions have not carried out a struggle against capitalism and thus have not been a centre of attraction of all these sectors. Capitalism has not the slightest concern for the population. The workers parties and trade unions have to develop a programme against capitalism by taking up the issue of environmental poisoning.

The logical necessity of capitalism is to increase the poisoning of the environment. This is part of the criminal nature of the system, which does not have the slightest concern for the people. The morals of capitalism are:- accumulation of capital, competition, profits. They are criminal motives, because they clash constantly with the needs of the population. Science and technology advance, but the population receives little benefit from this. It suffers worse effects from the more powerful means of production. In this sense, capitalism is waging war against people every day. The aggressive social relations of capitalism affect all aspects of life. Where pollution is concerned, how is it possible to expect anything other than war against the population? It is capitalism which has produced the neutron bomb to kill people and leave property intact. The system has an interest in killing people because of the permanent surplus of labour now apparent under capitalism. The poisoning of the environment shows the criminality of capitalism. It has always functioned with total disregard for human life, but now can do greater damage by having more powerful means at its disposal. The way to end explosions and contamination leaks can only be done by the overthrow of capitalism. Already the population has shown its readiness to mobilise against capitalism. There have been many demonstrations against the development of nuclear reprocessing plants throughout Europe. The people sense the lack of concern of capitalism for their safety, and also feel that nuclear weapons can be produced at these plants. Measures can be taken to limit the harmful effects of capitalism by taking over plants and factories and running them under workers control. But the problem remains that under capitalism, pollution is a necessity to protect profit

margins and so the total expropriation of capitalism provides the only true solution to the environmental problems.

We are not against the development of new scientific and technological processes. The problem of the poisoning of the population does not stem from the introduction of new techniques. It is a question of who controls everything. Nuclear energy, for example, is infinitely more efficient in the production of energy than other processes. The Soviet Union has the superiority over capitalism in use of nuclear energy. There are no demonstrations in the Soviet Union against nuclear energy stations, precisely because none of the problems inherent to capitalism occur. The population is secure that it benefits from the use of a more powerful energy source, whilst not being in danger of becoming contaminated on the vast scale that takes place under capitalism. Environmental problems do exist in the workers state, but as that state is not based on competition, it has the means to rectify the problems. Even with the bureaucracy, there are not the obstacles to the investigation of the problem, and its rectification, because the workers state does not have to concern itself with profit margins being cut. On the contrary, the state has an interest in the increasing quality of the standard of life of the population.

Under capitalism, its very structure hampers the control of contamination. In a workers state, the advantages of nuclear energy, such as its cleanliness compared to other fuels can be enjoyed and the economy continues to develop.

How can the problem of pollution in Britain be solved? British imperialism, which once dominated and controlled a fifth of the world, no longer has an Empire. The revolution has thrown it out of the colonies. To compete with other capitalist countries for reduced markets, Britain must increase its capacity to compete. How can this be done? If it is done within the framework of capitalism, all the methods which cut production costs will be used. Machines, which mean unemployment, chemicals, which mean poisoning, waste discharge, which means pollution are the result. The population suffers, the conditions of life get worse. The alternative is to take Britain outside the framework of capitalism, and to construct a workers state. The workers states have shown that they have none of these problems. The solution to the environmental problem is therefore for the trade unions and the workers parties to campaign on an anti-capitalist programme, to take Britain out of the framework of capitalism.

THE GROWTH OF REPRESSION . . . continued from page 2

policy of Carter and that of the Pentagon in relation to the war. And the answer of the Pentagon to Carter is very likely to be the same as the one they gave Kennedy; a bullet, or a bomb.

All this viciousness, repression, terrorism and assassination of imperialism does not indicate any strength, rather they are the actions of the cornered rat. The strength, the world balance of forces lies with the Workers States, the world masses, the process of the advance of human progress. All the social support of capitalism is being won to the struggle of the working class and this is shown by the growth of the trade unions among the "white-collar" workers, the technicians, journalists and scientists. In reality the capitalist system survives not on its own strength but on the lack of leadership in the workers movement. The petit bourgeois masses are attracted to the working class but it can only see it distantly through the limitations, confusion, weakness and conciliation of the present leadership.

Editorial

continued from page 1

perspectives. Everything is kept at the level of trivia and banality. Discussion turns into a series of complaints whether over micro-electronics or Grunwick or the state of votes in parliament or the agricultural policy of the Common Market. On the one hand capitalism finds it impossible to give a perspective of any viability, so they try to drown discussion in recurring sensational events such as reports of terrorism. On the other hand there is a profound crisis of ideas in the workers movement, because old conceptions of the social democracy no longer carry the same weight. Pollution may be mentioned just as road casualties are discussed, not as part of the whole complex of a moribund society but on the level of a commentary or small talk. There is no sense of social perspective because capitalist society once delivered the goods and now it does not, but after this it is not clear what to do. But at the same time the example of the Soviet Union weighs — as seen in the intervention of Kitson some months ago — and more and more the world brings into Britain the perspective of social transformations.

Objectively however the ground is being prepared for a much deeper comprehension of the world process and the process in Britain than in the past. British capitalism cannot find a world support for its policies. In Rhodesia for example, British foreign policy is to intervene towards Nkomo in other words to attempt to conciliate with the revolution. It cannot look to the Soviet trade unions to develop a policy of blocking the British masses as in the General Strike of 1926. It has no perspectives for the future. One of its last was the Common Market and this has failed. All its political teams are in turmoil — Tory, Liberal and Labour.

The forces for social progress in Britain and those with fundamental weight, whether in the Labour party or the trade unions and the Labour intellectuals have to go outside Britain to understand the fundamental processes at work in the world. That is why it is fundamental to understand the present events in the world communist movement. There the discussion places all the weight on the need to carry out the programme of class struggle, to prepare to smash the bourgeois state, and to unify the world communist movement. In all this it is the Soviet Union which decides. Problems which have beset the world workers movement for decades such as the role of Stalinism and the character of the Soviet Union are now being openly discussed as in the most recent publication of the French Communist party "Ourselves and the USSR". All this type of discussion liquidates the basis for anti-Sovietism, carefully nurtured during the period of Stalin and afterwards and gives the basis for an objective assessment of the Soviet Union and its role in the world. Such discussions liquidate pluralism and euro-communism, used also by anti-Soviet elements of the British "Left" and give rise to new currents seeking for objective balance of the process of social transformation.

THE WORLD DECIDES THE DESTINY OF BRITAIN

It is necessary that the middle cadres in the Labour party and the trade unions seek to understand the depth of the process in Britain. The possibilities of shoring up the capitalist system are exhausted. It is a feeble competitor with the rest of capitalism. It has to seek subsidies from the masses to stimulate its enterprises. Why keep it alive at the expense of the masses? Nationalisation just of a few enterprises or firms with compensation for capitalism is no solution. There has to be participation of the masses in the execution of policy and there has to be planning on the basis of the needs of the population not on the basis of profits of individual enterprises. Moreover why the monarchy? It is absurd to discuss the need for rational social change and say well the "monarchy is not important". The bourgeoisie attach a lot of importance to it because its removal means the end of all manner of irrational relations with the petit bourgeoisie and the need to discuss objectively what is best for Britain.

The TUC avoided the most fundamental discussions and the Labour party publications are based on acceptance of the norms of capitalism. But this cannot last long because the international environment which sustained British capitalism, the Empire and powerful alliances has slipped away. The epoch of Stalinism is gone. The Soviets intervene against world capitalism and internally capitalism is weakening and at the same time becoming more and more incompetent to meet the needs of the population. This will impose the need for the policy of social transformation, nationalisation under workers control, planning of the economy and the whole environment.

What is necessary is the creation of a leadership which is prepared for a struggle for social transformation and for this the basis has to be not one of protest but of analysis, of the use of the dialectical materialist method. The point of departure has to be an analysis that the bourgeois state is an instrument of repression based on the system of private property and that it will always act in defence of the system of private property. It is correct to propose transitional measures which will weaken the apparatus of repression, such as "the immediate withdrawal of troops from Ireland", or even from London Airport! And Trade unions in the army, full political rights for the soldiers, out with the Polaris bases and no neutron bomb but it always has to be posed with the clear understanding that it is not possible to change the nature of the capitalist state with "a better administration" or a "left Labour government". It has to be done also with the understanding that the monarchy represents the bourgeois state, represents British imperialism and there can be no clarity of thought, or development of an anti-capitalist programme, policy and method without posing the end of the Monarchy and the perspective of the Socialist Republic.

Editorial

IT IS NECESSARY TO DISCUSS EMPLOYMENT, INFLATION AND NATIONALISATIONS AS PART OF THE NEED FOR SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

The Labour party conference rejected the wage norm of the government but drew no conclusions from this. Fundamentally also it was a vote determined by the weight of the trade union sector of the party, not by the general political decision of the party itself. The pressure of the working class decided this vote but otherwise its voice finds no direct expression in the life and functioning of the Labour party. At the end the delegates arose with Callaghan to sing the "Red Flag" and sustain the capitalist system. But irrespective of the apparatus and its projects, the policy of the government was rejected. Callaghan was obliged to inform them in so many words "alright we shall get our own way anyway by monetarist methods, provoke deflation and increase unemployment". Spoken like a true capitalist. Rejection of government policies like this has importance, but only as part of a world process which begins to provide nutrition for sectors that feel obliged to think in the Labour party and trade unions.

Neither did the resolutions or the discussion at the conference show any elevation beyond previous years. One resolution on the need for law and order — sanctioned by the usual democratic "millions" of votes — was in line with the Tory party and is just one symptom of the Labour party as extension of capitalism into the workers movement. The movement for "democratisation" of the LP which was defeated, is purely concerned with modifications of the apparatus and is not linked to the need to develop a consistent anti capitalist current in the Labour party based on the anti capitalist programme.

The intervention of the working class whether at Fords or in the recent Polaris dispute contribute to the crisis of the capitalist system and of the Labour party and help to develop the conditions for a better discussion, but the development of a consistent anti capitalist current in the LP requires a superior discussion of ideas, conceptions, programme and policy and this does not come automatically from the industrial interventions of the working class however powerful and persistent.

SOCIALISM AND CAPITALISM CANNOT BE RECONCILED

However even with the carefully selected delegates for the Labour party conference and the careful censoring of ideas, it is less possible to control discussion than in the past, because the perspectives of capitalism are failing and the social democracy cannot point to the successes of capitalism. Issues such as how are we going to solve the problem of unemployment (by rearming?), if there is a discussion of civil rights in the USSR, how about civil rights in Iran, Britain etc. i.e. what are the objectives of the support for the dissidents? are being discussed as was evident in the recent Tribune speech by Benn. They are issues that go beyond parochial and local accommodation with capitalism and point to the deepening crisis of the LP even if as yet this is relatively contained.

But there still has to be a discussion which advances on the basis of the irreconcilable differences between capitalism and the objective need for social transformations. Nationalisations are for example frequently advanced as signs of going towards socialism. Certainly when they take place under capitalist governments they are signs of the incompetence of capitalism. They register an inability to develop the economy without state intervention in the service of private capital. But they are not incompatible with capitalism. The nationalisation of North Sea oil is no socialist measure unless it was under workers control. In other countries sectors of the bourgeoisie have called for the nationalisation of the banks as a means of elevating a private economy. Nationalisations to have a Socialist content involve centralised planning of the whole of the economy with the intervention of the masses, and all decisions of production to meet the needs of the population — otherwise nationalisation is submitted to the running of the rest of the privately owned capitalist economy. Public utilities have been nationalised in Britain for years and have merely underpinned the rest of the capitalist economy.

THE FORCES FOR PROGRESS IN THE LABOUR PARTY MUST REST ON THE OBJECTIVE SUPPORT OF THE SOVIET UNION

At the same time the emphasis placed by capitalism on inflation as the "main problem" is not challenged in the Labour party. It is not the main problem, the main problem is the criminal and incompetent functioning of capitalism as a whole. Callaghan is not challenged in depth — or only sotto voce — when he says inflation stems from wages. It does not. It stems from the creation of a purchasing power which finds no equivalent on the production of commodities i.e. arms bills, social security payments plus the intensified exploitation by the monopolies of consumer needs. When capitalism speaks of inflation it does not arise from concern with the population

Turn to page 3

In This Issue:—

J. Posadas

19.7.78

HOW TO DEAL WITH CHILDREN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN LOVE

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

282

Friday 20 October 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

The origin of the Labour leadership and the influence of the world in Britain

Title by the Editorial Board. Extracts from a report
on the activity towards the British Section.

30.3.78

J. POSADAS

The idealistic conception of analysis has developed in the Labour Party. But its idealism combines the leadership, which thinks about regenerating capitalism and living with capitalism, and a left which from ingenuousness proceeds to being conscious servant of the capitalist system, because they do not believe in the analysis of historic materialism.

In science, mathematics and the atomic sciences, British capitalism was interested in the dialectic. It does not call it dialectic, but science — that is the dialectical method. In politics and in social struggles it is idealistic and is determined by social interests, not because it is ignorant. Thus it has the idealistic conception of waiting for two or three centuries to improve Britain.

But, as it is idealistic, it is also impotent and incapable, because it is very visible that from 1917 in hardly sixtyone years, the world has changed, changed completely and the perspective has also changed. In precise and concrete events. The most backward countries are the most advanced. The apparatus see this but, at the same time, they think that the USSR, China and Vietnam, Angola and Mozambique made the Socialist revolution because they were very poor countries. On the other hand, 'Britain is a rich country, we have the queen...'

The leadership of the Labour Party originated more than seventy years ago. It comes from Fabian origin and from the stage in which the workers movement fought to improve living standards. The origin of the Labour leadership developed in a stage of the defence of wages, of some conditions of life of the working class, together with the development of British capitalism which was the first great capitalism. Afterwards North America took over. British imperialism was the first great economic empire of capitalism

in which military conquest developed with the structuration of layers of the local bourgeoisie assimilated to British imperialism. The latter did not go to smash but to impede the development of the independent bourgeoisie, to make the country develop as a source of raw materials and centres of capitalist investment and profit, with development of certain auxiliary industries. Thus it created in every country very extensive layers of the bourgeoisie in which they were interested as allies. Thus the Indian bourgeoisie, the Ceylonese like that of Africa, Asia, were natural allies of British imperialism. It was the most developed empire throughout the world. It had colonies in all continents.

This allowed it to develop a solid structure of the trade union bureaucracy in Britain. The investment in the colonies and the development of British capitalism in the colonies and of the great capitalists — Germany, France, North America and Japan — allowed the creation of a layer and a structure which developed and develops a process of selection and imposition of candidates as if it were a bourgeois class. This layer worked as a conscious class in which it structured its cadres in such a way that they always decide: the bureaucracy always decides.

Now it's the same, but not because it has power to deceive the working class but because they were helped by the reformist policy of Stalin and the alliance with capitalism of Stalin. Stalin made a policy allied to capitalism, not only reformist but allied to capitalism against the progress of the revolution. Hence it's called Stalinism. It's not lack of freedom, prison or persecution of the opposition: this is not Stalinism, that is bureaucracy. Stalinism is a conception which arises from the bureaucratic layer of the USSR, to put the USSR at the service of

this layer. Hence it needs to make the policy of alliance with capitalism. All this policy of Stalin which lasted a long time served as a very solid base and pillar to affirm the bureaucracy of the Labour Party.

The great events of the world and the war of 1918, like that of 1939, shook and weakened and destabilised the empire of the bureaucracy of the Labour Party. In 1926 there was the general strike in Britain which could have led to the taking of power. The conditions existed for this, but Stalin made a stupid policy which helped the bureaucracy to get over this stage.

Thus it's not the power of the Labour trade union bureaucracy which allows it to maintain its power, but the relation of world forces and the world policy of Stalinism which helped to sustain the bureaucracy of the Labour Party. This was not an inevitability, a situation without opposition, but the help of Stalinism and the Soviet bureaucracy helped the bureaucracy of the trade unions to maintain power. Thus, as in capitalism, the link which develops from father to son, the family, the grouping of people for power, for the economy in the bureaucratic apparatus, is the same. It's a whole structure of material capitalist interests which are maintained to prevent the possibility of being overpowered.

The structure of Stalin was stronger, very much stronger, but Stalin fell. Stalin was affirmed for many years in the retreat of the world revolution and also the bureaucracy of the Labour Party. The whole stage of Stalin supported the Labour bureaucracy and the bureaucracy of the trade unions of the Workers States, helped to maintain it firmly, because Stalin decapitated every revolutionary movement. The conditions existed

Turn to page 2

THE ORIGIN OF THE LABOUR LEADERSHIP

continued from page 1

for revolutionary movements, as for example in very eloquent and decisive fact, the war in Spain. In the full state of the advance of fascism, the Spanish war occurred following the triumph of the Popular Front in Spain in 1936. In that time Cardenas received Trotsky, in Mexico; there were no revolutionary movements in Latin America, but the Popular Front triumphed in France and that, even with a reformist policy, showed the will of the class to triumph.

At the same time as the triumph of the Popular Front, there was the triumph of the general strike in France in 1936 which shook the whole capitalist system. It was a strike whose extent and depth neither the bourgeoisie nor the Socialist leaders expected. It shook the whole of France! It was a complete strike. The basis of this complete strike rested on the less paid, the less politicised and less activist sections of the trade unions. These intervened massively and gave confidence to the vanguard, and this was the basis for the success of the general strike. This general strike showed the resolution and the sentiment for changes and social transformations. The police went with trucks to arrest workers. They had ten great police trucks and they arrested one thousand workers. The demonstration attacked the trucks, freed all the prisoners and burnt all the trucks. Stalin was frightened of this. After, there was the Popular Front in Spain, but the Popular Front there and in France with a reformist conception; they were not ready to eliminate capitalism, but to make a better administration. This was a limited and weak policy which did not attract the petit bourgeoisie. Electorally it attracted them, but socially afterwards, no, because it was a policy of reforms. But, even so, the Popular Front had the strength of the majority and hence imperialism armed the invasion of Spain. It is a lie that Franco prepared. It was imperialism which prepared the invasion with the nazis and the fascists of Italy. If Franco had been alone, they would have finished with him in one week. He was helped by world capitalism and, at the same time, the refusal of the Socialist government of France to help the revolution, and they left Spain isolated.

All this favoured the Labour aristocracy and strengthened the apparatus as Stalin did. The Labour apparatus has little difference from that of Stalin, because it is an apparatus submitted unconditionally in discussions and resolutions which do not prejudice the programme of alliance with capitalism of the Labour leadership. The war in Spain created the conditions for a revolutionary development throughout Europe. A very simple fact demonstrates this. There were 180,000 volunteers from the whole world who went to Spain. It meant that the ebbing of the world revolution was not complete and it was not fatally necessary that the process took its course. Spain showed that the process could pass from such an ebbing to the re-animation of the world revolutionary movement. One hundred and eighty thousand volunteers!

The Labour leadership used all this: errors, false policy, capitalist policy, and policy of alliance with capitalism of the Socialists and Communists. But, at the same time, it had a base in the British economy and the structure of the British economic apparatus, an apparatus constructed on a solid world structure - now it is falling down - and in all the countries which imperialism conquered and dominated, a part was integrated with the empire. The Commonwealth is this. It is a structure on a world scale.

The bureaucracy could organise all this policy through the errors of the Communist parties and the counter-revolutionary Stalinist policy of Stalin. It is not the result of power and the capacity of the Labour bureaucracy. Also the development of the economy influenced the British petit bourgeois base, and the idealist dialectical anti-materialist conception of the Labour leadership weighed on the petit bourgeoisie.

Thus the power of the empire had economic resources which other powers did not. It allowed the subsidy of the Labour aristocracy. There is a great structure of a workers aristocracy who are well paid, with good conditions of work, through the social function which they play with a very large petit bourgeois layer which is the basis of the affirmation of the support for what was the British empire.

Almost all the revolutions triumph in the most backward countries, but not because it is fatalist, but through historic conditions and because there are very few large countries: Japan, Britain, North America, France and Germany. Outside these there are no great countries and, of these, the two great industrial nations, North America and Britain, through the trade union bureaucracy and Stalin, succeeded in containing the revolution. But, in Germany, no. In Germany in 1918 the revolution triumphed, blocked by the German Socialist Party, which served as a base for a retreat of the revolution throughout Europe.

The proletariat tried also in 1926 to take power in Britain. It is not that the proletariat was immobile and British capitalism secure. It lacked leadership, programme and policy for this task. This was because the only leadership in history which existed was that of Lenin, and afterwards there was nothing. This is to say, there is no other example, and it was not able to develop. Thus the British proletariat and the British petit bourgeoisie which the second world war politicised, has not found the programmatic antecedents, the tradition wherein to find support. The method of Stalin was in the form of thinking, in the structure of Stalinist thought, the same as the Social Democracy of Britain: anti-revolutionary, counter-revolutionary and mystical, defending a mystical power. The power was very concrete, but the base which developed was mystical, the same as the social democracy.

That is to say, the power of social democracy or of Stalin is

not that it resisted the progress of the revolution, no; but because there were no leaderships. The only leadership which existed was that of Lenin and, after that, there was nothing.

Thus the British proletariat, the petit bourgeoisie, did not possess the world support to develop experiences; and this allowed the bureaucratic and capitalist apparatus of the Labour Party with its allies in the trade unions to maintain power in the service of British capitalism.

Many of the Communist leaders do not believe in the dialectical method. When they speak and discuss they accept the dialectic to discuss simple things which do not have importance, which do not relate to social struggles or to the economy and, above all, they do not damage the British empire. In social characterisation, they are anti-dialectical.

In the world Communist movement after Lenin the concern ceased for the dialectical method, for Marxism. The Marxism that they spoke and developed was a caricature, for example, the economic analysis of Eugene Vargas. Individually he was not a bad character, but he understood nothing. He wrote what Stalin said, otherwise they would have killed him also. The proof is that when in 1938 he wanted to write something against their line, he disappeared. Thus there is no tradition of Marxist method on which the proletarian vanguard could base itself in Britain. With the death of Lenin and the expulsion of Trotsky, in the Soviet Union there was a retreat. Everything. In the Marxist method also. Then the bureaucracy and the Labour leadership and the leadership of the trade unions has no tradition, no experience, no example to stimulate thinking.

The whole period of Stalin was a period of corruption of revolutionary principles, of Marxism and of the objective of Socialism. It was a whole mass of corruption, and outside this, there were no other forces. The IV International in the epoch of Trotsky was very small. It was a period of retreat and Trotsky dedicated himself to maintain the confidence and the security that this was a transitory epoch and that better stages were going to come. Hence everything that he wrote was to give the dialectical materialist bases, analyses to understand and develop the dialectical method to await the stages which are coming, as they will come.

Trotsky foresaw in 1938 'within ten years, millions of revolutionaries will move heaven and earth'. It was not ten years but seven, because it was in 1945. It began there. Stalin liquidated the Communist International, liquidated the Communist parties and in Tehran was allied to British, Yankee and Japanese imperialism in any part of the world to prevent the triumph of the Chinese and Yugoslav revolutions and to give power back to capitalism. This was one of the most powerful elements which affirmed the bases of the trade unions and the Labour Party.

Outside Trotsky, and afterwards

ourselves, there has been no scientific analysis.

Thus the British proletariat, the British leadership has no tradition on which to base itself. Thus it is not the power of the bureaucracy but a relation of world forces which allowed this to happen. Hence there is no preoccupation with the dialectical method or the objective analyses of the Workers States. They do not know the structure of the economy. In general it's like this in the Communist parties also.

Thus, outside ourselves, there is nothing which feeds, provides ideas or analysis in the dialectical method and analysis. Even the Communist parties today experience a retreat which comes from a conception which brings them to Stalinism. It is not Stalinism, but it brings them to the Stalinist conception, which is pluralism, euro-communism, the lack of need for the negating of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the negating of internationalism. The trade union and Labour bureaucracy of Britain sees this, it feeds them. It feeds them because it helps their ignorance of the processes of history. They ignore the processes of history. They ignore the methods, the causes and the conditions under which they triumphed. They believe that Britain is an economic power in which Socialism has to be a step a century; every century a step forward. They do not believe in the need for social transformations, but they believe that it is necessary to lead and administer the country to live and nothing more. Similarly the Communists. The Communists now are discussing recently that there is a partial regeneration. The Communist parties have also finally arrived at discussing euro-communism, which is completely unscientific. It does not exist.

Communism is a conclusion of the process of history. It is not an interpretation or a desire. It is a conclusion of the process of history. The development of the economy and centralisation leads to the need to generalise the progress of science and technology, because science and technology are cramped and exhausted under capitalism. But science, technology and human intelligence in five years could resolve the problems of the economy of humanity and finish with human starvation. They will use atomic energy to stimulate, not to kill. They will use atomic energy to give life and not to provoke death. Capitalism provokes death.

Thus the necessity of Communism arises from a relation of the economy, of science, of technology of human intelligence and of the needs of humanity, to which capitalism cannot respond. Thus Communism does not exist in varieties. The force that exists are different leaderships, who may have desires to change and to improve, but programme and objectives are unalterable. The policy can change transitorily here or there, but cannot be opposed. Then euro-communism, to what does it answer? To a timid, fearful conception, and also involved with bureaucratic interest, and this is through lack of the development of Communist ideas and of objective analysis.

If, in the Communist parties, such a conclusion exists of euro-communism and of plurality,

inevitably the bureaucracy exists in Britain and in North America. It is not that they have power and force. They are helped by these currents which do not give ideas, programme and policy. Thus they have not allowed the creation of a movement, the current of dialectical analysis. But this does not mean that the bureaucracy of the Labour Party has an indefinite power. All this is transitory, completely transitory. Thus it is not possible to measure the power of the Labour and trade union bureaucracy as though it were fixed, but it is subject to the pressure of the relation of world forces.

The recent miners' strike in the United States has an infinitely greater importance than their triumph. There is a miner tradition of great combativity, above all a fundamental point of combativity has been the right to make strikes without repression. Their gains include the management having to pay for hospital and medical attention, and attention and maintenance even with the strike. The trade union leadership three times resolved on a return to work. Carter said 'Get back to work'. The workers did nothing about that. But Carter, instead of utilising the law which authorised him to order the suspension of the strike for ninety days and return to work, resolved on nine days. It is the same Carter who gave arms to the Israelis so that they could attack Lebanon, the same Carter. It's the same Carter who goes and fights South Africa and on the other hand provides them with arms and shakes their hands. If Carter and Callaghan decided, the government of South Africa would hardly last a minute. But, when Carter has to make a policy of 'nine days', it is because he wants to appear as someone who is not opposed to progress. Hence Young was sent to Africa. When this happens, it is because Carter feels that the North American people look, think and develop ideas, otherwise he would order them 'back to work' and try to enforce it, too.

All this shows that the power of North American capitalism and British capitalism is not omnipotent. It does not do what it likes. It's decrepitude and its weakness increase. This is expressed in the fact that British capitalism does not have the resolution, the capacity and the economic and social means to extend its power throughout the world.

The bureaucracy of the trade unions and Labour movement is also incapable. The world perspectives are not favourable to them. They are all against them. They do not have the method of thinking dialectically. In their origins, a layer was like that because it had no idea, no interest and was not attracted to dialectical thought. But, afterwards, for more than sixty years, they have had a conscious interest to think in an idealist form and to create layers, categories of workers, of petit bourgeoisie and, consequently to lead labourism and trade unions in that way. In the past, they elected, developed and prepared layers as an inheritance to secure power, layers that would not think in a revolutionary way, and that would allow, yes, agitation of some proposals for improvements, but nothing more.

But the relation of world forces advances. When the Soviets intervene, as they have intervened in

Mozambique, in Angola, in Ethiopia and in Vietnam, it shows that they cannot sustain co-existence with capitalism. The Workers State is repelled by it. The Soviet economy to advance must liquidate capitalism, otherwise they have a crisis-

Of all the dissident sectors, 190% are representatives of the previous bureaucratic layers, and now they feel that they are watched, whereas before they were allies of the present bureaucracy. Before they were allied with them, but now the Workers State cannot consent to co-existence with capitalism because the Soviet economy needs to extend and extend, and clashes with the capitalist system. This is one of the bases which is going to liquidate the bureaucracy of labourism and of the trade unions.

