

FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE TRADE UNIONS FROM THE GOVERNMENT, TO STIMULATE THE ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

The Labour government preoccupied with trying to sustain the outmoded capitalist system has relied for its policy of reducing the standard of life of the masses on the collaboration of the trade union leaderships. There was no mass discussion of this policy, it was imposed by the autocratic, hierarchical structure of the unions — based on the aristocracy of labour devoted to queen and country. The union structure of this country does not function directly with gangster methods as do the American unions but it has an army of links with capitalism. Ideas do not penetrate this particular gloom save those of maintaining the status quo. Such a union structure is based on careerism and acceptance of the system. The leader of the TGWU says 1977 must be the year of the beaver, a fine way of saying work harder for the system that exploits you.

It is important to raise in the coming discussions on the socialist programme for this country, the need for the trade unions to act independently of the government but proposing an alternative socialist policy, not a moderated bourgeois policy. The conservative sectors in the trade unions talk now of "free collective bargaining" as the next stage but the question is not a return to "free collective bargaining" of trying to negotiate with a system incapable of solving any problem, but of overthrowing it. The voice of "free collective bargaining" is the croaking voice of the aristocracy of labour. At the same time the apparatus is not prepared for the situation as it is developing. Loyalty to the system no longer pays off. They have come out with schemes to make capitalism invest but they are seriously concerned with the turn to the left in the Labour party which threatens their little empires, because ideas are a threat to all these functionaries. The time when they all went round calling themselves "left" and even marxists is over. They still have an apparatus but it can no longer determine the activity of the masses and more seriously, the Labour party is out of control. On the other hand the unions as in Italy must adopt a policy of unremitting hostility to the policy of the government. When Healey proposed his budget, the Tories said it was their policy. The forces of the left in the unions and the party must press for a socialist programme of nationalisations under workers control and planning to be pushed forward by the unions. Such a programme is not the prerogative of the Labour Party. This epoch brings unions and workers parties closer together. Unions like the miners and the engineers have in their programmes socialist objectives, it is necessary therefore that they act independently of the labour government.

CLASS AGAINST CLASS, SYSTEM AGAINST SYSTEM

The entire process in this country and the world is dominated by the struggle of the two world systems, on the one hand capitalism and on the other the workers states who lead the struggle of the world masses for communism. No country is independent of this course. Local, regionalist, reforming concerns are signs only of incapacity or lack of preparation for the forms of this world struggle. Capitalist society in all its manifestations, its press, its films etc. shows only decomposition and absence of ideas. It is in total and final crisis, without energy, preparing only its war of suicide, fundamentally crushed by history while the workers states light up the world. The decisions taken in Moscow are historic — whatever their present limitations — but the decisions taken in the capitalism of the imperialist world amount only to grunts, groans and a prolonged death rattle. Every day that passes is a joy for the revolution and the advance to communism but for big business, and the eulogists of private interest, it brings only a succession of disasters. They have to make way for a superior civilisation and unlike previous transformations in class society, they will have no new ruling class with which to fuse. No wonder their news, their reports can only show despair. For them it is the end of the world, but it is only the beginning for humanity.

It is in this perspective that it is necessary to analyse the situation in Britain. The British Empire is no more, countries like Jamaica and Guyana take the road towards a total change of regime. British capitalism like world capitalism as a whole, does not possess the means to develop. The workers states and the revolutionary states are outside the capitalist world system and tend to expand all the time — Guyana, Angola, Laos are all examples of this. Capitalism could only develop on the basis of a constantly advancing world market, now all is contracting. Nowhere is safe from the advance of the revolution. Hence the only solution is war to defend its interests against the inevitable superseding by a superior regime based on the collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Hence the dedication of resources to arms and the dedication of research to this as well. But all this diversion of resources suffocates the social bases of capitalism. How to maintain the authority of the aristocracy of labour, how justify capitalism when the social services decline in all the capitalist countries? The small and medium capitalist firms deteriorate, only the largest survive.

THE CALLAGHAN GOVERNMENT TRIES TO ADMINISTER CAPITALISM

When the masses voted for the Labour government the intention was to concentrate the quality of the class forces to confront capitalism, to impel if possible, measures of social change. When the capitalist class has to accept such a government to run capitalism, it is because it is very, very weak. Moreover all the world and national processes under the impact

Turn to page 4

The singer Biermann, the function of criticism and the construction of socialism

CENTRE PAGES

J. POSADAS

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

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

263 Friday 4 February 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year.....£2.00

European Marxist Review
No. 3

Containing Texts
•Crisis of capitalism
•China
•The living thought
of Trotsky J. Posadas

PRICE 50p

Order from
IV International Publications,
Adminaid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL

PRICE 10p

PARTIAL REGENERATION AND THE SOCIAL HISTORIC ROLE OF THE SMALL REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

J. Posadas

16-12-76

On movements like Polisario or Chad, it is very important to reiterate and deepen the analysis for the intervention of our Algerian section. They must develop the activity to educate these movements, to elevate them in theoretical and political understanding, to develop the experiences of the function of the workers state; with criticism which may be adequate to impel the movement by seeking to correct with criticism.

It is necessary to teach revolutionary behaviour to these small movements to elevate them to a world vision of the process. We understand that they have difficulties, because they are small movements, which are under the severe pressure of local needs, through the very bad conditions in which they live from the economic and social point of view; lack of the most basic things and lack of a previous tradition of theoretical and political education, of life and experiences.

All these comrades find difficulties in understanding, but at the same time they show will and all of them see the function of the Soviet Union and of the workers states. While maintaining the critical attitude towards the behaviour of the leadership of the Soviet Union, it is necessary to impel them to understand that these movements which they represent, are small and do not mean a force or a point of important or fundamental support, economically, militarily and politically. But on the other hand, socially and historically, yes, they are important, because they show that any country which wants to develop itself, has to advance towards socialism.

Any country to free itself with the problem of self determination, of languages, of the economy, of any aspect which wants to elevate itself in civilisation, has to advance towards socialism, and they all coincide, in that the Soviet Union has an interest in going towards socialism. It has an interest in

going towards socialism with a bureaucratic apparatus which makes a usufruct but less and less now, because the conditions historically reduce the scope and advantage of the bureaucracy. On the contrary, it is obliged to impel the world course of the revolution. To the extent that it impels the world course of the revolution, it elevates the intelligence of people and then shows more and more that the bureaucracy is not necessary.

Hence all this process is not one of affirming bureaucratic power but of weakening it. This is the process of history. Then we consider that the education which they can achieve with these small movements is very important. It means maintaining the critical attitude, but not the critical attitude of opposition, by seeing the contradictions of the soviet bureaucracy and that within the contradiction, the line which wins is that it has to impel the revolution. It is enough to see the progress which Brezhnev has made until now, an immense progress.

In the meeting of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the intervention of the soviet delegate reiterated proletarian internationalism, the dictatorship of the proletariat and that socialism resolves all the problems, which means satisfied property and planning. Although in the Soviet Union there is bureaucracy and for a time there was hunger, now the function of the bureaucracy is not that of the epoch of Stalin, the usurpation which impedes the development of the movements. The bureaucracy to live has to justify itself and to justify itself, has to impel the movements and proceeds to eliminate points of support.

It is necessary to intervene to elevate in them the understanding, the orientation towards planning, co-ordination between the movements, although there are difficulties because Chad is on one side, Polisario and the movement of Dhofar in another part. These

small movements must struggle to triumph, but at the same time to develop the tendency to unification, with the organisation of a Federation, because through themselves alone, they do not have a solution. They have to understand that in order to triumph they have to be part of a much vaster movement. Thus they are like us who struggle not for our own development, but to develop the revolution which is the way to develop ourselves. We will develop as a leadership in this way and they the same.

It is a very important task which the comrades have to carry out and to influence in Algeria also. It can influence the Algerian leadership. The inexorable laws of history, tend to seek objectively planning. Our movement is concerned to develop in Algeria this current; to develop the principles of scientific socialism, of marxism with the experiences of the Soviet Union to proceed to help to organise currents, tendencies in Algeria, based on marxism and on the consistency of marxism; which is a very important task and they are going to win much authority.

The struggles of the next 10 or 15 years, if there is no war, is going to be this discussion, because any movement which arises, poses socialism. It does not occur to anyone to say "we are going to develop private property and the accumulation of capital." Anyone in a workers area making the revolution proposes "we satisfy and plan". Now there is the experience of humanity, in which one can see, that in order to progress, it is necessary to overcome private property. Even the communist leaders who want to conciliate, when they have to speak of progress, have to pose social changes and what is social change, but expropriation and statification of property?

It is very important that our Algerian section develops theoretical and political preparation. And for this theoretical and political

Turn to page 2

preparation, it is necessary to read all the texts of the International, the meetings of the executive committee, of the cadre schools, some texts of the world communist movement among them the first four Congresses of the Third Communist International, and the texts of Trotsky which are fundamental for a whole stage, which they are going to have to return to discuss.

All these people called "dissidents" in the Soviet Union are in the opposition. Dissidents are limited in their function ie dissident with something. But these people like Sakharov are against, and have nothing to do with socialism.

He wants a socialism more backward than that of the past century. This is going to be discussed in Algeria and in the rest of Africa. It is then very important to make this preparation.

In the discussions with movements like those of Chad and Dhofar, it is necessary to insist on the function of the Soviet Union, not to abandon criticisms nor critical opinions but to understand also that there are errors of the soviet bureaucracy, as with Egypt and Syria, and others which are not, but are logical consequences of this process of the nationalist movement that have limitations in advancing. And the soviet leadership does not have the capacity nor the understanding and the political preparation to understand these movements.

And then it has to intervene, even running risks to prevent them falling into the hands of imperialism. In relation to a series of measures which the soviets take although we criticise them in a vigorous, opposed form, we criticise to teach. For example with respect to Egypt. The soviets have to intervene, otherwise they fall into the hands of the Yanks and in the hands of the Yanks, Egypt is something else. Now it can be seen that it is not in the hands of the Yanks. They are conclusions that the soviets originally made, that it was correct to make a pact to maintain the Russian Revolution and they ceded a part of the territory in Germany to defend itself from the others. Now this is in the conditions of the final settlement of accounts and it's necessary to use the disagreements in the bourgeois camp to be able to manoeuvre. The manoeuvre which the leadership of the CPSU is making could be much better. It is not necessary to condemn all the means which they make of agreements of support to capitalist countries of a circumstantial nature. These are measures which they have to do, to extend the forces of the workers state and win historic stages and win also historic support, in Syria itself.

There was the Syrian turn, otherwise the Yanks would intervene. Then an essential part of Africa would be in the hands of the Yanks. But they reached a series of agreements which extend from the most conciliatory parts to the most revolutionary parts.

For this it is necessary to understand the function of the workers states, the structure of the process in which these leaderships develop, but the inevitable conclusion is, that it is not possible to hand over the

THE SINGER BIERMANN, THE FUNCTION OF CRITICISM AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIALISM

J. Posadas.

12-12-76

The function of Biermann is erroneous and objectively reactionary. It is erroneous because the criticisms of the workers state are not the objective. One thing is the epoch of Stalin and another is the epoch of today. Stalin handed over Spain to the enemy; while now the USSR has helped Angola, Africa and Latin America to advance. Then it is not the same situation. It is not possible to make the same global condemnation of a workers state or a leadership of the workers state as in the epoch of Stalin.

The other aspect to consider is that this is the stage of the final settlement of accounts in which the capitalist system is confronting the workers states. Thus the objectivity of anyone who wants progress is to consider what is the function of the workers state and what is the function of capitalism. Capitalism has nothing to defend or sustain. In capitalism it is not a question of errors but of regression, crime, war, these are the conditions of the capitalist system and this is the capitalist system.

It is more and more evident that the workers state is the centre which is opposed to the capitalist system. And it is the existing organism which humanity has to oppose the capitalist system. Then it is necessary to be based on this organ in order to improve it. But its function even with errors is against the capitalist system. Then it is necessary to sing, to produce poetry, works for the theatre or novels, as a function of this historic necessity, of this reality otherwise it favours the class enemy, discussing problems totally secondary from the point of view of historic necessity.

It is necessary to show that what impedes the development of history is the capitalist system, not the German workers state nor the leadership of the German workers state. Besides it is necessary to consider capitalist Germany. In West Germany, German capitalism is very wealthy and there is an enormous number of well off petit bourgeois but the rest are not well off. There are millions of foreign exploited workers. Why does not Biermann sing of this? There are millions of exploited workers and it is a lie that they live well. They live in a miserable way because the capitalist system is impotent and is incapable of incorporating them fully into the life of the country.

The USSR incorporated countries, zones, entire cities with various languages; it incorporated them into the Soviet workers state. It was able to do this through the structure of the workers state which is statified property, planned production, monopoly of foreign trade and support to anti capitalist struggle. No capitalist country can do this.

Then it is necessary to consider that all the criticisms made of the German workers state which do not have the objective of stimulating the anti capitalist struggle in the capitalist countries favour the capitalist system. They can make criticisms of the workers state, of the leaderships, but in order to elevate the function of the workers state, on the basis of the fact that it develops a necessary function in history; even if it continues in an insufficient way, it is not against necessity, because it is opposed to the capitalist system. This is the depth of the question.

Every poet, singer, artist, every scientist must proceed from this basis. Otherwise he is based on a supposition or on personal interest, individual interest or on individual lucubrations.

Capitalism utilises individual problems to turn them against the workers state and the workers movement. But all that has no effect. None. Biermann sings "they don't let me speak, the tragedy of the lack of democracy", but the world is not measured either by what happens to him or by the chords of his guitar. It is measured by the global progress of the workers states and of the revolutionary process.

The discussion on democratic liberty cannot be made as Biermann wishes to conduct it. It has to be done with an objective of progress. We demand democratic liberties so that the workers state prepares for war, helps the world revolution and the movements of liberation. In the workers state there must be freedom of discussion but to pose what? To pose support to the development of the anti capitalist struggle; democracy with this objective.

In the workers state there is democracy because capitalism which is anti democratic and reactionary represses these peoples whilst the workers state helps them. Is this democratic, yes or no? Then it is necessary to measure the relations of democracy and the function of democracy of which

revolution to capitalism; it's not possible to divide up the forces and hand over an important part to capitalism, because this has political and social repercussions in the camp of the workers states. This is our fundamental intervention in this stage. It is not our direct intervention that weighs but helping this understanding. It is very important that our small sections can intervene in this form; it is a small section with a great intervention. It is necessary for all the publications to reach these movements, to educate on this line.

It is necessary to understand that movements like Polisario have a minimal repercussion from the point of view of weight in the world; while Algeria is fundamental, Egypt and Mexico also. It is necessary to know how to measure the importance of the movements for us to orientate, to sustain and educate these movements, so that they weigh in the totality of the world

revolutionary movement.

To advance in this stage there is an objective front of the workers states with the revolution of Asia, Africa and Latin America. There is an objective front and the Soviet Union gives support. It is very important what is happening in China. There is quite a complicated process where the tendency of a turn to the right is not succeeding. They have quite a number of difficulties and there is no leadership for the left, but the fact is that after various months since Mao Tse Tung died, they have not succeeded in turning to the right. The declarations which they make are not worse than when Mao was around, they are not favourable to the Yanks. All this has to be seen and understood to help the world communist movement understand.

And at the same time our section can organise Posadist currents in these movements.

J. POSADAS 16.12.76

Biermann and Havemann speak.

They are all individual preoccupations of this type. Otherwise he would be ashamed of saying that there is no freedom nor democracy without seeing the function of the workers state. These demand freedom for themselves, for their own friends. Besides they are free, but they do not have the freedom to oppose the workers state. This is the obstacle which they feel.

Today, to sing on these subjects is to turn to the petit bourgeoisie, because neither the proletariat nor the peasants, nor the militant petit bourgeoisie has an interest in this type of song. It is not the song which organises political understanding, the scientific thought and the capacity or the organisation of the activity. It is ideas. And where are the ideas in Biermann? The song is a backward form. The song is not excluded and it is important because it plays a certain function, but in the epoch in which millions are mobilised, it is not the song which has a considerable importance. It is a small matter, or small strata. It is very backward.

It is not possible to make a criticism of the workers state, without at the same time expressing the defence of the workers state and the function of the workers state. Without the German workers state, today capitalist Germany would be again Nazi. And despite all the difficulties, to all the limits and Stalinism, the German workers state exists. This means that the structure of the workers state, that is statified property, the planning of production, the monopoly of foreign trade and the functioning of the trade unions is decisive for the progress of history. Then it is not possible to make accusations like that of Biermann which reduce the historic function of the workers state or elevate the assassin function of the capitalist system. Then Biermann is not mistaken but follows deliberately, intentionally a function which goes against the workers state. It cannot be a naive person who does not see that he is damaging the workers state.

When capitalism makes so little propaganda about Biermann, it means that he does not have any effect. They made a great propaganda over Solzhenitsyn and then put him out to graze. It cost them millions because they published all his books and bought them. Solzhenitsyn sells his books only to the bourgeoisie who bought them as an obligation to stimulate him to continue to write against the Soviet Union. But on a popular level, among the population, intelligent people, no one bought these books, no one was interested. It is enough to see what it said to him and it is sufficient. He said "There are concentration camps". And people say "the USSR supported Vietnam, Angola and confronted imperialism". It is enough to confront all that, nothing else. Hence despite all these individuals, such propaganda has no echo.

The mistakes of the soviet bureaucracy, the logical errors and the consequences of the bureaucracy, the reactionary aspect is not the norm of the workers state. The norm of the workers state is what they did in Vietnam, in Angola in Mozambique, what was done in Cuba. This is the norm. In the epoch of Stalin the norm was that of assassinating the Bolshevik party and the world revolution. Now it is the contrary.

All these individuals are stupid, without intelligence. Biermann is a twit. To make such a campaign which damages the workers state means to be stupid. It possesses no truth. If they do not let him speak, it is because he does not deserve to. He has no value. He has no capacity for analysis. An individual who writes a song exalting Dubcek, is of little value. People without any great knowledge say "what ideas did Dubcek have"? The ideas of Dubcek are "plurality" and "freedom for all" but for everything which is in accordance with the alliance with capitalism, not the workers, the trade unions, or the revolutionary tendencies. He does not demand freedom for that. Hence all these people "die suddenly". The end of Biermann has now arrived.

Even in West Germany the papers do not give him any more importance. Capitalism sees that it cannot utilise him, that it has no effect. The campaign has not won any support, none! Even in Italy, it is the television which has made a propaganda, the papers have hardly published anything. This is due to the fact that the Italian communist masses hardly give it any importance. This shows the capacity, the understanding, the maturity of the communist masses, the petit bourgeois and socialist masses. The maturity which understands, measures and confronts well. They do not confront on the basis of what he says, on the fact that they do not allow him to speak. The masses look immediately and say "The German workers state has supported Angola and the soviets have put their fleet in the Mediterranean confronting the American navy when there was the fight over Lebanon" and this is democracy. It is very democratic. What is the German workers state doing at this moment and what are the friends of Biermann doing? The USSR sends the fleet and people see this. It is the maturity of people who judge for themselves. Then it judges well and says "it can be that they don't allow Biermann to speak, but they support Angola, Mozambique and Lebanon. Then they see that the absence of democracy is not a going back but that the workers state advances.

For the workers it is necessary to demand trade union democracy, democratic rights of tendency to discuss progress and support to the world revolution. Then it is necessary to give a programme to the democracy.

The discussion which they are having in France in the CP is fundamental. Comrade Thevin says "democracy here is bourgeois and for capitalism but not for socialism". This is formidable and it is an answer to Biermann and to all those like him. Thevin is a leader of the PCF and they must publish him. Before they would have thrown him out. And it is an aberration that Marchais speaks about saying "it is logical that every impulse gives rise to excesses on right and left". What are these excesses to left and right? This is false! If the line is correct, it does not of itself create excesses, but there are tendencies against the line.

This shows the existing maturity in the world. This discussion in the PCF is the force which attracts and stimulates the French masses and not the singer Biermann who has no value.

The German workers state is one of the points of support against the capitalist system. It borders capitalist Germany which has elevated the life of capitalism, the riches, the economic, military, social power of capitalism while

FINISH WITH THE MONARCHY! FORWARD TO THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

the rest of the population live as before. Those of the left do not have the right to be public functionaries. The German workers state which was destroyed by the capitalist system and the nazis in less than thirty years was reanimated and is one of the most developed countries of the world.

It is on this that it is necessary to sing, that is: the future of socialism passes through the road of the workers state, which in its turn passes through the organisation of a leadership which is learning to lead, which represents, and develops the interests, the objectives of the workers state. But it is necessary to give time to history to fulfil this process and to intervene to realise this task.

It is necessary to see that objectively the workers state is superior to the capitalist system. In the German workers state, they live in infinitely superior conditions to those in West Germany. In the capitalist state, they eat more sausages, salami, fried potatoes and there is a great deal of imbecility. But there is less culture, less knowledge, less human relations and human dignity. In the Federal Republic about four million foreign workers are exploited and have no rights. And Germans who are public employees cannot have publicly held left opinions.

In the East German workers state it is possible to hold all the opinions which they want. It is bureaucratic leadership which does not fulfil integrally the function which it should fulfil. But in the historic sense it does so; it goes against the capitalist system. And the masses of the world see this. They see the difference between the German workers state and capitalist Germany. Thus there cannot be a song against the German workers state or the leadership of the workers state which involves the German workers state. It is necessary to make a separation if they want to make criticisms of the leadership of the workers state, just as the Trotskyists and now the Posadists have always made a separation between Stalin and the workers state. But now that the leadership of the workers state pursued, pursues and represents more directly the objective, world interests of the revolution, our support is more direct, without ceasing criticisms.

Among the demands which must be made in the German workers state, is the functioning of soviet democracy. But soviet democracy is designed to stimulate history not for anyone to do as he likes. It is not plurality, which is a barrier, an obstacle to the progress of history. Socialism does not demand the co-ordination, the mixture or the combination with the capitalist system. Socialism is opposed to the capitalist system. Then it is necessary to enter into socialism against the capitalist system.

Then it is necessary to demand soviet democracy, so that all currents and tendencies intervene in the German workers state to give their opinion; and as part of this, the struggle for equality of wages, to each according to his needs. It is necessary to eliminate the big wages of the leaders, of the President, of the leaders of the party of the German workers state, so that these earn like workers. It is necessary to seek to stimulate equality of wages according to the needs of each one, not according to what each can do but the needs of each one. Such conclusions would be an enormous impulse to the world development of the revolution. Above all for the American masses and also the German petit bourgeoisie.

This is what Biermann must sing about, if he wishes to be a useful instrument of history. Otherwise his confusion is utilised by the capitalist system and he becomes conscious of the fact that he is being utilised by the capitalist system.

We reject this function of Biermann and of all these who can exist like him and we appeal to Biermann as to other singers, writers, authors and poets that they base themselves on these considerations. The German workers state is an instrument of history. It is necessary to defend it with intransigence and to attack and condemn the capitalist system. It is necessary to demand the development of soviet democracy in the workers states, which means the right to speak, to discuss, to develop ideas, and so that the masses participate openly and in organisms. The designation of wages, of conditions of life must be determined by the masses, by their intervention, planning of production through soviet organisms; the trade union, the party in which the masses intervene. It will be an enormous education for all. The German workers state must stimulate the progress of history to live itself, while the capitalist state to live, must impede the progress of history.

It is not possible to be indifferent to this. It is not possible to be a poet in abstract. The poet and the singer sing to the reality to help it to develop. This singer Biermann does not sing in this way. He sings subjectively in defence of capitalism. He can praise socialism but defends objectively capitalism because he is attacking a workers state, accusing, giving insecurity in a state which pursues the objective function of the progress of history.

In the workers states, there is a development of human fraternity which exists in no capitalist state. It is the inherent condition of the economic structure, of the economic bases, the bases of stratified property which produces human relations of such a nature. It elevates the sentiments of human fraternity, a thing which is not possible in any capitalist country. In the capitalist countries, it exists within the trade unions and the workers parties, but not in the capitalist regime because this tends to elevate private interest, relations of private interest, associations of convenience of interests. In the workers state there is neither economy nor interests but yes it is stratified property which generates such fraternity and such elevated relations.

Of that it is necessary to sing and we appeal to Biermann to associate with this necessity and that he makes poems and songs of such a nature. At the same time as maintaining criticisms, supporting these conditions, his criticisms must demand a greater liberty and democracy to construct socialism. Then he will realise that he has no need to continue what he is doing. In this way he will not be found at the side of whoever they associate with the capitalist system, but would act with whatever criticism to develop or impel the workers state.

The first duty of every militant, every communist member or progressive communist member is that of supporting the progressive function of the workers state. Afterwards comes criticism and criticism serves to elevate this progressive function. It is necessary to demand democracy with the objective of elevating the progressive function which is anti capitalist. Then what is done is against capitalism. And in the German workers state, it is necessary to sing with the object of stimulating the intervention of the workers state to give an impulse to revolution in the world and to democracy in the workers state, in the workers councils, the right of revolutionary anti capitalist tendencies. This is the duty of every person who wishes to progress without need of being communist. Also it is in the worker movement where there are the bases to be able to develop cadres and leaders. Hence it is not possible to disregard the CPs of the workers states which are the most important organ which exist. The Communist Party is the centre of the world working class to construct the new society. It is on this base which that it is necessary to proceed for any objective of criticism, of progress in society. And every criticism must be a progress.

The abolition of the monarchy is a fundamental part of the Socialist programme, for Socialism entails the end of all vestiges of class privilege. In the late 19th century Britain was an expanding imperialist power with the monarch acting as head of the empire; there abounded plenty of surplus from exploiting other countries to enable British capitalism to give privileges to some upper layers of the working class, in order that they became satisfied with life and acted as a conservative block on the proletariat's revolutionary force. The mass of the proletariat remained exploited but the layer of labour aristocracy was a strata stopping their advance. The leaders of the trade unions and the Labour Party were recruited from the labour aristocracy and their concept of leadership has always been never to overthrow capitalism. They have been structured into the system, that is shown by the way the Labour Party and trade unions provide J.P.'s to run the bourgeois courts, put people forward for the honours list and leaders end their days in the House of Lords. The monarchy like the other institutions of the capitalist state is reactionary, as is seen by the Duke of Edinburgh's attacks on the welfare state. The Labour Party is in the process of changing from being dominated by the labour aristocracy into an instrument to construct socialism. For this reason discussions tend to arise about the institutions of capitalism, as with the proposals in the Labour Party on the monarchy and the House of Lords.