They do not discuss the objective experiences of history, but history teaches the objective experience. They do not learn. But the masses of Africa do. They emerge from slavery now, to a beginning of the Workers State. Mugabe does not represent the Workers State, but he represents a very elevated movement of a nationalism which has no other solution than Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia.

That is to say, all this weakens the power of the bureaucracy and people are going to develop who think dialectically. The Labour leader has no conception of programme, of ideas, of policy, of objective. For him, British capital-

ism exists, North American capitalism exists, German capitalism exists, and so they have no other choice than to accept that the Socialist powers exist. None of these Labour leaders nor the trade unions have written two lines on the economy, on art, on culture, on sport. They have written nothing. They are only co-ordinators, leaders of the capitalist system basing themselves on an apparatus which

is worm-eaten and disintegrating. The structure still appears, but it is breaking down and will fall in due course. This is their bureaucracy. They have no future. At the present moment they have the power of the apparatus, nothing more. They do not have the strength to exist and subsist and the previous absence of a dialectical and rational life, above all due to Stalinist policy up to Khrushchev, favoured the bureaucracy. Khrushchev lasted till 1963 and, until then, there was a policy of conciliation and the Labour bureaucracy was based on this.

Thus power is not determined by intelligence, by capacity or by the strength of capitalism, but it is helped by the leaderships of the Communist, Socialist and trade union movement. They do not develop in dialectical thought and they do not believe in this. But neither do they have the means to support themselves because, before neither the Soviets nor the Communist parties helped in this. This was the empiricism of the Soviets

who, above all in the countries of Europe until the time of Brdnev, had a policy of purges and blows against the Communist leaderships, the trade union and political opposition. Thus these Labour leaders could learn from nowhere. Also they could not learn because they believe in capitalism, impede and have impeded the development of dialectical discussions, tendencies and currents. The same with the Communists.

For example, the Communist Party in its programme does not include down with the queen, out with the queen. It does not propose: down with the monarchy. That is to say, they have contributed to this power of the Labour aristocracy. If the queen exists, it is not because she leads the capitalist system. She is a donkey and has nothing to do with intelligence. Intelligence walks on the opposite road to the queen. If the monarchy exists it is because capitalism feels that if it throws out the queen this will produce a development of ideas, of struggles, of thoughts, and the immediate influence of the republic towards Socialism will develop this. The first slogan which they should have proclaimed is: down with the monarchy, for the 'Socialist republic'. If they do not want to call for a Socialist republic, let them call it a democratic republic; but they propose a democratic queen.

These people who promise and cry about nationalisations - 'it's good' - and afterwards stop, or the

others who say, 'ah, nationalisations, we have to see... It's good but I'm busy,' have no importance, none of them, and there is no movement. Hence there are many people who think that to nationalise is a good thing, but to nationalise without political consequences. The leadership has still not arisen for this. It has to arise from a later struggle which will increase further the crisis of British capitalism as Britain, North America, Japan and Germany are the four very solid capitalist countries.

It's the same in Latin America where they do not discuss dialectically. The Communist parties of Latin America are like the British Communist Party. The Colombian Communist Party a year ago more or less posed: 'Is not the bourgeois revolution in Colombia still necessary?' And yet they wrote a resolution of the Soviet Union on Ethiopia in which they say that they pass from the tribe to Socialism. There are no leaderships. It is not only in Britain, but Colombia also. The Communist Party of Argentina continues to believe in the promises of Videla. Thus they expect that Videla will give democracy. In this way all the Communist parties of Latin America are like this. Three years ago the Mexican Communist Party, when Echevarria

visited the USSR and China, resolved and published 'the most urgent task is to overthrow the fascist Echevarria.' Meanwhile Echevarria was asked 'What did you think of your trip to the Soviet Union and China?' and he answered 'It's been very effective'. 'And, what is your opinion on these countries?' And he said, 'My opinion is that if China and the USSR unify, all the problems of Mexico will be resolved'. This means, 'If they unify they will help us to overthrow capitalism in Mexico!'. But the Communists speak of the 'fascist Echevarria'.

The consistency of the bureaucratic structure of Britain is going to last and a certain strength of British capitalism. But British capitalism is failing. That is, great new struggles are going to occur in which then it is necessary to intervene, to organise Marxist currents which do not exist in any of these groups now. Some may be gained in the future, but none now. They are all sceptical, petulant groups and, above all, anti-Communist. They are not anti-bureaucratic, but anti-Communist! They have nothing to do with the progress of the class struggle.

J. POSADAS 30 March 1978.

Editorial

continued from page 1

and its needs but its own preoccupation to reduce costs i.e. to contain the wage demands of the population. All this has to be explained and discussed publicly. At the same time all these particular discussions can only develop fruitfully on the basis of the conviction of the need for fundamental social changes.

The most important basis for any conception of social transformations requires that the sectors of the Labour party and the trade unions who wish to discuss need to comprehend the world process of history and to take into account the experience particularly of the international communist movement. The social democracy is rooted in its origins as a collaborator of capitalism in the days when capitalism was expanding on a world scale and could apparently guarantee an indefinite increase in the standard of living. The world communist movement stems from other origins completely. It was based on the need to break from the Social Democratic Second International, to break with the capitalist system, to destroy it and advance through the workers state based on the expropriation of capitalist property to socialism. Stalinism led to the temporary paralysis of this movement and its perversion into a form of social democracy collaborating with capitalism. But now the Soviet Union is reasserting revolutionary principles, that is the need to smash the state, the need to help with all possible means, revolutionary movements in countries submitted to imperialism and the need to develop a common anti capitalist and anti imperialist united front of the communist parties. Because of the previous complications caused by Stalinism some communist parties have developed conceptions about "pluralism" and euro communism to defend themselves from the Soviet Union. Capitalism has publicised all this to try to seal off the forces in the Labour party from the progressive influence of the Soviet Union, to make it appear that the social democracy has a future based on alliance with euro communism and "pluralism". All this is a distortion. Carrillo the main advocate of euro communism suffered a real defeat - even if a technical victory - on the attempt to eliminate Leninism as the doctrine of the Spanish communist party. An altogether superior discussion is developing in the French communist party on the need to understand Stalinism and the character of the Soviet Union. Berlinguer has to modify his positions on the historic compromise with the Christian democracy and make it plain that the communist party has the objective of liquidating capitalism. On a world plane where is there the perspective of a historic co-existence of capitalism and the workers states? The campaign over the dissidents by Carter is a sign of the total incompatibility of capitalism and the workers states. As most graphically illustrated by Africa, it is system against system and is the course of history which decides also the fate of the Labour party. Capitalism does not have the material means to develop the British economy. Every year that passes Britain is becoming more decrepit - even the sewerage system is collapsing because it has hardly been changed since the nineteenth century.

The Labour party conference showed that the apparatus that works in the interests of capitalism is still there and still powerful, but it can no longer govern and prevent discussion. The conditions that gave rise to it no longer pertain and more and more, it is being necessary for cadres in the trade unions and the party to rethink their positions, to free themselves from the pressure of bourgeois public opinion and ask where are we going, straight to hell with capitalism or progress towards a total reorganisation of society, without the monarchy but with planning, and the nationalisation of all the key industries under workers control.

THE MONARCHY...

continued from page 4

capitalism has, socially it feels insecure. It is not able to put itself as an example of progress. The standard of life in the country constantly declines, whereas the German workers state has economically overtaken Britain and the life of the population is one of constant progress. Any discussion on the validity of the monarchy leads on to other discussions. It raises how other countries have developed without a king or queen, of how the German workers state without a monarch provides housing and transport which is very cheap whereas in Britain it is very expensive. Capitalism feels that if a discussion starts which compares its monarchy with other systems, it will develop into a discussion where capitalism itself is compared with the alternative. If it felt secure it would not be so determined to avoid any questioning of the monarchy.

There will be opposition to the slogan of 'Out with the monarchy'. The apparatus in the trade unions and the Labour party will be against it because it involves questioning the whole direction that Britain is taking. Capitalism also will be perturbed, but it is a fundamental slogan for it gives a greater opportunity for the masses to intervene in a discussion. It allows a discussion on issues directly relevant to the interests of the population. Whereas the monarchy acts as a containing of discussion, the slogan of 'Out with the monarchy' develops one. It is necessary to link with this the slogan of 'For the Democratic Socialist Republic'. To oppose the political structure of the monarchy and propose 'Out with the monarchy, for the Democratic Socialist Republic'.

How to deal with children and the development of human love 19.7.78

J POSADAS

It is necessary to direct oneself to children speaking to them in the way they speak, to live with them, not to speak the adult's language, nor expecting that the child reflects immediately. It is necessary to adapt oneself to them. When there are times when there are many things to do and it is necessary to decide, it is necessary to do it without damaging the capacity of resolution of the child. The child acquires security through seeing the behaviour of the adults, and security is developed and allowed through the way he is treated and the relationship with the adult. If he sees a relationship of superiority, even though he is treated well, he does not stop feeling that it is superiority. If he sees a relationship of condescension, of protection he also feels it and then he develops it in all the other behaviour.

The child acquires its way of thinking above all from the immediate environment, that is the house. Here he acquires the way and the method of thinking and then he develops the sentiment of doing what is useful and necessary and he acts intelligently. It is necessary to develop him to act intelligently. It is necessary to explain to the child in a dialectical form whatever the situation, then the child acquires the method and love for the method because then he understands life. So the problem does not appear to be of a small child in front of an enormous world, but he feels a big person. In the future humanity will be like this.

In the future, but not in the distant future, love will be theory, thinking. Without eliminating love between human beings through the relations between the sexes, now sex will not be what determines love, it will be a necessity like anything else, nothing more, than that. On the other hand human love will be elevated by theory, because it is when human love will be able - as it has to do now - to develop nature with the universe and the cosmos in order to see where we came from and where we are going. But not in order to investigate in an arrogant way so as to say "we are superior" but in order to obtain links and relations, then developing the consciousness that the earth is a stage of the existence of life and that as a consequence it is necessary to make relations with what is in the cosmos and the universe. Human love will be the basis for this and physics will be the basis of human knowledge, because everything else will be the result of it.

If 3000 years ago the Greeks made the basis of all today's science and all the culture, then it is necessary to imagine what humanity will have when it has the security and it knows why we are here!

The children see all this, they do not have the conception of this, but they receive the influence and the relations of the adult who lives preoccupied by the problems that he has and that more and more are, through the existence of the trade union and the workers parties, united and linked with the importance of social progress. The child has to see all this and therefore gains security.

J. POSADAS

ETHIOPIA SHOWS HOW TO CONSTRUCT THE PARTY FOR SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

At the recent meeting of commemoration of the IV Anniversary of the Ethiopian Revolution in Addis Ababa, the Ethiopian leadership has pledged support to the masses of Rhodesia. It is well known that this leadership is also preparing to construct a proletarian Party to forward the revolution and construct socialism. The process of history has developed so far that an army leadership, built previously by a feudal regime, in a country with hardly any proletariat at all, is constructing a proletarian Marxist Leninist Party. When such events take place it is because the world process of the revolution has gone a long way, particularly in the realm of political preparation, political programme and the tactic to apply it, through a leadership prepared to construct socialism. This would not be possible if there were not 20 Workers States and 20 Revolutionary States. This is what the presence of all the Workers States and most Revolutionary States in Addis Ababa on that occasion has also meant. And in turn, this maturity of the masses of Ethiopia, this very elevated cultural revolutionary level of the Ethiopian leadership, is creating the conditions which the abandonment of the III International of Lenin has removed: the conditions for the construction of world anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist United Front, the returning to the functioning of the Communist International, to spread policy, programme, method and tactical orientation to all the countries of the world. The meeting of Addis Ababa therefore represents an enormous impulse to Cuba, Vietnam, and to the Soviet Union itself, allowing the rise of Communist sectors prepared to take this process of history to its full conclusion, the elimination of what is left of the capitalist system in the world, the construction of Bolshevik parties to take power in Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, South Africa, and in the rest of the world. The presence of the Patriotic Front in Addis Ababa shows how this process is already developing. The Communist Parties in formation today, in Zimbabwe, and in the rest of the world, are already being constructed from the United Front of all the progressive liberation movements, whilst shedding those elements who do not represent this progress.

This process makes it impossible to support at the same time the continuation of the monarchy in this country, and give some vague assistance to the 'liberation movements'. This position is prevalent in the Labour Party, but leads to a crisis in which the left will have to unify with the objectives of the masses Africa, or remain submitted to those of the monarchy, of British imperialism. Already the crisis between the Labour Party and the government, which has been going on for some time, is leading to a debate in the Labour Party on "which road to take?". If it is the path of the government, it is that of the defence of the British and Yankee imperialist interests. If it is the path of the proletariat and masses of

Britain, it is that of the defence of the revolution in Africa, the collectivisation of the means of production the leading role of the masses in the economy and society. The process in Ethiopia does not compel us to make a choice, but is determined by world conditions which exercise their influence also on Britain, and it is these conditions which compel us to choose. The socialist masses of Britain want the development of the life of the masses. To them this is progress. It is necessary to discuss how then to attain it.

Ethiopia shows once more that the development of the life of the masses does not depend on having a developed capitalist economy. It proves that it is not a high level of technical ability which decides the progress of the country. In Britain, there is a very high level of technical ability but this is put at the service of war preparations and therefore, it does not benefit the masses. Ultimately this is because this technical capacity is in the hands of a class, which seeks to continue to rule by means of war. In Ethiopia, the masses progress. And much more than technically which they do, they progress in their ability to use the initiative, their intelligence, through their intervention as a leading force in the economy. In the economy now being nationalised, everyone can use his creative ability to improve life. The young students go to the countryside, and everyone learns to read and write. And this is being done not as an imposition but it is welcomed by the masses who see through literacy the means of elevating their own way of life, and human relations on the basis of a better understanding of the economy and the laws of nature. This is a clear proof that it is not through a very elevated technical ability that progress passes. But through the ability to control the economy and technology, and this demands the collectivisation of the means of production. In this way, socially speaking, the masses of Ethiopia are progressing much more and they are much more cultured than the masses under the British capitalist system are allowed to be.

THE MEANS OF PROGRESS IS THE PARTY

The Labour Party has a very large proletarian base. But as this base is not incorporated in the functioning and objectives of the Party, it is the electoral interests which decide the functioning, structure, and the objectives of the Party. The Party functions solely as an electoral machine which disputes the power from the bourgeois party to run the capitalist system. The progress of the masses of Britain therefore has always been contained within what capitalism could be made to yield and no more. The conquests of the masses are therefore submitted to what the system can give. As it can give no more then there is no more progress. Those who can make the country progress is

the proletariat and masses. Ethiopia progresses, because it allows these to decide the leadership of the country, through the programme of collectivisation, committees of the masses controlling everything including the leaders and planning of the economy, whilst extending this planning to other countries in Africa, and seeking to link with the masses of Zimbabwe, the Arab countries and even Vietnam and Cuba. The new Party, the proletarian Party in construction is based on the giving the leadership to the masses, to the proletarian programme through the programme, even in the absence of proletariat. The bourgeoisie cannot accept the idea of being nationalised. It is antagonistic to this. The proletariat has collectivisation in its programme as a natural consequence of its function in the economy and its collective mentality developed in production, under capitalism. The programme for the collectivisation of the means of production, however, to be carried to its full conclusion and impede bureaucratisation or the bourgeoisie from retaining control of the nationalised industries, requires the party which leads the class and masses with the necessary tactic, slogans, for workers control, occupations, planning without becoming submitted to administrative or diplomatic tasks. Without the Party, countries like Algeria have advanced because there were not the world conditions for it to retreat. But for the elimination of private property in the countryside, for the removing of a whole bureaucracy with interests which would lead to the development of counter-revolution if conditions allowed — there is the need of a Proletarian, 'Marxist Leninist' Party. In this country, the Labour Party is not a party in that sense, it is a machinery for elections. However the need to progress is as great in Britain as it is in the rest of the world, and the only road to progress is that the means of production be nationalised under workers control. This puts on the order of the day the need for a Party, Socialist Party — from Labour — to function as a Party, giving leadership to the struggles of the masses, being the representative of the proletariat. It is a lie that the government 'needs to be more flexible with the Ford workers'. We need a government which represents the workers, learns to build an economy not based on competition with Japan or West Germany or the USA. This economy, is the planned economy of the Workers States. Already East Germany, technologically is as capable as the economy of Britain, and this in spite of the last war, in which it was destroyed. Since the construction of the East German Workers State, it has accomplished an uninterrupted line of progress. Besides it has given vast sums of money, many technicians and immense help to the liberation movements of Africa, Asia and Latin America. There is no capitalist country that can do this. The Labour Party must be changed in its functioning, making itself a Socialist party.

The demand that the government 'be more flexible' is only a pragmatic response from the apparatus of Labour as it stands, in front of a pressure of the proletariat which it cannot tame. So, it takes the easy way out, which is to be 'more flexible'. But the difficulties which lie at the end of this apparently easy way, are clearly perceived by the bourgeois government of Callaghan. This more flexible approach is the sign of an apparatus which has not the strength to expel the trade unions on which it has grown. This is a demonstration of its weakness. It shows that the Party cannot historically coincide with the government, however flexible it wants to be itself. And this leads to the government having either to yield to the proletariat — even if in part — or to confront it and this will lead to inexorable changes in the Labour Party and both ways, the greater weight of the proletariat in the

Party. It is necessary therefore to give to the Party a life based on the struggle and life of the working class, transforming each conquest of the class into a means of imposing further conquests, by means of orientations and programme. This can be done by a party which meets and discuss objectively, not by an electoral machine. This requires the organisation of an anti-capitalist tendency in the Labour Party. Immediately, it is necessary for the Labour left to support to the Ethiopian revolution, to seek to unify the struggle to transform the Labour Party with the struggle of the Ethiopian masses to construct a Socialist Party. And it is necessary to oppose the policy of the government, in trying to only impede the socialist revolution in Zimbabwe. It is necessary to pronounce oneself firmly opposed to British imperialism and to the monarchy.

FOR A DISCUSSION ON WHAT ROLE THE MONARCHY PLAYS

Whereas there have been questions raised about whether the House of Lords should be abolished, the issue of why the monarchy remains, is a subject that is not discussed. The House of Lords does not contribute anything towards progress but neither does the monarchy. The queen is the head of state but what role does she play? Political parties play a role in representing distinct tendencies in society, they are involved in the political process. The political party has to put forward an economic programme and a programme for what it would do in government. Also the president of a country represents a political tendency of the country and supports a particular policy. On the other hand, what ideas does the queen represent? She gives no political programme nor ideas nor anything at all. She is the figurehead of the country who takes part in ceremonies but lives an empty life, accumulating wealth and gambling.

The monarchy is not involved in the political life. It produces no speech nor anything written that relates to problems of the country. There is no proposal from it to deal with unemployment or any of the social problems. Not one idea to deal with the decline in the standard of life of the population. Taking all this into account, why is the monarchy still there if it does not contribute anything? The capitalist system is full of conflict. In the economy constantly the capitalist firms compete between themselves and one liquidates the other. It is disorder based on the dispute for trade. This disorder and conflict is reflected in the political field. The different tendencies of capitalism compete politically. Over issues like the E.E.C. or devolution, the bourgeois tendencies that have different interests dispute with each other over which policy to pursue. The monarchy is a centre around which they can unify to make it seem that above all the political conflict there is a queen which is superior to all this. The monarchy does not contribute any ideas to resolve any of these problems but she is a figurehead which gives the appearance of unity.

The monarchy is like a curtain

behind which capitalism tries to hide its disputes. There is a well paid sector of the petit bourgeoisie that still has a certain confidence in the system. The monarchy plays an important role in maintaining their belief. Capitalism uses the monarchy to convey to them that its system is not all conflict, but there is the "objectivity" of the monarchy that represents all of Britain. It makes it as though it is something above all the class struggle, that the struggle of the classes is not fundamental and that the real Britain is of order and tranquility. There is a constant concern to portray the monarchy as a representative of family life, of being just the most excellent example of the ideal family. The reality is the opposite, for the monarchy is full of corruption, but the aim is to try and relate to sectors of the petit bourgeoisie. To make it seem as though it represents them, even if in the rest of the country there is dispute.

In acting as a centre behind which the different capitalists hide their divisions, the monarchy makes it more difficult for the workers to take advantage of the divisions and influence more the petit bourgeoisie. Without the monarchy, the different tendencies would not have this centre to concentrate around. It would enable the masses to provoke greater divisions between the capitalist tendencies and to be able to increase the opportunities to gain the petit bourgeoisie. There is no discussion about a republic because the questioning of the need for a monarchy leads to a discussion on the whole future of the country. For this reason none of the political parties discuss this. The idea of a republic leads on to, what sort of republic? It is very important to discuss this in the Labour party. It is not a secondary issue that can be dealt with later on, it is fundamental to the whole discussion on the future of Britain. If the monarchy exists why does it exist? If it is to go what is to replace it? It is essential to raise the slogan of the need to get rid of the monarchy and to replace it with a republic, that is a Democratic Socialist Republic.

In spite of the wealth British
Turn to page 3

Editorial

FOR ALL WAGES TO RISE WITH THE COST OF LIVING! FOR A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS!

Despite the efforts of the Labour and Trade Union leadership to contain the process of the class struggle in this country, the working class have put themselves in the forefront once again with the threat of strikes at Vauxhall and Leyland, the continuation of the strike at Fords and British Oxygen and the near certainty of a bakers strike. At the same time council manual workers are threatening strike action, social workers are on strike in various parts of the country, the television technicians are poised for action and even the Royal Institute of Nursing — a body submerged in bourgeois and semi-religious ideas — has to say that they cannot contain the struggle of the nurses for much longer. These mobilisations, in general, take the form of a struggle for wages, shorter hours and, limited, improved working conditions. They take this form because of the lack of programme, policy, organisation and leadership for anything else at the moment but they put into question also the question of the inability of capitalism — and the lack of interest — to advance the standard of life of the mass of the population. This is the way in which, at this time, the world process of advance of the revolution finds its expression in this country. The confidence displayed of the sectors of workers who intervene without sufficient organisation or leadership comes from the world balance of social forces which is against the capitalist system and in favour of the advance of humanity to Socialism.

In this the Workers States weigh as a determining factor. The superiority of the Workers State in every aspect is demonstrated before the masses of the world in the experience of the two Soviet cosmonauts who have recently returned to earth after four and a half months in space. In this time they have lived almost normally, as if they were at home, and received better service in the delivery of food and letters — and the taking away of garbage — than most of the population gets under capitalism. And these comrades were "at home" in space in the sense that they have conquered the fear of space, of emptiness for humanity. And this is done on the basis of a Workers State which is still limited by what is left of a bureaucracy, that is still behind in some areas of industry and, in particular, agriculture — which still has some areas of private property — compared with yankee imperialism. Despite all this, the Soviet Union has taken an enormous step in the advance of humanity by showing that humanity can surpass the limitations of life on this planet. These experiences of the Soviets in space have a clear — and very important — military significance but they also have a great importance scientifically and socially. The social authority of the system of the Workers State is felt in this — and many other ways — by the masses of the whole world.

Capitalism, on the other hand, is in its death agony. British capitalism expresses its total crisis in every aspect, in every area of life. There is a crisis in all the social services, in the health service, in housing, in transport and in the prisons. It is sheer hypocrisy for the bourgeoisie and sectors of the Labour Party to complain about the "treatment of dissidents" in the Soviet Union when people are kept in the appalling conditions of British prisons under capitalism, not least of all those political prisoners in Northern Ireland. The Tory party, in all this, is falling apart on a comparatively simple issue of whether to have a policy of "free collective bargaining" or "wage controls" imposed by the government. Thatcher is in a complete confusion and actually insisted recently that there had to be some control on wages. The fact that Thatcher takes one position and Heath agrees with Callaghan is enough to show that this is a completely bourgeois discussion, concerned only with trying to maintain the system. It is simply a discussion on whether to manoeuvre using government control and the trade union bureaucracy in order to put-off the collision of class interests in Britain or whether you go directly for a confrontation with the working class now. It is the same discussion as exists in yankee imperialism in relation to the world revolution and the workers states; to gain time or to launch the war immediately. In Thatcher's thinking there is the idea that if you have "free collective bargaining", then the trade union leadership will be able to contain the struggle to wage rises and not be pushed into a political role. And anyway in the context of wages the big capitalist enterprises will be able to survive — for a period — wage increases and retain their profits on the basis of a rise in prices and the small firms will go to the wall. That is the attitude of the centres of

Turn to page 4

- We salute the forces of the left in Greece for their advance in the recent local elections.

The Greek section of the Posadist IV International intervened in the elections. One of the comrades of the section was on the list of the Communist party and was known as a Posadist. He was successful in being elected.

- We also salute the Venezuelan section who participated as part of the official delegation in the Youth Festival in Cuba.

Viva the successful trip of the Soviet cosmonauts into space!

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

283 Friday 17 November 1978

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY BEHAVIOUR OF THE CHINESE WORKERS STATE LEADERSHIP

1-9-78

J. POSADAS

The Sino-Soviet crisis basically is the difference between the world advance of the revolution which is expressed in an infinity of events, and the bureaucratic tendency of the leadership of the Chinese Workers State where counter-revolutionary policy conflicts with the advancing process of the revolution. The problem is not a dispute over policy or programme. It is the defence of bureaucratic interests which tend to oppose and contain the bigger danger for this bureaucracy. If the crisis was a dispute, difference or dissidence, it would be expressed in the programme, policy and objectives but there is no discussion of policy, programme or objectives.

The Chinese leadership does not express programmatically, politically any proposal, but the policy which they sustain is one of alliance and objective united front with the capitalist system: in Chile, supporting Cambodia and the counter-revolutionaries in Angola. This is the policy of the Chinese leadership: alliance with capitalism against the progress of the revolution, with accusations and campaigns against the Cuban intervention in Africa and in Ethiopia. It is not a mistaken programme, one of error or dispute against the Soviet bureaucracy, like that of the Rumanian with the Soviet bureaucracy. The dispute of the Rumanian bureaucracy with the Soviet is a dispute of bureaucratic apparatuses within the camp of the struggle against capitalism, although it is not an active policy of development. But the Rumanians, as much as the Soviets, support the policy against the capitalist system, but not the Chinese leadership. The claimed difference and accusations of the Chinese against the 'policy of absorption' of the Soviets or 'hegemonism', how are these demonstrated? The Soviets are hegemonists undoubtedly. They come from a bureaucratic and counter-revolutionary origin like Stalin, but now the policy is not that of Stalin.

Stalin betrayed the Spanish revolution. The Soviet Union supported the Ethiopian revolution against capitalism. The Soviet

Union supported Angola, Mozambique and Vietnam. If this is a policy of hegemony, it is good hegemony. It is the hegemony of the policy against capitalism. What does the Chinese leadership do against hegemony? They support Pinochet, support the counter-revolution against Vietnam, support the movements who go against the progress of the revolution in Angola and Mozambique. What are the differences of the Chinese? They do not have programmatic or political bases, or circumstantial differences. Then, what do the Chinese represent? China is a Workers State and this counter-revolutionary leadership defends the Workers State, but it defends it for itself as a body. It is not defended as property because it cannot possess nationalised property but, yes, with a conception of social interests like Stalinism. It is not a consequence of the stage of Stalin, but there is quite a lot of Stalin in all this that is happening. But even this does not explain the policy of the Chinese, and does not justify it. It does not explain why the Ethiopians, the Cubans, the Vietnamese could not do the same who, in worse conditions than the Chinese, have resisted the Yanks. The Angolese, who have resisted Portuguese imperialism, French imperialism and the backwardness of the country show clearly that the Angolese revolution does not retreat.

What is the reason for the policy of the Chinese leadership? Why do they develop in China in a process of the advance and elevation of the Socialist revolution a counter-revolutionary leadership. It is the logic of the process of the weakness of the Chinese Communist Party, of the proletarian base of the Chinese Communist Party of the development of layers come from the camp of the bourgeoisie, whether soldiers, technicians or scientists. The principal leaders have their origin in the bourgeoisie and in the stage of Stalin, who developed the local conception of the revolution. It developed the interest of competition against the Soviet bureaucracy. The stage of Stalin originated this,

and the absence of base, of tradition of the workers movement in China, the absence of weight of the proletariat of the Chinese Communist Party, allowed a part of the leadership of the revolution in China to defend itself from Stalin and developed the local, nationalist interest, local, not bourgeois but the local nationalist interest. It is not nationalist in the sense of handing matters over to capitalism, but a sphere of nationalism in the Workers State. It is not the same conception as bourgeois nationalism. The nationalist bourgeois defends private property, whereas the leadership of the Communist Party and of the Chinese Workers State defends the Workers State, nationalised property and conflicts with capitalism. But the Chinese leadership does not have the conception, the homogeneity of Socialism, but the local interest. Hence, in front of a series of events, they do not decide through the logic of the interest of the class struggle of the Chinese Workers State, but through the temporary logic of the conflict between the Workers States, Yankee imperialism and the world capitalist system. Hence, in China, they support Pinochet and there is no reason politically, socially or economically for this; and they support Cambodia against Vietnam. What are they defending, what are they supporting? How is such a position expressed in the whole policy of the Chinese? In defending the Cambodians, they defend the leadership of bourgeois origin. They defend Prince Sihanouk. Up to a few months ago, Sihanouk defended Cambodia. They got rid of him through internal struggles with an annual income of 8,000 dollars. Sihanouk was, of course, accustomed to eat in the big restaurants and 8,000 dollars could only get him four meals, but the simple fact of giving a subsidy shows that the Chinese Workers State seeks alliance with layers, wings and political leaderships of bourgeois and monarchial origin. Without being against, without rejecting the relation with the Workers States, it controls their relation. It puts all the accent on

turn to page 4

The Counter-Revolutionary Behaviour of The Chinese Workers State Leadership ...

impeding the development of the Workers State, because the development of the Workers State influences within China and develops the phase which was the cultural revolution, the first phase of the Chinese revolution. The advance of the Workers State develops China to impel the programme of the planned development on the basis of the world course of the Socialist revolution. But the Chinese act on the basis of the local, national course of the Chinese revolution.

An example is the programme of the leadership of the Chinese Workers State and the programme of the Soviets. The Soviets still have the bureaucracy which plans and leads bureaucratically, but now without Stalinism. Stalinism was a programme of alliance with capitalism to contain the revolution, one of selection between the revolution and alliance with capitalism. The choice was the alliance with capitalism. It was the perversion of the revolution. Stalinism was defeated by history. History was called Stalinism, Warsaw, Indo-China and also the Chinese revolution. Thus, the masses of the world which expressed progress defeated the capitalist system. Hitler was not conquered by Britain or the United States. Hitler was conquered by the Soviet masses, and also the Chinese masses. If the Chinese masses had adapted themselves to the struggle against Japanese imperialism and had remained there, China today would not be a Workers State. But, at the same time that the Chinese masses - led by the Chinese Communist Party - confronted Japanese imperialism, they liquidated Chiang Kai Shek. Today there are the same circumstances of progress of the revolution in which Angola, the Angolese Communist Party, has the programme of social transformations and is at the head of the process. They have in their programme principles which neither China nor Stalin had. This situation is not a contradiction or a degeneration, but the bureaucratic conception of the revolution; and it receives the support and the aid of all the previous stages of the Stalinist leadership and of the errors in part still of the bureaucratic leadership of the Soviet Union and the other Communist parties.

But, even with the errors and the bureaucratic policy of the Soviet Union, like the other Communist parties of the Workers States, that policy is anti-capitalist. There is not a single Workers State which seeks to affirm, sustain or diffuse capitalism from Yugoslavia to Cuba. There is a very urgent need for a united front.

There is an incessant progress of the Socialist revolution in all its forms. It is a permanent process. It is the form in which the world revolution develops. In a permanent form it means that the most backward country, in order to advance, has had to leap from semi-feudalism to the Socialist programme - like Angola. It has to pass from tribal conditions, from rival nationalisms to the coherent, centralised programming of the anti-capitalist struggle, the programme for Socialism. The less capable countries economically receive the influence, the support and the relation of world forces which is anti-capitalist. China, in front of this process, takes

an attitude of confrontation and of opposition, as it does concretely in Angola and Ethiopia. Ethiopia is an event for the history of humanity. A country full of tribes, of classes, which lived in a backward sphere of civilisation has passed from the life of the tribe and of the clan to a Socialist programme. The peasants who can only produce with their hands, because there are no machines, are attracted to the organisation of the Workers State. The most backward peasants of Ethiopia, without culture, without social life and policy, adopted, accepted and impel the programme of the Socialist revolution. They do not ask for the land for themselves. The Ethiopian peasant is not preoccupied with the security of his family, of himself, of his future. He does not see the future in private interest but in the centralisation, in economic, political and cultural concentration, and in a leadership which plans. This is the culture of today.

This situation shows the immense progress of the most backward layers of the population which advance to the most elevated progress of humanity. It is not the problem of the economy, but what society to construct. Capitalism has educated people in the sentiment of private property, has developed the interest of private property, has developed in society through the individual interest of the family and the conception that the future resides in what each one is capable of doing individually. The relation of wages of each one according to his capacity is the principle of the social relations of the capitalist system, which extends to all the other relations and which creates the family relations of this form. Particularly the peasant who, by tradition and need, was impelled to the aspiration to possess the land to resolve the needs of himself and his family and see the world through his family.

The peasants of Mozambique, Ethiopia, Vietnam, do not ask the land for themselves but ask for the land to work it in a collective form. The women of Angola live in tribes in which they live barely clothed. They do not have food and have an enormous economic backwardness, but nevertheless, they ask the leadership of the Angolan Workers State to send them pencils and writing pads because they want to learn to write to overcome the backwardness of Angola. They do not see the problem of Angola in an individual form, but in a collective form. The Chinese leadership is against this. They want to smash it. They have supported the counter-revolution and they still support it. What do they sustain there? What hegemonism in Angola? What hegemonism do the Soviets have who support Angola? This is not the stage of Stalin. In Angola there does not exist the economic, social or political strength to be exploiters of other peoples. On the other hand, it has internal problems of tribes, class, ethnical, racial and language differences which imperialism uses to dominate them. The Angolese revolution ended with this. The tribes who before confronted each other with arrows, arms and with the canon, now unite with pencils and note books to make plans. The Chinese leadership is against this.

What hegemonism is this? If the Chinese support Angola, what advantage is the Soviet bureaucracy going to get? What benefits? If Angola develops, what benefits can the Soviet bureaucracy win? The more the revolution advances, the more the economy, the more the social relations on the basis of the centralisation of the economy, the more social relations and culture advance, what individual advantages can the Soviet Union secure? The more the revolution advances with the culture and the science of the Workers States, the more the bureaucracy is shown to be unnecessary and superfluous.

Every progress of the revolution is depriving the bureaucracy of existence, because it has no historic justification. It is unnecessary. What does the Chinese leadership do in front of this? There is no discussion, neither programmatically, politically or one of perspectives. There are accusations aimed to conceal, obscure and divert the attention from the essential centre: the existence of a bureaucratic layer, of an alliance - because it is not a homogeneous layer - between the leadership of the Party, part of the leadership in the economy, the army with layers which come from a bourgeois origin, in the Chinese Communist Party, where there is a great number of layers of capitalist origin.

If there had been just differences of programme and policy, the Chinese leadership would defend the progress of the Workers States, would support Socialist revolutions, would seek the united front, the relation to develop the united front; and this they do not do, quite the contrary. They seek to work, to prejudice, to place obstacles in the way of Soviet policy, of support to the revolution throughout the world. This does not mean that Soviet policy is just and necessary in all aspects, but, yes, in a general sense Soviet external policy is linked, allied, dependent on the world course of the Socialist revolution. It is not true that the Soviets hope to defeat Yankee imperialism and be masters of the world. The Soviets have to support the world course of the revolution, because they are inexorably linked to the anti-capitalist struggle. Hence the Soviet Union supports Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, Cuba, Indo-China. Hence it supports any revolution. Hence the new Soviet Constitution, without being a total transformation of the previous process, is an immense progress towards the anti-capitalist struggle and defines the function of the Soviet Union. In 1917 the Russian Revolution defined the Soviet Workers State as the representative, the lighthouse which illuminated the world, and that the function of the Soviet Union was to impel the world course of the Socialist Revolution. This new Soviet Constitution, even limited, even full of bureaucratic points - an expression still of a bureaucratic conception, not only interests but a bureaucratic conception - still has as essential points: the historic conclusion of the Soviet Union is the world construction of Socialism to support every movement of social and national liberation. This is the conclusion of the Soviet Union. It does not fulfil it integrally, but more and more it approximates to this con-

clusion. What is the declaration of the present Chinese leadership? What policy do the Chinese follow? Support to Pinochet, support to the Angolese counter-revolution, Mozambique, and Indo-China.

The organisation of the bureaucratic layer of the Chinese Communist Party is not a mystery. It is not a surprising fact, but a consequence of the errors of the bureaucratic policy, of the counter-revolutionary action of Stalin which developed in the rest of the world, the opportunistic conception and the adaptation of the Communist parties to the bourgeoisie of every country. It's the elimination of the theoretical Marxist conception, exhibiting a great portrait of Marx but not studying him, a great portrait of Lenin but not applying Lenin. It is the consequence of the abandonment of the theoretical Marxist conception, of the programmatic practical policy of Leninism. Leninism does not mean to make the revolution every day, but the dialectical analysis of the class struggle of this stage of history. It means the programming of the struggle for power. It is not true that this means the abandonment of every programme for democratic conquests. In Leninism, it's a question of democratic conquests combined with the anti-capitalist struggle. Democracy is not a conclusion of history, Socialism is. Democracy is a means of social relations to allow the development of the progress of society. The bourgeoisie is democratic with one foot, the rest is anti-democratic. The bourgeoisie gives democracy because it is obliged to give it. It gave it because it was obliged to.

Democracy does not allow the construction of anything more than the capitalist system, but Soviet democracy does; because democracy has a Soviet conclusion, that is to say, the destruction of the capitalist system and making Soviet society. Democracy is abstract. It ends in property, in interest, in the regulation of property, of opinion and of the capitalist system. Hence it is not possible to fight for democracy in the abstract. In Greece, it is necessary to fight for democratic rights, combined with the demands for economic rights to develop the country, because bourgeois democracy cannot do it. Democracy is a means to develop the activity, to gain authority, to form revolutionary thought; but not a conclusion in itself. Democracy has a limit. What interests does it represent? If it is bourgeois democracy, it represents capitalist interest. If it is Soviet democracy, it is Soviet interest. The problem is that Soviet democracy has to have a Soviet leadership. This is what has to be discussed today.

The Chinese leadership does not discuss this. Hence they do not accuse the Soviet Union of absence of Soviet democracy, because then it would oblige them to give democracy, and neither do the Soviets accuse the Chinese of lack of Soviet democracy, because neither do the Soviets want it. Hence the Soviets, who have a thousand means of accusing the Chinese and showing that they are a bureaucratic camarilla which makes use of the Chinese Workers State, makes very limited accusations and criticisms of the Chinese. It does not make accusations of principles, it does not seek conclusions of principles.

The Soviets accuse the Chinese of being 'hegemonists', that is to

say, they make the same accusation as the Chinese make of the Soviets. This is no accusation. What is hegemonism? What conclusion has hegemonism? Lenin was a hegemonist. The base of hegemonism was Marxism. It aspired to Socialism throughout the world. It was a beautiful hegemony. They aspired to eliminate poverty, capitalist power, war and backwardness. This is a good hegemonism. Anyway, it's badly defined because it's not hegemonism but a necessity of history made in this way. There is no other way of doing it than was done in the Soviet Union, in China and Cuba. In Cuba they killed quite a few people. Having taken power, Fidel Castro did not think of constructing the Workers State. He thought of correcting the capitalist system and of making it pure. This is impossible. Capitalism is capitalism. That is to say that, at the same as in one stage it developed science, culture, art and knowledge, because it was necessary to production, when now it's no longer necessary to production, all that ceases, as now. The United States, Britain, Germany, France and Japan have no great painter or singer.

Capitalism developed the economy because that is the reason for its existence, but as now the development of the economy does not interest it, the economy is not united to the development of culture, of science, of art, literature and population. Capitalism has stopped from every cultural incorporation, every objective scientific incorporation for humanity. It incorporates scientific knowledge for war, for production and, in a lesser scale, for medicine, and there it finishes. That is the democracy of capitalism. Everything which alters this democracy makes the capitalist system react. Thus, how speak of hegemonism without giving it a historic definition about the programme of hegemonism? Hegemonism is an invention to justify the policy of the Chinese, like the invention of pluralism and eurocommunism. If it was a necessary conclusion, the Chinese would give the programme, policy, objective and organisation, and immediately, rapidly, action on the base of this programme. Then the programme determines the action, not the action the programme. It's the programme which determines the action. Where is the programme of the eurocommunists? What is the programme of the pluralists? Insofar as they have the opportunity of being pluralists, they are individualists. The French Communist Party is against the incorporation in the European Common Market of the agricultural production of Spain. This is not eurocommunism. That is to say, eurocommunism is not a scientific programme, but it is a programme created to justify a policy for itself. It has no basis in history.

The objective development of the economy, of science, of technology goes away from eurocommunism. It clashes with it. What do the Chinese say in front of this? There is not one idea. These are the thoughts of this stage of bourgeois democracy. This programme was within bourgeois democracy and, before being applied, differences and divergences already appear between the principal French, Spanish and Italian Communist parties.

The Chinese move out of this reality and continue attached to local interests, to the interest of the big Chinese bureaucracy which is

linked to the sectors who have their origin in the large-scale Chinese landed property. This is not because the great proprietors have infiltrated the Chinese Communist Party. No. It comes from the conception of the limitation of revolutionary development, so that the CCP seeks points of support and political bases in sectors of capitalist or feudal origin. It is not an accusation against the Chinese. The Soviets also had leaders of noble origin who afterwards became revolutionaries, and in China also. Chou en Lai came from a wealthy family. Their social origin does not determine one's definition of them, but their conduct determines how one defines them. The present leadership of the Chinese Communist Party has as its principal leaders, sectors linked to the former apparatus of the Communist Party who were linked to the policy of the hundred flowers. The hundred flowers was a policy of Mao Tse Tung in 1956 in which he proposed 'Let a hundred flowers flourish', which meant that everybody could write, everybody could give an opinion, not from the workers camp but from the bourgeois camp. The hundred flowers meant that all the big bourgeoisie up to the greatest mandarin could write. It meant the opening to incorporate bourgeois thought in the programme, the thought of the Communist programme. It was the insecurity in the programme of the revolution, the result of the doubt provoked by the stage of Stalin.

The Chinese leadership is a consequence of this, it's true, but they are carrying out this policy and they are making errors. It originates from earlier stages. It does not come from a stage of Marxist programming, from a life of preoccupation, of analysis or of historic comparison. While in 1956 in China they spoke of the hundred flowers, in the Soviet Union they were liquidating Stalin. But, not only because he died or they killed him, but because he was liquidated politically and programmatically. In 1953 there was the uprising of the German workers and in 1956 Poland and Hungary. There were uprisings against bureaucratic power, and this gave an immense impulse to the Communist parties of these countries and obliged them to change programme and policy. It is sufficient to compare Germany under Ulbricht with a whole bureaucratic structure and the uprising of the workers was against this. These events developed a very great function in changes in the German Workers State. In Poland it was the same, and in Hungary. Among the workers of Poland, Hungary, Germany, they rose to seek changes and to elevate the Communist life.

It is necessary to consider that this movement was the result of the reaction of the working class of these countries and of the Communist parties of these countries. The result can be seen: the progress of Germany, Hungary, Poland and also Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia reached a stage in which the leadership of the Yugoslav Communist Party was in the hands of a layer linked to world capitalism. It was linked to world capitalism by means of the bank and of trade. It was a country in which there was a federation. Each federation has particular interests, and they were united by a federal agreement. Stalin was responsible in principle for this situation, but he was not absolutely responsible. It was the Yugoslav bureaucracy which

did this. The Yugoslav bureaucracy finally put in question the existence of the Yugoslav Workers State. The Yugoslav workers and students rebelled. It was the stage in which on various occasions they got hold of managers and threw them out of the window - possibly it was the quickest way to get out. It was the time when the students and workers paraded the portrait of Tito as guerrilla, and with the Communist banner, which said 'That is the Tito we want'. Also Yugoslavia reached the same level of the bureaucracy of present day China. Also there was the case in Germany when in 1953 there was the uprising, as also in Poland when the workers rebelled. Thus, it is not an accidental phenomenon in China. It is a consequence of the development of the bureaucratic life, of the absence of revolutionary life and of the continuity of Marxist method. Outside the first state of Lenin and Trotsky, Marxism has never been applied. From 1925 Marxism was abandoned and the bureaucratic method and conception was substituted. This had as a fundamental conclusion that, in daily politics, the development of local interests, the link with forms of the capitalist conception was expressed. It was not a return to capitalism, but it utilised the Workers State for an objective which was opposed to its origin. Opposed to the construction of Socialism. It was used for the social benefit of layers created by the revolution to detain the revolution, as they did in Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary and Germany, and as Stalin did. It is not a Chinese phenomenon or a phenomenon arising surprisingly in a mysterious form without antecedents. The lack of life of revolutionary development leads to this, but also the lack of an adequate policy of the Soviet Union. Hence, the Chinese in the discussion with the Soviets do not discuss objective programme or policy. Between China and the Soviet Union there are common anti-capitalist interests. What does the Chinese bureaucracy defend? It does not proclaim a Socialist programme, of Socialist progress against the 'bourgeois policy' of the Soviet Union. It does not call it counter-revolutionary or bourgeois, but hegemonist. This has no value. It is not a definition which shows something. It is simply a justification.

Why do the Chinese do this? If they defended interests of the progress of the revolution, they would make proposals against capitalism. They would unify with the Soviet Union, with the Communist parties in support of Angola and before all, of Vietnam. Vietnam is an example. It is an argument for the superiority of Socialism in history. It showed that it conquered Yankee imperialism and world capitalism. It has no local bureaucratic interests, but interests which show that they are objective. Why do the Chinese attack Vietnam? It is an excuse. If it was really the problem of the Chinese residents who are fleeing, they could discuss. All these residents who are getting out are all capitalists who maintain small and medium businesses. In China there is a great commercial business, at least of restaurants and imports, through the Chinese residents in Vietnam. They did it before, long before. They were capitalists, usurpers, involved in currency exchange, black market, and they were a source of capitalist interest, corruption and decomposition. Their

relations were determined by capitalist interest. They were Chinese from a previous stage when, in Vietnam, French and Yankee capitalism predominated, and now the Vietnamese are throwing them out. It is a simple thing to declare.

Between Workers States there are no reasons for differences and dissidences, but it is necessary to discuss, to exchange ideas, to plan in common, because they have a common interest against the capitalist system. China unites with the capitalist system against Vietnam. What political reason is there? What programmatic justification? None, absolutely none. It's simply a question of pretexts as capitalism did in 1914 when an archduke was killed, and this was the excuse they gave for declaring war. The Chinese seek justifications for what they are doing in Cambodia, and what is the reality basically? Although the Soviets hide it, what is certain is that the Vietnamese are organising Laos with Vietnam. The historic need for the progress of Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam is unification. They are countries which develop under French imperialism. They have different languages. The common language is French, and they are linked by the same equal economic structure. They have the immense advantage of having a common language. Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam have different regional languages. The progress of science and the economy is made on the basis of the French language which unifies them. The natural tendency of the Cambodians and the Vietnamese is unification in order to centralise and defend the economy. Although the Cambodian leadership does not want unification, the influence of Vietnam leads and attracts Cambodia to this, because the masses see that the regional and isolated policy of the leadership in Cambodia maintains it in backwardness, while the policy of Vietnam elevates it. This is logical, totally logical and necessary for the progress of the history of these countries - unification, centralisation to plan production, the economy and the development of culture and science. If this develops it is an immense influence over China. Hence China wants to impede unification. This indicates a bureaucracy with a very profound bureaucratic influence. If the Soviet Union irritates China, it is because it tends to develop in every country the anti-capitalist struggle, the need for planning and centralisation.

The Soviet Union is not always correct. It makes bureaucratic errors and has bureaucratic interests but it is obliged to advance. In the case of Ethiopia it is clear that, while Ethiopia advances to maintain the unification of the country, the Soviets - who support this - have doubts in front of Eritrea which is a false political conception. It's not a question of interests only but of a false political conception on the part of the Soviets. It is not only economic interests which determine in policy political success or error, but the theoretical capacity to interpret, to develop, to programme and to lead. In the Soviet Union there is no experience of this process. The experience which they had, which was the unification of the Soviet Union, was lost with the bureaucracy. It did not remain as a programme, an acquired experience, but as a fact which turned out well. Hence the Chinese do not discuss this experience and the Soviets, at the same

time that they take a correct policy in Ethiopia, have doubts over the problem of Eritrea. It is necessary to unify Ethiopia and, in this unification, it is possible to plan the economy and there discuss the 'national problem of Eritrea', if it exists. Experience shows that there is no need for any separation to resolve a national problem which is small, because it is a problem of the tribe. Eritrea has no culture, no art, does not contribute to the development of humanity providing achievements in the field of culture, science, technology or the economy. Then, what interests promote and determine the interest of separation? It is cultural backwardness which pushes Eritrea to oppose centralisation with Ethiopia.

The Chinese leadership supports Eritrea, gives them arms, associates with Sudan, Saudi and Kuwait which are the centres of reaction throughout the Arab world and of the world capitalist system. They are the allies of this. Why? To maintain Eritrea separated from Ethiopia? No, for a justification seeking allies in the world against the advance of the revolution and to justify in this way their policy. In Cambodia they do the same. Unification advances in Indo-China. They have made a single Vietnam and unification with Laos is on the way. The Chinese are against this. Every centralised progress shows the weakness of the leadership of China. They have come out to cut this influence. This is the objective of the Chinese. There are no economic or political reasons. If there were economic reasons and political reasons, as there are two Workers States, they should discuss and establish agreement. But Cambodia makes war, a real war. It is not a total mobilisation of the country, but a war of frontiers. It is not animated to make a total war because then the revolution would come and eliminate them. Hence they pose as a justification that they are invaded, that the Vietnamese invade Cambodia, that 'they want to impose unification' and they justify military confrontation. But they do not say why unification is bad.

Unification is convenient. It develops cultural, economic and socially Cambodia. This is what Vietnam is proposing, and the Chinese leadership intervenes to prevent this so that it does not influence within China. Then a conclusion which is very eloquent is that neither factory nor trade union nor a movement of the students has intervened in mobilisation in defence of this Chinese leadership. There are no workers assemblies, or of the communes or peasants, in support. They could organise them. When they do not do it, it is because they know they would meet resistance because their first interest will be to publish resolutions of trade unions, factories, communes and universities. China still maintains the tradition of the big letter poster which is a backward form of political life. There are no letter posters against the Soviet Union, and they could do it. They have people to do it but they fear that, if they bring out posters against the Soviet Union, there will be posters of support for the Soviet Union.

The Chinese leadership is a bureaucratic camarilla, of bureaucratic conceptions which conceives Socialism as a decision of summits. It does not conceive Socialism before

and above all as the result of a necessity of superior social relations - although there are not the economic conditions like the Angolense, the Vietnamese or the Mozambican, and the first stage of the Soviet Union. A great economic development is not necessary to develop social relations. Social relations can determine the economic development. Angola shows it. If Angola had existed alone in the world, no; but the Soviet Union exists and China also. That is to say, they are points of anti-capitalist struggle. The conclusion of the Chinese is that they are opposed to these countries because it is an example of influence on China. Hence they liquidated the Cultural Revolution and without saying why. In the USSR they liquidated Stalin and they said why. They liquidated him as a dictator, as he did not represent the thought of the USSR or the masses. Hence they liquidated him publicly. In China why was the Cultural Revolution liquidated? There is not one document, not one analysis or justification, but they simply liquidated it and returned to the capitalist relations, the planning of production in the army and the university. In the university they eliminated the use of the term 'comrade'. The teacher was a comrade, now it is necessary to call him professor. Before, they had eliminated military ranks and the military salute, now they return to this. The military salute means the submission of the soldier to the arrogance of the officer. There is no need to do this. Capitalism maintains it for this. In China, they have re-introduced it and have eliminated the cell life in the army. They retreated on conquests in the capitalist countries, as in Italy. In Italy the soldiers outside the barracks are not obliged to salute. Outside the barracks they are civilians. In China, the officer continues being the superior officer who commands the soldier at any moment.

Why this re-incorporation of relations of command which mean establishing categorical distinctions, the basis of distribution of distinctions? Socialism is not constructed essentially, fundamentally submitted to the technology of production. Socialism is constructed

on the programmatic basis of consciousness and the will to construct. After, technology is necessary. But if first technology develops the country, production determines the social relations on the basis of technology, and that is capitalist. If the development of the economy is on the basis of Socialist planning, capitalist technology is used for this objective, as the Soviets did in the epoch of Lenin. In China, they have eliminated every form of development of social relations, and they re-introduce bourgeois relations. That is to say, in all their lives the Chinese bureaucratic leadership has developed in the interests of a bureaucratic layer, a bureaucratic caste which, to sustain itself and to defend itself from the revolution, from the army, the workers, the peasants, resort to bourgeois norms, to norms of bourgeois relations - because it corresponds to the bourgeois interest of the one who commands.

With the elimination of Stalin in the Soviet Union, was eliminated almost all the bureaucratic bases and programmes of Stalin. Not all,

but in the social relations, yes. Still there is a bureaucracy and there are bureaucratic apparatuses, forms of bureaucratic mobilisation. But the development of the Soviet Union is submitted, linked and dependent on the world development of the revolution. At such a level of the development of the Workers States, of the countries of Asia, Latin America, the Soviet Union has the objective need to impel the revolution. It does not have the adequate programme, does not have the experience, does not have the parties, but it has this need. Hence our function in the world Communist movement. The Communist parties do not have either the tradition or the method. Hence they discuss with the Chinese as the Chinese. They say to the Chinese, 'hegemonists'. What is hegemonism? They discuss in the same way because they are defending bureaucratic interests and conceptions, when the discussion which it is necessary to make is another. What has to be done is to appeal to the Chinese masses, to the workers, to the peasants, to the Chinese soldiers, to discuss and to plan an activity in common against the capitalist system. This is what the

Soviets have to do: to appeal to the Chinese for a programmatic anti-capitalist struggle. They must make the Soviet trade unions intervene, the Soviet workers centre, the regional committees of the Communist parties, the central committee, and the Political Bureau. It is necessary to make appeals to the masses of the world, the masses of China, the masses of the United States, of Britain and Germany, for the anti-capitalist struggle. It is necessary to unite an appeal to discuss programmatically with the present Chinese leadership - the one which accuses the Soviets of hegemonism - on an anti-capitalist programmatic discussion. Discuss throughout the world and pose as an objective the unity of the world Communist movement. The unity of the world Communist movement can only be done on the basis of the anti-capitalist programme and policy. Appeal for this discussion.

The Soviets do not appeal for this discussion, but they will have to do it. Still they have a bureaucratic conception and a defence of a bureaucratic interest, but at the same time, they have to advance in deepening the struggle against the capitalist system, a thing which the Chinese do not do. This is not

a result which arises from the impotence of Marxism, from the world Communist movement. It arises from the absence of application of Marxism, of study, the planning, the consistent application of Marxism. This is not the result of hegemonism or of Marxism, but of the absence of Marxism. It is necessary to return to the sources of Marxism. The Chinese return to Stalin, not Lenin. In the photographs Stalin still appears. They put Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. It is a form of remaining linked with the tradition of the world Communist movement, to appear before the Chinese masses that they maintain and are based on the tradition of the Soviet Union. Stalin was liquidated in China of the Cultural Revolution. When they return to him it is because they are defending counter-revolutionary bureaucratic interests.

This policy has no perspective. The process of the economy, science and technology has developed the intelligence of humanity. They do not have the necessary policy. The power of the Workers States is decisive and this weight of the Workers States is a conducting centre of the intelligence of humanity. They do not make the necessary policy. They do not have the necessary

leadership which represents what is necessary in this stage, but it represents the progress of humanity.