The days of the imperial empires are over, as the masses in the former colonies are throwing out the oppressors and are beginning the process of developing Workers States, as in Angola where the MPLA has a programme of nationalisations. Today there are no spare resources for capitalism to support the reformist layers in the workers movements, hence the labour aristocracy is losing its power and the proletariat is intervening to change the Labour Party into a party to overthrow capitalism. The labour aristocracy never challenged the bourgeois state and this is the origin of the Labour Party never having proposed a policy for a Republic. To discuss the abolition of the monarchy raises also the question of the role of other bourgeois structures, such as the courts, the House of Lords and Parliament. To start a campaign for a Republic in this stage of history means to start a process against the whole of capitalism and so the Labour and trade union leaders never raise the issue. The discussion in the Labour Party on proposals to curtail certain rights of the monarchy comes precisely because the Party is reflecting the pressures of forces that are going against capitalism. However the level of discussion shows the great timidity of that left. The discussion document proposes

"to take the monarchy out of politics" allowing her to continue and making an allowance for "the performance of state duties" but subjecting her other income to tax. In other words allow the symbol of class rule to remain but on the basis of income tax!

The very proposals do not in any way make the crown non political, they still envisage the monarch carrying out the state functions and merely seek to modernise the image of the institution. In the same way as capitalism has attempted to make the queen seem more close to the population, by such things as showing her domestic life, it is a feeble endeavour to make her more acceptable to petit bourgeois opinion. The monarchs over the decades have been notable for total lack of any capacity, they contribute nothing to progress, to discuss reforming them is an evasion of this issue. The monarchy is an obstacle to the advance of the proletariat, therefore we are against it.

The issue of the monarchy is a fundamental one in the path to overthrow capitalism. It is not that it is a separate issue and that there are other more important subjects socialists should concern themselves with. It is integrally part of the state apparatus that supports private property, as is shown by the way the British monarchy was used to throw out the Australian Labour government. The monarchy cannot be taken out of politics for it is one of the bourgeois institutions and being this, it will always be its role to support class rule. To propose to leave the monarchy is a symptom of being fearful of breaking links with the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie itself in its revolutions was in opposition to the monarchs; the French revolution, under the pressure of the masses, guillotined Louis XVI and the British bourgeoisie beheaded Charles I. This is because the monarchs represented feudalism and to achieve their class rule, the rising bourgeoisie had to confront the feudal regime and all its institutions, and Cromwell's army was their instrument. The English revolution was the first bourgeois revolution and the fact that the monarchy was restored reflects the weakness and contradiction of capitalism and also the essentially conservative nature of the system even in its revolution.

The fact is that the bourgeoisie cut off the king's head and established a Republic, Cromwell did not hesitate to dissolve parliament when it suited the interests of the bourgeoisie. The revolution of the proletariat will have to adopt the same decision as this in dealing with capitalism. The monarchy is an archaic remnant from a previous conservative system; the backwardness of the crown is an apt representative of an inert system. Today capitalism is very frail and it fears any movement against the monarchy as it immediately raises

discussion on what is to replace it. There is no long term perspective of a bourgeois Republic in Britain therefore any discussion on the monarchy brings up the issue of the socialist Republic.

There are currents in the leadership of the world workers movement who resist all profound challenges to the present order and seek instead to improve its functioning. The constant call for the N.E.B to pump money into the economy as a way to force capitalism to invest, rather than proposing the end of private property, is an example of this. Every proposal under the sun is made, like import controls and lower interest rates, rather than tackle the central issue of overthrowing the system that generates the crisis. The conception of modernising the monarchy comes from the same outlook, these ideas are not the ones that lead to the construction of Socialism. The monarchy must be seen as a representative of the rule of private property. The construction of Socialism requires the end of private property and therefore the end of all its institutions. Socialism with a monarchy is impossible, and therefore alongside the programme to nationalise the economy, there needs to be the call for the Socialist Republic. Britain is one of the most highly advanced industrialised countries but socially it is one of the most backward. Ethiopia has practically no industrial base but yet it threw out Emperor Haile Selassie whereas in Britain the monarchy still remains. The Labour left need to reflect that whereas the Ethiopian masses nationalise their economy and collectivise the land, in this country the leaderships still refuse to propose nationalising as a centre and seek ways to reform the system. If the peasants of Ethiopia can come from nothing to develop towards a Workers State, then in Britain with a powerful proletariat it is possible to construct a Republic.

One argument given against a Republic in Britain is that there is popular support for the queen. In reality, this claim is just propaganda from the bourgeoisie. Just before Haile Selassie was deposed, the bourgeois journalists proclaimed that he would never be in danger, as his subjects loved him. This was shown to be a myth, it is the same in Britain. The proposal for the overthrow of the monarchy would produce an upsurge of support for the Socialist Republic leaving only the bourgeoisie and a few backward sectors pledging their loyalty to that primitive institution. A programme put forward for the end of the monarchy would attract support from petit bourgeois sectors. The call for a Socialist Republic on the basis of a nationalised planned economy is the way forward for the Labour left to mobilise forces around the task to take Britain out of the backwardness of capitalism forward to a workers state.

IMPORTANT — CHANGE OF PARTY ADDRESS

From 1st February 1977, the Party address is:-

**IV INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS
ADMINAID, WESTON HOUSE,
WEST BAR GREEN,
SHEFFIELD S1 2DL**

In future no correspondence to be sent to Cranbourn Street.

THE LIBERATION OF CORVALAN, A DEFEAT OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

J. POSADAS

24-12-76

The liberation of Corvalan is a defeat of the capitalist system. They arrested Corvalan as a proof of the power of capitalism, not a hostage but as a proof that they were stronger, and they had to liberate him and exchange him for an idiot.

It's a triumph of the workers states, of the capacity of the workers states. And at the same time it's a demonstration that no Communist Party could do it, nor all the Communist parties together, but it was done by the Soviet Union. The masses of the world see this and although they do not have the means to say or express it, the masses guide their political orientation by this conclusion. It was the Soviet Union which liberated Corvalan and it is a defeat of the capitalist system. If it was the Yanks who possibly exerted a pressure to make this exchange, it was the least evil for them. At the same time they sought political electoral support in the United States. And this shows at the same time that the world communist movement cannot be contained, detained or rejected. It has to be admitted as a necessity of history.

The capitalist system has liberated one of its enemies and one of its replacers. This is not a political or tactical calculation but a defeat of capitalism. What is important is not that Bukovsky shows that there is no freedom in the Soviet Union which is not true, but what the Communist parties have to say; the capitalist system was defeated by the workers states. This is the principal conclusion.

Then the masses of the world see their strength. It is not a problem of legality and liberty, abstract and lying liberty. Every article which wants to judge the Soviet Union by saying that there is no freedom is idiotic. In the Soviet Union there are prisoners, prisoners because of their politics. On the other hand in the Soviet Union there isn't sufficient soviet political democratic freedom for the masses. This is what has to be demanded, so that the trade unions, the Communist parties and the masses can speak and discuss. We do not propose now, as before, the right to the masses in general but that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union acts, that the Communist Party calls public meetings in which all the masses intervene in public debate with full right to all the revolutionary tendencies to speak.

If anyone wishes to intervene, let them intervene but in defence of the progress of the workers state. The scientist cannot place doubt over his work because then he puts doubt on the truth. The Soviet Union cannot say "here everyone can come who wants and say what they want". This is absurd.

Neither is it possible in the capitalist countries with bourgeois legality to say what you want. For example in Italy, the fascists can say what they want, but the revolutionaries, no.

The young people in Milan went to the cinema to say "lower the prices", they are not

criminals, depraved nor shameless people, but organised an activity which is necessary and just. It was not for individual or personal benefit. It was for a collective benefit.

The people who occupy the houses do the same as those who demand the lowering of the cinema prices in Milan. They do not undertake simply action of personal interest, of arrogance. It is a necessity for people, that neither the workers state or parliament or the parties are carrying out. They do it. It was a necessary action, why didn't

Bukovsky do an equivalent in the Soviet Union?

As in the Soviet Union it's not necessary to do this, one can say "we must support Angola more, why does not Bukovsky say this? This shows these people are the residues of the bureaucracy.

The Communist parties must discuss this and salute the freedom of Corvalan as a triumph of the Soviet Union and of the workers states.

J. POSADAS 24.12.76

EDITORIAL continued from page 1

of the process of partial regeneration in the workers states and the world communist movement, tend to change the relations in the Labour party and a left begins to develop outside the control of the system. But the Labour government is not a government of the working class and those who argue that it is are those who repress the interests of the aristocracy of labour. The view that the Labour government is "our" government is the line of the trade union bosses who collaborate with capitalism. Yes, it is a government which mediates the interests of imperialism, the bourgeoisie and the layers of the aristocracy of labour and its equivalent in the top petit bourgeois layers. The Wilson government sabotaged the NEB and continued the traditional line of the social democracy. Callaghan has proceeded on the same line in constantly worsening conditions for capitalism. The latter socially does not like the nationalisation of aircraft and shipbuilding but economically it is not disadvantageous especially as it is not linked to any planning of the economy in the interest of the masses and there is no workers control. Certainly neither Wilson or Callaghan can control the development of the left in the party but the party is not the government. The line of the latter is one of reducing the standard of life of the masses, continuing the repression in Ireland and sustaining NATO. If there is a limitation on the arms expenditure, it arises from the incapacity of the system to sustain all their military requirements. Yankee imperialism is far richer than British imperialism. This Labour government has offered nothing to the masses save the line of capitalism, reducing the living standard of the masses, with massive inflation and mass unemployment. Productivity increases, and so does the number of unemployed. This is capitalism. It is in an immense structural crisis, economically, socially and politically and the Labour government has sought to sustain the system as best it can. But such a government has no perspective and the growth of the forces of the left in the Labour party has shown this.

THE NEED TO DISCUSS THE ALTERNATIVE SOCIALIST PROGRAMME

British capitalism is deteriorating very, very rapidly. Everything associated with it provokes contempt. Its criminal incompetence leaves no sector of life untouched. Now one of its "experts" proposes that it would be a good idea to reduce safety precautions on the railways to save cash. This is the mentality of confirmed imbeciles, the product of private property. They are unable to pretend that the economy has a future because the recovery does not take place. This is true of all the capitalist economies. The contrast with the workers states is shattering. Capitalism cannot stand such a comparison. The Soviet Union is obliged to sustain vast expenditures of arms to confront the capitalist system and it has given immense aid to other countries such as Cuba but the population is not submitted to the capitalist regime of rising prices, unemployment and lowering of the standard of life. On the contrary there is a constant elevation in living conditions and the quality of human relations based on the nationalised economy is immensely superior. Capitalism tries to frighten the petit bourgeoisie with terrible stories of lack of "freedom and democracy" in the workers states — but the proponents of this "freedom and democracy" in the Soviet Union are the Bukovskys and Sakharovs, openly linked to the forces who want to destroy the Soviet Union. Capitalism does not allow the honest mass discussion of marxism. It represses ideas in every way it knows how. "Freedom and democracy" as used by the bourgeoisie means only opinions acceptable to the functioning of the capitalist economy. If opinions of another order are allowed, it is only because capitalism does not have the strength to suppress them.

It is of fundamental importance to discuss the socialist planning of the economy as a whole. Sectors of the bourgeoisie talk of "import controls" and the "siege economy". This has nothing to do with the socialist alternative. It is simply modifying the capitalist functioning. Co-operatives were another gambit to conciliate with capitalism on the part of the aristocracy of

labour. It is necessary to link the nationalisation of the banks with all the key industries under workers control and to place all the nationalised industries under workers control. It's not possible to advance without the expropriation of the key sectors of the economy. One measure or another can make an inroad against capitalism, but that simply weakens the system, it does not allow the unification of the productive forces to transform the economy. Capitalism is not going to go without a fight and there is no perspective for reforms. Now the CBI is rejecting the idea of "workers" in the board room — the system is now so weak they are afraid that in practice the aristocracy of labour would not be able to contain the working class or indeed would interfere in the economy very much for their own interests.

Not only is it necessary to develop a discussion over the socialist programme but link it to the need for mass popular organs. It is through these, through price committees, committees in the workers areas and factory committees with the right of immediate recall that workers control over the economy is going to be exercised. There is no "cold" way to socialism on the basis of reforms, concessions, discussions confined to the limited functioning of the Labour party. Socialism and its attainment is revolutionary and the Labour party will be transformed in the course of this process.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LEFT AND TROTSKYISM IN THE LABOUR PARTY

The bourgeoisie are enormously preoccupied with the development of the left in the Labour Party and hysteria overflowed with the appointment of a member of the "militant" group to a position in the LP apparatus. It is a means to try to use people of Trotskyist origin to contain the labour left, to try to confuse the inevitable development of tendencies who want to stimulate an anti capitalist policy and seek marxism. The bourgeoisie are not concerned with "militant" but with the real development of a left which wishes to understand the world, the role of the Soviet Union, the need for socialism and a planned economy. The prospects of elevating the discussion are very good because necessity impels it. When Ponomarev came from the Soviet Union to visit Britain, he came to develop a current in the Labour party and they will be obliged to continue on this line. It is this which concerns the bourgeoisie — the development of marxism based on the recognition of the supreme role of 1917 and the workers states.

OUT WITH THE MONARCHY! FOR THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

The British proletariat despite being lumbered with the aristocracy of labour, a trade union structure which is autocratic and the absence of a consistent policy and programme in the Labour party, have never diminished their concentration against capitalism. They are not broken by inflation and unemployment but maintain their class cohesion against the parasites and the exploiters. The intervention of the postal workers against South Africa and the prevention of the publication of the Times are examples of the class will to break with all the garbage about "democracy and freedom" which is the capitalist cover for war and dictatorship. The clash of class against class has led to the LP proposing the end of the House of Lords, why not the monarchy? The latter is against socialism, the Duke of Edinburgh has always been very uninhibited in his support of the capitalist system. Throw them out! Forward to the socialist republic! It is ridiculous for the left MPs to accept a tribute to Lord Avon — he was the class enemy! The monarchy is the class enemy. Finish with them and discuss the programme for the socialist republic.

We appeal for the reanimation of the discussion of the programme of the Labour party not just in the party but in the factories. For the nationalisation of all the key industries and the banks under workers control. For all wages to rise automatically with the rise in the cost of living and all this to be decided by popular committees of workers and housewives. For the socialist federation of Ireland, Scotland and Wales on the basis of the centralised planning of the economy. For a government of the left. Down with the European Common Market.

FOR THE SOVIET SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE!
DOWN WITH THE MONARCHY! FOR THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW No: 3

- The crisis of capitalism, the decision of the World Communist Movement and the Socialist solution.
- The present phase of the Political Revolution in China.
- The living thought of Trotsky on the 36th anniversary of his assassination.

J. Posadas

Price 50p

Order from IV International Publications

MASS WORKERS ASSEMBLIES AND WORKERS CONTROL TO CONFRONT THE CAPITALIST POLICIES OF THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT

In all the discussions taking place whether among the masses or in the camp of the capitalist apparatuses, it is not a question of a perspective of reforms. Reformism was based on the perspective of economic gains and the continued expansion of the capitalist system. No one uses the language of reforms. The process is one of continued polarisation of forces, the masses against big business, the state apparatus, the Labour government and the policies of the Labour party which sustain that government. In a previous historic stage this alliance aided and abetted by Stalinism was a guarantee for the defeat of the masses. Now with the change in the world relation of forces such a defeat is impossible. Capitalism as a world system has been decisively defeated with the emergence of a host of workers and revolutionary states. Even when, as in the rest of the world capitalist economy, a severe reduction of living standards is imposed on the masses, this does not lead to demoralisation or defeatism, it is taken as one of the inevitable consequences of the capitalist system and the alternative is seen to exist in the planned economies of the Soviet Union, East Germany etc, where unemployment does not exist nor the exhausting preoccupation with the conditions of life, prices, transport, housing etc. The problem is not the problem of the masses, it is the problem of leaderships unprepared for the process, not understanding the process and geared to a type of routinist functioning in the workers organisations which impedes the development of ideas and objectivity.

THE NEED FOR MASS ORGANS AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ANTI-CAPITALIST TENDENCY IN THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE TRADE UNIONS

The solution to the problem of the leadership of the masses in this country relates to the need for both organs where the population can express its opinions directly and for a restructuring and elevation of the forces of the left in the Labour party to break the type of functioning and discussion geared to submission to capitalism. In the trade unions and the factories, there is no organ which directly reflects the will, desires and capacity of the masses. This is why none of the union leaderships in any way represent the struggle of the masses for socialism. None of them propose the programmatic socialist alternative to capitalism, a nationalised economy, planned under workers control. They propose "reflation" or "free collective bargaining" or "import controls". Anything but an alternative collective system of production. The masses use the unions in the same way as they use the Labour party, that is as points of concentration but in the course of the struggle, the rebellion of the masses will impose structural breaks and changes in both unions and Labour party. There are no factory councils where the workers weigh all the time to propose and decide, there are shop stewards who may be more responsive to the decision of the workers at particular moments but none can represent the power of the class because that can only be expressed in mass committees that continually function and can recall at any moment any delegate. That is proletarian democracy and it does not exist in Britain. Hence the force of the masses is not expressed but mediated through their organisations whose structure is made to serve the interests of those conciliatory with capitalism. The conservatism of the existing structures was shown in the April 3rd meeting of shop stewards in Birmingham. Its conclusions were not programmatic and there was no clear perspective of where to go or what to do, but the intensity of the struggle that is coming is going to lead to a reselection of cadres in the Labour party, the trade unions and the factories. It is not a question of a movement springing simply from the base, rather a continuous evolution of cadres obliged to meet a situation where capitalism is governed entirely by the preparation for the final encounter with the workers states. It possesses no solution to any problem however small. It pollutes the environment and prevents the advance of production to meet the needs of the masses. This means that sectors in the workers organisations, the middle cadres, sectors of leaderships are obliged to change, to seek for ideas, for an orientation and this means marxism and a break with all the traditions of the past.

THE ADVANCE OF THE WORKERS STATES IS AN ORIENTATION TO THE LABOUR LEFT

Everything favours the development of the new leadership, the new marxist current in Britain, because the internal intervention of the masses against the system and the inability of capitalism to stabilise itself, even with the aid of the Labour government - because the social democracy and the aristocracy of labour are not the forces they were - relate to a world structure led by the workers states, giving clearly the alternative perspective to the criminal, brainless system of capitalist private property. This alternative is signalled by the ceaseless activity of the Soviet Union in particular, encouraging the forces of the world revolution, with the recent intervention in Africa as an example. At the same time a discussion of ideas develops which in essence demonstrates the thesis of Cde Posadas that a process of regeneration is taking place in the workers states giving rise to the recovery of essential marxist principles. In the latest phase the discussion demonstrates a course towards political revolution which is very marked and is sustained by objective changes in the workers states. Thus in Vietnam a violent process of

Turn to page 4

Women in the present stage of the class struggle

J. POSADAS

CENTRE PAGES

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

265 Friday 13 May 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year £2.00
European Marxist Review
Publications
1 year £2.00

Order from
IV International Publications,
Adminaid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL

Cheques payable to:—
'IV International Publications'

PRICE 10p

The decomposition and crisis of British imperialism, the capitalist function of the Labour Party and the organisation of the anti-capitalist left.

15-2-77

J. POSADAS

The British Labour government is an ultra-capitalist government. It has the same function as the government of Schmidt in Germany. If it does not go further, it is because it has a very powerful worker base which it cannot ignore. But this does not mean that it is possible to expect from the Labour government any important transformation. Even the measures of nationalisations are the least painful for capitalism and besides they are very well compensated and almost all enterprises which are in deficit have their debts absorbed by the government. This is an essential principle.

It is not possible to expect or believe that it is possible to influence or support the Labour government. We are against the Labour government and it is necessary to say it clearly and decisively. We are against it and we combat the Labour government. But to combat the Labour government, like the government of the German Social Democratic Party, is not to combat the masses. It is a complicated situation because the masses aspire to progress and the leadership goes in the opposite direction. This is the condition of history which exists. Our duty is to understand this process and to proceed from an essential base; no support to this government which is an ultra-capitalist government.

We celebrate the fact that the masses vote for the Labour Party but not because they elect the Labourites but because the masses want to remain unified there. Thus it is necessary to construct a left there. The base to construct the left is to attack the bourgeois leadership of the Labour Party. This is the basis. Without this, it dies. Also we are against ignoring the left. It is an error, as it is an error to expect anything of the Labour government as though it were just half-capitalist. It is completely capitalist.

The left is formed in these conditions in Britain. There is no other way of forming the left than from this process. We must intervene giving ideas, ideas, ideas, analysing, helping.

It is necessary to be clear and decisive: we do not support anything of the Labour government. If there is an attack of capitalism, of reaction, a fascist uprising against the Labour government, we appeal to the masses to defend the democratic rights and to push forward a worker and peasant government (that's defending the Labour government!) There is nothing to defend, neither Callaghan or the others. None of them represent in any way currents, tendencies of the workers movement necessary for progress. They are defenders, representatives, instruments and direct agents of the capitalist system. Our flexibility with the Labour Party, not with the government, is determined by the need to form an organic left. In the base a left exists but it is not organic.

One of the essential conditions for this task is that it is necessary to study the texts, to discuss the texts and to seek every

process, not on Britain, but on Corvalan. But through the position of Corvalan, they adopt programmatic, historic and concrete positions on Britain. This announces our possibility to influence this process. It is necessary to intervene. For this it is necessary to elevate the political understanding, an intense political life. Intense political life means the discussion, the understanding, the elevation in the understanding of all that we are writing.

This crisis of the Labour Party and of the Communist Party is not motivated by Britain but by the world which influences Britain. One of the bases of the influence are the workers states. It is necessary to dominate this process to explain to the vanguard in articles, in texts, in bulletins, to explain the nature of the resistance of the Labour leadership including the left, to the workers states. It is a nature which has two principles; one which rejects the workers state, because it is a catastrophic conception for them. They are accustomed to the free market. They are the champions of the free market, the labour left itself, because Britain constructed its power in the free market. They have never discussed the Soviet Union. There is no practical, political, theoretical life. They do not know it. The Labour base, the Labour cadres, the intellectuals of the Labour left do not know the process of the Soviet Union and take Stalin still as if he was the one which determines the life of today. But not because they are mistaken, but because they do not have the preoccupation to interest themselves in this. It is necessary to construct, to help to construct, to develop a layer of intellectuals within and outside the Labour Party, the Communist Party, in the trade union movement, in the "leftist" movement, on the understanding of the workers state.

It is necessary to explain why the function of the workers state is superior to any other regime of the economy, to analyse showing

Turn to page 2

THE DECOMPOSITION AND CRISIS OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM...

continued from page 1

that the workers state is a fundamental conception, what was Russia, what is it today? What is the condition of cultural scientific life? What afterwards determines democracy? What was there before and what now? This is to help people.

Culture is not an instrument for knowledge but for political action. The cultural elevation of the population determines that even in the bourgeois layer, the lower part of this sector is liquidated. Posadas has written a text on this; the lower part is liquidated. In other epochs it was not like this, now it is, because in other periods there wasn't a lower sector, in this epoch yes. In this epoch of the concentration of capital on a world scale, there are lower layers of capitalism which correspond to the petit bourgeoisie of before, layers which are disintegrated, which have no perspective of development either within capitalism, because they cannot compete with the large enterprises, or with the proletariat because they resist because they do not want to be proletarians. They are bourgeois who have a conception of life which is miserable. They are bourgeois, bosses, but they have a miserable life, they have the constant preoccupation of how to live on the following day. All these layers are disintegrated by the revolution. It is this layer to which Posadas refers when he speaks of the lower layers of capitalism. They are of this epoch, not of before.

The so called multi-nationals, the process of concentration of capitalism made in this way, has an effect on functioning which did not exist in the epoch of Marx or Lenin. It's "seething" capital, not "hot" but "seething". It is capital which they put in and take out and it's put elsewhere. But not only in search of profit - this is an aspect - but also because they do not have any security in what they are doing. They arrive and as soon as installed they come out. And not always in search of conditions of greater economic advantage but because they have to get out otherwise they are expropriated.

This alters the functioning of capital. This alteration does not make it change its role, but it alters the functioning, changes the effects of the functioning of capital and produces a disintegration of the homogenous structure of the capitalist system. The lower layers of capitalism feel that they cannot influence the system and survive. We are the only ones who posed this. Neither the Soviet Union nor the Chinese economists posed this. We are the only ones who did.

In Britain there is an important layer of these capitalists who now feel disintegrated and wear a collar which is changed every year, before it was every week. It is a layer of capitalism in decadence whose security in the system has fallen. They do not benefit from, they do not support or sustain the struggle of the masses but they do not make a great impediment. The families of all these are anti-capitalist.

At the same time this shows a profound deterioration of the capitalist structure of Britain and an influence of the workers states. In Britain there is an influence of the workers states superior to that which appears in the literature, because part contributor to the destruction of

the secure structure of the British capitalist system, is the advance of the workers states. Ponomariov was not invited because the Labour people invited him. It was British capitalism which needed Ponomariov. It was a necessity for its world competition. Ponomariov was invited by British capitalism and by the social democracy to provide a political support, a base for British capitalism, the bureaucracy of the Labour Party and the trade unions. But at the same time because they need the help of the Soviet Union, it was not made as an appeal answering to the process of growth of the leadership, no, no on the contrary it was a question of being hidden behind Ponomariov. The Soviet Union

It is necessary to discuss the resistance which exists in the workers movement, in the trade unions and in the Labour Party to the workers state, the discussion on the workers state. Such a discussion is fundamental. It is necessary to elevate the theoretical and political discussion. In Britain, the nature of the workers state is not discussed. In Britain, Australia and Germany, they don't discuss it. But in France and Italy they do. The capitalist press, including the Socialist has to discuss in Italy - including Craxi, secretary of the Socialist Party - on the quality of the economy, on the historic nature of the economy, private property or nationalised property. And the Socialists have to reach the conclusion that half is statified and half in private hands. Even with this, being a mixture which cannot coincide - water and wine can coincide, water and fire, no - Craxi shows a retreat from capitalism, a very great influence of the historic process of the workers states. The socialists never accepted statified property. In their programme, in their discussions, their congresses, in their preambles, epilogues, and prologues, private property was "sacrosanct" as they said. Now they say "half, yes, half no". This means that in the Socialist Party, the conclusion is already posed that the historic solution is to nationalise. In Britain it's the same in Germany the same. It is the apparatus which prevents the steam coming out. They put the stopper on the bottle and don't allow the steam to flow. But when Craxi who is in one of the parties most linked to the capitalist system has to accept now a mixed economy, statified property - private property, to prevent the formation of the Stalinist bureaucracy, when he has to admit, yes, that statified property is a factor of progress, it is a change in the movement of thought of the Socialist Party because they undertake a programme which until now they had ignored. What is the form of the economy for the progress of history? Before it was "good administration, good representatives, good bosses, good policies". Now, no, now it is the programmatic conception and the historic relations of the property regime which is discussed. There is a transformation. It is being discussed below, and is developing in Germany and also in Britain.