Our intervention is critical, to help the leadership of the CPSU and the Communist parties to intervene in this process to develop the programme of the Communists of the expropriation of capitalism, planning of production, workers councils, councils of soldiers and peasants, Soviet democracy and the unification of the world Communist movement. This is the programme of history, of the progress of history. Humanity is going towards this. Hence every country which ends with feudalism or capitalism adopts these norms, although it does not apply them. But this is the necessary programme. This is not submission to 'hegemonism' of the Soviet Union, but to develop the Marxist programme. There is no perspective for the triumph of the Chinese. They are against the reasoning and necessity of history. The necessity of history shows that any country, to progress, adopts Soviet forms; expropriates capitalism, the feudal sectors, makes workers control, and plans production. This is the basis of progress, incorporating in this the development of Marxist life, the experiences of Marxist life to pre-

pare, as a consequence, the integration of all the population in the leadership of the country. Thus, the mothers of Angola, they ask for pencils and note books for their children. They do not ask for meat nor do the mothers of Polisario who have come from the very great and total backwardness, but have organised an army of children and old people. At the same time, they organised culture, the development of knowledge, of science, not the distribution of food - which is also better than before - but scientific knowledge. It is necessary to return to all this. It is on this problem it is necessary to discuss.

It is necessary in consequence to make an appeal to the Communist parties so that they intervene with resolutions condemning the Chinese and appealing for a world discussion between the Workers States, the Communist parties and the Chinese leadership on the basis of the anti-capitalist programme. This is the conclusion.

The policy of the Chinese leadership has no perspective. But the programme of the development of the anti-capitalist struggle has to be applied.

J. POSADAS 1-9-78

THERE IS NO THIRD ROAD TO SOCIALISM. PROGRESS PASSES THROUGH A WORKERS STATE

The social democracy has always had as its objectives the improvement of the capitalist system so that more benefits could be gained from it. It has never sought to solve the problems of society by making fundamental transformations. This is alien to the whole concept of social democracy which believed that gradual changes over centuries would eventually lead to a better society. This type of philosophy is based on the premise that capitalism can give concessions. But what happens when capitalism is in such a crisis that it can no longer hold any perspective of advancing the standard of life of the population? Then the logic of the social democracy cannot be upheld, and it is thrown into mortal crisis.

There is no perspective for social democracy but for sectors of the left who want to orientate themselves by looking at the world communist movement, will find there is a constant process of changes and advance. The world communist movement grows in influence, authority, quality and numbers. The objective of the communist movement is to overthrow capitalism. Despite the experience of Stalin, that programme was not lost, and now, new opportunities arise which demand that the communist parties change, and retake the anti-capitalist programme. The communist parties have constructed twenty workers states whose progress, economically, socially and technologically is enormous. What have the socialist parties done? All the material advances are being taken back. For a tendency of the left to develop requires that it takes into consideration the changes and discussion going on in the world communist movement.

For the economy of Britain to develop, the only road is nationalisations, workers control and planning of the economy. This is the programme which has allowed the world communist

movement to develop countries which were nothing to countries which can now contribute, culturally, economically and scientifically to the progress of humanity. Democratic socialism, or eurocommunism is stated to be the way to progress. But there is no third way to go to socialism. Where has there been an example of another way that has permanently elevated the life of the people, other than that of the workers states? The origin of the movement of Castro in Cuba was that they wanted to free the people from oppression, doing this by correcting capitalism, improving it. But Castro found that he was not able to achieve his aims, without applying the socialist programme for Cuba. Now Cuba is playing an immense role of helping to liberate the people elsewhere!

What form of economy would "democratic socialism" have? The existing forms of economies are the workers states which are based on nationalisations and planning, and on the other hand, capitalism, based on private property. To provide for the people and to give democracy is required. Does a mixed economy attain these objectives? In Britain, there is a mixed economy, some nationalised, some private enterprise. Has the economy developed? It goes from crisis to crisis without any solution. In Spain 40% is nationalised, but where is the democracy there? The mixed economy functions in every respect for the benefit of big business. If there is democracy for the bosses there cannot be democracy for the people, because the two interests conflict. Democracy cannot be discussed in abstract. If the state gives enormous subsidies to the bosses and workers don't control the running of the factory, then the boss will make plans which allow the nationalised sector of the economy to be submitted to his factories, thus getting more profit. Where is the democracy? The boss gains more profit, the

people pay more taxes to subsidise both the nationalised and the private sector of the economy. The mixed economy thus doesn't lead to more democracy for the population.

In the Soviet Union, there is a centralised plan for the whole economy. The most important basis for democracy is the economy. If the population have jobs, have enough to eat, have adequate clothing and good housing, surely this is the beginning of democracy? Capitalism cannot provide even these basic necessities. It is centralisation in the economy of the workers states which has led to all these necessities being fulfilled. If the economy is not planned it is not possible to coordinate all the production of the factories so that the needs of the people can be provided for. Empiricism leads to tremendous wastage, shortages and over production. Socially useful goods can be made on a widespread scale in the workers states whereas in capitalism, products that obtain maximum profits for the boss are the most widely produced.

The conception that a third road to socialism exists does not rest on any scientific basis. There has been no example of any country in the world which has managed to fulfil basic human need apart from the workers states. Any advancing society has had to develop the productive forces, and expand. How is democratic socialism going to achieve this? How will the economy be organised to do this? The workers states have shown that they are capable of developing. One can see this just by looking at the tremendous achievements in spacial science. This third road to socialism has to demonstrate how it is going to contribute to the scientific progress of humanity in the way that the workers states have.

It is fundamental that the Labour and trade union left should discuss what way to

Editorial

continued from page 1

capitalism, of the industrial bourgeoisie. It is the same with the European monetary system which is to try to regulate the inter-capitalist competition in Europe to some extent but much more to regulate European capitalism from the crisis of yankee imperialism which, through the crisis of the dollar, is being imported into Europe. If the Labour government is not at all certain about this system it is because British capitalism is weak compared with French and German capitalism and has, in any case, a somewhat closer relation with yankee imperialism. None of this, of course, is anything to do with the standard of life - except to lower it - of the population. And the position of the Labour government, in defence of capitalism, is very clear in, for example, the defence of the Shah of Iran by Owen. It is enough, in itself, to characterise the Labour government as "ultra-capitalist".

At the same time, there is a discussion, a movement of sorts in the Labour Party which in the face of the total crisis of capitalism and the refusal of the workers to pay for this crisis, proceeds in a generally anti-capitalist direction. This is why Benn has to talk about the "middle road" between capitalism and the Workers State. He can no longer defend, as traditional social-democracy does, the capitalist system openly. When Benn goes on to pose a perspective of a Labour Government, controlled by the Labour Party and no longer "her majesty's" government and, at the same time, calls the monarchy into question it is because he seeks to answer a discussion in the Labour Party. He is answering a discussion in which sectors of the Labour left are seeking for an instrument of anti-capitalist struggle and social transformations, expressed in the fact that the Socialist International refused to support the call of Craxi (of the Socialist Party of Italy) for a campaign against the Soviet Union. It is part of the weakness of all this leadership.

The gains which the workers made in pressurising the trade union leadership into opposing the governments policy of wage limitation is now being taken a step further in translating this into action. It is not a support for the trade union bureaucracy anymore than the victories of the Labour Party at the Pontefract and Berwick by-elections indicates a support for the Labour leadership and its pro-capitalist policy. No the class remains centralised around the Labour Party and trade unions as a centre.

Underneath this struggle for wage increases, is a demand for shorter working hours against "productivity" that is used to raise the profit of the bosses and create unemployment and lower the standard of life of the masses. This small group of Bakers who are saying that the Baking industry should be run by the workers in order to produce decent bread for the mass of the population are expressing the question being raised by the workers. And that is: "who is to run industry, for the benefit of whom?" In a series of demands now being raised like, for example, the 35 hour week, wages to rise with the cost of living, the guaranteed minimum wage, equal pay for women, the end to unemployment there is, in embryo, an anti-capitalist programme. It now requires a discussion and development of ideas to raise it to the level of a programme, an anti-capitalist programme and to take the whole thing one stage further by posing the necessity for social transformation, for nationalisations under workers control. 4-11-78

socialism. Meetings, conferences, debates and publications should be organised which allow all anti-capitalist tendencies to intervene. The crisis of the social democracy becomes constantly

deeper. Hence the need to discuss what programme and policy is valid by taking into account the rich experiences of the world communist movement which has constructed workers states.

REGIONALISM AND THE ANTI-CAPITALIST SOLUTION

In the most recent stages of capitalism a whole series of movements have appeared putting forward separatist claims. It has occurred in Britain but also – within Europe – in Spain and Belgium. Lavish claims are made for “national independence” and the possibility of achieving greater progress freed from the “central power”. In the time of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg the national question weighed heavily in the workers movement because the progress of capitalism did involve wholesale suppression of national groupings and the subjection of one bourgeoisie to the other i.e. Russia, Austria and Hungary, the national “minorities”. Furthermore there was no concrete example of a workers state existing which had solved these “national problems”.

Now the reassertion of the “national” question takes place in somewhat different circumstances. The use of the “national minority” issue has for less historic justification. The bourgeoisie have always exploited the issue to defend bourgeois interests and to utilise the popular masses for their own objectives. “Nationalism” has always had two faces – opposition to imperialism oppression but at the same time preparation of continued repression through the continued regime of private property. Now two social systems confront each other one of which has solved the problem of nationalities (the workers states) and the other which through its own crisis consciously uses the “national minority” issue as a means to cut across the concentration of the masses to get rid of capitalism by suggesting there is another road. The inability of capitalism to solve the problems of separate cultures and uneven economic development is now used as an excuse to advance on the basis of decentralising society and the economy.

It is true that traditionally the line of capitalism has always been one of “balkanisation” – as was shown in the wreckage ensuing after the collapse of the Austro Hungarian empire and the substitution of a mass of small nations exploited and smashed down by imperialism. The capitalist solution had no justification then. It has even less now particularly when the perspectives for the development of capitalism do not exist and when the centralised economies of the workers states can progress without oppressing nationalities.

In Britain in particular, the cult of separatism is largely a recent invention utilised by the local bourgeoisie who take advantage of genuine needs of the oppressed areas to propose a non existent perspective. It is one thing to reject the centralisation around the union jack it is another to reject the claims of a unified socialised economy joining different regions together in the name of a specious separatism.

The development of local national assemblies, what does it benefit the mass of the population? How does the existence of local parliaments assist the masses when the property relations of capitalism are retained. It is true for example that Scotland and Wales show all the signs of underdevelopment-depopulation, serious unemployment, bad housing and the lack of any dynamic development of the economy to replace the older industries that no longer thrive. But this also applies to areas of England i.e. the North north west and east. What is at fault is the functioning of capitalism. There is no programme of the regionalist groupings that transcends the functioning of the capitalist system. It is also the case with Northern Ireland that its unification with the south is an objective necessity

but it would be absurd then to separate the economies of Britain and Ireland which only plays into the hands of decentralising the masses in their common fight against capitalism.

It is true that British imperialism functioned completely empirically and Scotland and Wales suffered from the predatory character of the system. They suffered from the uneven process of capitalist industrial development but what future has a regionalism in the epoch of multinationals whose technological investents eliminate manpower and develop countries not in a balanced way but simply in accordance with their own profitability requirements. What regionalism can solve mass unemployment? There is no such programme. Objectively now British capitalism is decaying. Its crisis is continuous and the question that is raised is the need to transform the functioning of the whole of the economy? How does decentralising the economy put an end to the problems of the whole capitalist economy? Its the same mentality as goes with self management – putting one factory against another instead of joint planning to prevent the waste caused by private competition.

Recently the Scottish nationalists have suffered a decline because their protests do not conclude with a viable historic programme. But their existence can continue until the forces of the left in the Labour party develop a coherent attitude towards the problems of separatism and instead of modifying the existing system with regional assemblies, actually state as a method of replying to regionalist conceptions used by the bourgeoisie “yes we guarantee room for cultural autonomy within a federation but on the basis of maintaining the gains of centralisation on a socialist basis”. We do not accept centralisation under the union jack but under the socialist republic, yes and without the monarchy which oppresses the whole population. When capitalism has to use the separatist card as in Spain, Belgium and Britain, it is because it can only play a game of diversion but not provide an historic perspective.

It is necessary also to use much more the experience of the Soviet Union whose inheritance from the Tzarist regime was much more formidable than the problem of regionalism in the British isles. There a vast number of nationalities have been totally integrated within the federation of socialist republics and the most backward areas benefit from the progress of the economy as a whole. Those who put forward “nationalist” views in the workers states are those who reject the whole functioning of the workers states and want to break up the centralised structure in favour of local interests.

Marxism does not make a cult of regional peculiarities or “national traditions”. It rejects suppression and repression of such cultures, but the way to progress is to unify populations with a collective economy which in this way overcomes the limitations of national and regional cultures. Resistance to progress by artificially cultivating local dialects or dying languages is simply used by the bourgeoisie to complicate the anti capitalist aspirations of the masses. Regionalism is an effort to contain objective discussion in Britain on the way forward. But it should be discussed in the Labour party as part of the discussion on the need for social transformations for a Socialist basis of the centralised economy and within that local autonomy if that is desired.

Editorial

FOR A DISCUSSION OF A PROGRAMME OF DEMANDS TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT FROM AUTOMATION

The whole dispute over the European Monetary Fund shows the continual crisis of capitalism in Europe. German capitalism has increased its economic strength in relation to the other European capitalist countries. It is the most powerful capitalist country in Europe. It wishes to extend its political power and to be able to be master of Europe. Its economic wealth comes from the fact that after 1945 the capitalist system gave it great amounts of money to rebuild itself as a force to try and contain the growing influence of the Soviet Union and the development of other workers states. Now capitalist Germany makes links with the Soviet Union in order to gain an ally against North America. At a time when capitalism needs to centralise itself in front of the workers states it is, in fact, having greater competition amongst itself. In the whole world it is losing its power, as in Iran where a whole process of uprisings is taking place against the Shah. This is an intervention of the masses who want changes. Imperialism has put massive amounts of armaments into Iran but it is incapable of ensuring stability for itself.

German capitalism in alliance with France, is seeking to be the determining force in Europe. Callaghan's concern over the loss of national independence is a fear of the power of German capitalism. British capitalism feels that the European Monetary Fund can lead to a situation whereby through the fact that the British economy is weak, capitalist Germany will be able to determine economically and through this also politically. Britain is very dependent on the United States and therefore does not support the strengthening of German capitalism and the greater dispute with the United States. On a whole series of issues in Europe, Britain has taken a position in opposition to proposals from the other major countries in the European Economic Community. This is not because the government is concerned to avoid the rights of the people being taken away by the E.E.C. but because the proposals are not in the interests of British capitalism. With the growing domination of the E.E.C. by German capitalism, British capitalism tries to protect itself from this. Therefore it is correct for the left to be against the European Monetary Fund but is necessary not to leave it as just opposing the entry into the scheme. Callaghan expresses the reservations of British capitalism to entry, the Labour left needs to express the opposition of the population to this financial institution. If it is left as just not entering the European Monetary Fund it does not lead to a solution to the problems. Inside or outside this currency arrangement in itself does not solve the problems that the population face. Inside the European Monetary Fund is a continuation of economic crisis. But outside the fund also means the continuation of the crisis.

All the scandal of the Thorpe trial illustrates that accompanying all the economic decline of British capitalism, there is a social and political decay. A leading member of one of the main bourgeois parties is accused of a whole series of crimes. It is a scandal which touches all the authority of the parliamentary structure. In the midst of all this decline, the workers in the 'Times' newspaper have stated they are not prepared to accept that technological advances result in the loss of their jobs. It is not that the workers are saying that they are against technological advance, but that the results of this must not be used against them. In capitalist Germany the print workers faced the same issue. They went on strike to demand protection of their jobs which were threatened by the introduction of new printing processes. The print workers were intervening to say that they did not oppose technical advance but that they must have the right to live, that they had to have money to live even if this led to a reduction in the competitive power of German capitalism. They won a big victory and imposed that their jobs be protected for eight years and after that period, they should still receive work and an equivalent payment.

CAPITALISM MEANS A DECLINING STANDARD OF LIFE

In relation to the microprocessing, it is necessary to make demands that the workers do not pay the price of the introduction of these techniques. If they are introduced the jobs must be protected. Also the profits made from the introduction of microprocessors must go to the workers. There has been a continual increase in the productive capacity of the economy. What once took thousands of workers, months to produce, is now done by a few workers in days. This has meant a constant production of more material goods. There are now more cars and refrigerators but it is not possible to measure the standard of life in Britain solely by that. It has been accompanied by decline in the level of life in other respects. There is a greater poisoning of the environment through the introduction of more powerful chemicals in the processes of production and this results in an increase in illnesses and in the poisoning of the population. The bakery workers, as well as making a strike over the wages issue, have also made a campaign over how the competition and drive for profit has resulted in the nutritional value of the bread being reduced until it is full of artificial components. This campaign is important as it expresses the concern to intervene not just on

Turn to page 4

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



monthly organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

284 Friday 15 December 1978 Price 10p

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

LENINISM, THE LIVING EXPERIENCE OF HUMANITY TODAY Extracts

17-6-78

J. POSADAS

...We are living at a very elevated moment of the maturity of the world revolutionary movement, although the coherent leadership does not exist. But the movement seeks to achieve the objective of its progress in the only way possible — by eliminating capitalism. That's the programme. The armies of the whole world, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the big capitalist countries like Italy or Spain are going to be shaken by this conclusion. It is necessary to elevate the understanding of this world process and to understand in this way the situation in Italy. It is not a question of making Italy depend on the world but to see how the world influences Italy and how Italy influences the world. Without being proportional, the influence of Italy on the world is very powerful and important, through the existence — above all and particularly — of the Communist Party and the Italian trade unions which have, from the organisational point of view, achieved the greatest conquests already obtained within the capitalist countries. These are not economic conquests, but the unions have won the greatest victories from the organisational point of view, and capitalism feels it,

We discuss all that in order to elevate our capacity of understanding, to see how to intervene in Italy and to measure the process which develops within the Communist and Socialist parties and the trade unions as a function of the world process. We do not remain rigorously submitted to the limitations of the Communists or the Socialists, but we take account of the world influence, of the world experiences which occur and influence Italy to see and foresee this process. The condition and the most elevated quality of the revolutionary leadership of the Party, of the International or of the trade unions, is to foresee where the course of history is going and for what reason. When the Party foresees, it can determine the forms of organisation to concentrate the forces and to progress. There are no leaderships having a revolutionary programme but there are, on the other hand, leaderships which aspire, seek for, and have as an objective, social transformation.

But what is going to decide the course of the process in the contradictory struggle — and even sometimes antagonistic struggle — between the objective of the programme of social transformations and the tactic of accommodation

within the capitalist system? Is it adaptation to the capitalist system or the programme of social transformations? It is the programme of social transformations which, in the last instance, resolves the problem.

The CPSU has intensified its attacks against the capitalist system. This is what the speeches of Breznev pose, 'It's either capitalism or Communism'. He does not make very many important appeals but says, 'The struggle of the peoples of Latin America, of Africa, and Asia is against the system of imperialist oppression'. It is in this struggle that they seek their liberation and they have support only in the Socialist countries. That means that in the midst of the campaign of Yankee imperialism, tending to threaten the Soviet Union and the Workers States, Breznev answered by an attack on the capitalist system. He did not say 'capitalist system', 'Yankee imperialism', but spoke in a general way: 'It is imperialism which provokes all the problems and the Soviet Union will not cease aid in the liberation struggle.'

It is necessary to develop the understanding of this process, the level which it has attained, our intervention and the effects in the Communist parties. We do not seek — with the conclusions which we draw — to modify the relation of forces, but we are going to contribute enormously within the world Communist movement to give confidence and assurance in the Marxist method. People speak of abandoning Lenin. Carrillo abandoned him. But, as the song goes, 'The beloved always remains in the mind of the lover'. Lenin is always in the mind of Carrillo or, at least, in that of the Spanish masses. Although Carrillo abandoned Lenin, he must return to retake him, because Lenin means capacity for foresight, organisation of the programme which foresees the course of history and, at the same time, the tactic. It is Lenin through his genius who organised forces which, without wanting social transformations, aspired to the progress of Russia; that is to say, among other things, 'Down with the war, we want bread!' At that moment there was progress. Lenin

concentrated the Bolshevik Party in the function of replying, 'We want bread, peace and land'. These world, which are simple and used every day, have been united with slogans for social

transformations.

Lenin was a genius. Genius does not exist humanly speaking, but we use the term to give a definition of the enormous ability of Lenin. He tended, with all his ability and concern to understand the course of history, how to utilise all the forces which existed. All the forces were not Communist. The latter were a minority in Russia, but these forces expressed the need for progress of Russia. It was necessary to determine concretely the stage for the programme, the tactic and the delays to obtain the objective. The ability to organise the rhythms and the delays of history, that is Leninism. When Carrillo wishes to reject Leninism, it is because he is embarrassed by it because it imposes on him the rigour of the Russian, Chinese and Cuban experiences and that of all the Workers States. This experience means that, in order to progress, it is necessary to overthrow the capitalist system. It is possible to advance a lot by parliamentary means, and socially, to overthrow the capitalist system. But to progress it is necessary to transform society, and one cannot transform society if one does not smash the ruling class. One can only eliminate this class by force.

If the class which governs capitalist society was conscious that it has to go, so much the better. But now there does not exist any experience or any expression showing the existence of an animal of this type! There is no animal which says, 'I must go'. It is for that reason that they eliminated Lenin. But, as Lenin represents an experience lived by humanity and not only by Carrillo, Lenin continues to live even if Carrillo puts him on one side. He removes him every day, but Lenin remains there. When people discuss, they do so on the basis of the experience of Lenin.

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO ELIMINATE LENIN FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF HUMANITY.

In Italy it is the same thing, they could eliminate Marx, Lenin and the others but, when they want to discuss 'what are we going to do', they have to return to Lenin. In medicine they have made a series of discoveries with anti-

Turn to page 2

Leninism, the living experience of humanity today . . .

continued from page 1

biotics and operations. Any doctor uses the experience of the world. In medicine, as in all branches of science from mechanics to spatial science, one does not take as a guide the particular qualities of each moment, but the total experience. In political experience it is the same thing. In medical or space sciences there can be changes due to changes of environment, but in political experience it is a question of social classes which determine the qualities of human behaviour. There can be differences in the delays and the rhythms due to the relation of forces. But there cannot be an alteration in behaviour, because it is a question of classes. In wishing them to eliminate Lenin or Marx, the classes are eliminated. It is a road which leads inevitably to the elimination of classes. It's absurd! Lenin is not embarrassed because he is put outside, and is not impatient to return. They have eliminated his face, his name and his texts, but the experiences are living. This is going to be expressed in Italy in the whole course of the class struggle. It is already lived and is going to be deepened.

When Mengistu of Ethiopia in place of making a formal review of troops in Cuba, says with raised fist, 'We will destroy the capitalist system', this is not just a case of general speaking. When an army proceeds to transform itself as an instrument representing the world Socialist transformation, it means that almost all the armies of the backward countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa are ready for that. Mengistu does not represent a particular quality of Ethiopia, but a state of sentiment of the soldiers of Africa, Asia and Latin America as, in part, those of Iran.

At the moment where certain people speak of abandoning Lenin, the behaviour of the armies of the world pose again - that Lenin is necessary. It is true that it is the Soviet Union which puts Lenin back in his place, but even without an official policy in this sense on the part of the Soviet bureaucracy, Lenin is indispensable and Marx is indispensable, for they are the representatives of the ability to think, to analyse and to resolve the problems of progress and of history.

The course which is developing in Italy is not independent of these struggles. It is said that, in the next Congress of the Communist Party, Leninism will be put into question. It is possible that a sector wants to abandon Lenin and will put him on one side while venerating him and making homage to him. But Lenin is going to laugh about all this. The world progress of the revolution tends to maintain Lenin and his programme. That is done in a special way in the leaderships of the Party, of the trade unions, as in the leaderships of the Workers States.

In this process of the revolution it is no longer the crisis of the capitalist system which determines the course of history. Its economy is exhausted - unemployment increases more than the augmentation of productivity. Productivity increases more than consumption. Consumption only increases in two branches of capitalist production - armaments and massacre. These are the only two single branches of capitalism which increase,

The essential centre of the exports of countries like France and Belgium consists of arms, and this is true also of Italy. Although for Italy it's not the most important it's one of the most important branches of export. To obtain clients, in order to find arms, capitalism needs to make war; and consequently to use them against the masses of the world - in the Workers States it is the opposite. The conquests increase proportionally with the progress of science, and that is expressed among other things in Siberia, where the Soviets construct an entirely new population at 60 degrees below zero. The cold of the Pole is dissolved by the warmth of human relations of the Workers State. This is not a poetic image, it is a reality.

The paper of the German Communist Party published a letter of a Communist leader who originally was a protester, a dissident on the USSR. He went then into the Soviet Union to see what was wrong, and he found that everything was going fine. He criticised the bureaucracy in a good way, and his criticisms were good. But the most important thing to see was his emotion; having stated that people in the USSR live and think in working to impel Socialism on a world scale. This comrade says, Every Soviet worker knows that a part of his wages which he does not receive goes to Angola, to Ethiopia, to Cuba, to Vietnam, and he is very content to give it. It is as if a child of an oppressed country sat at the table of every household of little mother Russia'.

This is not expressed in daily life, but this conclusion can only arise when, in the leadership, in the programming of the leadership of the Workers States, there is the will to confront the capitalist system. That does not mean that they are going to impel the revolution in every way. They are less audacious in tactic, but they are no longer timid. These comrades of Siberia, interrogated by a journalist, recount that they are conscious of their function of aiding the world revolutionary process. They do not complain of the reduction of their wages, but are content to give. When they are asked, 'And the dissidents in the USSR?', they answer, 'What dissidents?'. 'But aren't there exiles and mad people?' 'There are no mad people in the Soviet Union, but only in the capitalist countries'. For example, it would not enter the head of any one in the Soviet Union to contaminate water, to adulterate food, to harm people with the object of profit or by harming people. People doing that would be considered mad. People would say, simply, he is mad. But as there are no such in the USSR there are no mad people'. 'But what about the people who have been arrested?' 'Here no one is arrested because he is a Soviet citizen. Those who are in prison are there because they harm the Workers States'. While expressing this in a bureaucratic way, the person who said it is not bureaucratic but a peasant of the Siberian region. He expresses the sentiment of the Soviet population.

The progress of the Workers States impelling the revolution is the essential factor of the crisis of the capitalist system. It is not the economic crisis but the progress of the Workers States. This progress means that they must impel

the revolutionary process. That does not mean to say, to confront the capitalist system with arms, but it does not mean any more to withdraw. This is no longer the epoch of Spain, of Stalin, but the epoch of Ethiopia, of the Soviet Union of 1978. In Spain, Stalin handed over the revolution in order to conciliate with the capitalist system and hinder the process of the Spanish revolution influencing the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the Soviets today must give arms to Ethiopia and impel the revolution throughout the entire world in order to maintain themselves.

The condition of the existence of the Soviet Union is to impel the revolution. This is not a programme which is applied every day constantly and regularly, but it is the programme of the Workers States. The leadership of the Workers States has not accomplished the necessary programme in an adequate fashion, an integral way but it has not rejected it. It does not reject it any more. The biggest crisis of the capitalist system is not its economic crisis nor the competition between Japan, Germany and Yankee imperialism or British or French imperialism. It is not the inter-imperialist confrontation on the economic plane which is the principle effect of the crisis of the capitalist system. The proof can be seen in the meetings and the discussions which they are holding, and the lack of agreement between them. The contradictions of the capitalist system constantly deepen, but the cause of these contradictions do not lie only in the internal contradictions of the capitalist society stemming from world competition. They exist, but that is not the most important aspect.

The most important issue is the historic social competition of Ethiopia, Cuba and Vietnam, upheld by the Soviet Union, which provokes contradictions and antagonisms with the capitalist countries. There is no agreement, no solution. It is for that reason that the capitalist countries have a crisis without issue. They do not foresee the possibility of surmounting it. If the crisis was economic, if the root of it was only the economy, they would have the strength to solve it, and they would already have launched the war. They have not done it because they must confront a socially superior force. They are superior from the military point of view, but socially they are not - because the Workers States influence the masses of the United States.