All these nationalisations which are secondary from every point of view, are not only a means of self defence of British imperialism, but a concession made to the least evil, and also to defend the structure of capitalist profit. All the enterprises which they expropriate, they compensate very well, enterprises which make no contribution and give no profit. The government did not declare nor project nationalisation of any important enterprise. On the contrary the law subsidises them and how!

In the British Labour government, there is nothing like Craxi. Nevertheless when Craxi who forms part of this world socialist movement and this conception of the economy and of social relations has to announce that he accepts half private property and half statified property, it is because there is an influence within the cadres of the Socialist Party on a world scale.

In Japan in the Socialist Party, the left has conquered among three currents, but all currents are unified against the right. They have defeated the right and they have a programme close to the communist movement. It is significant that in the socialist movement such an influence can arise. But such an influence as in Japan does not occur awaiting events from on top. It is a struggle which is based on the masses and with a programme of

sent Ponomariov, because this also is convenient to them. It is not a prepared work, not a synchronisation of activities, but British capitalism and the trade unions have one path and an interest and the Soviet Union has another. The interest on the part of British capitalism was to utilise the visit of the Soviet Union as a means of acquiring prestige and weight before the rest of European capitalism. In part also in the competition, which today is clear and decisive with France and Germany which form a block, a united front against Britain and North America. They appealed to Ponomariov to form part of this block. Ponomariov went without being part of the block, he was impelled by the interest of the Soviet Union to impel the left of the Labour Party.

the left. And never in the government. These changes in Japan, these changes in Italy and the changes also in France are not circumstantial results, local or regional but come from the influence of history and influence means that nationalised property resolves the problems which private property cannot resolve. The conclusions on the political leadership are independent of the economic solution of history; they are independent. Stalin dominated the workers state, nationalised property remained, it developed and influenced the world and Stalin remained outside. It is necessary to consider this influence also in Britain. There is no discussion, there is no life, there is no literature, we have to carry out this task and it is not a task of great magnitude; it is short, very short, of a very few years.

It's only necessary to see what has happened with the Socialist Party of Italy. Craxi accepts now things which de Martino did not accept before. "Half nationalised". Good, we are in agreement. "Half no, because otherwise the bureaucrats dominate, they eat everything". We say "you want the bourgeoisie to eat everything". There is a very powerful influence on the world socialist leaderships.

To understand how to work, it is necessary to understand all this. The error of not considering

the left is very important but less. It is an error but less, but what is an error of principle is to consider that it is possible to make of the Labour government an instrument of the revolution. No, no, never. In the best conditions, the Labour government is a government of the Queen of Britain. Nothing more than this. If they have to yield, it is because it is the least evil for them. It is necessary to seek not waiting to change the government but to form a left to break this leadership and this government, to appeal for a revolutionary government, not to say that if this government may fall, let another come. Our objective now is not to change the government but the objective is to impel a left which may go to the government as a socialist republic, a democratic socialist republic, which is a slogan we posed two years ago and which it is necessary to impel every day.

It is necessary to consider the necessity of a better theoretical and political elevation. Our party influences quite a lot of "leftists". It is not true that the "leftist" groups can form a conscious left. They do not have a programme, not Grant not Mandel nor any of them. The condition of Britain is that it is necessary to form a left with a consistent anti-capitalist programme, and to mobilise

A fundamental problem is the scientific preoccupation with the defence of the workers state, of nationalisation and to reiterate two fundamental points for Britain; Out with the monarchy, for a Democratic Socialist Republic! as the Soviet Union was called in the beginning, and the defence of nationalised property, which is the solution for the problems of the economy in Britain. It is necessary to form a left with this programme, not an occasional left, tactical for an electoral or trade union problem, but programmatically for this. Hence it is necessary to elevate the understanding that it is not possible to expect anything of the Labour Party such as it is. It is necessary to break the Labour Party, it cannot be transformed, it is necessary to break it, to break it, and to break it, is to form the left. If the breaking afterwards takes another form, it may change, but it is necessary to form a left with this programme. Otherwise it cannot be made. Now one cannot hope for the formation of the left. It can advance tactically, it can support, sustain, including the government on one or another occasion, not to sustain the government as a whole but supporting a measure for example of nationalisation. We support statification, which is not to sustain the government, but statification. If the government makes a measure of agreement with the Soviet Union, we support this measure but we make our differentiation with the objectives of the government. The government does it to make the capitalist system survive, we do it to weaken the capitalist system.

These are the problems which it is necessary to discuss, which are the essential base to understand the nature of our tactic. In relation to the necessity of the left, it is necessary to insist, to reiterate the programmatic aspects, not to silence, not to keep silent on criticisms of the government, nor to be dedicated to criticisms of the government, but to construct the labour left.

There are unequalled conditions now to make a base of the left, to open a discussion. For example our newspaper or a review should open a discussion on the left, what is the solution for Britain? programme, policy and tactic, programme of nationalisations, workers control, programme of the united front of trade unions, labour sectors and all the groups, all the tendencies, a discussion of the programme of statifications with workers control, to open a discussion on all this.

Also towards the Communist Party. This change of the Communist Party is very important because the British Communist Party is one of the most backward. It is necessary to make a text aimed at the Communist Party, appealing to them to support this policy, the policy of statification, of planning, of transformation of Britain. They do not have in their programme the transformation of Britain to a workers state. But what is the road to take for the progress of Britain? It is a

tactically, seeking to impel a leadership which may go from the Trade Unions to the Party to impel this. This is not done only with a trade union work, but with a work of literature, literature, literature and intervention. In the case of our party which is small, the literature is indispensable because the literature gives ideas to the intellectual vanguard which grows much more rapidly than our party, grows infinitely more rapidly as happens also in France. In France the left in the Communist party and the Socialist Party grows infinitely more than the growth in capacity of our party. To achieve this influence, to promote it and to elevate our authority, it is necessary to publish, publish, publish, publish. Although it does not have effects now, it will have effects within the Labour Party in the formation of the anti capitalist programmatic left.

The conclusion is the necessity to elevate the discussion, not at the level of whether the Labour government can or cannot change. No, it is necessary to exclude this, it can change nothing. In no way do we support the Labour government. As a government we are against. It is a capitalist government. We support one or other measure as if we supported a measure of the government of Italy.

conception very simple and logical: progress is determined by the relation with property and the economy, with production. Good what is the form? Thus it is necessary to propose - the best administrator which capitalism has is the Labour Party, and the only thing which it has done is to favour the concentration of capital. And there has been no progress for the masses. It is necessary to give all these explanations daily. The economy led by the bourgeoisie, the conservatives or the Labour sectors has had the same objective, to extend the concentration of big business, to diminish the quantity of capitalists, of the petit bourgeoisie, middle and poor and to diminish the standard of living of the working class. It increases unemployment and as a consequence they increase the bases of repression. What is the change? A better administration a better Labour government? This has no solution.

It is necessary to make appeals to discuss this, to the communist themselves. When they speak of the dictatorship of the proletariat, defending it, this does not mean that they have the understanding. It is necessary to make a plan of appeals aimed at the Communist Party, to the Labour vanguard of the trade unions and Labour Party with analysis and conclusions aimed to include the intellectuals, the leaders, the middle cadres of the Labour Party; it is necessary to

make a selection of our orientation, programmatic, organisational. If we aim at the masses as a whole, the effect is very remote and not immediate. It can have an immediate effect in conditions of great mobilisation, of a profound mobilisation and agitation. It can have an effect but the objective is to impel the leaderships which exist. It is not possible to create new leaderships in a short stage. And the problems are in short stages and are in the left of the trade unions and of the Labour Party. It is necessary to write to impel the leaderships which already exist. This is not to aim at one or another or a strike, a factory occupation - in which it is also necessary to intervene - but not

waiting to organise there the leadership, but to impel the movement which in its turn impels the leaders. Our strategy is to impel the middle cadres, the leading cadres, the cadres in process of advance in the Labour Party and in the trade unions, and in the Communist Party. Also in France there is the same process. We cannot win either authority or base or support in a direct form but impelling within the process, which is the most logical form to win strength. It is different in Spain. In Spain we can win directly. In Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Argentina, Bolivia also. As is happening. In Italy also but with repercussion in the Communist Party.

ignore them and help inclination and influence towards anti soviet sentiment.

We write on Biermann, the singer Biermann does not interest us, the song of the Soviet Union interests us. We are not distant from any song. We understand that Biermann has no importance. He himself is neither organiser nor leader nor political orientator nor theoretical orientator, nothing. But we take Biermann whom the bourgeoisie take as a centre to impel against the Soviet Union, we take him as a centre to aim at the communist masses and those who are parallel to the communist movement; socialists, labourists, trade unionists to educate them and it has had a great echo. And we have impelled Communist parties like the Italian to change their positions over Biermann and now no one speaks about Biermann.

There is a public for these themes on all sides and in Britain also. There is an enormous field for Posadism anywhere in the world. Posadism is not a new current of the world communist movement. It is the conscious representation of the marxist necessity of the world communist movement. And in Britain there is no conscious or unconscious. There is a communist movement which is disintegrated, which has no programme, policy or objectives for anything. The groups do not have it either, they are disputers who go in search of a public, but which do not have the objective of educating the world communist movement nor the Labour masses. We carry out this function.

It is necessary to develop the

theoretical understanding of what the Labour Party is. The Labour Party must be broken. We do not say "it is necessary to break it", we are impelling the left which is the way to break it, a left with a programme and education of the problems of the workers state in Britain.

Ponomariov did not come to benefit the queen. He went to impel the support of the Soviet Union in Britain and to weigh against the Britain-American united front, to weigh against this. It is a bureaucratic policy which is not now strictly bureaucratic. On an infinity of occasions there are forms of bureaucratic expression but the programmatic conclusions are correct. They were not so before, now, yes. Before they went to impel capitalism, today they do not go to impel capitalism. Today they are going to impel the workers movement and seek to base themselves on a sector of capitalism against the other. Stalin based himself on a sector of capitalism against the other, against the revolution. These base themselves on a sector of capitalism against another, while they impel Angola. It is another stage of history. The left groups, do not understand this, neither those who passed through Trotskyism like Grant or Mandel, because they have another conception and another perspective of the process. They do not see that the structure of the world is defined which means that there are about twenty workers states and thirty revolutionary states. This is the structure of the world and this cannot change. It is not possible

to create new forces to dispute the leadership of this structure. It is absurd not to see this.

It is on the basis of the understanding of this structure that it is necessary to intervene. And to intervene cannot be done expecting a movement of competition with them but developing this strength. This is the historic nature of our scientific capacity to observe this process and of this process, partial regeneration in some aspects achieves now the limits of conscious regeneration like Vietnam. And there are revolutions which commence with complete regeneration, in the form, if still not in the process of development like Mozambique. It is another stage of history. It is not the previous stage in which it was necessary to wait. Now there exists a process in which the orientation of history is the necessity of the workers state and the regeneration of the workers states. This opens the conditions for a theoretical, political and programmatic discussion and of our influence, including the Soviet Union.

There is a new left in development in Britain. The present left is a timid left which still supports itself on a conciliation between a programme of statification and the Labour government. The next left has to be nationalisations without conciliation with the Labour government. It has to be the open fight and this open fight lies in the Labour Party, the trade unions and outside the trade unions.

J. POSADAS 15.2.77

The Labour Party concentrates all the strength in Britain, the Communist Party has shattered itself against the Labour Party. It is not through backwardness that the British proletariat supports the Labour Party. It's the same as we had spoken about the backwardness of the soviet masses in the workers state in the time of Stalin. The masses found a centre of assembly, organisation and centralisation. They feel that this puts them in communication between themselves and it is a centre which can influence and be influenced. The masses have this understanding. They do not have the scientific cultural policy but they have the practical understanding which reaches the understanding of scientific cultural policy; the practice of daily life. Hence they remain concentrated in the parties and they do not abandon the parties. Otherwise they would have abandoned the party in the Soviet Union and they would have united with the Germans when they invaded the USSR. And the masses did not unite themselves to the Nazis, they smashed them and afterwards they smashed Stalin, without damaging the workers state.

There is a vanguard in Britain which our party can construct. It has neither the habit, the custom, the tradition or the development of scientific discussions but it has a great scientific preoccupation. The Labour and trade union

leadership, the communists themselves, and the groups conceal from the masses the essential problems of what is happening in the world. Neither the left groups nor Mandel, nor Grant discuss the essential problems, on the contrary they

WOMEN IN THE PRESENT STAGE OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE

4.4.76

The rebellion of women is not motivated because they are preoccupied with the problems of abortion or individual problems. These give them an opportunity to show their discontent with the slavery which men impose on them in the cultural, trade union and political movement.

In these demonstrations, they are saying, we want to have the right to decide like men. It is a problem created by relations that exist in private property. Women have to decide but also men on abortion. In a particular case the woman can decide. When it is a general issue the man also has to decide, but also has to participate in all the problems of abortion. This then establishes a unity in the sentiment, in the consciousness and in the intelligence to resolve together the common interest of humanity. There has to be the same political, trade union and cultural life. The woman has to be as much the leader as the man. It is not a question of making a list of twenty men, of twenty women but to develop woman in all posts and to develop woman in the conception that she is as capable as the man. Still it is not like this, because women are the result of thousands of years and this cannot just stop now.

There are advances in various countries but the Soviet Union and China have contributed little on this question. The Angola revolution, Mozambique, Polisario, Indo China have contributed much to the development of the equality of women in society. The East German workers state has also advanced, but less than these movements because in Germany

for example, they have a conception of an apparatus. Thus women have to go to open a road in the apparatus, conquering the resistances of social interests of a social anachronistic conception, a lack of marxist understanding, because they have a big apparatus and a very powerful team of men in industry and technology who can develop without the need for women. On the other hand in revolutions which have a very backward base economically, in which there are no formed teams of men, women develop the same as men because there isn't an apparatus a structure which impedes or smashes them. Then they are allowed to advance.

It is necessary to be based on all this to generalise it. It is not the problem of fighting for the defence of women only in the capitalist system but in the workers states also, to see that the workers state gives an example. It is the workers states who send diplomats, revolutionary leaders and give them great importance, for example the Vietnamese comrade. There are others but they are exceptions. It is necessary to see that women develop in the same way as men, in all positions, organisations, leaderships. It is necessary to develop this preoccupation in women so that they have the historic place to be able to develop in society, otherwise they are constrained.

It is not a problem which is going to be resolved in the capitalist system nor for a considerable period in the workers states, because there is already a structure of society in

which the bureaucracy participates and has an interest to defend because women in incorporating themselves in the struggles are more to the left than all the leftists. It is a lie when they say that women are conservative, that they are passive. It is a problem for which it is necessary to wait to intervene and which is not going to be resolved with these demonstrations which are good. It is necessary to propose slogans of "women in the trade union leadership, women in the leaderships of the political parties". And not in a protectionist way, so that a woman gets a post but it's the men who decide. This is the backwardness of the Communist and Socialist parties and these in their turn are the result of the backwardness of the leadership of the workers states, of the bureaucratic regime, of the bureaucratic conception and of the slow progress in the workers states, which is not uniform, not general. This advances a great deal in political understanding, because this affects more directly the bureaucratic interest, but in the social, cultural and scientific interests, it is much more distant. The bureaucracy has much less interest in this and fears that if women intervene, women will go further because they do not have the structure of interests which the bureaucratic apparatus has and the women who seek careerism can be counted on the fingers. There are women who seek to make careerism and corruption but they are relatively few. The immense majority of women want to intervene objectively.

Society does not prepare

women for a leading and objective function. The life of the woman in the family is oppressive, develops in a relation of rancour, of irritation, of dispute, of submission and develops in her a sentiment of demand. But the social struggle overcomes the family limitation. Then women behave not as a reaction of family life but as an intelligent expression of the world class struggle.

Now it is not the epoch of Rosa Luxembourg. She is an example. Now there are multitudes, millions. It is necessary to see the limitations of this revolutionary leadership, of the workers parties, of the trade unions where men of eighty can intervene but children of six and the women do not intervene. This is to say when there are two poles of society and all intervene save for women, it is because there is an interest in oppression which prevents women intervening. And when they make her intervene, it is as an element of oppression not of thought, of leadership, of capacity. Hence women are rancorous towards men. But the social struggle diverts the rancour, elevates and makes women conscious, that there is no need to be rancorous but to develop a unity to elevate the relation of human dignity. Then the demand is not to demand simply for women, but to elevate human dignity in such a way that women can be equal to men with full rights, with all the attributes to intervene in life. Women have greater problems because they are mothers, it is true. It is a consequence of nature but a better social relation eliminates nevertheless this. Men

undoubtedly cannot substitute for women but it is compensated for in social relation.

Before, childbirth was a catastrophe. Today childbirth is more and more accepted as a normal affair. This is to say men do not intervene as a substitution for women or sharing the pain of women. But the elevation of the social relations, creates the climate, the relation, the social and intelligent understanding so that childbirth can take place without pain. Painless childbirth elevates the intelligence and eliminates part of the pain from social relations. They are all problems of intelligence, of human dignity which for now are isolated and separate demands.

All the problems of women, the child, the old people are the results of the social organisation which private property has created with the conception of human relations in which the weakest sectors through economic relations pays the price, which means women. She was the weakest not because she is weak, but because she has to assume among other things, the function of maternity and through a series of attitudes and activities, she was not able, was not in the conditions to intervene immediately, nothing more. She developed a series of activities which made the women inferior, compared with her previous quality and elevation, not because her qualities diminished but society made her qualities diminish. It created the psychology, the mentality of the woman, of inferiority to the man. This is the world division of labour.

J. POSADAS 4.4.76

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TRIP OF PODGORNÝ AND CASTRO TO AFRICA

The interventions of Castro and Podgorný in Africa show the leadership of the world socialist revolution by the workers states.

These interventions by Castro and Podgorný are of very great importance for the world socialist revolution and for the increasing level of the intervention of the workers states in that process. They correspond to the renewed weight placed upon "proletarian internationalism" in the workers states led by the Soviet Union, and are part of the process of regeneration of these states analysed by Comrade Posadas in innumerable articles. This means essentially that the policy of the Soviet Union is returning in part to the principles held by the Bolsheviks, that is the active stimulus and support to revolutionary movements, the famous "export of revolution".

The intervention towards Africa is particularly powerful, in the sense, that not just one country is involved but a whole continent. Beginning directly with Angola and supporting Mozambique, now the Soviet Union intervenes directly to stimulate the fight with the imperialists of South Africa and in the course of this intervenes towards Uganda and now Ethiopia. Such a policy does not result from the "idealism" of the workers states but is a necessity resulting from their structure and development. It is a profound need because the workers state is essentially transitory, it is not a completed class structure like capitalism, but only a step in the direction of socialism. It is incomplete and whilst it contains features of the new that are decisive i.e. nationalised property, planning, monopoly of foreign trade, it also from the point of view of social relations, maintains bourgeois features, i.e. inequality in the norms of distribution and consumption. But to transcend this "unity of opposites" requires the advance to socialism, but that requires the superseding of the divided capitalist market on a world scale. It is impossible for the workers state to develop, to use all the forces it possesses, to expand to advance towards socialism without freeing all other nations. Only then does it fulfil its "striving", its objective and free itself from the bondage of bourgeois norms.

PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Inevitably the more the world system of workers states develops, that is the rhythm of their development, production and productivity, the constant application of science to production, the more the need to develop social and economic relations with the whole world, the greater the pressure for the unification with the rest of humanity. But this means confronting the resistance of capitalism, hence the export of revolution and hence Podgorný's and Castro's visit. In concrete terms the Soviet Union from its own nature is obliged to adopt the conceptions of the permanent revolution. Stalinism derided the permanent revolution, that is the conception that it is possible to leap stages and advance even from very backward conditions to socialism and not proceed through capitalism. It proposed "socialism in one country" and in so doing objectively truncated the development of the Soviet Union, retarded the development of other workers states and the

world socialist revolution. But Stalinism was not able to prevent ultimately the expansion of the Soviet Union. The dedication of the masses to maintaining the workers state against world capitalism and the nazis led to the expansion of the Soviet Union so that now Eastern Europe, China, Cuba etc make up an army of workers states. The visit of Castro and Podgorný are the continued expressions of this necessity of the workers states, but in a stage where the legacy of Stalinist thinking is being pushed aside and a partially conscious return to marxism takes place. This tends to mean a conscious acknowledgement of reaffirmation of marxist principles such as proletarian internationalism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the non-necessity of fixed stages of development and the ending of bureaucratic functioning in the party (this last most graphically seen in the evolution of the Vietnamese comrades).

THE ECONOMIES HAVE TO BE NATIONALISED

At the same time the process of the African revolution has shown convincingly that there is no solution for backward economies save nationalised economy, planning and mass intervention in this planning through organs of the masses — very consciously affirmed in Mozambique with the last conference of Frelimo and its transformation into a revolutionary marxist party. The nationalist movements advance from limited nationalist objectives to socialist objectives and in all this, the "black-white" struggle is replaced by the capitalism versus socialism struggle. No economy has developed in Africa which can satisfy the needs of the masses on capitalist basis. Zaire, Kenya, Sudan are just a few examples of the stagnation and poverty allied with great wealth for a few which result from the capitalist "road".

The intervention of Podgorný and Castro to Africa bringing with them the material aid and the immense authority of the workers state reflects and at the same time will stimulate, further discussions and orientations within the workers states themselves. The leaderships of Mozambique and Ethiopia have shown a decision and socialist objectives which did not arise from the conscious line of the CPSU but arose from the objective strength of the workers states which gave these revolutionary teams in Africa a new historic perspective, plus fusion with Trotskyist conceptions maintained outside the workers states. The coming together of the forces of the workers states and of the African revolution is a confirmation that the world is ready for communism.

THE WORKERS STATES HAVE THE INITIATIVE

It is a striking confirmation of the dynamism of the world course of the revolution where the relation of forces allow the workers states to intervene in such a way and imperialism is impotent to prevent it. When the magnitude of this intervention is assessed, it demonstrates the rapidity towards the confrontation of system versus system. The development of the world capitalist economy has tended to concentrate all the resources, the capital and the technology in the hands of a very few nations.

No other "young" nations have the slightest possibility of competing. Thus capitalism possesses very limited internal resources within Africa itself to use as a stable base, whereas the workers states find an objective support in millions of people!

At the same time it is very notable that the initiative has passed into the hands of the workers states. Where is the counter response of imperialism? Since Kissinger, Yankee imperialism has had to work through the British and what a feeble performance! Castro, representative of a small nation, tours the continent and launches uninhibited attacks on imperialism and the latter can do nothing. No major capitalist statesman can make journeys and open up a new perspective for the oppressed continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America. de Gaulle used to do it but that was a long time ago and it was totally false then.

The trip has to be seen as an expression of the need for the workers states to prevail over capitalism, the need to create a world structure of workers states which advance in a harmonious and scientific way to communism. At the same time, as it is a natural expression of the transcending of "natural" frontiers by the workers state to reproduce itself, it is within that, a conscious preparation for the final settlement of accounts with imperialism. This is a means of depriving capitalism of points of support, weakening its world defences and diminishing its authority. It is a partial preparation for the inevitable conflict. Such a process intensifies the relationship between theory and practice and enlivens the discussions in the world communist movement, affirming the need for an increasingly coherent policy by the leaders of the workers states to explain its policy at home and abroad in class terms, in marxist terms. Podgorný was less the representative of the soviet bureaucracy and more the representative of the workers state. There are still stages before a conscious regeneration is achieved in the workers states but the Castro-Podgorný intervention is an indication of the depth of the process and its historic weight.

construction is taking place with the wholesale expulsion of party members, a process of controlling the functioning of the bureaucracy and the administration, while at the same time confidently integrating sectors of the former regime in the construction of socialism. A recent article in Pravda put all its centre on the need for leaders to be at one with the masses, to learn from them and those who don't should be thrown out. A series of functionaries have been thrown out of the soviet trade union for their bureaucratic methods.

Although discussion is still not public in the Soviet Union, it is on the road to being so. Just as Podgorný's visit to Africa objectively impels the permanent revolution externally, facilitating total regeneration, so the discussions within the workers states on proletarian democracy and proletarian internationalism feed the process towards total regeneration which requires the complete marxist consciousness and application. All these experiences are diametrically opposed to the previous Stalinist experience and give a basis for security and confidence and reorientation for the left forces in Britain inside and outside the Labour party, unions and the Communist party.

THE SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE TO THE PRO-IMPERIALIST POLICIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

While the catastrophe continues for capitalism in Britain, the electoral victory of the left parties in the French elections is a reflection of the world ambience for socialism. The Common Programme with all its limitations means an anti-capitalist intervention in the functioning of the economy and the masses are not going to stay there but open opportunities for the complete overthrow of the system. These are experiences which are going to influence in Britain. Whilst the French proletariat does this, the preposterous visit of Owen representing British imperialism shows the impotence of the Union Jack to achieve anything save further loss of authority in front of the intervention of the workers states. British capitalism has lost the means of sustaining itself by the authority of Empire and imperial arrogance. This destroys the insularity, the complacency, the belief that Britain is somehow special, and superior to other nations. Now also an essential structure of capitalism, its police force manifest its lack of confidence in capitalism, its desire to be assimilated to the rest of the population in the right to strike against the system.

The crisis of the government and the Labour party has been demonstrated in the Ashfield election with the massive abstention of Labour supporters. In the past the electoral manipulators and careerists in the Labour party scowled at such results but proceeded in a God like manner to accommodate to the system. Now the weight of the world relation of forces is totally unfavourable to capitalism. When Foot has to use the term "socialist republic" — and only the Posadists have maintained this slogan — it is because he tries to make use of an ambience which is developing strongly. Union apparatuses like the Scottish TUC can still come out for the continuation of the social contract, can still contain the masses but the world process no longer confirms the power of Union Jack Labour and Union bosses.