The papers of the very democratic countries have not reported the great demonstrations of students of the petit bourgeoisie, and of public employees which have taken place in the United States against the intervention of Yankee imperialism in Africa. There have been demonstrations. It is not a question of an occasional fact, but of a norm of conduct. This deepens the crisis of the capitalist system, hindering the stability of private property and the continuity of the development of the capitalist system. This limits its capacity, its possibilities and, as a consequence, leads to other crises: the economic crisis becomes social. It is a question of a social crisis. The uprising of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America - although a degree lesser in Latin America - the development of the revolution in Vietnam, where they

expropriate what remains of private property, and nationalise, and eliminate the Chinese camarilla who owned half of Saigon: all this is equally part of the crisis of the capitalist system and disorganises it.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REVOLUTION IS THE ESSENTIAL BASIS OF THE CRISIS OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM.

Every day the Common Market, the eleven, the five, the 'serpent', the dragon, the camel meet. They seek measures for the movement of money, for the movement of the economy, and invent the 'snake', whereas it is in reality a question of buffaloes and rhinoses, that is to say, of animals bypassed by history. The rhinoses is not blameworthy, but the capitalist is. When they constantly hold meetings to find agreements, this does not come only from their own internal contradictions, but they have no means of expansion.

The logical nature of the capitalist system means that their internal contradictions were resolved by war. War eliminates the weakest. But now what war are they going to launch? Against whom? If France or Britain made war on Germany - and they have a thousand reasons to do this - the victor would be the British and German proletariat. The winner is the Soviet Union and China: not the China of the thieves of the present leadership, but the China which in a short stage is going to break all this.

One must see then that this process alters and provokes changes in the physiognomy of the parties. The Communist and Socialist parties of the world do not live this conception. They live the life, the monotony of the previous life, of the 'capitalist system and see the normal monotonous crises of the capitalist system. They are shaken and shattered, faced with this process of crises as, for example, Ethiopia. The Italian Communist Party, had it discussed anything of Ethiopia? No! 'Where is Ethiopia? But they have killed a lot of people. They have invaded Eritrea. This is what the Socialists say.

It is not true that the Ethiopians have invaded Eritrea. They have invaded the capitalist system and thrown it out. They have said nothing about that. All this weakens the capitalist system and alters the relation of forces. A simple conclusion which shows the importance of our intervention is that we have been the only ones to write on this theme. We have given the programme to solve the problem of Ethiopia, Eritrea and the Ogaden: the programme of a federation, but a federation submitted to economic unity to advance towards Socialism. Otherwise it is not a federation and everything breaks up. We have written on this subject some time ago. It seemed a rather superficial task.

An Italian review published an interview with Fidel Castro. The latter knew the text of Posadas and took it integrally. All the papers said, Ethiopia will receive no more Cuban aid, the Soviets are withdrawing... Even if the Cuban troops do not intervene, the reasoning of Fidel Castro is taken integrally from the text of Posadas. The Soviets do the same thing. They say, At the beginning there were revolutionary movements in Eritrea which were against the Negus but, as a consequence, they were dominated by Saudi Arabia'. They say the same as our text. Now they are prisoners of these movements. They do not have political or military freedom, and they are the victims of this leadership so the independence of Eritrea

does not exist'. This would be an independence in favour of Saudi Arabia, of the capitalist system, to stifle the development of Ethiopia. This is our function: we have written seeking this objective to influence the Soviets and the Cubans.

The whole situation in Ethiopia is a part of the crisis of the capitalist system. It is much more important than ten economic crises for the Ethiopians show how to resolve problems. The problems of Ethiopia are new. In the epoch of Lenin these problems would have been resolved differently. Everything was different. Russia was a country that was centralised and unified around the Tsar. Ethiopia is a country made up of all sorts of remains of previous colonies, but it forms at present a unity. How to act now? Either to dismember in order to re-unite it later, or maintain unity and go further? These are new problems of history. We have been the only ones to have the audacity and the resolution to propose answers. These are new problems of history, and now Castro and Breznev also say the same.

Such is the basis of the crisis of the capitalist system. The economic crisis is a base but not the essential one. Backward countries like Ethiopia have nothing, but they have the ideas of Lenin. How can one believe, admit and suppose, that a backward country like Ethiopia would install Lenin; and now Carrillo is going to reject him! It is absurd! What Carrillo did was absurd, but the most absurd thing is to believe that Lenin is going to remain outside the process. Ethiopia said to Carrillo, 'You are an idiot, this is not the way to do it. Lenin's thought leads to the solution of the problems of backwardness.' This is the discussion in the Communist movement.

The capitalist system hopes to profit from Carrillo. The latter is not a counter-revolutionary. He has a false conception. We criticise Carrillo and tell him so, but he is not a counter-revolutionary as the Soviets say. That's a lie. He has a false and weak position. He yields to the national pressure expressed, above all, by the petit bourgeoisie. They reject Lenin in Spain, but in Ethiopia they re-take him. Which has the most value? The side who rejects Lenin with the object of an electoral settlement, or the side who uses him to achieve social transformations? The masses of the world see; here there is an election, but there is a social transformation. Their experience is formed in this way. It is there, not in the economy, that the crisis of capitalism is to be found.

All that has to be lived with all our passion. Such is the nature of the crisis of the capitalist system and the nature of the crisis of the Communist parties. This example of Carrillo and of Ethiopia is valuable for every one. All the Communist parties who erase and reject Lenin have the nominal power to do it, but Lenin means an experience already acquired by humanity. Humanity does not go back on this, because it is the experience which indicates the road of progress. As Lenin showed progress is not a prediction but the experience of humanity which sees that this road is good.

Russia became the Soviet Union on the basis of the programme of Lenin, and Ethiopia today envisages the problem of removing imperialism, imperialism in Ethiopia being represented by Saudi Arabia and the Sudan. One cannot speak just of a liberation movement - liberation from what? For whose liberation? The liberation of the

most essential part of humanity is liberation from economic oppression which determines social oppression and everything which follows as a consequence. Ethiopia tends to eliminate every social exploitation. From what side then does progress come? Where is it? From the side of the independence of a country which has no culture or tradition, or from a federal organisation to make the economy advance and resolve, among other things, the problems of language? It is not by expelling Lenin that this will be resolved. One can efface or reject Marx, but to resolve the problems of history one has to return to Marx and Lenin.

Humanity has already acquired experience. It is the experience of the masses of the world and not that of the leader. It is not only Carrillo, Berlinguer or Breznev who know the experience of Lenin, but also the masses of Ethiopia. Thirty years are not necessary to know Lenin. In the process of progress the masses learn of Lenin in one minute, in a second. They learn simple and easy things. Their intervention allows the development of the progress of each country, which consists in expropriating, planning and leading under workers control. The army can be an instrument of the construction of the country which can intervene in the military as in the economic or political sphere. This is what Lenin did. The Soviet army was the most complete army. Stalin warped it. It continues to be - in part, as in the epoch of Stalin - in its organisational structure, but not in its historic function. It is in process of returning to Lenin, because the function of the Soviet army is not to affirm the bureaucracy to conciliate with capitalism, but to expel capitalism.

The masses of the world are making this experience. They have the creative capacity to understand, to see that Leninism is the life which develops. They do not see it only in reading Lenin but in life. They see Leninism develop in application. The masses of Ethiopia are in the process of learning, as they were among the most backward in the world as regards food and culture. There is nothing in Ethiopia. From this nothing, Ethiopia became one of the places where Lenin is most read. Lenin served as a base to overcome illiteracy. Carrillo rejected Lenin, and Lenin is a highly qualified teacher in Ethiopia! He unites ABC and the Communist programme. All that is part of the crisis of the capitalist system. It is on this aspect that it is important to discuss, to prepare, to develop the activity anywhere. These are not episodic facts, but centres which determine the course of history.

The progress of the revolution in the world and the progress of the intervention of the Workers States and of Cuba in particular - in the name of the Workers States - is the essential base of the crisis of the capitalist system. The masses of the world see as Castro did. We are always intervening; in the Congo and the Middle East. Cuba is three metres from Yankee imperialism, which possesses the atomic bomb. Fidel Castro does not intervene in Latin America with arms and with troops, but he intervenes in Africa, in Congo and Ethiopia. 'We have aided Guinea Bissau and we can intervene at a moment's notice. We are at the disposal of the world process of liberation from capitalism'. At another stage of capitalism it would have already launched 36 bombs against Cuba!

They killed Kennedy because he sought to conciliate and make agreements with the Soviet Union. Now Fidel Castro calls publicly for the overthrow of the capitalist system, among other things the Yanks, and the latter cannot kill him. Castro impels the revolution. There is the crisis of the capitalist system.

THE COMMUNIST PARTIES CANNOT BECOME SOCIAL DEMOCRATS.

Our intervention must tend to deepen our activity to influence internally and externally the Communist parties and even the groups. But in Italy the two centres which determine the course of history are the Christian Democracy and the Communist Party. We do not orientate ourselves as a function of the daily policy of the Communist Party, but according to its historic function. We do not make criticisms, seeking to protect our purity, our responsibility, but to influence the Communist Party and knowing how to wait. There is no perspective for the Communist Party to become social democrat. There is no condition for that, nor historic reason. The social democracy is the product of the conditions of history and of the theoretical feebleness of leaders like Bernstein, Hilferding or Kautsky, who believed that capitalism offered conditions for an indefinite elevation of society. The social democracy became a world centre in the epoch where the colonial imperialist policy allowed the progress of the capitalist system. Now this perspective does not exist. There is, on the contrary, on a world scale, a process of the liberation of countries from capitalist oppression.

The historic conditions do not allow furnishing a base for a capitalist, conciliatory social democratic development, for a retreat in the Communist parties. The Communist Party removes Lenin, but it is going to make the policy of Lenin. To be able to advance on the economic plane, it is necessary to lead the social policy which allows such an advance. There is no experience, apart from that of the Workers States. No experience allows the verification of the validity of pluralism. Where? In what part of the world has capitalism been overcome by means of pluralism? They have not. On the contrary, the masses of the world have the experience that progress resides in nationalisation, planning and the intervention of the masses, Soviet democracy, and freedom for all tendencies on this basis.

In the epoch of Lenin and Trotsky there was freedom for all tendencies. There were tendencies like those of Kollontai, which struggled for 'proletariat art' and the proletarian army. They had the conceptions of a small group. The Bolsheviks confronted them without repression. When the situation became dangerous, through the invasion of the white Russians, there was an agreement to stop the struggle of tendencies. But, as Trotsky said, 'Everybody accepted it, but the nature itself of the process meant that the struggle of tendencies arose every day. It was a struggle which did not harm the fight against the white Russians. But now it is not a question of that,

There is no possibility that the Communist Party will retreat in this discussion and that it becomes an instrument of capitalism. Without any doubt, a lot of Communists individually will go towards capitalism, a lot will remain at home. But the Communist Party as an instrument of history must advance, and our intervention is necessary to advance.

It is a fact that there is no right nor possibility of a tendency within the Communist Party, but no one can hinder the formation of tendencies. No one. The tendency does not come only from certain interests. It can arise as representing certain determined interests but, if it persists, it must have historic foundations and a programme, a policy and objectives.

It must be based on experience. In all the Communist parties it is necessary to discuss the need to elevate the policy.

The two last speeches of Berlinguer, without being a modification of what he said before, put the accent on two essential points.

'The Communist Party must live more the world process of the class struggle. We are a result of this process of the world relation of forces'. That does not come from him but from Posadas. When we write, we address Berlinguer to influence the Communist Party, to help it to elevate. We would not be able to carry out this task if we were within the Communist Party. We would depend on them to write.

The process advances and that is going to help the Communists to understand a great deal. All the previous analyses which we have made show that there is no possibility of eliminating Lenin. One

can withdraw the statutes but Lenin is not a statute. This is an experience of humanity. The statutes have a certain importance, but the experience of humanity is the most important statute. Humanity knows already that Lenin means to take power, plan and transform society on the basis of workers councils, councils of soldiers and peasants. Soviet democracy is the most elevated form of democracy. The Workers States have no other solution than to advance on this path. Moreover, they already follow this road with understanding, confidence and assurance.

J. POSADAS

17 June 1978

A EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW PUBLICATION

The historic nature of the crisis of the leadership of the Chinese Revolution

J. Posadas

29.10.77

PRICE 15p

FOR NATIONALISATIONS UNDER WORKERS CONTROL TO PLAN THE ECONOMY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE POPULATION!

The Government has proposed very drastic redundancies in the shipbuilding industry, 12,000 jobs are to be lost. The shipbuilding industry is nationalised. The State has taken over the industry, but no benefit to the workers of the industry or to the population of Britain has resulted. Using the resources of the State, the government is going to modernise the industry, with the aim of making it more efficient. Part of the way that productivity is raised is by making massive redundancies, thus cutting labour costs. The problem for the workers is however, that it is their living which is at stake. Where are they going to find other jobs? With unemployment at very high levels permanently, the workers from the shipbuilding industry will remain unemployed.

The intervention of the state has frequently been used to take over industries which are making a loss, with the objective of investing huge amounts of money to modernise machinery, develop automation, and generally make the industry more able to compete with other countries. It is the need for the industry to be competitive which prompts the State to take it over, not any desire to see that the workers and the population of Britain gain a real increase in their living standards through the industry being nationalised.

Britain has to compete particularly with Japan in the shipbuilding industry. In other industries it may be Germany, America or France. This is why British capitalism has a constant pressure on it to catch up with other countries because their goods are cheaper, due to their having more modern methods of production available. Within the framework of capitalism, there is no alternative than to rationalise production to maintain the competition of British products abroad. Nationalisation, like that of the shipbuilding industry, has been done with this aim.

Who pays for the compensation given for the nationalisation? The resources of the State come from the taxes of the population. Money used to give compensation to previous owners and for the investment in new equipment all comes from taxes. Capitalism is constantly complaining about state intervention but the reality is that they do very well from it. They don't pay for it,

the masses do. The population pay more taxes. Ailing firms are taken over by the state. Workers are thrown out of work. Capitalist owners take the compensation. Then more of the people's money is used to rationalise production. All this is done without any perspective of any increase of the standard of living of the population.

What type of nationalisation is required? If nationalisation is the determining force in the economy, as in the Soviet Union, then it enables planning, which capitalism simply cannot envisage. The Soviet Union has stated that by 1980, everyone will have their own accommodation. This is planning! The state has been able to provide decent living accommodation for all the population, which only sixty odd years ago was living in immense backwardness. Capitalism cannot even guarantee that the smallest building site will finish work on schedule. In the Soviet Union the State has played the role, not of the employer kicking out workers, but of protecting the workers by guaranteeing them a job. In other words, nationalisation is a basic requisite of a planned economy. Not one or other nationalisation, but as a principle, as part of the transformation of society. Many capitalist economies have quite a substantial part of the economy nationalised and it has not led to any alleviation in the long term, of the problems. All the capitalist economies face a huge unemployment problem. 40% of the Spanish economy is nationalised but all the economy is in complete stagnation. This is because the nationalisations exist side by side with private property with private property determining. But if the nationalisation determines the economy, as in the Soviet Union, then the population are assured security from all the problems facing the capitalist system.

In the Soviet Union the basic industries are nationalised, the State can plan how all these resources are used to expand the economy. For example, to begin to solve the agricultural problems the Soviet Union has dedicated enormous resources of the State towards investing in new machinery and technology. These resources are obtained by co-ordinating all the different branches of production, and planning which areas need most aid and development. Without

controlling all the basic areas of production, this cannot be done. Capitalism does not devote itself to solving the agricultural underdevelopment of the regions in Britain for example, because it cannot get much profit from doing so. Thus having fundamental areas of the economy determined by private interest prevents any logical planning for the objective development of the economy. Reports are issued of the chronic running down of rural areas of Britain. Compare this with the development of Siberia, new cities and towns being made in the ice; Scientists and technicians sent to research and work on important projects. The Soviet youth have gone to help stimulate production in these vast and at present unproductive areas. It is an enormous undertaking, which because the means of production are planned, it is possible to co-ordinate all resources - scientific, economic aid, material forces and human labour for the aim of developing the economy for the benefit of the population.

It is necessary for nationalisation to be accompanied by workers control. The workers must control the functioning of the factories, for example, to prevent the redundancies proposed by the government. If the bosses cannot run the factories so that the production expands, then let the workers take them over and run them themselves, demanding they should be nationalised! The workers must lead by deciding directly what plans should be made for the factory. At present, the bosses of the nationalised industries control their functioning and make the plans. These types come usually directly from private enterprise in search of a career in the state sector. They do not change their methods when planning the nationalised industry as compared to private industry. They plan production in the interests of private industry. Hence many nationalised industries run at a loss, not because nationalisation means inefficiency, but because private enterprise submits them to their interests. It is necessary to have nationalisation under workers control. Then the workers can intervene to impose a plan of production for the benefit of the population.

'OUT OF THE EEC' IS NO SOLUTION THE ALTERNATIVE IS THE UNITED SOVIET SOCIALIST STATES OF EUROPE

The European Common Market (EEC) concentrates all the elements of the total crisis of capitalism; economic, social and political. The problem of agriculture is by no means the most important aspect of the total crisis of capitalism but, in a very direct way it does reveal the nature of capitalism and the nature of the EEC. Capitalism has neither the capability nor the interest to fulfil the needs of the mass of the population even in respect of such a basic necessity as food. And it is not a question of a shortage of food but rather the reverse; too much food is being produced in the EEC. Too much that is for the interests of capitalism. Massive quantities of food are stored away or destroyed while large sectors of the world population starve and while, even in "developed" capitalist Europe, malnutrition is common particularly among children and old people. There are, in fact, 20,000 tons of butter, and over one and a half million tons of cereals and large quantities of sugar, milk and wine which are stored, taken off the market and therefore, under capitalism, cannot be consumed. The reason for this is simply that of keeping prices — and therefore profit — as high as possible. Since in order to store and destroy all this food costs money, the money is raised by taxing the masses. Thus we have a situation in which the population is taxed in order to ensure that it pays higher prices for its food.

THE C.A.P. IS TO MAINTAIN PROFITS

Callaghan is moved to attack the CAP but not in the interest of the population which would welcome cheaper food, which would be pleased to be able to afford a good diet but as part of the internecine dispute of British capitalism with the rest of European capitalism. The common market is made responsible for all the ills of agriculture and high food prices. British imperialism tries to rally support for "Britain" against "the rest". In fact the problems of food prices and the support system for farmers are endemic to the capitalist system. The crisis of the capitalist system is such that food is expensive for the mass of the population in or out of the Common Market. The problem is not that the EEC is badly administered or that the CAP is an inefficient system. It is but that is not the problem. The problem lies with the system of private property, with capitalism. The destruction of food for profit to maintain prices is a norm of capitalism. In fact in recent weeks the egg marketing board has ordered the destruction of millions of day old chicks in order to keep the prices of eggs high.

The capitalist system has developed, in previous stage of history, the means of production and this includes the production of food but this was done for profit, for the accumulation of capital and massive quantities of food on the market means a

lowering of profits. So capitalism has to seek what means it can to assure that there is a shortage. In other words the aspiration of humanity to produce plenty, enough to feed all, the work of the scientist, the engineer and the farmer towards this end are prevented from benefiting the masses by the existence of the system of private property.

However, the solution to this problem — and all the problems created by the existence of capitalism — are there in the Workers States. It is true that because of the existence of the bureaucracy — and elements of private property in agriculture — the Soviet Union, Poland and other Workers States have not developed agricultural production to the level which is necessary but they have made enormous advances in a very short historic time and everyone eats, nobody goes hungry even if some shortages exist. The food is wholesome. Capitalism adulterates and poisons food, as well as the air and water. The facts on bread production published recently by the bakery workers show this very well.

The best of the grain is removed and replaced by water, air and chemicals. At the same time the experience, advance and very existence of the Workers States provide the impulse for the raising of consciousness in all the Revolutionary States which are moving towards becoming full Workers States. Ethiopia is a case in point; here all the land has been nationalised and the organisms of the masses, of the peasants are created to ensure that the land is worked by the masses, for the benefit of the masses. In Angola they have the conception, the aspiration of "for each according to his needs" even if, as yet, they do not have the means to produce enough. Even with all the backwardness of the Chinese leadership and the limitations that this has meant in the development of the Chinese Workers State, the Chinese masses have solved the centuries old problem of famine. But capitalism with all the technical advances that have been made, cannot do this.

THE ISSUE IS NOT IN OR OUT OF THE EEC

The dispute over the CAP and now the EMS have to be seen as part of the general competition between American and British imperialism on the one hand and French and German capitalism on the other. British capitalism in itself carries less weight than in the past and hence the complaints, but the issues that are being raised in depth are not just currency or agriculture but the problems of tendencies in capitalism on where to go and what to do in the world. They reflect the weakness and incapacity of British capitalism which then proceeds to try to make the EEC the cause of its problems.

Linked with the USA, British capitalism is in collision with German imperialism and on the

other hand sectors fear confrontation with the workers states and hence have no confidence in the EEC. It is a complex situation but it is certainly not just "agriculture" and "currency".

Just to "come out of the Common Market" does not change the nature of capitalism and neither does "staying in and fighting for improvements". And, since it is the economic and class structure which decides, the "European parliament" even with a "socialist majority" is no solution either. In or out the problem is the same and that is for humanity to advance, it has to finish with what is left of private property and to develop society on the basis of nationalisation — including the land — under workers control in order to plan production for the benefit of the masses.

There is a particular problem in agriculture in capitalist Europe in the sense that in France, Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal and other countries there are still a mass of small producers that have not the capital to mechanise and, therefore, cannot produce as cheaply as the big, capitalist farmers.

Under the subsidy system the lions share goes to the big farmers in alliance with the monopoly distributors who produce nothing at all and gradually the small producers are liquidated. Originally European capitalism envisaged a massive rationalisation but social competition with the workers states modifies this to some extent. Even so the liquidation of the French peasantry since the end of the second world war has been notable. The proposed entry of Greece, Portugal and Spain in the EEC is the necessity of capitalism to extend and rationalise the available market and inevitably it means social competition with the workers states — but in the worst conditions for capitalism as assimilation into the EEC means wholesale destruction of layers of the population particularly in agriculture, and the social weakening of capitalism.

THE UNITED SOCIALIST STATES OF EUROPE

The Electoral campaign for the European assembly is again making the EEC a focus of attention and there is a necessity to elevate the discussion in the Workers Movement, in the left on the nature of the EEC and capitalism, and on an alternative programme and policy. An alternative to the "in or out" argument. The abstentions in the referendum on the British entry into the EEC show that a large sector of the population see it exactly in this way. The Socialist International at its conference in Lille recently posed "a workers Europe" but they conceive this within capitalism and, with a "national conception" of socialism. They hope to be able to reform capitalism and create a kind of federal structure of reformed capitalist states in

Europe. In this discussion they are not helped by the Communist Parties which, in general, have the same "national conception" even if they have a more anti-capitalist attitude. In these circumstances we are treated to the spectacle of the French Communists and Socialists accusing each other of being "nationalist" over the question of the entry of Spain, Portugal and Greece into the EEC. The alternative, in reality, is demonstrated by the system of the Workers States and there is no "third road" to advance to Socialism.

In this country the Labour left, the trade unions, the Communist Party and the general left is against the Common Market but the discussion is still in a vacuum. What needs to be done now is to discuss a programme for Europe which is based on the

nationalisation of industry and the land, on social transformation, on the means for the intervention of the masses. The discussion has to be in the context of the fact that with the EEC there is NATO and the whole structure is part of the preparation for the war of capitalism against the Workers States.

The "in or out" argument over the EEC reflects an inter capitalist dispute, that is the struggle of American and British capitalism versus German and French capitalism.

A discussion of the EEC cannot be submitted to the different interests of capitalism. Differences among the bourgeoisie can be used but what has to determine any discussion of a United Front is the programme and the programme is for the United Socialist States of Europe.

Editorial

continued from page 1

the issue of wages but on the quality of life of the population.

There is a need to develop a series of demands to confront this decline of the level of the life which results from the way that technological advances are used. The government is spending money on developing microprocessors. It is not going to provide alternative employment to compensate for the jobs that are lost, as the government says. There has been a constant process of increasing numbers made redundant and capitalism will seek to displace more workers with the introduction of the microprocessor. We appeal for discussions between the Labour left, the Communist party and the left groups for the development of a programme to meet this situation. Basing the discussions on the experiences and gains of the German printers. In the German steel workers strike is the demand for the 35 hour week. It is necessary to develop this demand in Britain, for a 35 hour week now, not as a distant demand for the future, but as a measure that must be put forward now.

THE SUPERIORITY OF THE WORKERS STATES

The economic crisis and social decline of British capitalism is not just a crisis particular to capitalism in this country. The whole structure of capitalism in the world is in decay. The Communist Movement has its crisis, but these difficulties are caused by the need of the communist parties to elevate to deal with the constant progress in the workers states. Unlike capitalism's crisis, it is not one of disintegration but one of growth. The leadership in Rumania has disputed with the Soviet Union. This is because there is a constant process of a greater co-ordination and planning between the workers states and certain leaderships which seek to protect their own separate interests try and resist this advance. By the nature of capitalism, each capitalist country competes with the other capitalist countries. This results in the disputes as between all the countries in the E.E.C. The workers states on the other hand, have the need to plan together and the disputes of Rumania and China against the Soviet Union come about because of the backwardness of the Rumanian and Chinese leaderships, not because the workers states are competitive with each other. While British capitalism is losing its influence everywhere, a small country like Cuba has authority and pushes forward the progress in Africa. This is because Cuba is a workers state, while Britain faces the problems of being a capitalist country.

We call for discussions on the development of a programme to confront the crisis of capitalism, for measures against the increase in unemployment, caused by the way capitalism uses automation. For a 35 hour week, no loss of work or pay due to automation, and all the profits from it to go to the workers. For discussions on the alternative to the crisis of capitalism which is the workers states.

9.12.78

Subscribers' Rate to

RED FLAG

£2.00 a year.

obtainable from the Party's address.

SUPPLEMENT TO

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)**

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

THE SCOPE OF THE GENERAL STRIKE IN IRAN AND THE INSURRECTION IN NICARAGUA.

J. POSADAS 1st Sept. 78

There are very acute problems now developing in the world situation: they are, the struggle in Iran and Nicaragua.

In Iran, the movement of opposition to the Shah is growing. It is led by the bourgeoisie. In Iran, the development of the economy has led to an important growth of a bourgeois layer. The main means of production are nationalised, but an industrial bourgeois, commercial and agricultural sector has managed to develop, and the policy of the Shah is in their way. This is so, and in two ways: One, it prevents these bourgeois layers from being in the political leadership of the country and two it is preventing these layers from determining the laws, the planning of production, of making investments and getting the sort of loans which would favour them. Therefore, these new layers seek to participate and they are making uprisings to pressurise the Shah, so that they should be free to intervene.

They use the workers and peasants, they base themselves on the workers, peasants and petit bourgeoisie. They draw on this force and present themselves as the representatives of the movement. At the same time as the bourgeoisie uses the mobilisations of the workers, peasants and students, it seeks to prevent the process in Iran, which goes towards changes in any case. It seeks to prevent this process from being channelled, used and led by the proletariat. The bourgeoisie comes out in order to contain this. This is why the Shah discusses with them and not with the workers. It shows a process in which the bourgeois democratic revolution remained in mid-air with Mossadegh, when he was defeated by the very same people who now rule Iran.

The bourgeois democratic revolution cannot be developed and completed other than with the installation of a Workers State. But to reach that objective, it is possible to develop the struggle for democratic rights, very profoundly, accompanying it with the demand for planning of the country's industrial and agrarian productions, the development of the economic life in a planned way, while the country's immense wealth is used at present by a very centralised bourgeoisie created by the Shah, layers which have no interests in the economic and social development of the country, or of its culture. This is why there is an immense number of students in Iran who find nowhere where to apply their university skills.

In Nicaragua, it is not the same thing. Somoza is the main owner of the principal means of production, trade, the banks, etc. He is the owner of Nicaragua. But even then, the natural development of the economy, the day-to-day development of it, has developed bourgeois layers in the countryside, in

local industries, in commerce, whose interests clash with those of Somoza. They have enough forces to clash with him. But as in Iran, there are thousands and thousands of peasants with nothing at all. These rise against Somoza for social progress. The bourgeoisie sees this and feels the influence which the world revolution exerts on the masses, from Cuba, Vietnam or Ethiopia.