In the struggles that exist and are to come, it is essential to place the emphasis on mass WORKERS ASSEMBLIES with the object of WORKERS CONTROL. Prices cannot be regulated by pro-capitalist sectors, by the government which simply administers capitalism and cannot in any way be objective, but by POPULAR COMMITTEES acting in the interests of the population. In face of a continuous inflation, all wages must rise with the cost of living and this must be measured by the mass committees, not by the statisticians of the bourgeoisie. But only the programme of NATIONALISATIONS UNDER WORKERS CONTROL and the PLANNING OF PRODUCTION in the interests of and with the intervention of the masses can solve the problems of society.

**OUT WITH THE MONARCHY! FOR THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!
FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE TRADE UNIONS
AND LABOUR PARTY ON THIS PROGRAMME!**

VIVA THE PUBLICATION OF THE FIRST ISSUES OF:-

- Lucha Obrera (newspaper of the Venezuelan section)
- The newspaper of the Greek section

Fourth International Publications.

— Eurocommunism, the progress of Europe and Socialism.	30p
— European Marxist Review No. 3.	50p
Contains texts on . . .	
The crisis of capitalism.	
The present stage in China.	
The living thoughts of Trotsky.	
— The meeting of the Socialist International, the Congress of the Spanish P.S.O.E. and the world process of the revolution.	10p
— The crisis of capitalism in Britain and the organisation of the left with an anti-capitalist programme.	10p
— The organisation of the left of the Socialist Party and the class struggle in capitalist Germany.	20p
— The draft Resolution for the Congress of the Vietnamese Communist Party and the function of Posadism.	15p

Order from the Party's address.

The Earthquake in Rumania and in the Capitalist States

J. POSADAS

9-3-77

The silence of the Soviets in the first days of the earthquake in Rumania does not indicate that they are not going to help. There are discussions and the Soviets are negotiating an investment because the damage is quite extensive. Above all it is an enormous loss for all the industrial apparatus and it is the Soviets who can help them, including Rumanian petrol which seems to be involved with the earthquake.

These blows like the earthquake are a very great damage and at the same time with the damage, there is a certain advantage because they will reconstruct with the latest developments of science, whereas the installations are twenty years old. Now factory equipment is much better, more rapid and there is an industrial base of workers which before did not exist.

It does not compensate, because there is a very great loss. It is possible that the Soviets are going to help with the establishment of entire factories with modern methods and this can advance production one hundred percent.

Now if capitalism had an interest in a developing market, it could establish textile factories which could mean for every thousand workers, eight hundred could be thrown out. Textile factories are progressing even in full crisis. In textiles, in Italy employment is diminishing by 26% but production increases by 22%. Italy is one of the big capitalist countries which has much domestic manufacture. 150,000 textile workers work in the home. It is very backward, because to work in this way to earn a wage, means to work twenty hours a day. And this causes tremendous family crises. It means a life of nervous tension. They live with this.

The Soviets are going to intervene in Rumania. If they do not intervene, it is necessary to see if they are exerting a pressure on the Rumanians that in principle is not correct, but neither is it reactionary. It does not have a useful effect on the world working class. These are bureaucratic methods, but they are not counter revolutionary.

But the attitude of the Rumanians shows that the workers states have to be preoccupied with the population. It is not a question of categories, of sectors, of a sector of the workers aristocracy, but of the population. It is necessary to see if there is sufficient attention to everyone. It is necessary to see if they are not better towards the functionaries, the skilled workers and it is necessary to see the attitude of the trade unions, how they speak now of the government, if they do not criticise it, because it favours a layer. But for what is known the help is for everybody. And the working class has quite a lot of T.V. sets. In Germany seventy percent has television, in the Soviet Union also, in the workers state before, in the epoch of Stalin, to have a radio was a luxury, as also a pair of shoes or a television set. And in Rumania now they have two pair of shoes. It is necessary to see what layers benefit because it appears that the earthquake is in central zones. They say they aid everyone.

At the same time as the help to Rumania, the political unification of the workers states is necessary. According to the information which has appeared in the daily newspapers, Ceausescu criticised openly the delay, the torpidity the bureaucratic interest which has impeded an immediate mobilisation and on the contrary, subjects people to the local interest of groups, of sectors.

The stage in Rumania is very elevated. When the Soviets are slow to intervene in the conditions of Rumania in which it is clear that they support Rumania, it is because the Soviets have a much greater objective, that is, to eliminate this leadership or to impose more open changes on this leadership in relation to the USSR, for a greater link with the Soviet Union. Behind this silence, there is all this. It is a silence in the form of an intention to weigh, whose intention is correct but the methods, no. They could do the same in another way.

This is a stage which is developing and concentrated. When the Soviets do not send help to Rumania (but that they are going to have send anyway) it shows that they are making a pressure on Rumania to make it change for a more direct relation with the workers states, not dependency which is a lie, but a better relation with the USSR for the global confrontation with the capitalist system. The Soviet bureaucracy defends bureaucratic interests, but it is obliged to defend the workers states against the capitalist system.

It is a more elevated stage, every day more elevated of the final settlement of accounts. They are relations of system against system. They are not relations of one or other workers state, they are of system against system, a definition towards the confrontation. Capitalism feels it.

All the attitude of capitalism is that of someone who is paying the price, that little Rumania is also not at the side of the Yanks. This is the resistance, the movements of resistance of imperialism.

This is a process which requires more and more clarification in representation of system against system, more and more. Thus the small countries like Rumania have to intervene in this process.

In 1940, there was the invasion of Finland and Poland by the USSR. Hitler invaded Poland and there was the Hitler-Stalin pact, but Hitler invaded Poland and was going to invade other countries of Europe including Finland, not immediately because of the frontier with the USSR, but it was in their plans to do this. The Soviets occupied the other half of Poland and Finland before the Germans. It indicated a reaction against the pact, a lack of confidence in the making of the pact. The measure was correct, the method afterwards was insufficient. It was necessary to appeal to the working class to form soviets. If they appealed to the working class to form soviets, the war would have been over quicker and the nazis would have been defeated before.

Hence the objective was correct, the methods insufficient or not correct, not correct does not mean bad or against, not correct means that all the possibilities of alliance with the working class of this country or to impel the revolutionary movement do not develop in this country.

Continuously cases like this are going to occur. As the Soviets have not declared support, it is because they are seeking to chuck people out. On the other hand the support of Germany and Czechoslovakia, led by the Soviet Union shows that through these, they show they want to help but not this leadership. There is a struggle and Ceausescu is one who flirts most with imperialism.

It is necessary to see that the visits that Ceausescu of Rumania made to five African countries, is an agreement with the workers states although it is the country which appears less linked, more resistant to integration with the

Turn to page 2

The process of partial regeneration and the final settlement of accounts

Centre
page

J. POSADAS

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

266 Friday 10th June 1977

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,
Admainid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL.

Other party address:—
24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

Editorial

THE LEFT IN THE LABOUR PARTY HAS TO CAMPAIGN FOR THE PROGRAMME OF NATIONALISATIONS, WORKERS CONTROL AND THE PLANNED ECONOMY

•For meetings in the factories to discuss this programme.

All the recent events on a world scale show that conditions are maturing which allow the possibility of an elevation in the functioning of the Labour Left. Constantly, the masses are expressing their will to change society. When the police in Britain declare overwhelmingly their desire for the right to strike, it has a very profound significance. The police is an organ built for the defence of the capitalist class, so that when it expresses such a total rebellion, against the central power, it points to the vehement militancy of the working class in its opposition to the capitalist class. The police could not act in the way they are doing without such an ambience on the part of the population which makes the police feel isolated in their function and want to have the rights of a worker to strike against the system. British capitalism, therefore, disintegrates in the same way as capitalism on a world scale. Its fate is bound up with the world capitalist system.

Essentially, this will to combat of the masses is the reason for the very defensive and weak policy of imperialism in this stage. Imperialism has to disguise its sinister intentions to launch the war on the workers states by carrying out a conciliatory facade to deceive the petit-bourgeoisie. Young raises the militant salute, with this intention. The Yanks withdraw troops from South Korea, but if they were serious about "peace", they would liquidate the nuclear bases there, which they have no intention of doing. Their policy is a dangerous one because it tends to lead to demoralisation and disintegration within their own camp. The capitalist class is trying to centralise itself, to put itself in agreement, in order to gain time. The summit meeting in London was such an attempt, in which there was no discussion related in any way on how to solve the economic problems, and which turned out to be a fiasco, as this is the stage of increasing sharpening of contradictions between them. The conference laid the basis however, for an increase in the military budgets of NATO, a conference in which the British Labour government was integrally part.

The contrast between the concentration and shrinking of the boundaries of the capitalist system and the expansion of the alternative social system, the workers states, is striking. The leaderships of the workers states gain an increasing confidence from this process, which is shown by their statement that they 'are no longer encircled by capitalism'. It is the workers states who decide history in this stage. The need for the workers states to expand is the essential basis of the partial regeneration of these leaderships, expressed both in internal and external changes in the policies of the workers states. But certain norms of action are being generalised, for example, in relation to the support given to the African revolution, which takes on a more consistent form than before. Despite the bureaucratic leaderships, there is a political elevation shown in the statements of Castro, that it is possible for backward countries to

advance directly to socialism. Objectively this shows a fusion with the concept of permanent revolution of Trotsky, even though Trotsky is not mentioned by name. Inevitably, the more the process advances, the more Trotskyism has to be recognised, and there are instances where it has gone quite far, with the recognition of the role of a Trotskyist militant, by the Vietnamese Communist Party, and the Polish Communist Party, who admit that if they had listened to Trotsky they would not have lost as many cadres as they did.

The immense richness of the quality of the struggles of the masses does not find a representative in the existing leaderships, either in the trade unions or the workers parties. The struggles are unified in will, but do not have the centralisation of a programme for the solution of the problems of capitalism. The tremendous success of the general strike in France, the constant tumult in Italy and Spain show that the working class seeks to impose changes on the leaderships of their own trade unions and parties and are preparing the struggle for Governments of the Left. There is a constant decomposition of capitalism, which takes the form of an empirical disintegration, in the sense that there is no force consistently and consciously intervening against the system with a programme. And yet the conditions are over-ripe for such a programme. Capitalism has shown that it has no solution to the crisis, it can give only increased unemployment, declining social services, sharpening competition between small and large capitalists, in which the small enterprises are liquidated, and yet because there is no leadership, prepared to develop a programme of nationalisations under workers control and posing the planned economy, capitalism is allowed to continue to putrefy and stagnate. This is why the struggle in the Labour Party against direct elections to a European parliament must be waged posing the unification of all the struggles against capitalism in Europe on a programme, for the United Soviet Socialist States of Europe, otherwise the struggle remains at the

level of against the parliament and the E.E.C. and no alternative is developed, to show the way out of this crisis.

The situation is throwing up daily problems for which the Labour and trade union left are required to find solutions. One important centre on which it is fundamental to intervene in Britain, in particular, is the need for campaigns, meetings and discussions to be organised in the factories and workers areas on the need for nationalisations, workers control and the planned economy. This is relevant especially to Britain, because of the apparatuses of the workers aristocracy in the trade unions which prevent the working class from intervening with all their force. In all their strikes, demonstrations, including the resistance to the Ulster "General strike", the masses are saying in their own language that they want to intervene against capitalism. Then why are not the masses capable of discussing in factories? Why are there not meetings organised to discuss the alternative programme, in which the masses are able to give their opinions, and not merely spoken to by some leaders and then the meeting finishes? Moreover, a consistent programme provides the basis to unify and centralise all the struggles and to win all types of sectors of the population. If the police, without any conscious orientation from an anti-capitalist force are already attracted to the working class, it indicates that much more can be achieved.

There is an increasing ambience developing for marxist solutions to the crisis. The nationalised planned economies of the workers states are essentially the living material basis showing the superiority of these economies to capitalism. Nationalisation and planning is the only way to develop the economy for the benefit of the population. The bourgeoisie are not capable of solving their crisis, precisely because to do so, would mean eliminating their class function. Their economy is based on private enterprise and therefore private interest based on competition; private interest is antagonistic to the interests of the

Turn to page 4

The Earthquake in Rumania continued from page 1

Soviets. Then this is going to attract them to the relation with the workers states. It is the same with Yugoslavia, which does not do things for itself, because it does not have the strength. What strength has Rumania to do this? It does not have the strength and besides depends for 65% of its trade with the Soviet Union. All the petrol, minerals and other raw materials, agricultural products depend on trade with the Soviet Union. Thus there is a co-ordination of the Soviet Union with these countries. And also Yugoslavia, although Yugoslavia has more independence, Yugoslavia has quite a lot of trade with the capitalist countries but each country depends more on the workers states.

It is necessary to see the policy of the Soviet Union which tends also in this aspect to express partial regeneration, to extend the relation with what is called the block of the workers states, which is the relation in the area of the workers states influenced by the capitalist system, that is to say, it is a drive of system against system.

The Rumanians have made a series of progresses and advance in security which does not come from the bureaucratic leadership. Now ideas are coming. The workers states, particularly the Soviet Union, Germany and in part in Rumania, but above all USSR and Germany, are adopting positions in a consistent form which are confrontation of system against system. It is not general, it is not complete, such behaviour is not homogenous but it is the line which determines the behaviour. There are hitches to stop, to impede it, but this is what determines the course of history.

There is a deepening on the part of the workers states of the development of consciousness of what is meant by system against system. And this develops in consequence intelligence, obliges them to be intelligent, and besides obliging them to be intelligent, already they are intelligent. Any leader of the workers states is a hundred times more intelligent than all the capitalists put together, because they are supported on just and necessary conditions. They are not integrally representative but they are supported on these conditions. Capitalism is based on the backwardness, on the ruins of humanity, the ruins which capitalism has made, the ruins of Hiroshima.

On the other hand the workers state supports itself on the progress which the workers state means and the concrete and historic progressive function. Although concrete, it is not all progressive, in all its line. But what dominates the course of this process is the necessity to make progress against the capitalist system.

This dominates and orders the thought, the form of thinking in the workers states and it has to develop and to generalise the base of this thought. They cannot think in this way and remain in the previous backwardness, no, because this is an antinomy, a clash. Before with Stalin there was a clash because there was an apparatus and there was a development united to the capitalist system which was awaiting an historic resolution which the war determined. Now such a type of war is not necessary, now the expectancy of a war to determine is not necessary, it is a question of the final settlement of accounts.

They are learning to develop intelligently and consistently which means system against system. This develops the intelligence of the leaders of the workers states. This is our task. We intervene in this process. And more and more frequent and evident is the position of Brezhnev, of Rumania and Germany. It is clear and decisive. This now cannot retreat. And we are the ones placed there, not thrown there but put there, and not because they let us in but because we are working in a concrete form for this end.

The Rumanians declare that the immediate objective from the earthquake, is to see immediately that everyone has a house, everything that is necessary. And besides from everywhere in Rumania, people have intervened and no one lacks food. It was the opposite at Friuli. From the ends of Rumania, they send food. People see what food they need and send the rest. They have declared they are going to make better houses than before. And it is going to be a tremendous blow at capitalism which shows what has happened in Friuli and Belice, where for twenty years, they live in barracks.

In China now there is not a sign of the earthquake. And among the most important aspects of the workers state is that people say "I have two pieces, I give one to you" or "let the children sleep with me" and everyone has resolved everything. No one speaks of tents in Rumania but people seek out those affected by the earthquake and say "come, I have a place in the house". Moreover they transform public buildings into houses for people.

This is the workers state. It shows that it is superior to the capitalist regime. Through its nature, it shows that the workers state has a collective nature which does not develop private property, it develops the collective objective interest.

The behaviour of the masses and of the workers state in the earthquakes is a sign of what it is going to happen in the atomic war. Instead of panic, it is the capitalists who are going to die of panic. People are going to say "well, it is necessary to die, some millions are going to die, we cannot impede it, but on the other hand afterwards we are going to impede more people dying". This is going to be the ultimate lesson of love because capitalism is going to commit bestiality, a massacre. Only half an hour is necessary for capitalism to launch many atomic weapons, and the Soviets are going to have to respond.

What has happened in Rumania is formidable. It is the opposite of Seveso and Friuli. In China now there is no sign of the earthquake. On the other hand in Belice, they have spent twenty years living in emergency accommodation, with bad construction, in which it is fantastically cold and in summer you die of heat. People have to live in these conditions. They make money out of this, they get 15,000 million lira profit ie the construction companies. In a few years all these dealings are going to come to light with the leaders of the workers parties who have allowed this and have been involved in this. They will throw out many in the cleansing as was done in the PCI. This cannot last long.

Rumania shows that the earthquake shook the political life, the political structure and has elevated the political class life in Rumania. Apparently it is the earthquake, but it hastened a process which without the earthquake would have happened anyway. It is another earthquake which comes from the necessity of human progress. The earthquake hastened this nothing more. The earthquake was like a general strike which exploits and accelerates the process.

The earthquake showed that changes were necessary. Otherwise it would not have come out like this. But the government cleaned out a number of dirty people and elevated the population to intervene. And this intervention of the population supported the government; not creating any problem for the government but criticising, pushing forward a profound criticism shows in its example "why cannot we do the same to-morrow" with the problems that do not require an earthquake. It elevates the political life, the critical and cultural capacity of the population. And this is going to influence the

communist parties because, it does not support plurality, co-existence, non internationalism. On the contrary it is against all this. And although they wished to conceal this, it still comes out. It happens because the masses of the world have a thousand ways of informing themselves and knowing.

It is necessary to place always as a determining example, the superior behaviour of the workers state. the people and the leadership of the workers state.

J. POSADAS. 9.3.1977

THE NEED FOR THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE LABOUR LEFT

Great changes are more and more apparent in the world socialist and communist movements. Mitterrand of the French Socialist party says that Europe will be socialist or nothing and makes a world tour to win and stimulate support in other countries. The Spanish Socialist party proclaims "the dictatorship of the Proletariat". Sectors of the JUSOS in West Germany call for united fronts of the socialists and communists, internationally. The CPSU reasserts basic marxist conceptions such as the need to smash the bourgeois state, the dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian internationalism. This is part of the constant advance to the left which is apparent all over the world, led by the workers states and tends to weigh in Britain more and more.

The left in the Labour party is evidently in a phase of transition. In many respects at this moment it is silent on fundamental issues or speaks of the alternative programme to Callaghan's policy, still in terms of modifications of capitalism — although this now is said without conviction. Objectively there is on the surface no serious reappraisal of the positions and objectives of the Labour party. The appearance of a representative of the "Militant" tendency in the apparatus of the party, shows nevertheless in a distant way that changes are being prepared — in a distant way because this tendency, although maintaining a programme of nationalisations is reformist and anti-Soviet. Hence in no way can it represent the depth of the process in the Labour party or the country. It is an "intermediary" between capitalism and the revolution, and its life expectancy is short.

The discrepancy between the decomposition of British imperialism and the slowness of the workers organisations to respond, is due basically to historic factors which have profound roots and once the consciousness of these are understood, it is possible to advance much more rapidly. Thus the "culture" of the Labour party and the trade unions has basically been bourgeois in origin. A class analysis has been missing — all the elections, the existence of the Monarchy, the organs of local government, education, arts and sciences have all been seen not in a class context but as though they were fore ordained and outside history. Everything was consensus, conformist and eternal. The Union Jack represented not just the Empire but civilisation! All culture was submitted to the overwhelming authority of the bourgeoisie, all the rebellion of the masses, workers and petit-bourgeoisie was contained. This means that logical, rational discussion was blocked. And now that all the foundations that gave rise to the insular and infinitely arrogant culture are collapsing, a new beginning is necessary which sees problems historically and objectively. This can only come from marxism, not liberalism or empiricism, the twin pillars of bourgeois thought.

The belief that the world really revolved around the Union Jack, continued even after the first world war. Trotsky wrote his brilliant and perceptive work "Whither Britain" when the conditions which gave rise to all this suffocating cultural milieu were already in decline i.e. British supremacy on the world market and the development of a powerful aristocracy of labour conciliatory with capitalism and containing the working class. How did this come about?

It was primarily the consequence of the emergence of Stalinism in the workers states. 1917 gave an immense impetus to socialism in Britain but this was dissipated by the bureaucratisation of the Comintern

which showed its disastrous course in the ruination of the General strike of 1926. The repudiation of the application of marxism by the Stalinist functionaries gave a lease of life to an exhausted British imperialism. It meant that the social democratic mentality of the Labour party could survive even the gross pro-capitalism of its "socialist" spokesman Ramsay Macdonald and in fact the Labour party acquired a form of monopoly of political life. The Communist party sank into a subsidiary of the Stalinist bureaucracy and the errors of Stalinism were a wonderful opportunity for the trade union bureaucrats and the labour aristocrats to prevent discussion of the alternative to capitalism, that is the WORKERS STATE based on CENTRALISED PLANNING UNDER WORKERS CONTROL.

Moreover the degeneration of the first workers state led to the disorientation, the destruction and confusion of whole layers of intellectuals who would normally have contributed to the life of the workers organisations. In a sense they were siphoned off from an active relationship with politics or became accommodated to the system. A host of intellectuals were effectively paralysed by the policies of the Communist party, and this again left the Labour party as a stairway for careerists without ideas but well structured into the world of social climbing and accommodation. It was a tradition that someone "left" in his youth in the Labour party would gravitate "with experience" to a more "mellow" view of life and with luck and sycophancy end up in the House of Lords duly honoured for services to capitalism. The "left" in Britain has been full of such histories. The conditions are different now, but there is always a lag between a previous structure of thought and functioning belonging to a previous period and the objective needs of the new situation. The classic alliance between Fabian reformism and admiration for Stalinist conservatism was the Webbs. They exemplified the mentality of people who never saw the masses but only themselves, the "superior" people who would in the wisdom of time bestow some sort of "socialism" with the consent of capitalism upon the masses. Shaw as Lenin called him "a good man fallen among Fabians" ended up a fashionable dramatist for the bourgeoisie. This process has to be seen historically and objectively, because it does not lie outside rational explanation and once it is objectively seen and the process as it exists today is assimilated, then it is possible to work scientifically for changes.

The world relation of forces cripples British capitalism. It does not have the resources to offer a perspective and hence all the trade union leaderships enter into crisis. Without the ability to extract concessions from imperialism their whole bureaucratic functioning is endangered, sectors of cadres there and in the Labour party are obliged to think and to change. This is why the existing experience of the workers states is absolutely fundamental. It is not possible to continue moaning about Stalinism when the soviet economy on the basis of nationalisation and planning, with whatever limitations, has shown a capacity to satisfy the needs of the population, give material aid to the world revolution and carry the immense burdens of armaments to confront American imperialism. This is the example for the world and all the people i.e. Mozambique, Ethiopia, Laos who want to advance, follow this path.

The forces of the left in and outside the Labour party have to see in depth the stage through which

humanity is now passing and to realise the role of the working class. Due to the weight of past traditions and the overwhelming force of the advance of British capitalism at an earlier stage which developed the aristocracy of labour, the left has not seen, not appreciated at its value, the independent role and aspiration of the working class. It is not a class to be patronised or judged through individual comparisons, but is the class which determines history through its role in the economy. Moreover the process of advance, of social progress is not the steady amelioration of "society" as it is, but the waging of the class struggle to change society, to transform the economy and social relations completely. This requires marxism, the complete antithesis of bourgeois compromise, and empiricism. Imperialism has always tried to obscure the truth, to write history in its image. Hence the idiocy of monarchy, the manoeuvres of ministers and apparatuses was seen as real and the historic struggles of the masses as unimportant. It is necessary to see that the struggles of today have an infinity of antecedents on the part of the masses. Today is not new, but the conditions to secure socialism are infinitely superior. Before the systematic elaboration of Marx, the Chartist movement had already broached the need to take power by physical force and for nationalisations. Chartism, the role of the proletariat and the role of the workers states headed by the Soviet Union are in this sense indivisible.

The Labour party is now in profound crisis, its electoral functioning cannot correspond to the pressures of history. It cannot remain in the stage of prop for capitalism. The most conservative sectors in the unions and in the Labour party are going to try to prevent discussion and utilise the bureaucratic structure for this. But that was only possible when British imperialism could strut across the world and jeer at the absurd ideas of those "Germans", those "doctrinaires". That is no longer possible and the way goes towards the breaking of links of the unions and the Labour party with capitalism.

When the police enter into complete collision with the bourgeoisie and show a massive contempt for the regime which refuses them basic democratic rights like the right to strike, what does this mean? What is the interpretation of the Labour left? Is this just wage issues? Why do they have the force to deride completely the Home Secretary? What does it say about the social situation in Britain? All this requires a method of interpretation, otherwise it is just another fact. When an organism trained to represent the forces of private property enters into collision with the state it is supposed to defend and sectors say "yes we would support the TUC in a general strike if we were asked" is this not the reflection of the need for fundamental social changes? And again it is not possible to just look at Britain but at the world to see such processes in depth. After all the Italian police have gone even further in their open desire to be at one with the rest of the population and not to act as repressors.

The cultural superstructure of British imperialism has already suffered an immense blow. What can they point to that shows the "superiority" of western culture? Nothing, because apart from some technological or scientific advances — immensely limited — there is nothing of any account. As the whole structure of capitalism, political, social and economic is in total crisis, it does not have either the ideas or the resources to combat the

Turn to page 3

THE PROCESS OF PARTIAL REGENERATION AND THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF ACCOUNTS

(Extracts IEC text 10.8.76)

The perspectives in the process of the revolution are not given by the isolated revolutions in France or Germany or Italy, or Africa or Asia. These revolutionary movements contribute to the process just as Algeria, Madagascar, Polisario contribute powerfully to the process. But they in their turn are effects of the world process of the revolution whose central axis is sustained and animated by the process of partial regeneration.

In synthesis, partial regeneration means to reanimate, to go back so that the workers states, particularly the Soviet Union, exercise the legitimate function of their origin: to be a lighthouse which illuminates the world, to be the centre which impels the world socialist revolution.

This is happening and is going to be accentuated, because the economic, scientific and technical development, the development of intelligence in the Soviet Union demands all these conditions. It demands this in its totality, because to exist, the Soviet Union cannot maintain the perspective of agreements, of status quo with the capitalist system. It has to impel the economy in accordance with the character of the workers states, because otherwise the economy of the Soviet Union is strangled.

These are not political conclusions, the results of the analysis and of Congresses, of the party or of the leadership of the Soviet Union. These resolutions which they adopt are conclusions from the prior existing forces which allow these conclusions, which is the economic, scientific, technical, social development of the Soviet Union and the workers states.

It is sufficient to make the comparison between the soviet economy of ten years ago and now. We analyse the conclusions of the reforms of the Kolkhoz. These are reforms which at the same time, tend to elevate the productive capacity by eliminating the number of Kolkhoz, concentrating them, eliminating the power of the kolkhoz and intensify the activity of the sovkhoz. This is of fundamental importance because while it increases production it diminishes the political power of layers which are the support of the bureaucracy. These are the next reforms which are going to be discussed, inevitably and shortly in Poland, and in Yugoslavia also inevitably.