The Iranian and Nicaraguan bourgeoisies come out to behead the mobilisations so as to prevent the proletariat, the Communists and the revolutionary national - lists from being a centre of political organisation, because they would go much further than simple demands for democratic rights. The masses would seek democratic rights, yes; but to develop the country. In these two processes you can see how the bourgeoisie puts itself in the forefront of movements which they did not create or organise but which they try to usufruct.

In Iran and Nicaragua, the Communist parties have to intervene to make a United Front with the bourgeoisie but with a programme for social transformations, along with democratic demands, showing that one can go infinitely further than what the bourgeoisie is prepared to give in terms of production, and economic and social, and also in scientific progress. But the bourgeoisie has no programme at all. What policy, programme, does it have? They do not have any either in Iran, or in Nicaragua.

On the other hand, the Communist parties and trade unions must give one, for democratic rights, but also for social transformations, for the economic development of the country; for the planning of agrarian production, for the diversification of production, for the industrial transformation of agrarian production so as to develop the country internally, to take Nicaragua and Iran out of backwardness! This can only be done by combining bourgeois democratic demands with anti-capitalist ones. Even if we do not manage to get all these now, it is necessary to carry out such a campaign.

THE INTER-BOURGEOIS CONTRADICTIONS AND THE PROGRAMME TO DEVELOP IRAN.

In Iran, one has to combine democratic demands with ones for the country's economic development. It is necessary to take Iran out from backwardness. This can only be done with a policy to develop the economy at the same time as democracy. The bourgeoisie cannot give democracy, because it has to favour a development such that in the struggle for democracy, it already has to face the struggle for social progress. It is not only a matter of the right to speak or to ask a question.

The right wing pressurises Carter not to propitiate any democratic change at all, because as far as Carter is concerned, it would be convenient if a bourgeois sector along with the army also, went to power in Iran. This is so because the Shah can no longer give any guarantees to Carter. It has been like this for many months, and this situation announces a collapse which is also part of the influence of Afghanistan. But this collapse stems from before, a long time before that. This struggle will influence Afghanistan, and to the left.

The Shah is looking for an alliance, an agreement with industrial bourgeois sectors. He wants to frighten them by showing to them the following: "Careful, mind where you go if you let yourselves become dependent on those who are allied to the people and to the Soviets". So Carter is applying pressure on both sides: On the bourgeoisie, and also on the right wing, which is frightened of going further at all. But the right has little weight. At the same time what the Shah sees is that it is the proletariat which can channel the process and be the representative for progress. As the proletariat is small, numerically speaking, the Shah tries to intimidate it.

There are sectors which are directly linked to the national bourgeoisie, and others who are influenced by the world process which go further than the national

bourgeoisie and who would favour changes and transformations. They are prepared to support changes and transformations. As yet, one cannot judge the depth of this because the movements are unclear, they are mixed and combined. They are repressed and the proletariat does not have any leadership. The Communist leadership is very small and has a very limited and suivist policy, hoping for historic stages to come one after the other, when it is quite plain that the stages are joined and now combine with one another.

For the development of all these backward countries, capital is necessary. But the existence of capital is not irreplaceable for them to develop. No backward country which has taken a revolutionary road has had to wait until it had capital to develop itself. The problem lies in planning, in the centralisation of production which allows planning and replaces capital, even if the existence of capital would have been a very convenient and important thing.

There are technical sectors in Iran which are won over to the progress meant by the Workers States. Many of these sectors have now a social preoccupation and a social understanding. So, they do not necessarily go for careerism, but are won over to progress. Without doubt, there is also a layer which wants to make a career and puts itself at the service of the structure in the country, on the bourgeois plane to make a career for itself - and this is so in Iran and in Saudi Arabia. But they are not increasing numerically. What is increasing instead is the social influence of the Workers States on the technicians who are won over to them. They are sectors which want to develop as human beings and find that one can do this only in the Workers State whilst in capitalist society, it's not possible.

There are sectors of the bourgeoisie in Iran which want to give some liberty, so that they can develop and get rid of the Shah's monopoly. Therefore, it is necessary to study how to make a United Front and alliances. But alliances must be with bourgeois sectors, with the army and left religious sectors. One has to make alliances. But at the same time, keeping the independence of action so not to be held back on the bourgeois plane, which is what the bourgeoisie would like. One has to go beyond it.

New leaps in Iran and in Afghanistan are being prepared. Even in Saudi Arabia in spite of an appearance that everything there has been crushed because there is a tremendous dictatorship, even there, it is so. There are sectors of technicians which demonstrated they want a certain progress and want to stimulate the formation of a national bourgeoisie, which does not yet exist. They want to develop the national bourgeoisie and always talk for a plan (in Saudi Arabia) applicable in 20 years time. That is to say, always for later. The Soviets stimulate those sectors in development, which is good in general, but - as a policy - it is very limited.

The policy of the Communists in such countries as in Saudi Arabia or Sudan is a failure. It is not just due to their impotence but also to the difficulty of conditions, because they are murdered, they cannot act freely. But the mistakes they made before, were very big ones. For example in Sudan. The errors they committed in Sudan allowed the whole Communist leadership to be murdered by the assassins. The Communists were those who tried to impede and contain the process from advancing. Thus, they helped the functioning of the dictatorship. They were in favour of a policy in stages: first to have a national bourgeoisie, industrialisation and 'democracy'. Then, later, the struggle for socialism. On the other hand in part, the Soviet Union has already changed about this: The Soviet Union now accepts that it is possible to pass from feudalism to socialism. The Communist parties still live as if in the old stage.

The events in Iran have a very great importance. They are the expression that movements are soon going to come. There are not simply assassinations in Iran. The

assassinations take place, as in the case of the cinema of Abbadan. This was done by the CIA in collusion with the government and sectors of high finance. But when they have to go to such extremes, it indicates that they had to try to cut the process short and deviate it; to contain a very deep process. Such murders indicate the profundity of the reaction of the movement, and of the protest which is in store. This setting fire (to the cinema) was to contain, to crush a very elevated movement which the bourgeoisie was trying to draw advantage from in a previous stage.

A sector of the bourgeoisie is trying to gain advantage from the situation, to manage to get demands from the bourgeois democratic point of view, for itself. In turn, the reactionary bourgeoisie sees that the Shah may yield, and to impede him, from yielding, it comes out confronting him too. And so, he is confronted from the far right and from the left.

At the same time, a bourgeois sector, quite important and supported by the yankees, seeks to replace the Shah. But now they go back to support him again because his replacement would already mean their own liquidation! It is the same in Nicaragua. The bourgeoisie which started the game off to share the spoils, now falls back into silence.

All the mobilisations which they made in Iran, did not represent the struggle of the masses against the Shah. There have been strikes, mobilisations. But these had no leadership. And these mobilisations have served to show that the masses are unified, that they have unity, will to struggle and that this is why other movements (of the bourgeoisie) will try to break this front by making an agreement with the Shah again. There is a sector of the bourgeoisie which proposes the agrarian reform of the country and nationalisations. And there is a religious sector, linked to the poor layers of the petit bourgeoisie and poor which sees that if they do not allow changes, they will have to be changed. Of all the team of the dictatorship, the Shah is the only one who understands this. This is why he wants an agreement (with the bourgeoisie) whilst there is another sector with him which wants to hear nothing of this. These fear that such an agreement will lead to a later one with the Soviets, or at least to a slackening in front of the Soviets.

For what regards the role of the yankees, they were looking for an agreement with the bourgeoisie but now they support the Shah again in every way. The repeated declarations of the Shah that only he, can give democracy, are directed towards the bourgeoisie, not to the proletariat. He seeks a compromise, an agreement, to defend himself from the far right. And the bourgeoisie is looking for an agreement with the government. It uses the workers and the peasants as a pretext but it does not want to resolve the problems of the masses at all. This means that the force of the Shah is not very firm. There are sectors on his right who want him out. And the Shah poses the need for democratisation, at least for the need of it, in order to contain the far right.

Therefore it is necessary to intervene to make a United Front for democratic liberties. Not to put social transformations now in the programme and as a centre. But to pose social transformations, as part of a programme which combines democratic demands and to pose that, in order to reach these, social transformations are necessary. To pose in the programme a plan of investments by the State and to develop the economy for the population and not for exports. It is necessary to elevate the consumption of the masses, immediately and before anything else, in the food sector. It is necessary to make a plan of production and of transformation of the raw materials. A programme of transports and fabrication of the necessary machinery for transport, be it cars or trains. A programme for hospital construction. To make a plan of construction of installation of running water, electricity, gas, houses. To make a plan to resolve the most immediate problems of the masses.

J . P O S A D A S 1st Sept. 1978

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MOBILISATIONS IN IRAN. J.POSADAS - 15th. October 1978

The movements in Iran have their origin in the internal conditions of Iran, but the force which organised them is the world relation of forces which are, from every point of view, decidedly favourable to social transformations.

The Shah has the support of the big imperialist countries such as Britain, Japan, the United States and Germany, all of which supported him openly. But it is demonstrated that in spite of this force on his side, with the economic and military support it means, the masses are not intimidated and, inevitably, it has to end up with changes. So the force which there is must not be measured by the limitations in the demands put forward by the present movement. The force resides in the persistence of the struggles which have to go much further and which are turning to the Soviet Union, and not to the yanks.

This is why imperialism has a panic fear of Iran. Once a movement develops in Iran, and it is going to develop even if it takes time in doing so - a movement favourable to social transformation, for democratic changes which are the base for transformations - this will influence the whole of the Near East. And it will confirm the USSR and will influence Turkey, Irak and will also isolate Saudi Arabia and Egypt. Beside, this agreement between Egypt and Israel is not intended to resolve their own problems but to resolve the problem of imperialism in the present world relation of forces.

In Iran there is no leadership and the guerilla - an important element in the struggle - does not express the capacity for political and social action which there is. This is because, together with the guerilla, it is necessary to pose what to do, what measures to take, and what economic, political, social and cultural positions to have. And it is necessary to pose how to influence layers of the bourgeoisie which are disposed to be associated with the struggle for changes. The lower layers of the bourgeoisie are disposed to do this because they realise that anything else is a dream. So, their force can be utilised. Even the "ayatollah" Khomeini, with all the religious base he has, cannot avoid, eliminate, or exclude the fact that social transformations are necessary. In front of this process one cannot simply oppose the guerilla as an instrument because it is the guerilla, at present, which has power and mobilises. So, one has to make an association with it. Not to abandon the guerillas but not to think that they are the instrument for the struggle. A programme for social transformations has to be put forward together with the guerilla, so that what will advance will be the programme and not the guerilla. And the more the programme advances, the less there will be for the guerilla to do. There will always be guerillas, even in the greatest of revolutions, like the Russian revolution, there have been guerillas, but they had another, and minimal function, a secondary and minimal function. The essential function to exercise is a political one, of organisation of the Party. This is what has to be discussed in Iran.

The Shah resists but it is not him, rather it is yankee, British and French imperialism who sustain him. However, already the weakening of even this imperialist front begins to show. The imperialists see that they cannot support this and it influences them too. German imperialism has to confront the yanks, whilst they are united in their support for the Shah, but not all that united. The Soviets should have made a series of movements, saying that if there is a process of democratic liberties in Iran, they will support it, that they support a process of democratic liberties for social transformations. If the Soviets came out with this now, in one week, everything would change. The problem in Iran also, is not to reject the religious movement all at once because there is

no political force to compensate or to substitute for it. Neither is there a political force which would be superior to it. The Communists are a small group, they used to be a large Party but now they are a small group.

In the top spheres, religion is the opium of the people, but in the lower layers already it is no longer the opium of the people. Today it unites itself to the people. However, in any circumstances, religion contains the struggle because the base of the Church structure continues to exist. But, on the other hand, already those who participate in the faith do not play that function. As an institution it continues to be the opium of the people but, in practice, it is no longer like this because people who believe are linked to social transformations. It is the same in the army and the police. They are all organs which no longer have the same rigidity as at the time of their origins. And this is because social transformations influence them and have an influence on the petty bourgeois layers, the lower bourgeois layers, the intellectuals, and this gives another orientation to faith without faith being lost. The religious movement in Italy is less than it was before, but not so much. On the other hand, the political-religious movement towards the left is infinitely greater. So, between religion and the left, they choose the left and not religion. It is what is happening with the "ayatollah" Khomeini who has a terrible fear of marxism but who does not have any other remedy but to collaborate with the marxists. None of them can be on bad terms with the USSR, otherwise the Soviet Union would prepare a movement and cut short the plans of all of them. If Mossadegh failed it was because of the stupidity of Stalin. If this happened now, it would take another turn.

What is happening now in Iran is the prologue to a much more elevated process, much more elevated and of a force which does not reside in Iran but in the world. It is Iran which applies such a force but, in turn, in that process the one who executes also forms part of the overall force. It is not as if Iran obeyed an order but it forms part of this (world) force. But there is the lack of a Party for this force to become conscious of what it can do. Today it is necessary to make an alliance with the "ayatollah" Khomeini. He is in favour of changes and this is why they threw him out of Irak. He said: "I am not a Marxist but one has to make changes. The Americans have to go away."

It is the first time that there is a movement of this nature in Iran. The movement of Mossadegh was a movement of top military people, of bourgeois and he created a bourgeois layer which now sees how little it decides. The Shah spent three thousand million dollars on four ships ! And now, in front of this movement, he says that he is going to cut expenditure ! They are going to spend money on atomic energy instead, they say. It is a lie. In a country so rich in oil, they are not going to go for atomic energy . They want this money for military purposes, for use against the USSR, to create an anti-Soviet base.

It is necessary to develop a movement which reaches the understanding that it is world forces which decide and not local forces. Local forces have importance and are decisive in some moments but the relation of forces is world wide. If Iran was on its own there would not be the force to make such a movement. In this process you can also see the weakness of the policy of the Soviets, who should have created a movement. They do not have a policy, they just bring out the policy of Stalin. The Soviets should have intervend but they have not the preparation, even the Communist Party which before spoke only of bourgeois democracy, now poses bourgeois democracy and a little more.

The policy of Carter, in General, was to seek an agreement in order to prolong the stages, seeking an agreement between the government and opposition to contain but it is not Carter who controls at all. It is the Pentagon which imposes its military plan and not a political or economic one. The Pentagon has a direct force with 45,000 "advisers", about three for each of the Iranian leaders. The strikes and mobilisations in Iran are decomposing the government apparatus and creating conditions to intervene and develop a more programmatically elevated movement.

SUPPLEMENT TO

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)**

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications.

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence to:

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE FRENCH AND SPANISH COMMUNIST PARTIES ON THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET. 23. 7. 78. J. POSADAS

The form of the discussion between the French and Spanish communist parties on the entrance of Spain into the European Common Market is not correct. The European Common Market is no solution. Neither entry or non-entry is a solution.

The position taken by the French Communist party takes into account the development of French capitalism. The problems of the French peasantry are not resolved by the rejection of Spanish entry into the Common Market but only with a policy of the suppression of capitalism, a programme of anti capitalist struggle.

The ECM is a gigantic multinational which is controlled by the most capable capitalists, including Yankee imperialism which intervenes through France, Britain and Germany. Spain entering the Common Market or not is not going to resolve any problem and the policy of the two communist parties intensifies the confrontation between the French and Spanish peasant masses.

It is necessary to propose to the French and Spanish masses an anti capitalist programme to unify agriculture under a socialist Europe. In front of a capitalist Europe, propose a socialist Europe. It is the only scientific form of developing Europe. The present development of European industry is not favourable to the masses. It serves the enrichment and the accumulation of big business.

The policy of the French Communist party in relation to the discussion on the European Common Market indicates an absence of principles. It is aimed to try to influence the petit bourgeoisie. They do not have a perspective of socialist development but of capitalist development. If they took into account socialist development they would not have this policy. They coincide on a series of points with Chirac. If they had another policy they would not coincide with him.

Chirac represents very small sectors of the French bourgeoisie. The stage of de Gaulle was different. The latter expressed the effort to protect French capitalism against the invasion of Yankee imperialism which wanted to displace it. Now the multinationals who operate in France are closely linked to the Yanks and the rest of world imperialism. Chirac does not represent French capitalism. Giscard does. Chirac tries to develop a reactionary policy to sustain one particular sector of French capitalism. The communists coincide on a series of points with Chirac and give him their authority. They can make agreements with the bourgeoisie but maintaining their independence and appealing to the struggle for class objectives.

If for example the French bourgeoisie agreed to unite with the soviets to develop some project which could be progressive, we would support it but together with this maintain class principles and class policy and appeal for the struggle against capitalism and against Giscard. If Giscard made an agreement like this, it's because it would be convenient to him, not because it was going to be for the benefit of the interest of the working class.

Thus we use their contradictions but without submitting ourselves to their policy. But the policy of the French communist party is submitted in the last instance to them. The policy of struggling to impede the entrance of Spain and of Portugal into the ECM is absurd. It is in defence of the interests of a sector of French capitalism because Giscard represents big business. The communists must propose a Socialist Europe as the alternative to the ECM, showing that within the ECM there is no solution for the Spanish, the Portuguese or the French peasant. The proof is that in the last few years tens of thousands of small peasant farms have disappeared.

It's not that the communists have the same policy as Chirac but they coincide with him in the form of dealing with a series of problems. The problem of the petit bourgeoisie is not now the same as in the epoch of Trotsky. Now the solution is global. This does not negate the fact that there can be local and partial solutions but now with the conditions created by the centralisation of the capitalist market it's not possible to have an incomplete policy. We cannot regulate the Europe of the great trusts. Thus it's necessary to propose a socialist Europe and this shows that in order to advance Europe has to be unified and centralised otherwise it does not advance. Thus the question is posed what sort of Europe? Socialist or capitalist Europe? It's a question of the economy. When Lenin and the communist International posed the slogan of the Socialist United States of Europe, they foresaw all this.

The backwardness of the policy of the communists makes them follow one capitalist policy or another. They do not have their own policy. The French peasant cannot defend himself within capitalism. To defend the small peasant in France it's necessary to defend the small Italian and Spanish peasant. It's not possible to defend them within capitalism. There has to be a struggle for socialism whilst at the same time proposing a series of measures which allow the attenuation of the burdens thrown onto the small agricultural producer by big business. It's necessary to show that there is no perspective within capitalism for them. There must be a policy in defence of the small agrarian producer but not as the communists are doing at present. Even within France, the peasant depends on big business and on the banks for loans, the sale of products and also for transport. There are times when it's necessary to dispatch the produce at short notice to the market and the small peasant does not have the means to do this. Thus he is obliged to go to the bank and they take responsibility but he is made to pay for it heavily. If he sells at a low or medium price, they destroy large quantities of the produce and impose an enormous increase in prices.

The communists know this because they also write on these problems.

Every year capitalism buys the greater part of the peach production of the Greek and Italian peasants to export but instead of exporting them, the crop is destroyed and hence there is scarcity in the European markets. Enormous profits are made through the increase of the price of fruit. They throw out tons of fruit and in the hospitals there is not enough. The communists although they do not have the intention of defending this, through their policy sustain it. The problem cannot be eliminated without overthrowing capitalism.

The ECM means the concentration of the apparatus of production, of finance and of commerce in the hands of big business. Everything is determined by the interest of heavy industry. Financial and industrial capital is amalgamated with agricultural capital in the summits of business. They decide the questions of exchange, the market, buying selling and the course of agricultural production, meat and grain for example.

This is not the stage of the advance of capitalism when competition between capitalism allowed some gains. Now capitalism is exhausted. It's the Europe of big business. To make another Europe, it's necessary to make a socialist Europe. Thus it's necessary to struggle for the unification of Europe under socialism. The experience of Portugal is very precise. The failure of the policy of Soares is the failure of the policy aimed to content, to sustain capitalism and be led by the party which is allied with big business, with the landowners and the big capitalists.

The ECM is the community of big business which dominates the market. The answer to this has to be on a European scale not a national response. Capitalism acts in defence of big business and the workers movement has to act against this. The petit bourgeois opposition has no effect nor value because it does not have the capital to defend itself nor the social base. Even if it had these the only policy which can replace capitalism is one with the programme of the workers state.

The FCP, the FSP and the trade unions must discuss this. It has to be discussed in the factories, in the workers areas and in the schools. The communist and socialist parties regard the European Community as a necessary fact for the progress of humanity. It's a lie. The European Common Market is not a necessary stage. It is an imposition to allow big business to dominate. It's the concentration of local and national capital in Europe. Outside this capitalism cannot live. It has no other way to live than through the great concentration of capital.

COMECON is a centre which stimulates, which develops the economy of the workers states. This has to be discussed.

In France the discussion on tactics and objectives is elevating and its expressed in the discussion on euro communism and pluralism. Notorious and public differences exist between the French, Italian and Spanish communist parties. In the French communist party theoretical, political and programmatic doubts have been expressed which more and more approach the point of rupture. They have just passed through one crisis which has ended but it is continuing in another way in the form of partial discussions. This is going to be generalised shortly when the struggle in France and the world intensifies.

The French communist party has different positions from the other communist parties of bordering states around the problems of tactics and programme and what to do within euro communism. This shows that euro communism is not a programme nor an orientation which arises from objective necessity for the class struggle but an invented programme. Thus they clash all the time.

Euro communism is not a progress verified by history unlike the programme of the Bolsheviks for the taking of power and the programme of the workers state. This is going to lead to a much more profound crisis than that at present. It's expressed in the differences which they have on problems like that of the entry of Spain into the ECM. The French and Spanish communist parties attribute a strength and power to the ECM which does not exist. The ECM does not answer any need of progress. It serves to co-ordinate the interests of big business and to control the

struggle between them or to prevent any country entering the socialist area.

The other aspect is the discussion within the communist party itself. This is developing in another form the crisis of the French communist party. They are not public discussions nor ones like a rupture but they are discussions which resist the policy of the leadership. The leadership of the French communist party has an inconsistent and conciliatory policy which through lack of a theoretically firm position leads them to approximate to Chirac. Although this does not occur organisationally there is an approximation politically and this confuses the petit bourgeoisie because with this policy the communists stimulate the progress of France under capitalism. That is as though France could progress within the sphere of capitalism.

At the same time the letters which they publish, the speeches which the leaders make, particularly Marchais show that there is a great deal of resistance and rejection of the change against dialectical materialism and Lenin. The French communist party has not discussed this openly but from the statements of Marchais and the other leaders it is clear that all this is being discussed. The communist party does not have its own orientation programmatically. Moreover it is an enormous error of the CP to dedicate its policy essentially to attacking the socialist party. This shows an absence of programme, of policy and of analysis. At the same time a discussion is developing in the socialist party for the formation of a left with a programme which answers to the problems of the masses. The process is not clear because there is still not a leading team there. But the objective of the discussion which they are developing leads to this conclusion.

There has been a constant retreat in the CGT which has its origin in the lack of political life of the workers parties and there is an adaptation of the CGT to passivity in relations with the government. But in the communist and socialist parties and the CGT there are an infinite number of cadres who seek to reanimate the class policy. This is expressed in an indirect form through Seguy who defends agreements over wage increases and better conditions of work which mean a relative progress, but leaves intact the structure of the capitalist system. In France it is not possible to do anything without combining wage demands and better conditions of work with changes of structure. Without posing the elimination of capitalism no improvement is possible in France. Thus Giscard tries to make a policy which opens the gates to discuss with the workers organisations. It is a policy aimed at the petit bourgeoisie. It is not a policy which comes from the strength of French capitalism. If it had that, it would launch a policy of repression. The policy is aimed to impress the petit bourgeoisie and to win people, to show that the policy, the organs and the objectives of the workers parties and trade unions are weak.

Together with this Giscard tries to increase the function of the multi-nationals without referring to them. The last meeting of the nine was a meeting of a gigantic multinational. They met so that nothing could escape the control of capitalism and to try to dominate, control and give a perspective to the differences between them and also deal with the fixing of prices and production. They are trying to contain the consequences of the crisis of capitalism which is expressed in the increase in prices, unemployment, inflation and the intensification of competition between them. They may to contain this situation. The Yanks are the dominating force, with the Japanese, the Germans and the French. When such meetings are called it is because these powers feel the weakness of the system and try to maintain themselves as a block. They reach an agreement which is in any case superficial. They make recommendations, not resolutions which have to be applied. It is aimed to prepare the conditions so that NATO at the right moment can launch the war. This is not a simple thing to do because capitalism feels that the Soviets have the arms to smash the lot of them. But the capitalist powers see that the crisis of the system if it goes on for two years or more and there is no solution, is going to lead to war very soon. That will depend on the ruling sectors.

It is quite clear and evident that the most powerful capitalist countries are trying to co-ordinate their intervention in the encouragement, the stimulus and the protection of economic development to contain unemployment. Thus they try to show themselves as if they were capable of resolving problems so that the workers states do not gain authority over the masses.

One of the most important aspects of this last meeting of theirs was motivated by the resolution of the German trade unions. In Germany, which is one of the most reactionary countries of the so-called democratic countries of Europe, the unions have demanded nationalisations, expropriations, and the ending of the berufsverboten. Moreover, this meeting was designed to make capitalist Europe depend on the Yankee apparatus. The European capitalist countries live in an enormous contradiction because they constantly clash with the Yanks but militarily also they clash. Yankee imperialism tries to weigh with its military superiority and the other powers resist. This shows that between the military and economic solution, it is the military which decides without eliminating the economic differences which are very important.

This weighs on France and French imperialism has had to participate much more in the world market to extend the forces of capitalism and thus to save itself. French imperialism is still the weakest of the imperialist powers who attended this meeting. It still has quite a lot of strength to survive but socially it is weaker. It has to meet the powerful communist party and the CGT and the most developed and elevated petit-bourgeois organisations in combination with the workers movement, the police trade union. Hence they need to maintain French imperialism. Although the Germans compete with the French they need to protect them from the consequences of the political and trade union struggles in France.

It is necessary to elevate the political life of the workers parties and trade unions in this process. The intervention of the Yanks is to protect the capitalist system but at the same time to canalise the crisis so that the other capitalist powers have to carry the burden. This is what they seek and partially achieve.

At the same time they are organising the economic development. Germany has to invest more to develop the economy to provide more work. For this they have to increase internal consumption and export less. They want to regulate production without eliminating competition. But it's impossible to control it. This shows a very great crisis of capitalism.

To confront this the workers parties and the trade unions must make proposals combining trade union demands with better conditions of work, allied to changes and transformations. The policy of the French communist party is chauvinistic. There is no such solution for France. It is a solution which tends to seek to damage the big bourgeoisie through the government but stimulates the petit bourgeoisie through the Gaullists. The policy of the Communist party is false aimed to try to influence the petit bourgeoisie with nationalism.

The cadres of the left parties must intervene in this crisis. There is a real crisis of the leadership which is absence of programme because the workers parties do not have the answer to the crisis of capitalism and they feel that they were defeated electorally when this is false. They did not win but capitalism cannot solve any problem. It continues with the same policy as before. The workers movement has shown itself as powerful as before. But the programme which seeks solutions outside the capitalist system is absent. The workers movement centre everything around an improvement within the capitalist system or nationalisations which in themselves are a very distant solution. They must make a whole policy of education of the masses of the population in which they show the advantage of a policy of nationalisations, of workers control, of planning of production and of the products to

produce. They must make a campaign of education in the schools, the trade unions, the workers areas, the police trade union and the committees in the factories and the workers areas. This conclusion should be discussed with the socialists.

THE POLEMIC BETWEEN THE FRENCH COMMUNIST AND SOCIALIST PARTIES
AND THE NEED TO GIVE AN ANTI-CAPITALIST REPLY.

It is necessary to stop the criticisms of the socialists accusing them of being agents of the government or preparing to be agents of the government and propose the programme which is going to educate the communist and socialist vanguard and aimed to impel the Socialist party. This is the solution. The socialists are in quite a big crisis and it is a product of the fact that they do not know how to answer the problems of society. It is the same with the crisis of the communists. In the name of who are the three hundred speaking, the ones who complain about the party? It is necessary to answer this. It all shows that the party is disconcerted because they do not have precise objectives.

Eurocommunism and plurality prevent them having an objective programme. Thus their programme oscillates within the capitalist system. It cannot give security. On the other hand this situation feeds and stimulates the currents conciliatory to capitalism, tendencies that adapt to capitalism, believing in progress combined with capitalism. It accentuates as a consequence the character of pluralism and makes it much more bourgeois.

This is a consequence of the lack of policy, of programme and class objectives in the policy of the Communist party. It has class objectives in general of demands but without social transformations. French capitalism can navigate through its crisis because neither the communists or the socialists present a programme of social transformations. The cadres of the communist and socialist parties must discuss a plan of social transformations.

The discussion which has resulted on the problem of publishing the letters of the comrades that wrote has not had an adequate reply. The communist militants have the right to speak and the duty to orientate the discussion and demonstrate that it is a discussion in the void because in the discussion they do not propose that it is necessary to change the capitalist regime nor is it based on the experiences of history. Is this because the experience of the Soviet Union, China, Cuba, Angola, Algeria and Mozambique are not valid? Is it that these experiences are no guide for France? They leave all this and discuss Marx in the air as much as those who defend themselves from Marx. There is no discussion based on scientific experiences. They do not take decisive experiences like Angola, Mozambique, China, Indo-China and Cuba. Thus we have abstractions and the leadership accompanies and develops this type of discussion. To justify eurocommunism they dedicate a main part of their external publications to a criticism of the USSR. on the dissidents but they have not been able to publish a single idea of the dissidents which is valid for communism. Thus they defend the dissidents. With this criterion it is possible to defend assassins and nazis. It is the same criterion because it is an abstraction. They defend the dissidents on what policy, programme and objectives? How does one measure the Soviet Union then? By its condemnation of the dissidents or the support of the Soviet Union to Angola, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Madagascar and Vietnam? Does one judge the Soviet Union because they do not allow those people to publish books that sing the praises of individualism and the individual? What contribution do they make to the socialist idea? The same criterion does not apply to the Soviet Union and the Yanks. In the discussion in UNO when people want to compare the USSR with the Yanks, various countries have declared that they play different functions. It is the same phrase that we use. The Soviets support the progress of the world. What progress do the dissidents defend? Not once have they supported the revolutionary struggle of the masses

of the world.

When the French Communist Party and the Communist parties defend these people, what right are they defending? It is an error and a false policy. It is a false conception which comes from eurocommunism. It is not possible to defend the abstract right to speak. For what are they speaking? While the Soviets do not let the dissidents speak, they let the Angolese and the people of Mozambique speak and influence the world. If it is necessary to correct something in the USSR this is a question of the leadership but not in the way these parties say but to affirm the leadership in the class policy to elevate the internal functioning which can allow a life based on soviet democracy in order to improve the policy which they act on. Thus it is not a total change. It is not necessary to ally with the democratic bourgeoisie but to ally with the world workers movement, the workers states to impel and correct them.

The communist parties have a false policy on these questions and this has consequences in their internal policy because then they propose an ambiguous, doubting and vacillating policy. They do not offer a resolute policy and one which has effects in the present discussion in the Communist party. There are discussing in abstract and empirical forms devoid of anti-capitalist and revolutionary objectives and content. They have abstract democratic objectives.

It is necessary to propose a programme of wage demands, of an improvement in conditions of work, a plan of production and of nationalisations and a plan of the extension of the discussion in the Communist party of all the problems of the crisis of the capitalist system. There should be a discussion in the FSP

EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW PUBLICATIONS

Published this month:-

+ THE WORLD PROCESS, THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL
AND THE TASKS IN BRITAIN.

J. POSADAS 5.4.78 Price 20p

+ THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM, THE WAR AND SOCIALISM.

J. POSADAS 16.4.78 Price 15p

Order from IV International Publications
24, Cranbourn Street, London W. C. 2.

on all this also. Organise a discussion on the workers states and make all the criticisms which they believe it is necessary to make but on the basis of supporting and impelling the workers state and appeal to the workers states to discuss openly all the problems of communism, the experiences which have been made and the path to follow, everything. They have to discuss that it is necessary to support openly and unconditionally the revolutionary workers movement of the world and the movement of the colonial and semi colonial countries against the capitalist system. This should be united to the discussion of a programme for social transformations in France combined with wage demands better conditions of work and a plan of production. The Barre plan has to be confronted. It is going to cause a very great increase of prices. The bourgeoisie are seeking to return to the classical forms of the functioning of capitalism, to eliminate every control through the world crisis. The elimination of control favours the great firms as against the medium and small firms who are not going to be able to compete with the big companies who can produce cheaper than they can. The most powerful capital is going to absorb, liquidate smaller firms and production is going to be concentrated in the large enterprises, and more workers are going to be unemployed. Production will develop with less manpower. It is not only a question of prices but one of production and cost of production. With price control there is some protection for the small firms. Now all this is being eliminated. This is going to be an impulse to increase unemployment and the cost of living.

Instead of the Barre plan, they have to make a plan (the workers parties) to nationalise under workers control with control of production and prices, the sliding scale of wages and hours and the sliding scale of wages has to be done weekly. There must be weekly meetings of the factory, workers area and school councils to discuss the cost of living and decide the increases which have to be made. The sliding scale of hours should mean a reduction in the hours of work to 36 hours on the same wage related to the cost of living and with everyone employed. If the factories cannot allow this, let the state expropriate them. The workers parties must choose between the capitalists who are a small minority and the working class, the immense majority. Educate the party and prepare for this and bring the socialist party into this discussion and show what it is that we want to change and that we want to develop this programme; not saying that they are responsible which is a diversion from the problem.

The crisis of the bourgeoisie is the crisis of the capitalist system

The crisis of capitalism in France is expressed not through collapse but because it has no solutions to offer. It has no proposals to make the economy expand and provide work at the same time, thus maintaining employment and stability. In this way the crisis of capitalism is expressed in this process of history.

The bourgeoisie is going to have to take measures like those of control of prices and the free functioning of capital in all branches of production so as to eliminate the

small firms. It is a lie that the elimination of price control is going to be a means to develop the small and medium firms. On the contrary it is going to liquidate them. It's going to accentuate the policy of loans, support and aid for heavy industry. This measure was taken by all the capitalist nations which met with the object of dominating the crisis of capitalism. But there is nothing which projects an increase in production and the level of employment. On the contrary they predict an increase in the level of unemployment. This latter is not determined strictly by the economy but also through the competition with the workers states. It is the crisis of the economy of capitalism which to compete socially with the workers states and justify itself historically has to increase productivity. In increasing productivity, it increases automation and thus eliminates manpower.

Thus it competes with all the workers states and increases the concentration of a mass of capital but at the same time as it makes enormous investments in modern equipment and electronic and automated complexes, it gets rid of more and more labour. They vacillate over the launching of the war because they see that now the workers states are a force. Thus the whole capitalist system is an indecisive regime. The policy of Carter is the precise expression of indecision. They want to maintain relations with the Soviet Union while they want to contain it.

The capitalist system cannot respond anymore to the need for progress in history. The progress in history is not made only in the economy but in the social competition and comparison with the workers states, with the countries which advance and adopt immediately the character of the workers states. It is not a crisis which capitalism can resolve economically. It is a crisis in which they try to gain time to resolve afterwards all questions on the military plane in the final encounter of workers states against the capitalist system.

The trade unions must live this process and organise so that the workers write, hold meetings in the factories, in the schools and so that courses, conferences and schools are held during the vacations and the hours of work during the year. In this way they prepare the working class in the understanding of the crisis of the capitalist system and the confrontation of system versus system. Instead of distracting people and saying that they are with the dissidents and that they want freedom, they must say capitalism is preparing a general massacre. The workers must demand of the workers parties and the trade unions conclusions such as the ones outlined and make the unions live these problems but not only calling meetings and conferences but organising debates and publications. Allow all the anti capitalist tendencies to write and polemicise. From this a didactic capacity, behaviour and orientation from the conclusions and resolution of the working class is going to arise. The population is going to see there the historic function of the working class. They are going to see it orientated to learn, to lead and to prepare socially. The working class does not have the historic preparation which capitalism had to pass from feudalism to capitalism.

Capitalism prepared itself in its class associations but in defence of its demands. Thus it is necessary to elevate the organs of the working class in their historic class functioning to smash capitalism. Capitalism was able to prepare in five hundred years of intervention in the economy. The capitalist class did not appear with the French revolution. The French revolution made its power legitimate but it was prepared many years previously through the function which it exercised in the economy. The proletariat is not able to prepare in this way. The experiences of the workers states are very recent and very weak. They have only existed for sixty years and Stalin made the revolution retreat. The working class has not had the possibility of

leading as a class the economy and society. It has not participated directly as a class. It does it through the parties which is not bad but it is insufficient. To construct a society, the party must not only intervene but all the organs of society have to intervene, such as the trade unions, the workers area committees and the school committees. It is necessary to educate the proletariat in this function.

The crisis of capitalism has to be discussed and the significance of the increase in technology under capitalism. Thus it only benefits a small part of the population. For the rest there is no improvement. On the contrary there is a loss of jobs, lower wages and a worsening in the conditions of life. The increase in technology under capitalism does not mean an elevation of the comfort of the working class in housing, transport etc. Completely the reverse is the case. There is an increase in assassinations like Seveso and the petrol lorry which exploded in Spain recently. The working class must write, discuss and organise debates on these problems. Capitalism develops industry for consumption on the basis of the chemical industry and half the chemical industry is for killing. It poisons the people who work in it, plants and flowers and pollutes the water. This has to be discussed. One cannot speak of advancing and progressing without destroying a system of production which damages the human organism. The trade unions have to discuss this but at the same time proceeding from the trade union plane to the political plane showing that it is necessary to eliminate the capitalist system.

The working class must have the possibilities to lead society. This is not done only through the party or the trade union by proposing improvements in the conditions of work and life but the working class has to intervene directly through the workers councils, planning production. Let all the tendencies have complete freedom to express their opinions, including the left groups but on the basis of the principle that it is necessary to defend the workers state because it is the concentrated instrument of the progress of history. Discussions have to be elevated scientifically, overcoming the sentiment of the group, and the tendency, and the fraction. The instrument of polemic is to advance in the discussion and to unify the ability to reason to think and to organise. This has to be discussed. One must overcome the the form of the old life of functioning where one person speaks and the meeting finishes. Prepare the meeting with documents, with texts and let everyone intervene. Organise discussions on the experiences which exist like the experience of how the USSR progresses in spite of the bureaucracy and Stalin, how it advanced and what principles it left. It affirmed the principle of statified property and of planning which showed that this was the instrument of progress of history superior to the damage of Stalinism. The instrument of the workers state sustained all this. Moreover at the same time as there is the development of the USSR, the latter supports revolutions which go from feudalism to the workers state.

The ecologist groups and the need for the historic function of the political parties.

As production advances on the basis of new techniques and the organisation of capitalist production, there is a deterioration in the living conditions of the masses in France, Britain, Spain and Portugal. Pollution produced by the utilisation of chemical elements in production cannot be prevented in the capitalist system because that is the essential condition of their production. Their objective is to see how to reduce the costs of production. There is a constant deterioration in the living conditions and health of the masses of Europe. Assassinations increase. If we add up all the killings in the capitalist countries from gas explosions, the pollution of the atmosphere,

and of water by chemical waste and petroleum ,then there are thousands of dead and others suffering from damage to health. This has to be fought against.

It is not possible to fight against this in a partial form only but against the system responsible for this which is capitalism. Capitalism has no other solution than to act in the way it does in order to be competitive. Thus, it is necessary to eliminate the capitalist system. The masses have to discuss this. The ecological movements increase rightly not because they have the historic right to exist but because the workers parties do not answer to this need. There are no female or ecological problems. They exist as the complements of the absence of an adequate anti capitalist policy. They are the effects of the capitalist system.

The workers parties have to pose in their programme the struggle against the pollution of the air, the inequality of women and to show that these problems can only be resolved with the elimination of the capitalist system. The problem of women does not come from their being used by the husbands. This is the case less and less but from the capitalist system. The workers parties have to discuss this and propose also the need to give attention to children. The nurseries which exist today are an attack on children. There are tens of children from eight to ten who die working. Tens of children commit suicide in Germany and Britain and the United States through the life in the schools. They are the expressions of the pressure which comes from the decadence of the capitalist system.

This is part of pollution. It is the social pollution of the capitalist system. It is necessary to intervene showing the need to change the capitalist system. The tendency of capitalism to degrade human relations is expressed in many ways, in the pollution of the air and in the exploitation of women and the nurseries. All the relations are aimed to increase capitalist exploitation. The rest has no importance for capitalism.

If policy is conducted like the Spanish communists with the pact of Moncloa the mothers, the children and the peasants are going to see that that is no answer to the capitalist system but it is a reply which maintains the capitalist system and also the degradation of their life. The comrades of the communist party the socialist party and the trade unions are going to see that it is not a catastrophe, that it is not a confrontation to go to eat the bourgeoisie or that the army and the bourgeoisie will make an insurrection, giving the possibility of smashing the progress of the workers movement. They do not have the strength to do it. On the contrary the workers movement can advance much more. It is necessary to mobilise the workers movement to attract the petit bourgeoisie and the peasants. The peasantry and the petit bourgeoisie must see the proletariat interested in giving a programme of development of society and of the country as a function of the interest of the masses..

They have to count on the workers states to develop the programme. It cannot make such a programme expecting that it is going to be applied by itself alone. The communist and socialist parties must show that capitalism does not have the strength to smash the workers movement. If it retreats its because it has no strength and if it does not retreat further it is because the workers parties and the trade unions intervene insufficiently. They could go much further. As there is not an intervention of the workers movement and of the masses in all these problems capitalism feels that it has the strength to get together and discuss with the leaderships of the communist and socialist parties to try to regulate the problems.

We are not against Carrillo or Felipe Gonzalez if they wish to discuss with Fraga or another capitalist leader but this does not substitute for the necessity of the workers movement proposing statification, planning of the economy and workers control.

In the epoch of the Bolsheviks the latter held meetings with various tendencies but they maintained the programme of anti capitalist struggle, the taking of power and social transformations. The masses saw very well that the meetings with the bourgeoisie did not play the role of substitute for struggles against the bourgeoisie. It was purely a tactic because the conditions still did not exist to overthrow the bourgeoisie. But these meetings now in Spain substitute for the programme of anti capitalist struggle. There are no meetings with the workers to elevate the struggle against capitalism. But there are meetings with the bourgeoisie to take a series of measures which maintain the capitalist regime and which are not necessary because if they abolished capitalism the economy would advance much quicker. It is necessary to show that there are twenty workers states which give the example of how to resolve problems. Even Karamanlis has held a series of meetings with Bulgaria and Rumania to increase commercial links. The Greek state is going to install a series of factories which are going to remain nationalised and be maintained by the Rumanian workers state and the Bulgarian workers state.

The trade union must not limit itself to the struggle for better wages, working conditions and the standard of life but increase its function. Trade union demands are insufficient. They do not answer to the necessities of life of the workers which now cannot be met anymore with the trade union but are united to the struggle for social transformations. Thus it is necessary to maintain the struggle for immediate demands with the struggle for social transformations. At the same time the workers have to participate, and the factory, workers area, zone and shop committees must intervene in all the problems and the trade union must extend its function. Discuss all the problems of politics, of the world, and the intervention to elevate the conditions of life which passes through the transformation of social regime. To develop France it is necessary to eliminate the capitalist system. This is not a task of the trade unions alone but of the party and the trade unions. As the trade union has to struggle for the improvement of the conditions of work and the life in the factory, it must unite both things. It must educate the life of the workers and the political functioning of the workers to transform society. It must not make a political life without objective and programme. This is a perversion. It means loss of time and creates difficulties and increases struggles within the working class without objectives. But the discussions in the workers movement can be very good if they discuss ideas, positions and programme because it increases the ability for reasoning, judgement, conclusion and unification of the working class.

When the working class reaches conclusions, it unifies. It does not just record that it did this or the other but it seeks how to advance. This can be achieved by discussion.

On this basis it is necessary to continue the discussion in the communist party and on the basis of these conclusions it is necessary to discuss with the socialists. They should stop making attacks on each other about who is at fault, or accusations about acting in the interests of the boss or who is conciliating with the government which may be the case. It is necessary to discuss what to do and why. This elevates the discussion and the area of the level of discussion of the timid and conciliatory leaderships. In the workers parties and the trade unions there is no tradition of theoretical and political discussion. Hence they do not discuss about experiences. When they discuss the dissidents, they do not discuss experiences. No dissident says that he supports the workers states against capitalism which is responsible for the evils that exist. The dissidents say nothing about Angola, Mozambique. Then the communist and socialist leaderships cannot be silent over this. It is possible to criticise the workers states and the leaderships of the workers states because they do not allow these people to speak but they have to show that such a negative

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

**REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)**

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

THE RESULT OF THE 1978 FRENCH ELECTION AND THE CONTINUATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE

J. POSDAS - 19/3/78

The result of the elections in France does not correspond to the will for combat, and the change expressed, in the whole of the previous stage of the struggle of the masses. In the first ballot the Popular Union had the electoral majority. If it has not managed to gain a parliamentary majority in the second ballot, then it is because the electoral process prevents the Popular Union having a majority in this way. This is going to be expressed later in social struggles.

The electoral triumph of the bourgeoisie is not a victory. It does not prove that it has the power and the security to keep it. All the candidates of the bourgeoisie, and of the government, have posed, immediately after the elections, and as an essential point of their speeches, that they all have to make changes, alterations and that they are going to respond to the need for social progress. This does not correspond at all to the capitalist programme of this leadership. It is, in fact, the programme of the Popular Union! When the electorally victorious bourgeoisie has to declare, or imply, that it will take account of a part of the programme of the Popular Union, it means that inside of it already there are large sectors of petty bourgeois who have voted for it. But not so much because they are bourgeois, as because they desire a series of reforms and improvements which they seek to gain in this way. Not through the Popular Union but through the government. All these petty bourgeois sectors are, potentially, a base of support for the Popular Union. They can be won over by means of the direct intervention of the proletariat.

The direct intervention of the proletariat is not a thing which can be done through one, or another resolution of a trade union; and direct intervention means that the workers should discuss, resolve and enter into communication, in a thousand ways, with the mass of the petty bourgeoisie in the factories, the workers districts, the schools. Let the workers discuss openly all the problems, propose social transformation in which the workers intervene as organs of control! This is the way in which the proletariat can intervene directly to the country. It is correct to do this through the Communist Party, the Socialist Party and the trade unions. This has an effect. But it is not the same thing as the direct link of the proletariat with the masses. The Communist Party and the trade unions are sufficient to influence the working class. But to influence the petty bourgeoisie, which is unformed, which does not have either intention, or capacity, or historic confidence in the proletariat, it is the intervention of the proletariat which is necessary. The proletariat

must intervene and lead politically.

It has been the defects and failures of the leadership of the Popular Union in this direction, which has prevented the petty bourgeois masses from being influenced. And it was possible to influence them and win them over.

All the problems which existed before, like unemployment and the crisis of capitalism are going to remain, and will increase. This is the reason why, when the government knew that it had won an electoral majority, it declared immediately that it was also going to take a series of measures. Why did not they propose these before? The electoral campaign of the right was centered on other aspects such as "liberty", "democracy", "totalitarianism and democracy". Now, they say no more about this, but they talk about giving social improvements, social measures responding to the need of the masses.

The electoral result shows the swindle which capitalist elections are. There are a million foreign workers who work in France and who do not vote. This removes forces from the proletariat. Had these workers been French, the Popular Union would have won! It is necessary to see that the elections do not record, do not demonstrate and do not represent the real relation of forces in a country. The proletariat is a great power but it is not the majority of the country. To win over the rest of the population, the proletariat must show that it is itself, convinced of the need for social transformations. If it does not show itself resolved for this, for improvements in the country's situation, then, the petty bourgeoisie remains with the government, or at least with important sectors of it. It stays with the government because it sees it in a better position to bring about changes. The mature petty bourgeois sectors, who are a majority, vote for the Popular Union; but other sectors do not. These are problems which the Popular Union must discuss.

The Popular Union has not lost. It has not won, which is not the same thing. This does not mean that it has been crushed or destroyed. No; it is the lack of programmatic understanding, the lack of political comprehension and of decision, which has allowed the bourgeois parties to win in a parliamentary way in these elections. This is so since we saw in the first ballot that the majority was with the Popular Union. Had it been then just a matter of the number of votes, the left would have won. But because of the electoral laws, candidates of the bourgeoisie are favoured whilst the left needs correspondingly many more votes to be elected. It is an electoral swindle!

The problems continue to be exactly the same as before. There is no solution for France within the capitalist regime. If there was, the government would say that, to maintain this system alive, it is going to propose steps of advance on its own programme. But it is they, who have to speak of improvements and of developing social progress. This does not mean that the streets will now be swept but that the conditions of the life of the masses must be elevated, there must be better medical care, less working hours, less poisoning of the workers through pollution. Capitalism could have said these things before. Why did it not do it? When the government has to reach such limits, it is because there is not just the need for some administrative improvements, but for social changes affecting the whole of the capitalist system. And when capitalism must say this, even in these ambiguous statements, it is because it feels that a petty bourgeois sector has given it support not for itself, but for social changes. This shows a part of the effect and the influence which the proletariat, the trade unions and the workers parties already have.

The public polemic between the Socialists and Communists has not had a very important effect in the decrease of votes for the Popular Union. This is not the problem - comrades Marchais and Mitterrand! Had this had much of an effect, up to the point of making sectors of the population give up, it would have meant that either the population was enormously politically mature, or that it lacked maturity completely. The discussion between the Socialists and the Communists has weighed only on a small petty bourgeois layer. Neither the proletariat nor the politically developed petty bourgeoisie have been affected by this public discussion. If they have been affected, it is only slightly and only on the undecided sectors. But what has weighed enormously on the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie, has been the lack of workers assemblies,

the lack of meetings calling for changes and social transformations, calling for workers control. This is what has prevented the left from gaining an electoral majority.

The proletariat can never be the majority electorally, because of the very form of functioning of the capitalist system itself. Therefore, if the proletariat is to win, it must gain the undecided petty bourgeois bases. There is a sector which is already won over, and even the ecologist movement is won to the revolution. It expresses the need for changes in the same way as movements of the same nature as the ecologists in other countries, do. The parties of the Popular Union and the trade unions must discuss all this and make a public balance on: why have we not won? It is not necessary to discuss why the Popular Union has lost. It has neither been crushed, nor pushed to the margin, nor demoralised. It has not won because the workers parties and the trade unions have not known how to organise the forces to triumph. Then, there is the need for a public discussion in the workers movement to make everyone intervene, including the leftists, so as to prepare a new victory for the Popular Union. Meanwhile, the crisis of capitalism continues.

The vote of the major part of the leftists for the Popular Union indicates the immense authority which the Popular Union has over a very large layer of the petty bourgeoisie. Had the workers parties and the trade unions had a more polemical, a more solidary and more anti-capitalist conduct, this would have had a greater influence still on these sectors. It is necessary to feel that when once again, the votes of the leftists go to the Popular Union, it is because very important layers of the petty bourgeoisie already understand that Socialism is necessary.

The Popular Union must base itself on this. There is no reason for being cast down, dismayed or grieved. We repeat that the left has not lost, but simply that it has not won. This means that it is going to win by other means. Even by triumphing electorally, the left would not have necessarily been able to realise much changes and social transformations through parliament. Capitalism is going to put a thousand obstacles in the way to impede that social transformations materialise. So, it is necessary to prepare for social struggles, public discussions, to show that improvements in conditions of work and life - like the cleansing of the air, the elimination of pollution - cannot be realised without social transformations.

It is a lie to say that the Popular Union is breaking down. The criticism which Mitterrand made of the Communist Party, after the elections, was a weak criticism. He did not say things which intended to attack the French Communist Party, but that tended to show the need to continue to go forward, to be sure of what one wants, that the will to reach what one wants exists. The problems are going to continue in France the same as before. Capitalism has improved neither the economy, nor culture, nor science. It remains the same as before.

All this is a demonstration that the workers parties must improve their behaviour and lead a policy aimed at making the working class intervene with an anti-capitalist programme. The Socialist base has to be influenced for it to influence in turn a public discussion, making appeals to the petty bourgeoisie with an anti-capitalist programme. It is necessary to show that the problems of the economy cannot be solved with a new capitalist administration, but through social transformations. The actual crises are not determined by the errors of the leadership in the government or by administrative errors, or by a lack of administrative capacity on the part of the actual government leaders. The crises are due to the capitalist system. The reason for the crises is to be found in the capitalist system as such. The problems are still the same as they were before. The Popular Union must prepare itself to draw experiences from this non-victory, later on, in the social and trade union struggles, which must transform themselves into political struggles to impose changes.

The rest of the world accompanies such a conclusion. The Italian proletariat has responded unanimously to the kidnapping of Moro, not because it regretted Moro, but because the proletariat was against such a policy. In this kidnapping, the proletariat has seen an attempt at intimidating it, repressing the workers movement, and impelling the bourgeoisie to repress and intimidate the petty bourgeoisie, in France also. By presenting themselves as 'red', those who did this kidnapping wanted to make it believed that the Communists and Socialists of France are capable of doing the same there. The 'Red Brigade' are direct agents of capitalism and imperialism even if they have

arrayed themselves in red. The Italian proletariat has not been able to weigh sufficiently and in time, on the petty bourgeoisie of France, particularly on that part of it that did not vote to the left.

It is the limitations of the workers leaderships which have meant that the world weight of the struggles of the masses among others that of Polisaria have not been transmitted and have not intervened in these elections. With this, it would have been possible to get even a parliamentary majority. Communist and Socialist comrades: It is necessary to make all these forces intervene, and to make the workers centres participate with the workers parties on an equal basis! Both have the same interest, they have the same objectives: to improve and elevate the life of the masses in France. This cannot be done without social transformations. The masses are going to make new crises for the capitalist system. They will seek a solution to them by means of electoral, and extra-electoral roads.

The conclusions drawn by Marchais are not bad, when he says that the same problems which there were before, will continue to be. The limitations of the parties of the left - showing that this present leadership does not have the objectivity to intervene - are shown by the fact that none of them has said why the left did not win. They have said that they will go on, but they do not say why they have not won. The left could have won. But even if the left wins an electoral majority, this is still not enough. Allende had won 36% of the votes and when he took a series of measures of a fairly great social importance, he increased them to 46% in the parliamentary elections. But even then, the right wing eliminated him. All the eulogies, the amicable speeches which the capitalists and the government made in front of a defeated adversary, the Popular Union, after the elections, are lies. All these things are for the petty bourgeoisie which feels the influence of the Communists and the Socialists. This means that the petty bourgeoisie is looking for closer links with the struggles against imperialism - which reaches it through the world situation and which influences it - in spite of the fact that it has voted for the government.

The capitalist system is in a process of enormous retreat. Unemployment increases constantly and capitalism cannot resolve it. Technology increases; the capacity of capitalism to give work diminishes and inter-capitalist competition accentuates. The main competition against capitalism comes from the Workers States which show their superiority. This impels the revolutionary struggle of the masses of the world. Polisario and the Palestinians are the expression of it.

As in the first ballot, the proletariat has voted integrally in favour of the Popular Union. An undecided sector of the petty bourgeoisie has not voted for the Popular Union, because it has not felt enough decision in it. And it has not seen either the intervention of the proletariat in the struggles for changes. It saw more security on the part of the government. This sector has now to be won over and the proletariat has to weigh.

The parties and the trade unions must discuss the result of the elections and draw the conclusion that all the problems which existed before the elections continue to exist still. Unemployment, low salaries, bad working conditions, the poisoning of the workers, of the waters, of the sea, as in the case of the oil now poured into the sea north of Brittany. The pollution of the rivers and the increase in the cost of living continue as before. If the right wing has been unable to resolve this problem before, how is it going to resolve it now? Social struggles are going to develop, and sectors which did not vote for the Popular Union until now, will be drawn in. New conditions are going to be posed for social and political progress. One of the necessary slogans then is: workers control over salaries, over conditions of work and over the food.