These reforms in the Soviet Union without being complete, are on the same line of increasing production, lessening the power of the local bureaucracy, the branches of production, with the effect of accentuating centralisation, the centralised political leadership. This must be done in the Soviet Union, because the confrontation with imperialism is not only military, it is economic and social. Then it must eliminate the interests of the local bureaucrats, the camarillas of the local bureaucracy depriving them of power, because these local interests are determined and mixed up in concessions with the central power. The central power gave concessions to the local bureaucracy permitting it a certain role in the economy, in policy, in society yielding to the

interest of the bureaucracy, so that this in its turn supported the central apparatus. The bureaucracy was not animated to destroy the structure of the bureaucratic apparatus as it has social and political repercussions, and besides military consequences.

The preparation of the war which imperialism is preparing results from the intensification of the antagonistic contradiction. It is not the product of the same system, the contradictory competition within the capitalist system, but it is the competition of workers state and the capitalist system. If the workers state prevails in competition, it negates the capitalist system, weakens its capacity for action, security and political authority in front of the population. The competition between the workers states does not diminish the authority of the workers state, the competition is in consequence contradictory. With capitalism, it is antagonistic, because it tends to suppress it. The workers state needs to continue antagonistic competition with the capitalist system. Hence it eliminates local powers.

It is necessary to read the speeches of Brezhnev, the resolutions taken afterwards proceed to eliminate local powers. It is not a question of a political elevation, taken as a conclusion to cleanse the workers state. This is the conclusion, but they are urgent needs of the bureaucracy economically and socially, and it has to take measures against allies with which until yesterday it was identified, because now the economy cannot tolerate it, because the confrontation with the capitalist system cannot tolerate it. The military preparation to decide militarily, the capitalism-workers state antagonism cannot tolerate this either. Hence they had to cleanse it.

And this is a decisive example that the workers state put up with Stalin and conquered Stalin, put up with Hitler and Mussolini and conquered both. It put up with Khrushchev and his goulash and it was a constant progress. It put up with Khrushchev and now they put two lines in the large dictionary of the USSR: Khrushchev was President of the Soviet Union.

Then it is necessary to consider that the changes which led to the process of partial regeneration have their origin in the workers states themselves, but in their turn stimulated, fed and impelled by the world course of the revolution. It is not a particular process but the struggle of the masses of the world, the process of partial regeneration in the Soviet Union would be the same but it would be less. And being less in stages, in depth and in the historic levels, it cannot use the stages like Angola, Madagascar, Mozambique, it cannot use, cannot base itself on these

processes to impel the relations of forces favourable to the revolution.

This is the origin of all the changes in the Communist parties and also of the reaction and the retreat of the leaders of the Communist parties, because it is in the Soviet Union that Stalin developed and stalinism. And capitalism now tries to seek support in the weakness of the Communist parties, of the absence of marxism in the Communist parties to offer agreements, to try to take hold of them and push them to conciliation with capitalism. It cannot identify them with the socialists as before with the capitalist system, but it tries to attract them into agreements with capitalism, it tries to gain time. Capitalism does not have the policy for its future. Outside atomic arms, it only has a messenger of death who afterwards without being eliminated, has to exercise the function of the "begger of death" saying "please let me kill". Before he went the rounds "kill"; now he says "please kill otherwise I die".

When the United States, Yankee imperialism, has to put up with Cuba sending soldiers to Angola and proclaiming it openly, it is because it does not have the capacity to impede it.

Consequently it is necessary to consider that the changes in the Soviet Union, these internal modifications, the changes produced in the Kolkhozes and sovkhozes, the concentration of agrarian production, the elimination of individual parcels in a very pronounced way, not negated totally but very pronounced, the elimination of local interests not as a whole, but quite considerably diminishes the total power of the bureaucracy, elevating the power of the centre of the bureaucracy, but also depriving it of support, the base of national support. It weakens the totality, the structure of the bureaucratic apparatus.

This process was achieved and developed after the war and reached in this phase, but it is not a process which has finished because in this process, the world course of the revolution has a very great influence with the final settlement of accounts.

We were the only organisation which had the audacity to pose the final settlement of accounts. This did not occur recently but we posed it 15 years ago. The process of antagonism between the workers states and capitalism, is going to develop with a final settlement of accounts, that is to say it will be a global confrontation. It will not be local wars, small confrontations, these exist but they do not decide but it will be a global confrontation. As this is the perspective, it is necessary then to foresee the necessity, the possibility without it being a certainty, of the preventive war. These are two conceptions of the highest scientific and theoretical

elaboration, the foresight of a process which was going to develop in the course of years.

The IV International of Pablo and company and the soviets rejected this, ie it is absurd, socialism will not be constructed with the residues of the atomic war. They believe that humanity is going to remain exhausted with the war. They look at humanity, looking at themselves. Then there is the other bureaucratic sector, as today the bureaucracy itself through Germany, Hungary and the Soviet Union also speaks of this-one of the leaders of soviet aviation wrote a book in which he posed the final settlement of accounts and the preventive war. He posed, if the war is inevitable, why wait for the others to shoot first. He did not say, we are going to shoot first, but said in passing, if the war is inevitable, why let the others begin it? That is, it's a dialectical opinion, not certain and firm in the conclusion, but it is a dialectical analysis.

We are the only ones who did this, fifteen years ago and with reiteration afterwards. And Hoffmann says it in a clear and decisive way today: the next war is a war between systems, a final settlement of accounts. As it is like this, why don't we begin it? This is his opinion. These are aspects which although now they do not have a direct expression in policy and in the economy, are the centres of partial regeneration, because this indicates the level of consciousness acquired by the leading sectors of the workers state, who understand the function of the workers state and its confrontation with the capitalist system.

It's necessary to be based on this conclusion to feel the immense field for action of the IV International, because these are the ideas of the IV International, not the ideas of the world communist movement. On the contrary, when the Germans develop, the Soviets, the Hungarians, the Bulgarians scientific analyses on the war, the perspectives, the character and the preventive war, some fall back. They murmur in front of the process of the soviets impelling the revolution, plurality, plurality, socialism with democracy, socialism with the smiling face. This is not aimed at any class of experience.

To define the Soviet Union in the epoch of Stalin and even of Khrushchev as socialism with a tragic face is a lie. The tragedian was Khrushchev, because they threw him out. But the Soviet Union makes a constant advance; it is not possible to speak of the bureaucracy, of the invasion of Czechoslovakia without proposing the consequences of Czechoslovakia. An invasion means to take hold of a country, to utilise the economic, social and scientific forces for the benefit of the invader. This is the norm of the invader and the scientific norm exclusive of any other type

of invasion. If the troops go from one country to another and these troops impel progress, it is not an invasion, it is not a confiscation, it is not robbery, it is not a usurpation, it is a method which can be criticised, but whose conclusion is objectively just and necessary.

This is how to discuss! On the other hand the pluralists discuss: we are against every form, we defend independence and democracy whatever the place. This is a lie. The soviets are a conclusion, Czechoslovakia is a conclusion.

The other aspect of the invasions, did the Cubans invade Angola? yes or no? Certainly they did not invade because they were black like the blacks of Angola: among the blacks there was a struggle, somewhat obscured, but it soon cleared, all was white when the Cubans threw out the reactionary forces, imperialism. This can be seen very clearly. Cuba intervened invading the country with or without permission, it invaded a country because it went to struggle in a country which was not its own and the result is: the expulsion of imperialism.

Then dear comrades of the French communist party, it is in this way that it is necessary to discuss. It can be discussed with abstraction. Violence has ends, then it is not possible to pose violence in abstraction but the use for the end of violence. All these philosophers who are accustomed to philosophy ignore this principle. Violence is not harmful but the use of violence. If capitalism uses it to impede progress, it is damaging but if the workers state uses it to defend Cuba and it if uses it, as in Czechoslovakia, to prevent the pro-capitalist sectors prospering, it is not violence, it is a necessary form to achieve the necessary end in the progress of history. It does not please the philosophers, but it is so.

What determines the opinion is the principle and the objective of the principle. The world communist movement advances in its function because it comes from the workers states and from them in particular of the Soviet Union, because it was based on the first seven years of Lenin.

Hence our confidence in the worst circumstances following our master Trotsky to Lenin: the workers state showed its legitimate necessity in history. It was Trotsky who in the worst circumstances of the Soviet Union made the declaration of principles. He said referring to the stage of Stalin: there are very damaging circumstances for the workers state, of insecurity, but yes the human being advanced from the ape to man, how doubt that the workers state is going to triumph. That is, it was not an abstract confidence. The foresight of Trotsky was not zoological, it was a comparison to show what human intelligence was. It was the logical necessity of nature which developed the human being and intelligence which was going to triumph. And today the workers states with all their contradictions are the vital centre of the world course of the revolution. They have to regenerate, they do not have any other historic solution.

10-8-76

J. POSADAS

THE RESTRUCTURING OF THE LABOUR LEFT ... continued from page 2

need for social transformation — expropriation of all key industries under workers control. Thus ideas which correspond to the new situation in the world and nationally, enter the pores of the workers organisations, ideas of marxism fundamentally based on the role of the workers states and the changes

in the balance of world forces favourable to these states. At the same time this course is not going to be "peaceful". In the process the old functioning is going to be broken and sectors once being prepared to administer capitalism, change and become the leaders and agents of its destruction. There is no question of a

"smooth" and "evolutionary" change of ideas in the Labour party. A party geared to electoral politics can only progress by breaking that type of functioning and establishing a genuine political functioning which responds to the interests of the masses.

Subscribers' Rate to

RED FLAG

£2.00 a year.

obtainable from the Party's address.

population. As the capitalist class is interested only in its own survival, there is no possibility of trying to alter or restructure capitalism so that somehow it functions better, more in the interests of the population. The only basis to develop the economy is to expropriate the private interests which impede a logical rational use of resources, by nationalisation, and to run the industries by workers control. The total planning of the economy is the objective of nationalisations, to abolish private interests so that the productive forces can develop unimpeded by the restrictions of private capital. This is why class positions are required, to see that one cannot argue in a logical way against the capitalist to persuade him to function in the interests of the majority, when this goes against class interests.

The maturing of conditions is shown when Foot has to speak of the right for marxists to be in the Labour Party, and attacks the class role of the judiciary; they are proposals made in order to accommodate to the process, for his own survival, but they do indicate the tide of history, which is not in favour of social democratic solutions of propping up capitalism, but of expropriating capitalism. The visit of the queen to Scotland, shows that an apparatus still exists which can mobilise certain sectors like the older people and the children organised by their schools, but fundamentally the Jubilee campaign has no echo in the population, and indeed, anti-monarchical slogans have appeared. The situation is totally changed from a previous era, where there was a certain support from a sector of the population for the monarchy, and there were mobilisations of some size. Now, the social transformation of society is being raised, which means the elimination of all the institutions of the old order, including the monarchy. The forces in support of a programme for the Socialist Republic do not show themselves in a direct form, but like the manifestation of the police demand for the right to strike, there was a process of disintegration occurring under the surface, long before the process appeared directly.

Despite there being no orientation of the Labour left towards Ireland, the attitude of the masses, in smashing up tractors of the farmers who mobilised in support of the fascists, shows objectively the very ripe situation in Ireland to put forward a programme linking with this country. The response of the Irish trade unions with the 'Better Life for All' campaign is a distant and inadequate echo when measured alongside the attitude of the masses in the face of the repression of British imperialism. What is required is a programme of social transformations, recognising that there is no solution to the Irish problem without posing the need for nationalisations, workers control and a planned economy on the basis of a United Socialist Federation, including England, Scotland and Wales. It is important to link with the Labour movement in this country but this can only be done on the basis of the programme of social transformations.

Inevitably, the objective process of disintegration and decay of the bourgeoisie in this country, their constant inability to solve any of the problems means greater pressures on the left in the Labour Party and the trade unions to search for an alternative programme. The development of mass committees, meetings and discussions in the workers areas and factories is a means to impel this programme. The masses have an infinite capacity for initiatives and decision, it is necessary to organise so that these qualities are utilised, in order to put forward a programme of nationalisations, workers control and the planned economy.

OUT WITH THE MONARCHY!
FOR A SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF
THE LABOUR PARTY AND
TRADE UNIONS ON THE ANTI-
CAPITALIST PROGRAMME!

The role of the Communist comrades is to apply concretely Marxist principles for the construction of the workers state in Britain

The deep and now public crisis of disintegration in the Communist Party, is because it has long since abandoned marxism, sank into reformism, social democracy, and the eurocommunist anti-Soviet line. As it has no mass base in this stage of history of the smashing of all forms of reformism, this crisis is resolved with the liquidation of the objectives set by 'The British Road'. At the same time the public discussion on the draft of "The British Road to Socialism" which the leadership of the Communist Party could not prevent, shows that there are Communist comrades who support the positions of the Soviet Union, on the defence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, proletarian internationalism, against pluralism, the need to smash the bourgeois state. This is an advance, but still remains very abstract.

This abstraction comes from a sector of the apparatus of the Party which interprets the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' as meaning the bureaucratic imposition by an apparatus, as in the time of Stalin. This sector seeks to contain those sectors which want to advance, to prevent a return to marxism. This is why the discussion is on this abstract level. In order to play a role in this stage of the total crisis of capitalism, the Communist comrades who want to apply these principles, have to pose the clear objective of the construction of the Workers State in Britain, and the concrete method and programme in order to do it: the construction of the anti-capitalist current in the Labour Party, with the programme of expropriation of capitalism, United Front with the trade unions for the expropriation of capitalism and the planning of the economy. This means to start a discussion of the Communist comrades, on the need to construct the anti-capitalist current in the Labour party, which is the function which we, the Posadists, play in this country.

One of the mortal blows which is struck at reformism, comes from the fact that the capitalist economy can no longer be reformed and that 'more nationalisations', 'investments', 'import controls' etc. will not do. The other mortal blow, more powerful still comes from the USSR and the 14 Workers States (as comrade Posadas has posed). Whilst the Workers States intervene in support of the passing from feudal and tribal forms to Socialism in the world, thus objectively supporting the world process of the Permanent Revolution, they fundamentally elevate in their conceptions and ideas, and give norms of marxist understanding, even if this is still not complete.

There has been recently a declaration from the Communist Party of Poland, which said that Trotsky was right about making United Fronts of Socialists and Communists against fascism. In Vietnam, a resolution of the last Congress of the Communist Party decided to struggle 'against the bureaucracy in the Party'. These events show the return to positions of Trotsky, on the permanent revolution and the need to eliminate the bureaucracy in the Workers States. The Polish declaration is a form of inviting Trotskyism of today to intervene. The USSR denounces 'eurocommunism', as being bourgeois and the result of conciliation with the bourgeoisie. They defend the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the means to construct Socialism. Ponomarev raises that the Russian Revolution is not a particular experience, but an experience of "universal scope". The British Communist Party has rejected this correction by the Soviets. Therefore, as it does not play the necessary function of maintenance of marxist conceptions to which the world Communist movement returns, it is no different from the Social Democrats. Thus there is only one way in which the Communists who want to advance can play a role in this country. It is to apply concretely the principles which they uphold.

One of the means to apply the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat concretely, or the need to smash the bourgeois state, is to pose that the objective of the Labour left, of the Trade Unions and the proletariat of this country, is to construct the 'proletarian' state in Britain. This

principle has to be declared clearly and in rejection of the gradual, reformist and bourgeois outlook of the Communist Party, which is hoping for a purely bourgeois republic, with no queen but with the House of Commons, a Cabinet and a Left Labour government which only accepts workers participation. The need for the Workers State in Britain does not come out of our wishes. But it is the only way out of the total crisis of capitalism which is not resolved just by more nationalisations, but by producing for the needs of the population. This requires the planning of the economy and therefore, state control of property. The bourgeois state machine is the accumulation of capital, investment and production on the basis of profits, where it suits the capitalist class, and when it suits it. The interest of the capitalist class is antagonistic to that of the masses because it does not seek to elevate society, but only itself, at the expense of society. The state has to be smashed as it functions in defence of capitalism. This means the working class, constructing new organs of power, has to smash it and construct a new state. This is what history has shown has happened in practically the whole world. There are 14 Workers States and 30 Revolutionary States going to the Workers State, which all follow on the great experience of the Soviet revolution showing that force has to be used to defeat the bourgeois class and imperialism.

The Workers State is not a more elevated form of bourgeois state or a new form of oppression. It is fundamentally antagonistic to the capitalist state, in that it is based on the historic intention of the proletariat, collective property, based on the collective mentality acquired by the proletariat in its daily experience in production. Thus to surpass the capitalist mode of production a new form of property is excluded. The other quality is the objectivity of the proletariat, not because it is exploited — women

are exploited but they cannot play the historic function of changing society by themselves. This objectivity comes from being the ultimate class in society, which has no historic possibility to exploit, and which on the contrary has the objective need to develop its own life and that of the population through its own collective way of thinking and collective preoccupation. The Workers state, in the economy and increasingly in its function on a world scale, represents the proletariat. It does not emerge from reform, but the smashing of the bourgeois state, of a revolutionary process. Besides, history proves that it is the only way ahead. While Chile, because it did not construct the organisms of power of the proletariat to smash the bourgeois state, failed, Cuba with an infinitely lesser strength and comparatively smaller proletariat, won. It did it by smashing the bourgeois state, shooting the counter revolutionaries, and planning of production. Now it can send comrades to the whole world, to show how this is being done. This process demands therefore a clarification in the Communist comrades, of their own role, for this process does not pass through them. It passes through the Labour Party which is the nucleus for the mass of the workers. This means the formation of a revolutionary left, to transform the Party by means of breaking its bourgeois apparatus. This is a necessary stage in the construction of a Workers Party which is an instrument of class and revolutionary struggle.

Marxism is not an abstraction, it is a guide for action. There must be then a discussion in the Communist comrades who want to progress, on the concrete programme and tactic in order for them to support this process in Britain, which is not passing through the Communist Party, but through the Labour Party. Already one of the factors of the crisis of the Communist Party is there is an unorganised but quite tangible left in the Labour Party, which in the past impelled the Clause 4 in the Constitution, and which now poses the need for the end of the House of Lords, the nationalisation of the Banks, and insists on participating in the Congresses of various Communist Parties of Eastern Workers States. It has also received more attention than the Communist Party, from the Soviet Union precisely because it is the nucleus of the centralisation of the class from which the revolutionary leadership will be constructed. There is a process of breaking of the Social Democracy everywhere in the world, and of the elevation to the left of all Socialist parties. As this stage is that of the confrontation on a world scale, system against system; as imperialism is preparing for war with increasingly less social support and the USSR and the Workers States are increasingly linked to the world masses and are in a process of return to the norms of marxist thinking to smash what is left of the capitalist system; all the conditions elevate for the construction of the left in the

Labour Party. This developing left in the Labour Party has to rest on marxism, be able to generalise understanding, to adopt a policy for the application of the programme of nationalisations. This policy fundamentally has to be one of directing itself to the trade unions, to seek to make a United Front in action with the trade unions, over and above the bureaucracy of the unions, which itself is interested in keeping the separation between the Party and its base in the proletariat. This policy therefore, is not just a problem to be resolved by Labour comrades, but Communist comrades can support, give ideas, orientate on the basis of analysis, texts, leadership, as we ourselves do, to construct the United Front, in action, of the Labour Party, trade unions, a United Front which is not based on just elections but on the political discussion and marxist comprehension of how to apply the programme of nationalisations. This policy must rest on appeals for the construction of factory committees, areas committees, factory occupation, running of factories under workers control, the construction of a Socialist leadership in the Labour Party against its social democratic structure and the ultra-capitalist government of Callaghan/Foot. In this process it is necessary to pose the intervention of the Communists and the revolutionary tendencies of the workers movement, in the United Front.

It is not possible for the comrades of the Communist Party who want to advance, to do so without seeing that this world process confirms the fundamental principles of Marxism and of Trotsky. This is shown by the fact that the Vietnamese Communist Party and Castro have accepted that it is possible to go from feudalism, and tribalism directly to Socialism without the need for the capitalist phase. This is Trotsky's analysis of the Permanent Revolution. Also the intervention of the Soviets 'exporting the revolution' in their intervention in Africa, which is proletarian internationalism in a concrete form, is the position of Lenin and Trotsky. The recognition of the role of Trotsky is a necessary objective, without which the marxist method is not possible. The Posadist IV International, comrade Posadas, develop the marxism of this epoch and extend the role of Trotsky in the world Communist movement. It is not possible to advance without recognising this.

We call on the comrades to demand that the now public discussion with the participation of Labour speakers and comrades from the groups should continue, to seek to elevate precisely this function of acting for the clarification of the objectives of the Labour Party left, calling on them and developing with them a discussion on the basis of marxism in this stage, which is the anti-capitalist programme for the planning of the economy and the construction of the Socialist Republic, the Workers State in this country.

PARTY PUBLICATIONS OBTAINABLE FROM . . .

- Prometheus Bookshop, 134 Alcester Road, Birmingham 13.
- Books, 84 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds LS2 8AB.
- Bookshop, Union Building, The University, Leeds.
- Grass Roots, 109 Oxford Road, Manchester M1 7DU.
- Union Shop, Students Union, Percy Gee Building, Leicester University, Leicester.
- Leicester University Bookshop, Mayors Walk, Leicester, LE1 7RD.
- The Polytechnic Bookshop, Newark Pedestrian Subway, Newark Street, Leicester, LE1 5XT.
- Collet's London Bookshop, 66 Charing Cross Road, London WC2.
- Rare and Racy, 166 Devonshire Street, Sheffield 3.

Editorial

FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE LABOUR PARTY AND TRADE UNIONS ON THE ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

The violent explosion of confrontation between the masses and the police at Grunwick, the growing level of the struggles in the car industry, the occupation at Fords, the failure of the social contract, the inability of the "Jubilee" to draw any support to the capitalist system, show that there is an ambience of preparation for struggles in this country. This is a stage of the crisis in the conciliation between the trade unions and the government. As there is no leadership as yet prepared to represent the process programmatically in the Labour party, the trade unions have to put forward an anti-capitalist programme, to give a conscious form to their intervention. This is a way to elevate a conscious, socialist and audacious left in the Labour party, to confront private property and the Labour government and with the programme for the Socialist Republic and workers control, for the planning of the economy in the British Isles.

The confidence of the left in the trade unions and the Labour party has to be based on the world balance of forces, in which the Soviet Union is the centre. The visit of Brezhnev to France is a measure against the policy of Carter who came to seek to moderate inter-imperialist competition, so as to unify their forces against the workers states. Giscard d'Estaing and Brezhnev pose that the Israeli should withdraw from the occupied territories and the Palestinians should have a homeland. The Soviet Union tries to take advantage of the divisions in imperialism to weaken those forces who prepare war against the workers states. The workers states have the support of the masses of Africa, Latin America and Asia. The proletariat of each country see them as their allies, their conquest in the form of states, a spearhead against what is left of capitalism and imperialism.

The Soviet Constitution now has a clause which stimulates full support to the countries which go to construct socialism. This means a tremendous basis for advance, even if there are still aspects in the Constitution that have the objective to protect the Soviet bureaucracy against the genuine dictatorship of the proletariat which as yet, does not exist in the USSR. But the support to the world revolution for the construction of socialism is the condition which equips the workers state to smash what is left of the capitalist system and therefore, all forms of oppression and bureaucracy. Historically the workers state is more powerful than the bureaucracy. The proof is that now Stalinism is finished, Stalin's idea of 'Socialism in one country' is buried and the USSR and Cuba intervene in full support of the revolution in Africa. Cuba has now offered support to the black masses of South Africa, "if they ask for it". This is the partial regeneration, as comrade Posadas poses, which elevates in the workers states the need for soviet democracy, the elevation of the function of the Communist party and the return to marxism. The Communist party is made much more prominent in the Soviet government. This is the significance of Brezhnev becoming head of state. In a bureaucratic and limited form, this expresses the need for the communist function of the workers state to over-ride that of the bureaucracy. It shows that the bureaucracy is being weakened. At the same time the removal of 5000 trade union bureaucrats shows that the Soviet trade unions are liquidating the most backward sectors of their bureaucracy. What triumphs on a world scale is the form of the workers state: the nationalised and planned form of property, not the bureaucracy. It is necessary to discuss this in the British trade unions and the Labour party.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF GRUNWICK

Grunwick is an unimportant factory, which has only a few workers and these have only recently joined the trade union movement. However, to support them, workers have come from the Scottish mines and the Ford factories. When such a small place with a problem of trade union recognition, becomes such a focus of confrontation, class against class, it is because this is the state of feeling in the whole country. When the TUC and Labour party leaders pledge support, and trade union leaders like Scargill, and MP's go on the picket lines, it is because there is an objective need for a Labour party and trade union united front against capitalism. It has not been organised by the MP's and the trade union leaders, but they feel the pressure. Now, the pickets have declared that they would repeat 'Sattley Gate'. And they pour in thousands to do so at Grunwick. The Post Office workers have now defied their own leadership, to apply the boycott of Grunwick mail. The strike committee itself makes appeals directly contradicting the trade union leadership of APEX and by-passes it. This shows in an embryonic form the will of the proletariat to impose its power. This is the will of the proletariat to construct its own organs of power, through what it can, including strike committees, flying pickets. It is a search for forms of power which correspond to the much discussed 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. This is the way the class is seeking to influence.

Turn to page 3

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

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

267 Friday 8 July 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
Adminaid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL.

Other party address:—

24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

The mobilisations of the masses in Italy, and the Government of the Left

28 3 1977

J. Posadas.

The crisis of the capitalist system in Italy is constantly deepening. This crisis is determined by the world crisis of the capitalist system based on the United States. It is not an occasional, a partial crisis which with a better administration can be overcome or amended. There is no solution, there can be no settlement. It is the capitalist system which is in crisis. It is not one aspect or another, but it is the whole structure of the system which is disintegrating and which in an infinity of aspects, shows the sclerosis and rottenness of the system i.e. in the judiciary, in the capitalist apparatus of the army, of the police, in commercial agreements, in relations within the world capitalist system.

The competition within the capitalist system is intensifying and growing brutally. When this crisis grows and intensifies, it is to save one or other sector at the cost of the weakest. There is no solution to this crisis of capitalism, on the contrary, a series of symptoms shows that it is intensifying constantly, whether from the point of view of the productive apparatus which is stagnating, because in spite of the fact that production in part increases, the number of the employed workers is falling.

Although the capitalist system could reanimate partially, now it cannot return to employ the same number of workers which it had before, because there is now a selection in the productive apparatus of a greater productive capacity, eliminating manpower and accentuating the technical aspects of production. These are the logical consequences of the capitalist system.

To give work to all this enormous mass who have no work and who are displaced by the crisis of capitalism and by the technical development of the capitalist system — which to compete among themselves and with the workers states has to increase production more and more — cannot be done by the capitalist system. It cannot provide work for all the unemployed workers and those who are incorporated into production. This is the problem of the young students, of the young, that are not students, of the mothers and men who have nowhere to work. The areas, the zones and the conditions of unemployment, within the capitalist system, constantly increase.

The problem of the youth in Italy as in the rest of the world, is not the problem of the young who want work to resolve their problems. The youth have the political consciousness educated by the examples of Angola, Mozambique, by the intervention of Cuba and the Soviet Union in Africa, which give the idea that it is possible to overcome the limitations of the crisis of the capitalist system. They see this clearly. Then they want to intervene to transform society. Together with the need of work, they feel the need to be useful to society and feel that to be useful means to develop the social forms and relations, to transform human relations which is the most complete form of being useful to society.

The youth want this. They do not want work only, they want work to intervene to transform society. They want to participate in the leadership, in the discussion in the organisation, the orientation of the political leadership. They do not seek simply work, to be comfortable, to marry, to have children and that's it. No, they seek to be useful in history. Not only the country in which they live, but in history to transform society and lead it also. Men and women want the same.

Hence the process in Italy, as in almost all the world. But it is more accentuated in Italy, with an immense quantity of organisms that intervene with a very profound initiative for all the problems — women's liberation, students, transformation of relations in the

university and in the colleges, elevation of relations between teachers and students, with the programmes of study and the objectives of study. The youth are seeking to elevate the objectives of the university, in the service of society, of humanity and not in the individual service of each one to serve the capitalist regime.

The trade unions seek to intervene to impose a programme of production, of wages, of orientation of the economy to favour the population. The general strikes in Italy are complete. The last general strike of the 18th—20th March was total. Italy was stopped by the masses. It did not run because the masses decided that it would not run. This shows the will which attracted the students and the Christian Democratic sectors. The Christian Democracy was impotent and incapable of making a counter demonstration. If a counter demonstration had been made, the worker and peasant bourgeois base would have gone away from the party. Hence the Christian Democracy shut up and had to support such a movement of its own base against itself. It shows the influence over the Christian Democratic masses of the workers movement for the anti-capitalist struggle.

The strike of 23rd March is an expression of this influence in the Christian Democracy. The masses are attracted by the will to struggle of the working class, by the programme and by the resolution for social transformations.

The triumph of the Popular Union in France is the expression of the world influence of the relation of forces favourable to the revolution, to social transformations. Part of that is the influence of the trip of Castro and Podgorny in Africa which shows how the workers states are proceeding to intervene directly, to weigh in the world course of class relations and of the progress of the backward countries like those of Africa, to eliminate capitalism and develop the roads to socialism, passing directly from the semi-feudal phase of the semi-slavery of South Africa and Rhodesia, directly to the construction of a workers state.

They do this because the masses have the consciousness and the understanding to do it. They see the experience of the workers states and the capacity to do it. In Italy also.

There is no possibility of reviving the economy under capitalism. Italy has to compete on a world wide scale with the capitalist system and with the workers states. Italy does not have the technical capacity, nor the economic structure to compete.

The retreat in the democratic norms in Italy, the judicial arrogance, the arrogance against the masses, the increasing deterioration in the economic conditions, is the product of the capitalist system and not of the crisis of Italy. Italy is not in crisis, it is capitalism which is in crisis. The masses seek to reanimate and resolve Italy. It is on these conditions that it is necessary to be based.

The masses of Italy live the experiences of the masses of the world. They live the recent triumph of the Popular Union of France. The masses see that the Popular Union triumphed because it presented a programme of social transformations and now they announce that they are going to extend it. This attracts the masses. This gives authority and influences the masses. It is on this basis that it is necessary to consider the worker, trade union programme of the workers centres and the workers parties.

From the bourgeois point of view, the parliamentary point of view, there is no possibility of a parliamentary solution. The parliamentary solutions are trivial, slow and limited. Without ceasing to use parliament to the maximum, it is necessary to co-ordinate it with the workers movement, in such a way that it can achieve a co-ordination of struggle and show that a government of the left is necessary with a programme of satisfactions and planning to be able to reorganise the Italian economy. The masses are ready for this, the youth and the women also.

Turn to page 2

In This Issue:—

- THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
- THE NEED FOR NATIONALISATIONS

THE MOBILISATIONS OF THE MASSES IN ITALY

Continued from page 1

CONCENTRATE THE INITIATIVES OF THE POPULATION IN A PROGRAMME OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS

All this will of combat of the youth, of the women which is done in a partial way and on the basis of a clash, of confrontations of students and trade unions, exists because there is no programme which unifies the workers movement, a programme which unifies and co-ordinates the will of anti-capitalist struggle of the masses. With the existence of such a programme, students, workers, women would co-ordinate and centralise around this programme. The partial movements, the womens movement, the young people, the students, would concentrate around this programme which answers to the need for change and for transformations. It educates and teaches the masses to seek the solution of the individual problem in the solution of the social problem, as they all show, the youth, the women, the students, the workers, the trade unions and also the workers parties.

The mobilisation of the masses is unanimous and concentrated in the workers parties, in the trade unions and in the workers centres. The students also. It is necessary to take into account this initiative of the students, of the workers and of the women in which the capitalist leadership is rejected. They want to intervene and change the relations in the college, in the secondary school.

There is not a woman problem in the abstract nor specifically. There is a problem of the woman which is part of the exploitation of woman by the capitalist system. Then the demand of woman just for female rights is mistaken. The will to combat is correct, the desire to intervene and to change the capitalist system is correct. But for the woman to obtain equal rights and be respected not only sexually but as human beings, so that they can have the same rights and human representation as men, it is necessary to change the capitalist system. Woman is an aspect of the exploitation by the capitalist system, of private property.

The struggles of women's liberation has a correct historic sense. The form of representation is very badly expounded but it is correct. It is the human defence of the women. This cannot be done in the capitalist system. It is necessary to transform society, then the problem of the relation between men and women will be resolved. It is capitalist society which causes this. In the workers states, there are none of these relations which exist in the capitalist countries, neither the relations which exist between the students and the teachers, because between the student, the university, the teacher and the workers state, there is the unanimity of the objectives, the development of the human being. It is not the development of the special interest and science, education in the service of the special interest as in the capitalist regime. Even with the bureaucracy of the workers states, the objective is objective progress. Hence the workers state supports Angola. Cuba, a little country, even at the cost of its own population, in food, teaching, communication, transport, gives aid in the struggle which the soldiers push forward in Angola, in Mozambique and in Rhodesia.

The masses see such a relation. It is not the particular question of Cuba but of the relation which must exist and the students, the workers, the peasants, the women want such a relation. The resolution of the women to fight is admirable, to come out to fight is admirable. There is not a single lost strike. All the movements win. There is no desertion in the movement of the women or the workers movement or in the youth, among the children. There is a unanimity of human progress which must be expressed in a programme as in that of the Popular Union, as a government of the left with the appeal for the Christian Democratic Party of the left.

It is necessary to have an audacious attitude of the workers parties appealing for a programme of the left, showing that the triumph of the Popular Union in France is the will of the masses influenced by the relation of forces infinitely favourable to the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist struggle. In that, the trip of Castro and Podgorny shows that a small country like Cuba has the audacity and the resolution to confront the atomic arms of Yankee imperialism, intervening in Africa for the second time to stimulate the revolutionary struggle. Imperialism is impotent to intervene.

These are the actual conditions. The masses, the students and the women, the socialist militants, the communists, the trade union militants see such a conclusion and expect their party, their leaderships to push forward this struggle.

knowledge and of the progress of society, for the economy. The students represent and serve the economy. The student is conscious of this. For this it is necessary to have the unification with the workers movement but also respect for the ideas, the experience and the will to struggle of the students.

The worker and political leaderships of the socialist, communist, trade union workers movements must feel the will to combat of the students. They express a part of the thought of the population, of the sentiment. They do not represent themselves. They represent part of the will of combat of the population, of the home, of the mother, of the essential part of the will to combat. They cannot lead society but they represent this will to combat. And when the students show a will to combat, they are a powerful indication, of the will for changes and social transformations. Hence it is necessary to be based on parliament as a means of expanding and developing the judgements, the appeals, the propaganda for social transformations, co-ordinating with the worker and student struggle.

The Communist party, the socialists, the trade unions must take such popular initiatives, in occupying houses, forcing the lowering of prices, impelling measures which tend to facilitate the life of the population and tend to resolve the problems and necessities of the population. They are measures which neither capitalism nor parliament are interested in and do not have the preoccupation to resolve. On the other hand these initiatives which come from the young people, part of the workers and student movement, must be taken by the parties and pushed forward in parliament, concrete proposals and measures to be imposed on the capitalist government.

The worker, student divergences are in the form, not in the depth. The students do not seek something against the workers and the workers nothing against the students. A programme is necessary which unifies such a will to struggle and also a democratic trade union movement, socialist democratic, which allows discussions to advance with the exchange of experiences and will to combat.

The unification of the students and the workers movement is on the basis of a programme. It cannot be made on the basis of going behind the workers movement or behind the students. The student movement, the students, the university sectors are not the leadership of society. They do not have weight, role or function in society which determines such a function. The proletariat, yes. But the students have an enormous weight in society, a social, political weight which is indispensable. This is part of the divided development which capitalist society makes. It develops particular spheres to exploit them, spheres which are part of the

THERE IS NO POSSIBILITY OF FASCISM, BUT IT IS POSSIBLE TO IMPOSE A GOVERNMENT OF THE LEFT

The crisis of the capitalist system is intensifying throughout the world. Yankee imperialism does not have the strength to impose on Cuba to keep quiet. Cuba on the contrary has the power and the strength to come out to confront Yankee imperialism by going to Africa. It does not do the same in Latin America. It does it in Africa, but it has repercussions in Latin America and the masses of Latin America see Africa and Cuba in Africa. They understand that it is an attitude of Cuba not to confront imperialism in Latin America, not to make a direct confrontation. Hence they do it in an indirect form and the masses understand it and feel that it is like this.

Fascism does not have force nor capacity nor possibility to impede such a process. Indubitably fascism is going to try to deliver blows, to make counter revolutionary movements. All this is the intention of fascism. Fascism triumphed in the previous stage, because there was neither maturity, nor world social relations, nor the world correlation of forces which exist today. Then there was a single new workers state and the socialist movements still recently coming out of the nexus of reformism, of Kautskyism. On the other hand today, there are almost 18 workers states and 20 revolutionary states. The masses are in ferment throughout the world, with the intelligence, capacity, experience to transform society. There is no possibility of reactionary fascist movements that can triumph. There is the possibility that there may be a rising but they will be defeated.

Then it is necessary to foresee such uprisings. The relation of world forces is favourable to the development of social transformations. They are not favourable to fascism. Fascism is not going to triumph because it finds the working class disappointed, divided or separated. This is not true. The relation of world forces unifies the workers movement. The masses unify themselves in the programme which there is in the workers states and which means expropriation of capitalism, stultification, planning, democratic rights to develop the economy against the capitalist system. Imperialism has no possibility of a solution. A coup has no possibility. Rhodesia is an example. Yankee imperialism has an enormous military potential and is incapable of impeding Cuba going to Africa. This is the relation of forces which exists in Italy and throughout the world.

It is not a question of power in the hands only but the reaction of the masses against the power which capitalism has in Italy. It is necessary to consider such conclusions. It is not the epoch of fascism but of the socialist countries. This is the epoch of history. It signifies that in the masses of the world there is such an attraction that it influences the army, the police, the church and the petit bourgeoisie. It influences and wins people to the historic solutions.

Sudden attacks, reactionary blows, counter revolutionary blows are going to exist but they will be defeated. Fascism has no popular forces, nor security in the army nor in the police, nor in the population. Hence they make movements of assassination, throwing bombs, to kill, to assassinate magistrates, militants, workers and students. The fascists cannot organise any movement of people, any demonstration or process. They are small nuclei which can only make sudden

attacks. This is not the epoch of putsches. People are decided to smash them immediately and the proof is in all the movements and immense mobilisations of the masses in Italy constantly, without any doubt and the increase of the combative will, whether among the men, women, children, old people. All are combative. There is no passivity nor possibility to attract for fascism.

The working class is fully active. It attracts the petit bourgeoisie and disorganises the bourgeoisie. Where is their strength and what can fascism do? Only putsches which can have no effect. The proletariat is fully organised, in a state of development and ability to organise and influence the whole population including the army and the police. This means that the proletariat has an influence in the organs which are going to decide, the army and the police. It is not fascism which can do this.

An essential base of the army and

the police from the beginning, has been against the fascists and is won by the proletariat. Thus it is necessary to find support on this basis and on the impossibility that any putsch, either fascist or counter revolutionary, can triumph. They can try but they cannot win. They will be smashed. It's on these conditions that it is necessary to prepare for this process, to prepare the intervention of the masses, to unify it in an anti-capitalist programme to transform society.

It is necessary, as a consequence, to have a programme of the left. Capitalism is in complete crisis. The productive apparatus of capitalism is elevating and modernising and cannot absorb the existing quantity of manpower or the new increase in the labour force. The development of the workers states increase the contradictions of the capitalist system. It increases the contradictions and the inter-capitalist competition and the competition of capitalism with the workers states. It weakens it constantly and impedes the initiative in taking economic, political, social, and military measures. It's the workers states who take them.

Hence the Socialist parties, the Communist parties, the trade unions, the workers centres, must take initiatives for planning, as in France with a programme like that of the Popular Union and appealing to the masses and the students for such a discussion.

The students cannot replace the workers movement nor the political parties. Their function in the economy is secondary. The proletariat is legitimate in its leadership of society through its function in the economy and in society. But the student shows his will to combat, to associate with the workers movement and the workers parties.

It is necessary that the parties and trade unions acquire such an understanding and attract the students with a programme of combat and of social transformations. Then this concentrates there all the will of combat, of discussion, of exchange of ideas, of initiatives and of co-ordination in the workers movement, giving the student a perspective to participate in the social transformations, with all the logical discussions or disagreements which must exist, with the full right to all the tendencies to show their thought, judgement and positions.

It is imperialism which is in retreat. When Cuba is animated to confront Yankee imperialism, entering Africa again, it shows that this force is not Cuba but the workers states. The Italian masses also see this. They see that their forces are also the workers states, in particular the Soviet Union. Even in a limited form with the limited intervention of the Soviet Union, this shows in front of the masses of the world, the power of the workers states against Yankee imperialism and this intimidates world capitalism. The masses of the world feel and see this.

It is necessary to push forward a public discussion on how to transform the crisis of capitalism in Italy into an economic progress, by planning production. It is necessary to have a programme of production for the reanimation of the economy but determined by the needs of the population, houses for the poor sectors of the population, the petit bourgeoisie, the peasants and workers. Transport, electricity, omnibuses. It is necessary to eliminate the production of the individual car and to make collective transport. If Fiat does not have any interest, it must be expropriated and let the state do it. Hospitals for all the masses, drains, hygienic services. This is the programme, one which attracts all the population and wins the Christian Democratic base.

It is necessary to make a public discussion on the basis of this programme, to reject the discussion on the cost of labour. It is absurd and is a crime against the masses. They argue that the cost of labour forces up the cost of production, they intimidate and exert a pressure on them and frighten them, making them believe that if they do not

accept this, the world collapses. Capitalism is collapsing, not the world. The world is elevating and the workers states show this by intervening in Africa, Asia and in Latin America and this shows how the workers states develop. It is capitalism which is collapsing.

What has to be discussed is not the cost of production to save or maintain capitalist production and capitalist profit so that it competes with the other capitalists, but how to maintain the standard of living, the cost of living of the masses, and work must answer to this. Production for the masses and to develop the standard of living of the population, this is the policy for Italy.

Such a programme would attract and centralise the students, the workers, the peasants and the women. And all the particular problems which today arise through lack of the leadership which centralises, will be discussed in a concentrated form. All these problems exist but also the workers parties and the workers centres must feel that all these initiatives of the youth, the women, the left groups, even the autonomous sectors, respond to the needs which exist, they may be either badly led or in part utilised by the provocateurs or agents of capitalism, of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism but they are not the origin. The origin is the necessity which exists and that people want to intervene.

The masses feel that all these problems exist and they are stimulated by the development of the workers states, through the struggle in Africa, in Asia, through the development of Vietnam. People want to intervene and then all the problems arise. It is necessary to concentrate it in this programme of development of Italy which is going to answer the needs of all the population.

Together with this, it is necessary to push forward a complete democratic discussion. Full respect for all the tendencies and with the will to criticise the resolutions which they take, maintaining full trade union rights and political right of all tendencies, but respecting the resolutions which are taken.

It is necessary that in every factory, in every trade union, every workers centre, reviews and newspapers are edited, in which all tendencies write their experiences, their orientation, their judgement and their initiative and these should be discussed. It is necessary to develop democracy in the workers movement, which means to discuss everything. Not that one leader speaks and the others listen and then finish, or ten speak and that's it. It is necessary to see that in the factories, in the places of work, in the different sectors of work, there is discussion and leaflets and that bulletins and newspapers are brought out. It is necessary to proceed to elevate the discussion within the workers movement, from the summits to the base. The advance of the discussion shows the will of combat of the masses, so the decisions should be taken in accordance with the will of combat of the masses. For this it is necessary to prepare so that they can demonstrate and receive influences. It is capitalism which is in crisis, not the workers movement. It is necessary to concentrate in this programme, to give a solution to the crisis in Italy. The Christian Democracy was impotent to make a movement to sustain it. It did not make a mass movement to sustain itself against the development of the workers movement and the Socialist and Communist parties. Not one. The Christian Democracy is a heterogeneous party composed of the big bourgeoisie, of the bourgeoisie in general, of the petit bourgeoisie, of the workers and peasants. It is heterogeneous in social composition. But it is homogeneous in political composition. It represents the interests of big business, of capitalism allied to the world capitalist system. This is the Christian Democracy. It cannot change either its structure or its nature. A Christian Democratic Party of the left is necessary. Thus a government of the left with a programme of the Popular Union is necessary and a public discussion everywhere to push forward such a programme.

THE NEED FOR THE INTERVENTION OF THE TRADE UNIONS

Scanlon is obliged to confess his "error" over the social contract, but what programme to meet the crisis? "Reflation", as the trade union leaders insist is necessary, means in reality, the state to pay subsidies to capitalism and capitalism using the money to rationalise itself. Besides, it means to increase productivity, sack the workers, the killing of workers at work, the poisoning of the population through pollution, the lowering of the quality of products and food, to continue competing on the world market. This is what "reflation" is all about. In other stages of history the crisis could be temporarily relieved by increasing the level of exploitation of the colonies and inter-capitalist wars. Today the elevation in number and quality of workers states in the world precludes this. The programme therefore to be put forward by the proletariat, the trade unions in their direct intervention against the capitalist system and the government's policy, must be to demand the solution by going to the root of the problem. Investments of the state must be rejected unless they are to increase the standard of the life of the workers, lower prices, increase safety and wages, for full employment, and the re-employment of sacked workers. Production must be decided by the workers, and factories reconverted to produce for needs. The programme must be for the 32 hours a week, no overtime and sackings, the sliding scale of wages and decrease in working hours as automation and productivity advance; statification must be with the full workers control to produce what is necessary and to invest where necessary. There must be state control of the banks and foreign trade to fulfil this function. Such must be the programme of the trade unions. "Price control" will not materialise unless there are popular committees to apply and decide control. Reflation will only mean capitalist competition, unless the means of production and the banks are nationalised under workers control. This is the programme which the trade union vanguard must propose to the Labour left, calling on it to support this.

In Holland, the sliding scale of wages defended by the trade union centre, has been maintained as a conquest by industrial action and in this way imposed on the Socialist government. In Italy, the CGIL which recently had its Congress, decided to adopt "workers control" and not "workers participation", and called to make the trade unions weigh "outside the factories" in the problems of the population by means of the formation of "area committees". This is the programme of the Posadist IV International. The Congress of the CGIL shows an elevation of the conscious programme and is an example for the trade union vanguard in Britain to elevate its programme in a united front with the Labour party in this country, against the pro-capitalist Labour government. Doubtless, there will be resistance in the unions to a dynamic class policy because of their structure linked to the aristocracy of labour, but the pressure of the masses is inevitably going to impose discussion of policies. Such a mobilisation around a small place like Grunwick shows how much more could be done nationally, how much decision there is to intervene in the proletariat to give solutions to the major problems of this country. Grunwick shows that it is necessary to elevate the class struggle at the national level, on the basis of an anti-capitalist programme of nationalisations, workers control and the planning of the economy.

However, as there is not a formed Labour party left prepared to generalise the struggle in this way, there is the need for the elevation of the direct intervention of the trade unions with that programme. At the same time, it is clear that this cannot replace the need for a political leadership, a new structure to develop in the Labour party against the capitalist system and the present government. The independent direct intervention of the working class through the trade unions is a means to break the policy of the Callaghan government, just as the trade unions of Portugal show that they are able to impose the defence of land reform and nationalisations against the Soares government.

The present crisis in the Communist party is also a means of developing a discussion of fundamental aspects of marxism in the trade unions and Labour party, such as the dictatorship of the proletariat and the need to smash the bourgeois state. Such a discussion facilitates the elevation of the trade union, Labour party United Front, and the anti-capitalist programme in this country, one of the conditions for the construction of the Socialist Republic.

PARTY PUBLICATIONS OBTAINABLE FROM . . .

Prometheus Bookshop, 134 Alcester Road, Birmingham 13.
Books, 84 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds LS2 8AB.
Bookshop, Union Building, The University, Leeds.
Grass Roots, 109 Oxford Road, Manchester M1 7DU.

Leicester University Bookshop, Mayors Walk, Leicester, LE1 7RD.

Union Shop, Students Union, Percy Gee Building, Leicester University.

Collet's London Bookshop, 66 Charing Cross Road, London WC2.
Rare and Racy, 166 Devonshire Street, Sheffield 3.

The solution to the declining standard of living is a programme based on nationalisations under workers control to plan the economy

The population in Britain is continually facing a decline in its standard of living. Even the figures of the bourgeoisie admit that prices have risen twice as fast as wages. All the basic necessities of the masses are made more expensive as the cost of electricity, gas and food and the social services and health services decline. How is it possible to overcome this crisis of capitalism? There are demands made for more money for the N.E.B. so as to increase the level of investment in industry. The reality is that capitalism is in total crisis, which means that every aspect of its functioning is affected by the overall crisis. It is not just one firm or the other that has problems and with certain aid will recover and then function to give employment.

Capitalism functions by investing where it makes a profit. Because of its weakness over many years, it has had to accept a number of nationalisations in areas where it was incapable of continuing maintaining certain sectors of the economy. The railways were taken over by the state as they were necessary for the overall capitalist functioning but their use has been for the benefit of the bourgeois regime. The Labour government recently has partially nationalised Leyland, as the Conservatives did to Rolls Royce, but the aim of this state intervention is to stop a private firm from collapsing. This has not resulted in a social advance, there has been no elevation in the standard of life of the population and the bourgeoisie have been well compensated.

There is a need for the left to elevate its programme into one that is capable of gaining social transformations. Social transformations means to alter the property relations. Capitalism in Britain, as in the rest of the world, is only interested in one thing, that is for itself to survive as a system. The masses of the world pay the price of this which is poverty, reduction of living standards and assassinations from the bourgeoisie either directly as in Soweto or by such things as factory accidents and pollution. The example of the alternative to all this is given by the workers states, in all of them there is a constant increase in the standard of life of the population. The masses there do not have the

problems of worrying over rent and food, for the basic necessities of life are assured to them. The rate of growth of the countries in Comecon is double that of the E.E.C. countries and this growth is used to provide hospitals, schools and for an overall improvement for the masses. The characteristic of the workers state is that the property is nationalised and planned. In spite of the obstacles there have been with the bureaucracy, this basic structure of the state has enabled a massive expansion and a small country like North Korea has progressed incorporating the peasants in the overall advance, whereas in a country like Brazil which has tried to develop on a capitalist basis the peasantry are living in poverty, receiving no benefit from the industrialisation. The Soviet Union is now developing whole new areas in Siberia. British capitalism could not achieve anything like this. With all the oil in Scotland there are no plans for development, it is clear capitalism is incapable of expanding anything and any amount of subsidies or partial state interventions are only measures to try and sustain an obsolete system.

The proletariat is the only class which is capable of replacing the bourgeoisie and making the necessary social transformations. By its place in production it can only find collective solutions to its problems and therefore its intervention is for the benefit of all the masses. The proletariat cannot individually own the factory, as a petit bourgeois can own a little shop, as a class the proletariat has to make collective ownership of the means of the production. Collective ownership represents progress over private ownership, so the road to progress is the intervention of the proletariat. Workers control of industry is a fundamental need. If the nationalised industry still has a bourgeois boss appointed by the government as is the case now, the nationalisation will be used for the benefit of the capitalist, any losses the state will pay for, any profit capitalism will take. It needs the proletariat to take control of the industry and make the production not in accordance with what capitalism wants but so that the population benefits.

Nationalisations under workers control is the road for the proletariat to take the power. It is part of the whole reorganisation of the economy which requires a centralised plan of production. Under capitalism the factories produce to make a profit from a certain market, there is a great waste of production, it is very empirical with no plan. In a workers state it is possible to make plans and have enormous co-ordinated expansion of production which is related to the needs of the population. In all the discussions of the programme for the Labour party it is necessary to propose that the aim must be for measures that increase the standard of life of the population. To achieve this there is a need for a plan of production giving more hospitals, houses for the masses, cheap food, elimination of pollution. Capitalism cannot give this so the proletariat has to take the power. If only a few firms are nationalised there can be no planning and those firms are functioning within are capitalist market, the capitalist system still remains and so do all the problems.

The solution to the crisis in Britain is to make a workers state in Britain. The crisis here is that of capitalism and the masses must not be made to pay for it. For a number of years the bourgeoisie said that the economic recovery would be here soon if the masses kept down their wages. The trade union leaders accepted wage controls and then no economic recovery came. Then the bourgeoisie said, "When the oil comes there will be riches for all", the oil came and the decline continued. Today the crisis is so great, there is no longer any talk of a recovery, and living standards decline at an increasing rate. There is a need to develop a consistent programme of demands in the trade unions and Labour party for wages to rise with the cost of living, with popular committees to decide what is the real rate of inflation, not leaving the figures to be worked out by bourgeois statisticians. To link this with demands of plans for the benefit of the population to be carried out on the basis of the nationalised planned economy with the intervention of the proletariat through workers control.