The electoral result does not mean that people have given their confidence to the government, or to let it do what it likes. Many petty bourgeois sectors have voted for the bourgeoisie for they hoped to lead a quiet life in this way. But the crisis is going to deepen still further. The workers must intervene with a programme, tending to increase the development of the country, of the economy, by means of workers control. Let them intervene with workers control! Let them intervene with workers councils, factory councils and workers areas councils, with a programme for the economic develop-

ment of the country, making appeals to the police and the army! The bourgeoisie has no interest in investing to resolve the problems of the masses. It cannot resolve the economic crisis. And the economic crisis is the result of the crisis of capitalism itself. All the large car, textile, or chemical industries produce ever more with ever less workers. Technology is increased, but this reduces the number of workers at work. It is an enormous gain for capitalism and a means to increase its capacity of competition. The workers cannot prevent this automation being introduced at their expenses except by means of economic and social transformations.

It is necessary to discuss all the problems in the factories and give courses, to address the leadership and the Communist and Socialist workers. It is necessary to appeal to the Socialist leadership for it to discuss. The progress of France has to be done in this way. In the capitalist system, all the progress of science, of technology, is being made for the benefit of a small nucleus which is represented by the capitalists. The rest of the population cannot receive any gain from the progress of technology, of science or from the development of society. This has to be discussed. One cannot remain discussing only the 'dissidents'. These contribute nothing to the economy, to society, to science, art or culture.

The other problem to discuss is the real relation of electoral forces which has been demonstrated in the first ballot. The left obtained 2% more than the bourgeoisie! Even so, this figure does not express the underlying reality of social forces because there is a million foreign workers who are part of the proletariat and who do not vote, and the Youth, up to the age of 16, who already work but do not vote. Capitalism has everything arranged to its advantage. So, the solution has to be looked for, through the struggle for state control, planning, to elevate the conditions of life. The working class has to control the economy, investment of capital through organs of the base, through the trade unions and the workers parties.

It is a lie that the Popular Union has no support. More than half of the votes of the population is against the government. The first ballot showed this. Even electorally it was more than 50%.

In the coming stage, differences and divergencies are going to increase in the bourgeois movements, but also the cohesion of the working class will be affected. The withdrawal of Fabre (@) from the Popular Union shows the careerism of all these types, who came in the Popular Union hoping to draw Party advantages from it. This indicates the complete lack of principles of these people who, in front of the non triumph of the Left, are looking now for negotiations. Such are the conclusions one draws from the elections.

J . P O S A D A S 19th March 1978

(@) Fabre: leader of the Left Radicals in the Popular Union

ORDER FROM FOURTH INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS:
24, Cranbourn St WC2

-
- Published in March:
(A public Conference) The anniversary of the Soviet Union, and the tasks for the development of the struggle for Socialism today. J. POSADAS 2.11.77 20p
- Published in April: The relationship with children, intelligence and the future of humanity. J. POSADAS 24.7.77 10p
- Published in May: Terrorism and the struggle for democratic rights and Socialism in Germany. J. POSADAS 21.10.77 15p.
The May Day Manifesto of the Secretariat of the Posadist IVth. International.
- Soon to appear:
(Public Conferences) Marxism and the Greek Academy 20.10.77 J. POSADAS 15p.
The crisis of capitalism, eurocommunism and the objective necessity for the Communist society
J POSADAS 19 10 77 15p

SUBSCRIBE TO THE EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW PUBLICATIONS £2.00 a year.
which include the European Marxist Reviews No. 4, 5 and 6, containing the last XIth World Congress and Extraordinary Congress of the Posadist IV International. 30p each.

To be printed:
The historic nature of the crisis of the Chinese revolution. J. POSADAS 29.10.77 15p. (A public Conference)

..... Revolutionary Workers Party, (Trotskyist) British section of the.....
IV. International (Posadist),
24, Cranbourn Street, London W.C.2

@@@@@@@@@@

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence to:—
IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

J. POSADAS

(Title of Editorial Board)

ETHIOPIA, THE WAR IN ERITREA
AND THE ADVANCE TO SOCIALISM

29/4/78

The process of self determination is not posed as in the bourgeois epoch or the epoch even of Lenin, but as part of the instrument of progress of society. Ethiopia has the problem of Eritrea, which struggled for its independence from the Negus. Now the Negus no longer exists and independence from the Negus was not only the problem of languages but of social exploitation. The Ethiopians now put forward the elimination of every social exploitation. Thus the ethnic problem or independent problem of self determination is a lesser problem. The most important question is how to unify for progress, whether in Eritrea or Ethiopia and if they do not unify under the present leadership of Ethiopia, the independence of Eritrea means to depend on arms, money, food and political leadership from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and the Sudan, that is to say, of reactionaries. If Eritrea is independent it will remain in their hands. If Eritrea remains with Ethiopia, it will develop social progress and will also resolve the language and ethnical problems.

There is no contribution of Eritrea to the culture of the world either in science, or in the economy. Not because it did not wish to contribute but because it could not. It has been an oppressed people all its life. It has the right to independence but the independence of peoples is determined by the development of history. In front of capitalism, the independence of any people is a step forward, but here we are not confronting capitalism but a country which seeks socialism. Then it is not possible to make the same proposal. It is an error. It is necessary to pose the unification of Eritrea with Ethiopia on the basis of constructing socialism, and then to pose self determination if they want ethnic rights and customs. But what is evident is the example of the Soviet Union and China where they had a "hundred thousand Eritreas" and they demonstrated that all the peoples, once incorporated and centralised in the development of the economy, develop science and technology and to hell with previous traditions. Culturally progress is centralisation, which is not independence and liberty as an absolute, but to ask for independence and liberty for all Ethiopia and together with it, to eliminate the deprivation of liberty which is provoked by the capitalist system. It is in this way that the problems are posed.

Lenin and Trotsky combined the resolution to concentrate and centralise the leadership of the revolution with the flexibility to discuss. But of the two aspects the one which dominated and organised the others was the centralisation of the revolution. If the Soviets now retreat and take a step back, proposing to discuss with the Eritreans, it is for convenience, for political tactics and because they are not animated to confront them; moreover because they do not have logical ideas

and because afterwards a much greater process will develop. But a step backwards is not necessary.

Lenin and Trotsky discussed, "What if we give the anarchists Kronstadt, so that they can make their republic. As they are intelligent people, in a year they will see that things do not progress." Lenin said, "Yes, I would be disposed to do this, but now we cannot, we have the white Russians at the gate."

But Fidel Castro, who also proposes centralisation, puts it - at least according to the bourgeois press - as a final aspect. This is not the way to resolve the problem of self determination. It is necessary to centralise and afterwards self determination. These are the problems of this epoch but simplified compared with the epoch of Lenin, because now these problems are posed constantly in countries in countries which have nothing, as for example, Ethiopia. In the epoch of Lenin, there was a great Bolshevik Party with a great authority and tradition. In Ethiopia it is not like this. There is a movement with a great tradition of revolutionary struggle as there is also in Eritrea. But in the last years, the Iranians, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait have intervened and they finance the Eritreans. Their objective is not the self determination of Eritrea but the elimination of the revolution which is what they want to do with Afghanistan.

The position of Mengistu that it is necessary to smash the Eritreans, I agree with, in general, without ceasing to appeal to the Eritreans. The Eritreans who decide are allied to the bourgeois tendencies of Saudi Arabia. Some time ago, two reporters spoke to two leaders of the two movements of Eritrea and they asked them, "What are your objectives?" "We want to struggle for the independence of the country." This was the most they said. They did not speak of socialism, nor of the workers state, they spoke only of independence. This was said by the leader of the most revolutionary movement and when they asked the other, "You realise that Ethiopia is a socialist country, there are soviets?" He replied, "I have nothing to do with socialism or soviets, we don't want to know anything about this." That was it. All those who support Eritrea cannot ignore the fact that this movement has this basis.

There is much ingenuousness in all these movements. From the general point of view, everyone sees their movement as the centre of preoccupation of the world. Then they seek to resolve this problem. They do not impel the rest of the world, nor see the tactical relations or the programmatic consequences. But a conscious leadership would see their problem within a world process which is not defined just by their triumph, but the triumph of the Soviet Union with them. If they triumph and the Soviet Union loses, they lose. They can lose but the Soviet Union is winning and they will return to win. This is what we pose to the Palestinians. In the Soviet Union, there are bureaucrats, we agree, but even being bureaucratic, the Soviets are obliged to advance in the anti-capitalist struggle, and in general, are obliged by historic conditions to accept that there is no place for agreement between the workers state and capitalism. There is no base for negotiation of agreements between these two powers. When there is no base for this and Vance has to play the role which he is playing, it is because capitalism cannot put up with the workers states anymore. But while capitalism has to send Vance to discuss and seek an agreement, the Soviets discuss and give arms to Ethiopia. Vance has to go to Rhodesia and say to Smith, "Get out, otherwise they will throw me out as well." Thus, there is no place in history now for the defence of the backward aspects of the regime of exploitation. Then capitalism seeks to modernise, but there is neither time or place in history to modernise. It is not only that there is no opportunity, there is a superior regime, nor is there time to do this. On the other hand the Soviets have bases to support revolutionary movements.

Thus it is not only that the Soviets are stimulating progress because they are obliged to, but because they already have a certain consciousness. They have a certain consciousness, otherwise they could not do this. This cannot be done through constitutional programmatic obligation. It is happening because there is quite an elevated understanding of the path of history. All those who criticise the Soviets only see the limited aspect. There is a contradictory aspect but it is not always the critical aspect which dominates, but mostly the aspects of progress of the Soviet Union which dominate. It is Vance who went to arrange matters with Brezhnev, not Brezhnev who went to arrange things with Vance, and this in the middle of

the struggle within imperialism which is very great, it is enormous. They have not killed Carter but now he is a candidate for the Kennedy treatment because he has a policy which clashes with the great monopolies. In the historic depth, no, but in the immediate policy, yes, it clashes directly. The great monopolies do not see that what Carter is seeking is a social support to acquire a certain equilibrium which he does not have. The strike of the miners shows that there is no social equilibrium. The miners did not sustain a strike for three months because they had the support of the union, but through the influence of the world on the North American masses.

Hence in this discussion on Ethiopia, Mengistu represents the revolutionary will, with the lesser programmatic, theoretical historical understanding, but better than the Cubans. The latter want an agreement with a tendency which is good. It is good to seek it, but not the tendency which is leading. It is necessary to liquidate it. It is necessary to say that self determination cannot ever be independence. Self determination means: within the single structure of Ethiopia, the Eritreans can have self determination in language if they want, and also a road for themselves alone if they want it. They do not have culture, they have nothing, what has Eritrea done? The Lebanese themselves can say, "We have produced scientists who developed chemistry, mathematics, physics, geometry". But from Eritrea what has been done? Nothing. The only thing which has appeared was one of the ancestors of man which they have found. These are the problems which are posed now.

Eritrea remains in the hands of the great petroleum concerns. The arms which they have could not be acquired just with a guerilla movement. These are the interests of the Arab feudal oil sectors which use them to confront socialist Ethiopia. Ethiopia is socialist and to advance, has to unify the country and on the side of the Eritreans are the reactionaries and the counter-revolutionaries who use the revolutionaries as a banner. They are like the anarchists of the epoch of Lenin. When the Communists of Italy defend the self-determination of Eritrea, they are defending the formal aspect of democracy.

This is not the epoch of Lenin. We are the partisans of the view that Ethiopia should negotiate now, but negotiating to unify Ethiopia and Eritrea within the socialist leadership. Negotiate, but do not negotiate as in the epoch of Lenin, not negotiate so that they remain where they are because Eritrea is a counter-revolutionary base and it is supported by Iran and Saudi Arabia. Then the problem is not the freedom of Eritrea, the liberation of the Nomads of Eritrea, but the unification of Eritrea so that they advance into socialism against Iran and Saudi Arabia. This means not the empirical, superficial and subjective conclusion of the "nation", but the objective conclusion of what is the best for humanity, in this case represented by Ethiopia.

On the other hand the Italian Communists discuss in a banal and abstract form, "the right, the respect for peoples". What right? Who is pushing forward progress? Eritrea is supported by Saudi Arabia and Iran. Before it was also Sudan, but now Sudan has withdrawn because it has problems that mean it wants to leave Somalia alone. It is more convenient not to get involved. If the Eritreans represented some social interest, what culture, what policy, what science do they have? They have nothing, they have never contributed anything. Then where does the strength come from to resist the tanks, the navy of the Ethiopians? Where do they get it? All these countries keep them supplied, why do they give aid? It is the bosses, the most reactionary bosses in the world who give them help. Thus it is not a struggle for independence against submission, but a struggle to push forward Ethiopia as a vital centre for the progress of world socialism. On this basis, yes, give self determination, but within this process.

The Italian Communists do not discuss the conclusion of Eritrea and the conclusion of Ethiopia, but they discuss "liberty, sacrosanct liberty". It is an abstraction out of the air. They do not discuss principles, but desires, needs, intentions of a group, not the necessities of history. But history advances towards concentration for better organisation. The Communists say it was always like this. No, it was not always like this. Capitalism exists but capitalism did not always exist. Liberty was not always like this. Lenin resolved the problem in another way. How does Eritrea resolve problems? In an Eritrean way? No. If it is left to the Eritreans, Sudan, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait dominate. Then it is necessary to discuss concretely on the

ends and objectives of movements in history. Democracy does not exist as an immoveable or abstract principle. Democracy is an instrument of progress. At the same time as countries like Turkey still fought for democracy, in the Soviet Union they fought to elevate everyone according to necessity. In this combination is it necessary to retreat to Turkey, or has Turkey to advance to here? Turkey has to advance. The conditions do not exist in Turkey for this, but already there are the principles. In Eritrea, the principle of independence of Eritrea is because they have an Eritrean language. Nevertheless they communicate with Italian, with English, which communicates to all the tribes. It is not the projects produced by Eritrea, the atomic principle of Eritrea which determines Eritrea, but the atomic principles of the Soviet Union which is then transmitted via Ethiopia. One thing was the Negus, and its another thing now, when they are constructing socialism. But in their turn the Ethiopians have to accept that they have to discuss. There is something of this because the liberation front in Eritrea does not attack them, and the Ethiopians in their turn delay an attack which they could have pushed forward. It is because there must be a discussion amongst them. In Ethiopia, there is a tendency which wants to discuss but also to decide which is good. It is good because the progress is in Ethiopia, not in Eritrea. In Eritrea, a group of bandits is leading, the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Sudan.

One is not against negotiation, but what type of negotiation? It is not a question of respecting "so much for you, so much for me", but what is the best, the most important. Then it is necessary to propose unity against capitalism. And in this sense, they are going to have freedom, as the Soviets arranged with languages and customs. The problem of Eritrea is united to the relation of world forces where imperialism seeks the least evil, for it gets hold of the resistance movements, as it gets hold of the dissidents who have no scientific or cultural value, no value at all. They are all useless types. If they resolved to die of hunger, I would invite them to choose the place. They are useless. The value of anyone is to understand that the Soviet Union is an instrument of the progress of humanity now. If the masses of the world endured Stalin, it was because the USSR is an instrument of progress. These dissidents do not have the patience to wait for a better leadership. But that is not really their problem because they are against waiting for a better leadership. They do not want a better leadership, because they do not pose freedom for all, but for themselves to propose the retreat of the workers state.

In Eritrea it is a question of posing at the same time that the problem of Eritrea is a world problem as it was in the time of Lenin. If the Ethiopians yield, imperialism is there because it has a direct point of entry. Then it is necessary to propose that it is not only a question of Eritrea and Ethiopia, but of the relation of world forces for this historic conclusion: capitalism or socialism. There is no middle road.

Now they should discuss with the wing of Eritrea which wants to make an arrangement, but the wing which leads is not the wing which wants to resolve. There are others in the leadership. Then it is necessary to make the negotiation to discuss with them, while they liquidate the others. It is necessary to smash the leading sectors. Why did these people in Eritrea not say the same when the Negus was in charge, why didn't they fight against the Negus? The Negus was capitalist and feudal. On the other hand now they fight against Ethiopia because it advances towards socialism. The Eritreans have no idea about this. They have a backward mentality, more backward than the anarchists in the time of Lenin. There is no economic, cultural, political or scientific, or artistic programme, simply "our country". This is an enormous backwardness. In Kronstadt, the Bolsheviks smashed the anarchists. "Before their independence comes the unity of Russia to confront the capitalist system". It is necessary to pose the problem in this way.

J. POSADAS 29/4/78.

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence to:-

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

THE BOMB IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY
HEADQUARTERS

W/W78

J. POSADAS

Together with the intimidation of the Communist party by this bomb, which is to stop them intervening towards the Labour party, Imperialism is preparing a team throughout Europe, a team of assassins as in Italy. Italy is proof of this, before they did this in France and Germany. In Britain the conditions are not the same because the Labour party is a party whose leadership defends capitalism. But Imperialism feels that the labour masses do not defend capitalism. Then they intimidate in order to stimulate the bourgeoisie to intervene and to justify more repressive laws. Also at the same time as they are warning the communists, they are also warning the bourgeoisie that it must intervene, because not all the bourgeoisie knows and agrees with this. Thus a sector of capitalism intervenes without consulting all the bourgeoisie, that is the sector that represents the repressive policy of capitalism. This has to be discussed in order to measure this process.

First the policy was applied in France, Germany and Italy and soon other countries are going to be involved. This is the policy of imperialism and it forms part of the constant defeat of capitalism, the retreat and failure of the trip of Carter to Nigeria, Venezuela and Brazil, which was a complete failure. The bourgeois press like Le Monde does not say it was a complete failure, but that it had no success.

It is still not very important as it has more the character of a warning and intimidation. It is not direct repression. It was a bomb aimed to intimidate, which shows that the top apparatus of imperialism is still not involved. This episode was organised by less important sectors of imperialism. But it shows that imperialism is preoccupied with the fact that the Communist party can influence the Labour party. Because inspite of the conciliatory policy of the communists, they represent the Soviet Union. Imperialism knows that the communists have to change, if not these communists, others that are going to come. They feel that the labour masses are thinking about communism and the workers state, so they are resolved to interrupt the process. This is the conclusion.

World events are very dynamic and very great events have happened just in four days. There is the failure of the trip of Carter to Brazil, Venezuela and Nigeria. The Cubans openly admit that they have 25,000 soldiers in Africa and that Cuba is at the disposal of the peoples of Africa. The Soviets are already there and

they are not going to leave. The Soviets also announce that they have a thousand satellites always in orbit, each one with a different function and that they communicate within twenty to forty minutes what is happening in the place that they are surveying. This means a very great measure of control over capitalism and in turn a very great source of information for the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In Israel the demonstration of thirty thousand is very important, as are those in Iran, that is to say in two countries that appear to be very firm and secure. The movement in Israel has a much greater significance because it weakens the position of Israel in relation to the Arabs, which shows it is the position of Carter who seeks to stimulate a change, while the other sector of the Pentagon is against. This is not a manoeuvre of Carter. The essential basis is not a manoeuvre. He is seeking an Israeli Egypt agreement to make a more firm and secure policy against the Soviets. It is not for peace, it is not to impel the progress of Africa but to depend on secure military and political forces which now he does not have. Now it's all very insecure, because the progress of Africa, Asia and Latin America is influencing Israel. When these soldiers have succeeded in attracting thirty thousand people it is not the apparatus that has succeeded in this - because the yankee apparatus has not been in favour of this demonstration - but it is the spontaneous reaction of people which creates obstacles for the plans of Israeli imperialism and this is due to the influence of the world course of the revolution. Hence the failure of Carter in Nigeria, Venezuela, in Brazil and the failure in Israel. Together with this there is the crisis of the Communist parties. All this has taken place within four days. This indicates the insecurity and the instability of the capitalist world.

This bomb in the headquarters of the British Communist party is part of this. The process in Italy indicates a very, very audacious resolution, it is a very resolved attitude of imperialism. The fact that they do this in this audacious and resolved way shows that they feel the risk and the danger that the Communists may go to the government and succeed in attracting the Christian Democratic base. This bomb in the Communist party headquarters does not have the same significance as the kidnapping of Moro, but they are preparing actions of the Moro type. Imperialism is constantly retreating. It is continuously obliged to retreat and it resorts to these measures in order to justify measures of repression and persecution, including against the communists and including in Italy. They are seeking to weaken the Communist party. Undoubtly it is a failure but this is what they are attempting.

J. POSADAS 4.4.78

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence to:—

IV International Publications,
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)

THE MASS MURDER IN BEIRUT AND THE
INTERNAL STRUGGLE BETWEEN IRAQ AND SYRIA.

14-8-78

J. Posadas

There is a real struggle between Iraq and Syria. It is a struggle of tendencies so as not to be bypassed and they grab little pieces of territory so as not to be socially influenced. Both Syria and Iraq have assassinated Communists. Both are reactionary internally against the movement which seeks to elevate the revolution. The declaration of Iraq which opposes concessions to the Israelis is a fraud. It represents small sectors of the bourgeoisie, not of the revolutionary movement, who seek to take advantage of the dispute between imperialism and the capitalist countries and of capitalism with the workers states. They try to take advantage of this but none of them do anything of importance.

They all see with terror the development of Algeria and they are against it, and the same goes for the development of Guinea and South Yemen. They are venomous and want to stop the process. In Iraq, they have just shot a great number of Communists. In the government of Iraq are "democrats" but not very much, and the assassins of Tel Al Zaatar were the Syrians. They all have a lot in common with the Israelis; they fear the revolutionary movement. They try to use the divergences of the revolutionary movement, the antagonisms with Israel, to get an advantage for themselves. As they have interests in maintaining the relations which exist, the progress of Syria and Iraq is very limited— they therefore have a link with Israel. The assassination of Tel Al Zaatar was arranged with the complicity of the Syrians. They Syrians had a policy of the centre which has no future, a future of bullets and the bullets are finished. Killing and killing cannot lead anywhere. They killed and massacred in Tel Al Zaatar and what remained? The Israelis have massacred on a great scale and where did it get them?

They are carrying out a massive bloodbath in Lebanon, of the Christians, the right and the centre, like the Jews. They are just massacring the lot. The Christians made a front with the Jews but a most incredible front. It lasted two days and afterwards they fought and killed each other. They are fighting for a zone which strategically has no value, the coasts which were a point of entry for supplies, are now no longer necessary. With one rocket all this could be eliminated. Besides, now they can send 40,000 men in a fleet of helicopters and by plane they can send military supplies. The landing of Normandy has passed into history. Now they don't do this. Weapons are a substitute for ships. The Yanks and the Israelis are making various military experiments as are the Soviets. But the Yanks, the British and the French do not have common agreements. The Yanks want to make use of the conflict of the Middle East and in

their turn the British and French want to throw out the Yanks so that the Yanks do not establish themselves there, because the Yanks want to get in but there is no place for this. Hence the peace negotiations which the Yanks propose. Lebanon has no great value strategically.

Syria wants to use the Palestinians, but is afraid of them because the progress of the Palestinians- even historically though they are mistaken in the proposals which they make- stimulates an anti- capitalist struggle and uprising because the Palestinians have anti-capitalist tendencies. The Syrians are afraid of this. Hence they provide arms but they do not do more than this.

J. POSADAS

14-8-78.

ON THE POLICY OF THE SOVIETS

J. POSADAS

1-7-78

The Soviets have changed in Eritrea. They have liquidated the most reactionary sector and it is the Eritreans who are now seeking to make concessions. Thus the Soviets can no longer have the policy of Stalin (in relation to the nationalities and countries), because they have to see the world globally. They still do not have sufficient understanding to be able to adopt good positions in each case but in general the needs of the Soviet Union stimulate them towards better positions. This pressure stimulates them to confront every individual movement and to concentrate progress against the capitalist system. In general this determines the policy of the Soviets in a more and more outstanding form. In this sense they have to advance and to understand. It is not that they have the same bureaucratic policy as before, no, no, it is not the old bureaucratic policy. It is a policy which tends to answer the need of economic and social progress and as a preparation against the capitalist system. As they do not have the theoretical structure, they do not live theoretically and thus their positions are very indecisive. But in general, they have to act in accordance with the needs of history. They make mistakes of course, but in general they have to take coherent positions, because now, the Soviet Union cannot coincide with backwardness.

The Soviet Union, the masses, the population are also demanding that they intervene. A book was recently published by a German from capitalist Germany who went to the Soviet Union. He is Communist but he had many doubts. He is a well known writer and he was sent there for this reason. He wrote a moving book recounting all that he saw and he said, " I went not as a dissident, because I do not believe in the dissidents, but I went with doubts. Now I have no doubts." He recounted with emotion what he had seen. He spoke of Siberia saying, " The place where I received most human warmth was sixty degrees below zero. It was a human warmth and a security in constructing socialism." He said that amongst the youth, the old people and the children, there was no difference, but a sentiment of immense construction. He asked why there were only statues of Lenin and they answered, " who wants anyone else ." He asked about Stalin and the reply was " Stalin was buried by history." Not even an insult, nothing, he was just buried by history. The author continues, " They have excellent human relations , very, very human relations. They value the human being." Later he writes of the help given by the Soviet Union to the rest of the world. They all know that it helps and the trade unions also help. He says a worker said to him, " We have a proverb here, - at the table of mother Russia, there is always a place for the son of a poor country." They allow for this. The book has had a great success.

In the workers states, they have a very developed consciousness that they exercise a function as a centre to help the forces of liberation from the capitalist world. This exists. Twenty atomic wars can come and people know that the problem is to eliminate capitalism and eliminate the bureaucracy. In the book, he says that there is no attitude of vengeance about " that swine Stalin " , but they simply say " Stalin has gone. " No one remembers Stalin. But Lenin is everywhere.

J. POSADAS

1-7-78.

J. Posadas

2-7-78.

Two of the Eritrean movements have asked for discussions with Ethiopia, but everything indicates that they feel they will be defeated, because they are making an offer of a discussion which a week ago they were completely against. It is not a political progress of these groups, but a retreat which their defeat obliges them to make. They make the proposal of a discussion without preconditions, without a previous programme and with the demand that they are seeking the independence of Eritrea. It is a defeat of these groups.

These problems of Eritrea are new problems in history. Neither the Soviets or any Communist Party has adopted positions on the conflict in Eritrea, but the IV International has. We have proposed the solution of the integration of Eritrea in Ethiopia with self-determination later, but maintaining both the economy and the territory unified. The aim is to maintain Ethiopia as a front against the capitalist system. This is what the Soviet Union and Cuba now propose. It is not true that the Cubans now propose to give Eritrea independence. The official declaration of the Cubans, the declarations that Fidel Castro has given are to maintain the territorial integrity, the economic unity and on the basis of this to discuss self-determination. It will be determination without self! Because they are going to remain there. This is the logical conclusion.

It is not possible now to raise the problems as they were raised before. The problem of Ethiopia and Eritrea has a certain similarity with that of the Soviet Union and Ukraine. The similarity is that Eritrea and Ukraine serve as the base of the front to the imperialist reaction. In Ukraine, the nationalists were imperialists and also in Eritrea the leading sectors are imperialists. The problem of Ethiopia-Eritrea raises a similar basis to the Soviet Union in 1917, that is of movements that are used by reaction, by imperialism, but that have historically correct bases, but do not have perspective. The problem is not resolved by asking for "self-determination" in abstract, or for "democracy". What end does it serve? With territorial unity with Ethiopia, Eritrea progresses and for the first time has progress and for the first time Ethiopia is going to give culture to the Eritreans which they did not have from any point of view. They are a people who have developed from the tribe. United with Ethiopia it is able to develop. Ethnically it can have differences, culturally none and economically less. It does not eliminate the errors of Ethiopia, they have to state this, as we propose to the Ethiopians. Now, for the first time, they state the maintenance of the territorial and economic unity, which indicates a certain basis in order to discuss with the Eritreans. The Eritreans have a group that is revolutionary, that calls itself marxist, that wishes to construct socialism but a local socialism, and this exposes them to imperialism.

It is important to discuss these problems because they show the oscillation and vacillation like the Communist parties. The one with the firmest policy is the Soviet Union, not because it is obliged to, but because it is living an experience that no other country lives. But in spite of this, the Soviet Union does not have the necessary programme for this situation, it determines its position as regards Ethiopia, in agreement to its world relation with the capitalist system. This is correct but also it is correct, better and uppermost to maintain the territorial unity of Ethiopia, because this would show how the backward countries develop and can develop without putting at risk their relation with the workers states, or the relation of world forces against the capitalist system. It is necessary to discuss this. These are the essential problems of this stage of history.

J. Posadas 2-7-78.