COLOMBIA . . . Continued from page 4.

of study of the students must be to polemic not fundamentally with the communists but with the petit bourgeois currents.

In Latin America, Debray developed with a whole authority and ended up saying that the proletarian revolution was not necessary in Latin America. This was the conception of a certain Lenin, but here the revolution came from the country, so it was necessary to develop there. This was a totally mistaken thought which in this epoch, the thought of the Cubans represented. It was "focism". We made a whole polemical struggle against these positions and the attacks which they made on us.

It is necessary to realise that the world influence creates cadres in these countries of Latin America, without expecting the same process as in Europe, or Russia, or that great mass parties are generated. The great mass parties have their base in the army, in the students, in the peasants and among the workers. Not having a tradition of the revolutionary proletariat, the party

has diverse branches of development. But the base is a solid team, well formed theoretically and politically. In the last instance, the problem is simple. It is the relation of world forces which determines.

All the struggle of Latin America is going to intensify in a very few years and it is necessary to develop solid bases to intervene. In very few years, it is going to intensify, not through Latin American problems but through the world. Without this intensifying in a direct form in Latin America or in Africa or Asia, the relation of world forces is a base of stimulus, of influence which deepens the class struggle. The class struggle is permanent revolution. Now there is a world experience in which any backward country which has nothing more than a primary economic base decides for socialism. Now this exists in humanity.

It is necessary to be concerned to develop all these questions. The process of historic changes is already foreseen and prepared in the world course of the relation of forces. The resolutions for Latin America come

from the world relation of forces. Neither the bourgeoisie nor the Latin American proletariat are strong. The bourgeoisie cannot compete with world imperialism nor maintain power, nor has the proletariat strength of itself, it comes from the rest of the world. Cuba triumphed thanks to the Soviet Union. Without the Soviet Union, Cuba would not have triumphed, although their origin at the time in which they advanced to power, was the error of imperialism as we posed. Castro thought that he was going to cleanse capitalism, that he was going to whiten it, but it happened that the white turned into red without imperialism realising it. It was not that they deceived imperialism, but it was an error of imperialism. Thanks to the support and intervention of the Soviet Union, Cuba could triumph. It is an example, that it is the world relation of forces which decides in Latin America.

J. POSADAS 11.3.77

NO TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT!

For the united front of the European workers parties and trade unions against the capitalist system!

For the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe!

The crisis of the Callaghan government, its weakness and incapacity is refracted in one of its aspects through the discussion on the European parliament. The left in the Labour party cannot accept the admission to the European Common Market nor its organism the European parliament, but its response to this issue remains muted and without force. The acceptance by Callaghan of the proportional representation plea of the Liberals simply shows that the whole capitalist political structure is frail and it limps on through little negotiations which solve no important problem.

Any discussion of this European parliament has to be based on a class appraisal of its functions. In whose interest does it operate? There is now a profound economic crisis throughout the whole of the capitalist world. Even the most powerful capitalist economies, the United States and Germany, are deeply affected by it and it is admitted that there is no solution. Unemployment mounts and so do prices, sometimes on an astronomical scale. Whole sectors of the masses are oppressed by the difficulties of living under a regime which exploits all the necessities of food, fuel, living space and transport for the aggrandisement of the few, for the multi-nationals. Improvements in technology do not register in improvements for the masses, only in the competitive power of one or another company. Throughout Europe, whole regions are just abandoned from the point of view of development. Regions such as Scotland, Wales, areas in central and southern France, the mezzogiorno in Italy, large areas in Belgium have no perspective of development under capitalism. Where are the resources to come from? This European parliament discusses none of this. It is a discussion centre and regulator of inter-

capitalist disputes and that's all. It is an error of the comrades of the communist parties to have sustained this institution which is an instrument of the bourgeoisie and can be no other.

Any discussion of this European parliament and the Common Market has to take account of the existing balance of forces. In other words it's not a question of saying we are against and leaving it at that. The fact is that the masses are not intimidated by capitalism nor its institutional facade the European Parliament. The total crisis of the capitalist system is due not only to the ineptitude of capitalism but to the weight of the workers states and the resistance of the masses themselves. When the German bourgeoisie have to stifle opposition by all manner of measure against left wing expressions of opinion and organise the murder of Ulrike Meinhof, it is because their system is profoundly unstable, even with a powerful economic structure. When the communists open a discussion on the need to extend the number of nationalisations in the Common Programme in France, when even in a small country like Holland, the socialists win in hotly contested elections and in Italy, capitalism can only continue because of the insecurity in the leaderships of the workers parties, these are manifestations of a very great weakening of capitalism in all aspects. The last elections in Spain have been disastrous for the bourgeoisie and anticipate a deepening of the class struggle, because Spanish capitalism has no means of solving all the problems of the country, its party is an amalgam of several parties, and the Soviet Union, with the violence of its attack on Carillo, is showing that it is preparing to weigh in support of the Spanish masses. It's necessary to see this European Parliament in this light, to see all the progressive features which allow a unification of the proletariats

in Britain and the rest of Europe, on a common anti-capitalist programme. The Socialist parties are maturing in Europe. In an anti-capitalist direction, even the German Social Democracy cannot contain discussion, as can be seen in the JUSOS.

A fundamental aspect which the forces of the Labour left still do not take into account is that it is not possible to discuss the European Parliament or Common Market in isolation from the existence of the Soviet Union and the other workers states in Eastern Europe. The "Common Market" is in reality a very puny affair compared with all this. An alternative system of production exists in these states based on statified property, planning and monopoly of foreign trade. It is as though the discussion on the Common Market is carried out on the bourgeois plane i.e. that the workers states are a devil and are to be ignored. This of course means to eliminate a realistic socialist appraisal of the ECM and its alternative.

Whereas the ECM goes from crisis to crisis, from conference to conference without solving any of their problems, COMECON shows a constant advance — even if they receive some elements from the disintegration of the capitalist economy — in living standards, reaping the advantages of mutual support and collaboration. Cuba is part of COMECON and is sustained by it. What capitalist economy of the ECM would sustain in such a way another capitalist economy? They speak of the "terrible" life in Czechoslovakia for the followers of Dubcek who wanted to return to capitalism, but what of the great progress of the economy of Czechoslovakia, the constant augmentation in the standard of life. Between the wars, most of these countries of Eastern Europe were impoverished because of the existence of private property and the failure

of capitalism, now in thirty years they have made more progress than capitalism made in centuries. How then ignore these states in any objective discussion of the future of Europe? When the left speaks of the failure of the ECM it is necessary to be clear that this is the failure of capitalism. The ECM and the European parliament are not mysterious evil forces, they are most un-mysterious forces, they are the inevitable result of the concentration of capitalist economic power and capitalist political expression in the period of the multi-nationals, the period when capitalism is totally deprived of any more capacity to develop the world market and proceeds to concentrate more and more on the basis of destroying other capitalist sectors.

It is certainly true that the Common Market has given no new lease of life to British imperialism. The departure of the empire has not been compensated by new gains in Europe. The German — France axis remains predominant there and hence British capitalism has come away empty handed but the ECM is not only an economic union, it is dominated by its political military role which is preparation to confront the workers states through NATO. The European parliament is another form of expressing NATO. The fact that a struggle may occur with the Yanks makes no difference, the European bourgeoisie may not like the power of Yankee imperialism but it is obliged to submit in the interests of the final encounter with the workers states. In the recent French intervention to support Mobutu in Zaire against the revolution, it was the European parliament which sanctioned all this.

To be against the ECM and the European parliament means to be against capitalism, not to support "British" capitalism versus the "European" variety, but to be based on the struggle of the European masses as a whole

against the capitalist system in Britain and the rest of Europe. The massive general strikes in Italy and France, the intervention of the Spanish masses in support of the Socialist and Communist parties are the forces the Labour left has to take note of. Everywhere the big monopolies have driven the peasantry to the wall in Europe, food prices are controlled by the big food producers, plants are closed down and that's it, that is the democracy of big business.

We appeal for the Labour left to develop a discussion with the masses in the factories and the offices to discuss this issue of the European parliament, but linking it with the discussion of the problems of the economy which capitalism cannot solve, giving the perspective of a European workers centre which incorporates the Communist parties and the trade unions of Eastern Europe as well as Western Europe and has a perspective of social transformations on the basis of the replacement of the capitalist economy with a statified economy under workers control.

In the last capitalist conference in London, all that emerged for Europe was that no one had any capacity to revitalise the capitalist economy but they did want to revitalise the military budgets. That is capitalism, British and the rest. The masses win what they fight for. No parliament has ever conceded anything to the masses save under the pressure of the masses. Now capitalism at the end of its tether yields nothing, whatever parliament is in session. The European parliament is simply the bourgeois substitute for a fascism it cannot mobilise, because the counter attraction of the workers states does not allow the growth of fascist movements.

All the discussions on the need to advance towards a workers state in Britain have to be linked with the explanation of the process in the rest of Europe under the slogans:—

FOR THE UNITED FRONT OF THE EUROPEAN WORKERS PARTIES AND THE TRADE UNIONS ON THE ANTI CAPITALIST PROGRAMME!

FOR THE SOVIET SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE!

COLOMBIA AND THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM J. Posadas

It is necessary to be clear in relation to Colombia and Venezuela that the development of democratic rights is united to the struggle for the economy and for social transformations. This is the principal point on which we in Venezuela have to develop a current, not one or other sector but a current on the base of the publications which the comrades themselves produce and our texts.

It is not possible to struggle for democratic demands, if this is not united to social transformations. The bourgeoisie cannot give democracy, cannot develop it, do not have the capacity to develop the country and the economy. Thus, for this reason there is no democracy. Only the proletariat can give democracy, it's not going to give it to the bourgeoisie because there isn't any. It is going to give it for the development of the country, because the problem of the economic and democratic development is to develop the country and the bourgeoisie cannot do it. It has no interest nor preoccupation.

On the other hand, the proletariat has an interest in this development which means that the necessities of the masses and of the preponderant sectors of the population only can develop with nationalised property. There is no other way. In this it is very important to conclude to construct a current.

As in Venezuela, as in Colombia, there are communist parties, but they have never been preoccupied to intervene in the process of a semi-colonial backward country, to unite the struggle for democratic demands and the interest of the working class, in the development of the country. They have not understood the permanent revolution and now they have to begin to accept it. Hence in declarations of the Secretary of the Communist Youth of Colombia, it was accepted that in a certain way, they could make the democratic bourgeois revolution and the socialist revolution together. There are tendencies now which pose that democracy in Colombia cannot come without the struggle for socialism. Socialism is going to give democracy. Now there is no democracy.

There are sectors which pose a united front with the bourgeoisie and other sectors, but the condition to push this forward is the understanding of the permanent revolution and of the programme. The Bolsheviks made a united front with the bourgeoisie and afterwards took power. Hence it is very important to develop a current and our parties. At the same time as publishing and selling publications, it is necessary to develop our current with texts which respond to the local necessity. This is fundamental. Then our sections develop with precise objectives, not the general propaganda of power, of socialism, of socialist

democracy, but of the stages through which this struggle goes.

In Colombia, there was the left nationalist movement of Gaitan and also the movement of Rojas Pinilla and of his daughter, which mixed nationalist positions with demagogy aimed at the layers of cultural and social backwardness, not only economic. In front of the proletariat, they could not make demagogy. But it is necessary to consider that in Colombia there is no tradition of class movements with an important social base. Apart from the movement of Rojas Pinilla, there was Gaitan, but neither was this a movement of the working class. It was based on the petit bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie answered with massacres and massive assassinations against the liberals and Gaitanists. But there is no tradition of class movements and of theoretical and political discussion.

The backwardness in the theoretical and political discussion was very great. The paper of the communists, "Voz Proletaria", is very backward and years behind. It has nothing to do with communism nor with a newspaper of the left. It is a protest newspaper and the essential basis of this party is the petit bourgeoisie, including the peasants. The coffee workers still have a very weak organisation, and the Communist parties live from a petit bourgeois base. They have a little proletarian

base in the engineering industry — very incipient — in the shoe industry, textiles, construction, timber, but it is very small and there is no tradition of theoretical discussions, nor is there in the university.

For example they have not discussed how they will resolve the problem of the backward countries, like the Soviet Union, the Russia of Lenin, which was as backward as Colombia. It is true that there was a better quality expressed in a number of people and the proof was that it gave rise to the Bolshevik party and there was a very great concentration of the factory proletariat which was the basis of the Bolsheviks. But the Russia of that time was very backward.

The process in Colombia is different from that of Argentina. The essential differentiation consists in the much more advanced economic and social development of Argentina as of Colombia. But historically the two have the same problem, permanent revolution. One has more immediate stages than the other. It is easier, simpler because the proletariat of Argentina has great weight but Colombia, no. Also this proletarian weight exists in part in Chile, Brazil and Mexico, but in the other countries of Latin America, there exists little proletarian weight.

But even with little proletarian weight, Colombia has already a world relation of forces, which

(Title of the Editorial Board)

allows it to be based on the world proletariat. It lacks political leadership. The essential aspect is lack of political leadership to organise the petit bourgeoisie with the little proletarian nucleus, which is sufficient for the task to be done, because it is not a new task, nor a new experience, nor is it necessary to convince. All the masses of Colombia have seen that in Angola there are less proletarians, as in Mozambique also, and they go directly to the construction of the workers state. This is to say that now this is not the stage of the Russian Revolution, that then the small proletarian weight was a problem. The development of a leadership is necessary which has this understanding, and on the march achieves what is necessary.

The petit bourgeoisie, which was the bridge between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and with that the intellectual and cultural layers of weight, today are won by the revolution. Then it is necessary to develop a great activity of development, of scientific, economic, political and social explanation and to intervene in all the problems.

In all this, the students have a very great function. The weight of the students has to be associated with the workers movement and with a programme to develop the country. The essential base of the programme

Editorial

The Labour left has to participate in the discussion in the Communist Party on the dictatorship of the proletariat

The inability of capitalism to give any concessions in this stage of its total and final crisis and the nature of the Labour government is shown clearly in the steep rise in unemployment and inflation and in the continuous decline of all the social services. All the actions of the Labour government in the last period prove, beyond doubt, that it is a bourgeois government, dedicated to the maintenance of capitalism. The "social contract" is a policy to lower the living standards of the workers by limiting wage increases, whilst inflation remains at 20%. This "social contract" between the Labour government and the trade union leadership has been broken by the working class. In fact the perspective posed by sectors of the left that a "return to free collective bargaining" would mean that the Labour government would give concessions in the face of the pressure of the working class is false. The Labour government, in fact, rather than give concessions to the masses has retreated further into its alliance with the Liberals who are a sector of capitalism and with the Tories directly. This is the significance of the statement of Healey that if the working class demands and gains higher wages then unemployment will also rise. This is the same as the threat of the Thatcher/Joseph tendency of the Tory party who now stand aside and applaud the defence of the capitalist system by the Labour government. Indeed despite all the uproar the Tories create in parliament they are quite content to allow the Labour government to serve capitalism. This is the nature of the Labour government and since capitalism has no margin to give concessions, then nothing can be expected from the Labour government.

BREAK WITH THE IMPERIALIST POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

It is necessary for the Labour left to understand that so long as it defends the present Labour government it is not possible for it to advance towards the anti-capitalist measures. It is incredible that the "Lib/Lab pact" is maintained on the basis of an agreement to hold down the wages of the working masses and little is said against it by the Labour left. The nationalised industries like the Post Office and the Gas and Electricity undertakings make enormous profits by raising the price of necessities and the left does not react. We have now reached the incredible situation where the average family pays more in taxes and national insurance payments each week than it spends on food, and the Nationalised industries — along with the major capitalist enterprises — continue to make record profits. Even worse is the fact that whilst the left struggles to cut arms expenditure, British imperialism — administered by the Labour government — follows Yankee imperialism in supplying arms to Somalia. Is it not at least necessary to question what these arms are for? In reality imperialism is taking advantage of the limitations in the leadership of a Revolutionary State — which is what Somalia is — a state dedicated to raising the living standards of the masses, when it clashes with another Revolutionary State, Ethiopia. The arms given to Somalia are part of the strategy of imperialism to try to limit the influence of the Soviet Union and the system of the Workers States in Africa. It is necessary to compare the intervention of the Workers States with that of imperialism in this area. The Soviet Union — through the intervention of Fidel Castro — discussed with both the leaderships of Ethiopia and Somalia and proposed a Federation in the area with the right of self-determination for minorities and, on top of this, Cuba, a small country only just coming out of the economic backwardness imposed by imperialism, supplies doctors and medical supplies to Ethiopia which has only 137 doctors in the whole country. It is necessary for the Labour left to denounce the sending of these arms and the intervention of imperialism, to break openly and publically with the imperialist policy of the Labour government. Unless it does this it cannot advance, however good its intentions. Clearly to maintain a government which only serves the interests of capitalism serves no purpose, allows no advance for the masses, for the economy or for the country.

The intervention of imperialism is not a sign of strength but one of weakness. When they have to intervene supporting a Revolutionary State it is an immense weakness because the arms given to Somalia and those to Egypt are going to be used against imperialism later. These Revolutionary States are born out of the anti-imperialist struggle, out of the objective necessity to break with the domination of imperialism in order to develop the economy. This is why the new "government of the right" in Ceylon says: "we will not return on nationalisations, we will not give back imperialist property already nationalised". Imperialism could already see this process in Amin in Uganda who was used by imperialism to try to stop the anti-imperialist process in Uganda and who has now become more anti-imperialist than Milton Obote whom he overthrew. The world balance of forces is with progress and with the Workers States which, with the Soviet Union at their head, advance in the

Turn to page 3

NO TO THE IMPERIALIST LABOUR GOVERNMENT'S INTERVENTION IN SOMALIA! FOR THE SOCIALIST FEDERATION OF SOMALIA, ETHIOPIA AND ERITREA!

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

268 Friday 12 August 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
Admnsid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL.

Other party address:—

24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE ELECTIONS IN SPAIN A DEFEAT FOR WORLD CAPITALISM

19.6.77

J. Posadas.

These elections in Spain are a triumph of the left including the communists, whose result is not bad. But above all, they indicate a great impulse to the left. After forty years, when there is such an impulse, it shows that the conditions to advance towards the suppression of the king and of the capitalist system are very profound. There are all the conditions for this. The triumph of the left is going to influence all Europe because it reduces the points of support of reaction, of sectors of imperialism, and on the contrary, increases the basis of influence of the workers parties over the petit bourgeoisie and peasants. It is necessary to realise that this result in Spain is going to have a very great influence. The workers parties have to make their programme and organise their activity taking into account such conditions, not allowing Suarez to be the man who determines. The left drew more votes than the right and the centre; and the centre which supported the right, had a petit bourgeois support which did not correspond to its policy, because the communists and socialists did not offer anything very different. They offered democracy, work, some improvements, but not a programme of social transformations, of expropriating capitalism to thus increase the democratic forces with the weight of the working class.

It is not a problem of waiting for democracy to be acclimatised or established, or that the army has to be accustomed to accept. It is true that the army can make a coup. But when the army has had to allow elections, it is because in the army itself they do not have bases for a coup. When Suarez launched the recognition of the Communist party and there was a number of meetings, this was resolved. It is the least evil for capitalism which they have carried out. If they could have continued with Franco, they would have done so. They did not continue with Franco because of the contradictions that fascism developed to the maximum, the contradictions of the capitalist system. This weakens capitalism as a system and makes it weak in competition with world capitalism. The other reason is that the masses have not been crushed at any time. It is not, then, that the king, the Spanish bourgeoisie and world imperialism have resolved to provide democracy, but that they were obliged to yield. The working class is conscious that it won these bourgeois democratic rights. It is necessary to draw this conclusion! This is not a concession of the bourgeoisie, because it saw that this was going to lead to a better situation, but it had no other way out. The masses buried Franco and overthrew fascism.

It is necessary to draw the conclusion of a united front to maintain and extend democratic liberties, but with a programme for the economy, of transformation, expropriations, statifications and planning of production with the intervention of the workers movement, the workers trade union centres, in a united front of communists, socialists, left groups, workers centres and trade unions.

It is necessary to measure as a fundamental point, the world weight of the struggle of the working class, particularly the progress of the workers states and a policy of the workers states more linked to the anti-capitalist struggle which has influenced the Spanish proletariat. The

proletariat did not vote for democracy, for rights, it voted against the capitalist system. The petit bourgeoisie was not attracted, because it did not see a programme any appeal for the programme of social transformation. It saw a programme of democracy, of democratic rights, but this is not a pole of attraction for the petit bourgeoisie. Suarez also spoke of democracy. The fact that there were elections is democracy but the appeal for social transformations to which democratic rights should be united, was absent. Through the electoral swindle of the proportional vote through regions, the bourgeois parties have a far greater number of seats.

It is necessary to discuss and draw the conclusion that fascism was smashed by the world struggle of the proletariat, by the progress of the workers states, particularly of the USSR, which has deprived capitalism of the capacity of manoeuvre and of intervention and has stimulated the proletariat to see that it can advance and this all helped to disintegrate the fascist apparatus.

It is necessary to advance in the realisation, that this election is not a definitive conclusion of the grade of maturation, of the relation of social forces but is an experience which comes forty years after the oppression of the fascist regime. Neither is the proletariat which intervenes, the proletariat of before. There are a series of young generations who have not had a sufficient political life, have not been able to develop experiences, have not been able to influence the rest of the population. The student movements, the university movements and the workers, the peasants less, have mobilised in conditions of illegality, of repression and with a very great number of workers abroad. Differently from the Portuguese workers or the Turkish workers in emigration, these are not sectors from the land or backward politically, but contain many sectors who had to leave for political reasons. Many are the sons of militants who have not

developed the life, the political activity, save externally and have not been able to participate internally. Moreover the life of the parties has been very precarious, the trade unions have intervened much more than the parties, which means a certain containing of the capacity for political influence of the world socialist and communist movement towards the workers of Spain and also the petit bourgeoisie.

After almost forty years of fascist dominion of the Franco regime, there is a left vote of more than forty per cent and the votes of Suarez are not of the right. It is the centre against the right and of these, a very great quantity are to impel democratic reforms which are contained in the programme of Suarez. It is a prime proof which shows the very great concentration of the will of the proletariat which attracts the petit bourgeois and peasant layers to vote for the left.

The centre right of Suarez supported itself on the absence of decided directives on the part of the workers parties. Democratic demands are one of the essential points but they were not the only ones. People have not voted, and were not called to the struggle for social transformations. They were called for democratic changes and improvements. None of the programmes posed social transformations as the essential basis of the programme. Thus it's not possible to say that the vote for social transformations was very small, because there was no appeal for this. The trade unions were not called upon to support this programme.

Suarez gained from the democratic petit bourgeoisie who hoped by means of democracy to advance and gain improvements, but it is not a function of the aspirations of the bourgeois democracy, which is not democracy but the limited right to give opinions, to speak and to decide in relation to the strength in power which the bourgeoisie has. This is bourgeois democracy.

Turn to page 2

THE ELECTIONS IN SPAIN

Continued from page 1

Thus this election is not a definitive proof nor an opinion set for many years. It is not a triumph if Suarez has a few more votes than the socialists. It is not an immense strength. This election indicates that the most concentrated force is the proletariat which has attracted the peasantry and the petit bourgeoisie, because the communists, the socialists and the votes of the left were nearly 40% of the votes, whilst the government forces did not reach 40%. To be able to have a majority means to count upon the votes of the right and the Christian Democrats. That is to say there is no social definition, but it is a very circumstantial and transitory proof.

The trade unions have used the strikes and the mobilisations to attract the population. This is an enormous force for the workers parties but at the same time, the period of political preparation has been small, and the parties do not raise the campaign for social transformations. It is true that the struggle for democratic demands was necessary, but it was necessary to accompany this with a programme of transformations and statifications, giving the explanation that in Spain they will not resolve the problems with democratic conquests, but it is necessary to discuss what to do. There are three million Spanish emigrant workers. What happens if they return to Spain? The money from these workers forms part of the finances of Spain.

This election is not a testimony for many years but an immediate outcome. The bourgeoisie does not have the strength to govern and to govern, it has to employ a centre which if certainly it is a right centre, pretends to be a centre equidistant from right and left to maintain the petit bourgeoisie. All the previous policy of Suarez was to show that it was a democratic government which was not afraid, which yielded to democracy, which legalises the Communist party, which gives freedom to the peasants, the Basques of the ETA, wanting to show security and strength and counting on the support of the petit bourgeoisie. The government based itself on these petit bourgeois and peasant bases and on the petit bourgeoisie. The big bourgeoisie voted in part for Suarez and in part for Fraga Iribarren. The Church also.

It is a very unstable experience. The workers and the masses have not voted for the king. They did not want him and the king was not discussed. It is not a definitive election, it is an election of the apparatus in which the masses have not been included. What was the objective, why was the king there? The parties accepted the king. No party said, "we are against the king." The tactic to intervene was just and correct in the struggle for democratic demands, but nothing impeded them saying, "we are against the king, why do we want the king?" Who elected the king? It is an experience in which the masses still have not been able to develop their social capacity in strike movements, in political activity, in mobilisations, conferences, meetings and circulation of positions. They have not been able to do this and have not been able to enter into contact with the petit bourgeois and peasant masses, save through the great strikes and great mobilisations. This indicates in a clear and decisive way, the capacity of the proletariat which has not been

able to do this but won nearly 40% of the votes. The bourgeoisie who had everything in their hands did not get 50% of the votes. It is a mystification election, because of the three million emigrant workers, ninety per cent of those who voted, voted for the workers parties. It is not an effective majority of Suarez. There has been a swindle over votes with the emigrant workers. They force the emigrant workers to send money to Spain and this serves as a basis of exchange, but these workers cannot vote. There is the right to vote but they were not allowed to. Little more than ten per cent voted who in their immense majority, ninety per cent, voted for the left.

This is a decisive proof that the election is a transitory experience and it is going to be continued with great fights and mobilisations where socialist, communist and trade unions, but particularly the trade unions are going to advance a series of positions of transformations, of statifications and above all, the struggle against the king. Who sustains the king? Who does the king represent? The king is an imposition of Franco. Franco and the Francoist regime has been liquidated and the king is the continuation of Franco. Franco put the king where he is. It is an effort of the big bourgeoisie to maintain their power through the king, impeding a bourgeois democratic selection or a redistribution of the forces in which other sectors of the bourgeoisie can impose their candidates. They placed the king there, so that big business could determine. He is not going to be able to play this function and in a short time is going to fall.

In a short time a united front of socialists, communists, left catholic groups and left petit bourgeoisie is going to be posed to overthrow the king and to struggle for social transformations, to maintain and extend democratic liberties, accompanying them with statifications.

It is not correct to wait for a stage of parliamentarianism to confirm democracy. The masses have the experience, the capacity to struggle and the understanding, an understanding well to the left. The bourgeoisie also has experience. A long stage of the development of limited bourgeois democracy, like this, with the king, will favour the development of careerist groups, bureaucratic groups in the socialists, the communists and the trade unions, to make a united front and maintain this situation.

It is necessary then, to appeal for this struggle, posing that this shows that the left has a majority. The election is a very partial and superficial test. The struggles, strikes and mobilisations of the Basques, the Catalans, the Galicians and of all Spain were infinitely superior to the result of the elections. This is a proof which shows a failure of the bourgeoisie through the Franco wing in its effort to want to smash the Spanish people. The relation of world forces was one of the essential bases to defeat Franco. This means that Spanish capitalism in the name of world capitalism sought with Franco, to break and confront the Soviet Union, to prepare the fall of the Soviet Union and develop world reaction. The result is that they had to liquidate Franco and put up with the communists and socialists.

This shows that it is not a process of democratic progress but of the relation of world forces whose

essential base is the workers states (socialist countries) and the revolutionary states, which prevent capitalism developing the policy, military action and economy according to its own wishes. It is being lashed, through the world development of the struggle of the masses, through the progress of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America towards workers states, and this did not let capitalism use Franco, as neither

The contradictions of the capitalist system are the fundamental factor which impede its stability. Capitalism advances in internal contradictions through the means of competition which develops the contradictions infinitely. It is not a homogeneous regime, but one of private interests. This develops heterogeneity. Whilst the proletariat, even being heterogeneous in its social composition, is homogeneous in its objectives, because there is the vanguard, the elevated sector of the proletariat, which directs the rest of the class. Capitalism failed to make Spain a front to smash the revolution in Europe. The Soviet Union and the workers states showed the success of having impelled, sustained and stimulated with their single presence and with their triumph in front of fascism, the development of the struggle of the masses of the world against capitalism, against fascism, as is reflected in these elections.

These elections are a proof, a very elevated test, which show the will to combat of the Spanish masses who feel the influence of the world proletariat, the struggles of the world proletariat, the progress of the workers states and they have not been able to advance more because their leadership does not give the necessary programme and has confirmed them to merely a democratic programme. The struggle for democratic demands is just and correct, but it is not necessary to stay at that limit, rather it is necessary to pose why democracy? Is there nothing more that democracy can achieve now? On the other hand, in the army, it has been shown that there are tendencies which are very influenced by Portugal and by the process of the revolution. An audacious programme of social transformations will show that it's possible to win much influence in the army, in the petit bourgeoisie, in the peasantry and the majority of the workers parties.

The elections show the failure of world capitalism in Spain. The Franco forces lost and Suarez does not have the absolute majority, when they had all the means to have it. The world proletariat on the other hand, has influenced Spain to obtain a very great progress. It is necessary to appeal for a united front to extend democratic liberties, for the socialist republic and out with the king, so that democratic liberties develop in struggle towards a socialist republic. It is not necessary to pose civil war, nor the use of rifles, but it is necessary to pose the programme of social transformations.

Democratic liberties in Spain cannot be sustained if the economic conditions do not progress. Spain is not in the economic conditions to give democratic liberties to the struggle of the masses, because capitalism does not have the funds to make concessions. From where will it give them? The proletariat is going to utilise democratic liberties to improve its conditions of life, its weight in society, its leadership of society and they are going to pose the problems of the moment immediately.

We congratulate the workers parties in their success including the Communist party. But it shows the success could have been much more, if they had had the more advanced programme of social demands and social transformations, including the

was capitalism able to use Hitler. Hitler was a defence of the capitalist system against the advance of socialism, but at the same time was the product of the internal contradictions of capitalist competition and the antagonism with the workers states. This shows that capitalism does not have the strength to contain the workers states. It does not have either the strength or the capacity to contain them.

questioning and rejection of the king and posing that economically, Spain is not in the conditions of democratic development. There is going to be a tendency to return to what existed before, with Franco. There are not the economic conditions to develop. The proletariat in power can, because it eliminates private property.

The votes to the Communist party were less than they could have been because the proletariat cannot weigh on the population and the programme of the communist party is not a programme of social transformations but one of defence of democratic liberties. A whole sector of the petit bourgeoisie, the peasantry, backward sectors of the population see that the government was better. They have more confidence in the government, which has the power, than in the others. It is not because the Spanish people did not have time. If after forty years of fascism it votes in this way, it needed to be very mature to do so. If not, it would not have voted like this. Even if still it did not have time to be won or influenced it would not have voted for the socialists or the communists.

The communist votes do not indicate the real possible strength of the Communist party. Through the nature of the struggles and the will of the Spanish proletariat, the possibility would be, as a minimum, double for the communists, immediately. The programme that appealed to the working class was missing, to play the function as the class against the capitalist system. On the other hand here, it diluted the working class as a class in an empirical, superficial defence of democratic rights, as if it was a stage, leaving aside the combination of the defence of democratic rights with the anti-capitalist struggle, which did not break the alliance with the socialists nor with the petit bourgeoisie, on the contrary. The petit bourgeoisie has seen the lack of such a programme and thus voted for the bourgeois parties.

It is not as the communists say that the vote for the bourgeois parties is the result of the lack of maturation. How do the masses mature? In accordance with the programme, their experience with programme and policy and this is seen in the world, especially in a place very close to Spain which is France.

The stage which is coming in Spain, is one of great discussion, also of why the communists do not draw more votes. Why after the civil war, when they should have gained, does a party of the centre emerge? It is through the absence of anti-capitalist policy. One cannot say "after so many years of oppression . . ." If Francoism was thrown out, it was because it was incapable! The masses rose against capitalism. Why did they not vote for the socialist and communists?

The votes in the workers zones have much importance, where there is a definite majority of the left and the abstention for which the anarchists called, had little echo. The proletariat wanted to vote and wanted to influence. Of the abstentions, in every way, the most important are of the sectors linked to the working class, to the petit bourgeoisie and to the peasantry because the bourgeoisie voted integrally.

Where the working class was concentrated, the vote was one of concentration to the left because the class attracted the petit bourgeois masses. Where the class was dispersed, no, the policy of the parties for a programme, combining democratic demands with the anti-capitalist level, concerning the organisation of work, wages, the conditions of life, in which they have to attack capitalism strongly was absent. Although they may not appeal for the overthrow of capitalism, they have to make proposals. In the absence of this, in other places the workers votes were reduced, because the working class could not exercise a pressure on the rest of the population. This was through the weight reduced by reason of the number of workers externally and through the lack of a policy which allows the proletariat to aim at other sectors of the population. It is not possible to lead in the name of democracy and liberty, because everyone asks for democracy and liberty, without posing what programme, what policy, how to resolve the problems of the economy? This was missing, this is what it is necessary to do now in a united front of parties and trade unions.

Although afterwards, other elections may come, these elections serve only to "cleanse the rubbish of the past". If they had developed a programme, they would have the same quantity of votes and neither the army nor the king would have been able to oppose. If they gave freedom to the communists and elections, it is because they could not go on anymore. It is the crisis of capitalism and the empiricism of the contradictions of the capitalist system which determined that with the dictatorship of Franco, the whole Spanish economy was heading for collapse. Fascism led to the collapse of the economy, because it concentrates power in the small hands of big business

Subscribers' Rate to

RED FLAG

£2.00 a year.

obtainable from the Party's address.

THE CRISIS AND SPLIT IN THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE NEED FOR THE APPLICATION OF MARXISM

The crisis of the British Communist party, centred on the discussion of the "British Road to Socialism" has already led to a rupture. We do not agree with the split, because it does not develop or deepen discussion on the differences over the programme of the Communist party. It does the opposite, it tends to cut it short and leave the issues very superficially understood. We seek to stimulate all sectors of the Communist party, including the sectors that have broken away, to approach the problem of marxist principles not abstractly but in their application.

The issues which have provoked the original argument, that is, the impossibility of simply "taking over the state", the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat as opposed to the broad alliance of everyone taking power through due parliamentary process and the criticism of the concepts of "Euro-Communism" as an invention to conciliate with Western bourgeois "democracy", are important because they concern basic principles of marxism. But marxism is not the continued reiteration of abstract generalisations but the application of method in order to intervene on concrete events. The group which has left the Communist party has not affirmed an orientation which corresponds to the application of these principles, nothing which poses a new concrete perspective. But despite the grave limitations in this discussion, it is of very great importance, because it brings a little of the force of the world communist movement into Britain, provokes thought in sectors well outside the Communist party and thus fertilises the ground for the education of sectors who seek the means to advance in the Labour party towards the anti-capitalist programme and the concrete understanding of the process which requires this programme.

There have been other crises in the Communist party and they have all reflected, as over Hungary, problems and crisis of the workers states and the world communist movement, in that case the decline of Stalinism and the most violent aspects of the political revolution. It was a crisis which at that stage was particularly barren in its immediate consequences for the world communist movement and represented in part a political impasse. But the crisis of today which stems from crisis in the world communist movement is one of progress and theoretical growth — even if this may result

for some sectors of the communist parties of dismemberment or abandonment. The crisis in one sense is not new, it has always been there i.e., the question of conciliation with capitalism but the force of the discussion on principles is new. It stems directly from all the richness of changes in the world communist movement and the need for the Soviet Union to advance and break in part the conciliation with capitalism by the communist parties in the capitalist world. Thus the extremely violent attack on Carrillo by the Soviet leadership — and its style is not the way to polemicise — shows the force of the need of the Soviet Union to overcome those elements in the world communist movement that limit the struggle for power against capitalism and put their own desire for partial agreements with the bourgeoisie before the need for centralisation around the Soviet Union. Everywhere now elements of change and return to marxism are in evidence in the world communist movement. Thus Albania correctly attacks the Chinese leaderships collaboration with counter revolutionary forces such as Pinochet and Mobutu, the Soviet Constitution reaffirms socialism as a world system and Castro affirms proletarian internationalism in supporting Angola and Ethiopia and behind Castro stands the Soviet Union, which unlike the time of Stalin, actively extends the export of revolution.

In the discussion over the dictatorship of the proletariat, over proletarian internationalism, over "Euro-Communism", over "pluralism", it is most important to see the immensely progressive character of the Soviet Union and the workers states as a whole and how capitalism has entered upon a massive total crisis because fundamentally it cannot compete with this new world system founded upon nationalised property and the planned economy. It is necessary to see that the proletariat in Britain is not backward, but there are certainly structural problems. Lenin's conception of the aristocracy of labour and its separate caste interests is fundamental because the structures of the Labour party and the trade unions and the timidity of the labour left relate to this problem. Essentially these structures represent a prolongation of capitalism in the workers movement. On the other hand despite this conservative structure there is a whole range of phenomena which point to a very deep decomposition of capitalism.

When the police rebel in the way they have done recently in support of trade union rights and the need to strike, when there is an upsurge of "nationalist" sentiment in Scotland, Wales and Ireland and the convulsion of Unionism in Northern Ireland takes place, this is no ordinary series of events, and adjustments for capitalism, they point to the collapse of capitalist authority. How else can they be explained? Capitalism produces no solutions, and all the problems multiply, is this not a total crisis of the organisms of capitalism? The perception of the depth of the crisis of decomposition of capitalism but the crisis of growth of the workers states, means that it is possible both to understand the reasons for the ineffectiveness of the existing labour left and at the same time opens the possibility to intervene to construct a labour left that moves with the conviction that a real socialist programme of nationalisations and planning is viable.

Another aspect of the application of marxism is how to understand the problem of the Labour party, what is understood by the alliance with the labour left? What is the nature of this left? Has it a socialist orientation or does it have to be constructed? The Communist party in the midst of this controversy has not approached this problem. It makes no balance of this labour left. This means understanding the depth of the problem of the Labour party. They speak of the strength of the right but does not the Labour party as a whole sustain the Labour government? This hardly speaks of a mature left. How has this come about? To dominate this, it is necessary to understand both the role of the Soviet Union and the decomposition of capitalism.

We appeal to the communist militants to continue this discussion, not to follow the road of splitting which solves nothing, particularly when none of the issues have been discussed from the point of view of concrete policies as the alternative to those of the "British Road". It is necessary to elaborate on all the real issues of this movement. If it is correct to discuss proletarian dictatorship, then it means that any programme with a revolutionary perspective must take account of the need for mass soviet type organisms where the masses can express themselves. What exactly is the state of British capitalism? Why the monarchy, why not a slogan for a socialist republic? What sort of a "democracy" is it where one and a half a million are unemployed? Who voted for that? There are a vast number of concrete discussions it is possible to have, which are not isolated from marxist principles but if the principles are not applied marxism is embalmed. By entering upon these issues with passion and intelligence, the communist militants can make a contribution to accelerating the left forces in the Labour party not by competing with but elevating the currents who wish to advance and promoting that breaking of the rigid structure of the Labour party which hinders the flow of thought and breaks the pressure of the masses. In this way the Communist party has a powerful contribution to make.

EDITORIAL continued from page 1

development of a world anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist strategy and develop society and the economy internally for the benefit of the masses. There are limitations still but it is a process of constant advance in which the Soviet Workers State — as we can see in the new Soviet Constitution — is dedicated to the support of the world revolution, the advance of humanity. This is the balance of world forces on which the Labour left have to base themselves in order to develop the anti-capitalist programme, policy and strategy which is necessary.

Imperialism recognises this world balance of forces which goes against it and it prepares the war. We live in the stage of the final settlement of accounts, which means the confrontation system against system — in the Middle East and in Africa for example — and the war. The Labour left cannot allow the proposal of Yankee imperialism to develop the "neutron bomb" — the Soviets call it the "capitalist bomb" because it destroys people but leave property intact — without protest. It shows that Carter, for all the liberal smokescreen which he puts up on the question of "human rights" and the struggle in Africa, represents imperialism and they are preparing for war. We have to draw the full implications from this "capitalist bomb" in the sense that it is a weapon designed to be used internally, against the masses of North America, Europe, Latin America. It is a weapon designed to be used against the masses inside the capitalist countries. Clearly the Workers States are going to be attacked also by imperialism but imperialism is not much bothered by the destruction of property inside the Workers States. Its own property is another matter altogether. The Labour left, the trade unions have to denounce this development and to disassociate itself from the bourgeois policy of the Labour government.

DEVELOP THE ANTI-CAPITALIST PROGRAMME

However denunciations are not enough. The Labour left and the trade unions have to formulate an alternative anti-capitalist policy to answer the total crisis of capitalism. The proposal to "invest more in industry" through the National Enterprise Board (NEB) is no solution. To invest in capitalism at this time only means to raise the level of unemployment. If capitalism invests — or if the state kindly invests for it — it is to introduce measures of technical and scientific advance such as automation. Capitalism has to do this in order to maintain its profits in the face of inter-capitalist competition. Thus greater productivity is attained, less workers are needed and unemployment rises. This is precisely what has happened in British Leyland. It is precisely in the most profitable industries i.e. those industries which are still expanding within capitalism which "shed the most labour". What is necessary is nationalisation under workers control which is the only way in which the economy can be planned to serve the needs of the mass of the population rather than the profits of a handful of bourgeois.

The Labour left tends to clash with the government and it attempts to make proposals which don't actually take a fully anti-capitalist form, but are not favourable to capitalism either. The invitation to Mitterand (of the French Socialist Party) to this year's Annual Conference of the Labour Party, indicates that the Labour left seeks to identify itself with the Popular Union with the Communist Party which has an anti-capitalist programme. It is also an attempt to be seen to link itself with the left in Europe on the basis of a common anti-capitalist programme which is an advance over the idea of a "loose association of European states". The Labour left is impelled in this direction, impelled toward the left by the conjunction of the total crisis of capitalism, which makes reforms and concessions impossible to attain, and the constant pressure of the working class which is determined not to pay for the crisis of capitalism. What is essential for the Labour left and for the trade unions now is a process of discussion, of elevation of ideas, programme and policy; it is necessary to draw conclusions from the rich world process of the advance of humanity. The bourgeois structure, the electoral functioning of the Labour Party does not allow this. However the crisis in the British Communist Party, the breaking away of the "French tendency", has thrown up a discussion of basic Marxist principles not only in the Communist Party but publically. This crisis of the Communist Party is an expression of the process of partial regeneration in the Workers States in which the whole world communist movement is engaged in a discussion of fundamental principles in an attempt to advance towards the final overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism. The question "what is the road to socialism" is as important for the Labour left as it is for the comrades of the Communist Party. The Labour left have to involve themselves in this world discussion and help to continue and elevate the discussion in this country.

The fact that 20,000 workers mobilise in support of a tiny sector of workers on strike — and Grunwick is only one of many such strikes every year — means that they seek to advance against capitalism and they seek to impel their own leaderships. The trade unions are, at this moment, the organisation of the class most open to the pressure from the base. However the question of leadership is crucial in a situation where workers demanding trade union rights are faced with the combined opposition of the police, the bosses, the judiciary, the government and their own trade union leadership. The actions of the APEX and UPW leaderships in forcing — by threats to withdraw strike pay — the workers to limit their action, stems from the nature of the bureaucracy which is structured into the framework of capitalism. The Labour left has to intervene in this process to impel, in the trade unions, an anti-capitalist programme including the demand that any factory threatened with closure should be occupied and run under workers control pending nationalisation and that any enterprise which cannot — or will not — give the workers a reasonable standard of living and basic trade union rights should be treated in the same way. This demand should go together with the demands that all wages rise with the cost of living, work sharing without loss of pay and the reduction of working hours so that all the profits of automation go directly to the workers, the expropriation of all empty and luxury property (royal palaces etc) in order to ease the housing shortage, and the nationalisation of all major industry, the land, banks and insurance companies, under workers control and without compensation as a basis for the planning of the economy.

The Labour left has to intervene to impel this programme in the trade unions because without such a programme, the actions of the leaderships which conciliate with capitalism will continue. The action of the local Labour Parties in functioning with the trade unions in support of the Grunwick strike is correct but it has to be generalised and elevated to the level of the Labour Party/Trade Union United Front based on the anti-capitalist programme and on mobilisations of the working class. The elevation of an anti-capitalist programme in the trade unions and their intervention in a political way is a first and immediate step in this direction.

SPAIN, Continued from page 2

crushes the economy and creates intense contradictions. They did not have any perspective, hence capitalism had to concede. Hence they allowed elections not because the king became a

democrat, but the masses conquered this right together with the face that the capitalist system could not continue as before with the same level of contradictions.

In these conditions it is necessary to make a united front of communists, socialists, trade unions, workers centres, workers commissions with the Christian Democratic left and the social democrats, to propose a plan for the development of Spain, the planning of production, expropriations, nationalisations, workers control, better conditions of life and increase of wages and production for internal consumption. Appeal now for the republic — although tactically it may not be immediate to prepare to send the king to hell. Appeal also to the army for the slogan, "Out with the king and out of NATO," as the socialists pose "neutrality" which means out of NATO, because the Soviets are not in Spain.

The crisis in the Socialist and Communist parties is a crisis of growth, not of collapse. It is produced because the socialist and communist masses exert a pressure and wish to go further and the leadership does not do so. The masses exerted a pressure in the Congress of the CGIL.

This Congress of the CGIL discussed a series of interesting points, but it is an abstract discussion. There is some progress but it is very superficial. The progress is that the CGIL and the trade unions must intervene in policy, must support a programme of the United Front but they do not say what programme. Besides, this Congress at no time has discussed what is the situation of the working class? What is the standard of living of the working class? But they discussed what is the condition of the boss.

Even so, there is a very great internal fight which indicates there is a tendency which seeks to impel and which has stopped relatively the most conciliatory sectors. The one who spoke representing the line of the Communist party - which is not all the party but the wing which dominates - was Lama, and his line is one of conciliation with the capitalist system. It is one of a greater political intervention but a policy of conciliation and in the last instance aimed to block the workers movement.

This is not a policy aimed to form the united front of trade unions and workers parties to draw anti-capitalist advantage. There is the perspective of the trade union-party intervention which is a correct principle but it is necessary to pose what programme, what objectives?

In that they speak of going back on the conquests of the past, they are concerned in the depth with profit and the income of the owner. These modifications which they seek to make, tend to make a differentiation between the workers. The wage is determined by what each one contributes to the boss and not through need. The workers who do the same work have to have the same wage. On the other hand, with these modifications, they are establishing a system which afterwards is going to end in a type of piece-work. It is a reactionary principle and favours exclusively the owner. Besides, it increases the divergences and the bases of conflict within the working class. It is a great conquest of the working class to have abolished every form of piece-work. This is not the same, but the principle leads to it.

It is completely outside every logic of the interest of the workers movement in discussing these proposals and not discussing what is the situation of the working class in Italy. On this the proposals do not say a word. In France they have discussed and present a programme of nationalisations, statifications, increase of wages and greater workers control. In this Congress there was nothing of this. It is a Congress which was made to stop the workers movement and does not represent a programmatic progress.

The united front of the trade unions and the parties is a progress, but what demands for transformations and changes? There is not a programmatic formulation and in the Communist party, the same process is expressed.

Through the discussion which has been made and the containing which the more conciliatory sectors have undertaken, the communist and socialist base expresses itself, exerting a pressure which is going to explode in the course of the year. It cannot last like this. In a process in which in France, they increase the united front of the trade unions with the workers parties on an anti-capitalist programme, in Italy they give a programme which has as a pre-occupation, to maintain the profit of the boss. They do not say it in this way, but it is the depth of the issue. They consider the bosses profit, as if it was the source of work and employment, while they have not discussed at all the situation of the working class, the situation of the capitalist system, what is the strategy of the trade unions to confront capitalism. There was no discussion of all this, but a programme which the leadership made which is going to be aimed to contain the workers movement, so that it does not surpass the limits and put in danger and at

THE CONGRESS OF THE CGIL AND THE CRISIS OF CAPITALISM IN ITALY

EXTRACTS

13-6-77

J. POSADAS

risk the capitalist system. Lama does not say this, but this is his conclusion, while the will of the working class is to overcome this.

They have discussed a principle besides, which is very dangerous. It is of a trade union in common, in the workers area of the unemployed, of the neighbourhood. It is not a correct principle because if the trade union is placed there, it receives the influence of people who are not workers, sections which do not have the same capacity, will, decision and preparation of the working class. This exerts a pressure. The area committee is good, it is a progress and it is correct to act together with the unemployed, but it requires a programme. What is the programme? The unemployed are going to do what? If there is no work then it is necessary to expropriate for work. On the other hand, they propose an area committee with the unemployed, the students, the people of the workers area and trade union but they do not say what the programme is. Thus the trade union is submitted to the pressure of all this sector of the population which has other preoccupations and does not have the maturity, the will and the representation of the working class.

The workers area committee is a correct principle but the form of functioning and programme is not. This committee has to have a programme. How to provide work for the unemployed? What function do the unemployed play in this area committee. With them it is necessary to discuss that to give work the factory must function. If capitalism does not make it function then as a principle, expropriation is necessary. On the other hand, they do not discuss anything of this and these committees are going to be a meeting place for the employed and the unemployed and the latter are a pressure on the employed to contain them, and at the same time a pressure of the trade union bureaucracy to contain the unemployed. It is a just principle to declare support for the organism but the lack of a programme is going to make it function badly.

It is not necessary to reject the workers area organism, but it is necessary to give a programme to it. They say that the trade union is going to intervene as a trade union, that the committee and the union are not joined. This is good, but what programme is the union putting forward? Thus it is necessary to discuss that although the principle is good, the lack of a programme makes it lose in value.

In another sense it is a progress because it is a form of dual power. It is a principle of dual power because this committee can mobilise against the fascist provocations, for workers mobilisations, to mobilise and win over the police inclusively. Hence in its origin, the organism is not bad. The lack of order and programme is incorrect.

All this indicates the crisis of world capitalism which in Italy is expressed in a very profound form. It expresses the difference between the will to combat of the communist and socialist base, of the groups and the lack of programme of the worker and trade union leadership. But also and at the same time there is the crisis of growth in the Communist and Socialist party itself.

This discussion which has opened is not a collective discussion, a public discussion. It's a tea party with Amendola, showing the lack of programme of the party which generates a very great disequilibrium. Amendola posed a policy of conciliation but as a base to advance to socialism. The problem is that with this, one does not go to socialism but it is a reinforcement for Agnelli. The principal which Amendola defends is not bad, but instead of defending the democratic state, it is

democratic rights which it is necessary to defend. He is pre-occupied because he believes that Sciacia and a sector of intellectuals are abandoning the defence of democratic rights. While the criticism which they make is that this is an incapable state and it is necessary to change it. Thus to contain this the need is posed to defend the democratic state. This has no sense.

The position of Amendola is the old position of the Communist party. It tries to give them a theoretical explanation on the position of the party on the state. It is necessary to return to the conception of the state as Lenin posed. There is no democratic state. There are democratic rights, which have to be defended, but it is not possible to defend a democratic state which does not exist.

This democratic state defends the interests of the capitalist system, defends the fascist bands, it is the ally of the capitalist system. How is it possible to speak of the democratic state? It is the state of the democratic bourgeoisie which has to provide certain liberties because they are imposed and they are obliged to yield. Thus it is necessary to use democratic rights to transform the state. Can it be done by means of recommendations, requests or of progress? The communists are the most decided to win the maximum possible of democratic rights and we defend to the maximum all the democratic rights. But there is no democratic state. It is the bourgeois state which has to give democratic rights. This is the old discussion of Marx with Lasalle and the social democrats.

Marx, in the Communist Manifesto, posed the support to the Radical Party in the struggle for democratic rights, which was the most democratic activity in that epoch. But today it is not a question of this. Democratic rights are not very different from those which existed in the epoch of Marx. They have to give more concessions, because they are obliged to give them.

When they discuss in this way, it is not an evaluation in accordance with the class struggle, but an evaluation in accordance with a humanist criterion, the capacity of one of good will in relation to the other. In this way, scientific analysis is abandoned and is replaced by impressionist analysis. It is a discussion which expresses a very profound need in the Communist party in which the communist base is exerting a pressure, posing that it cannot tolerate things as they are anymore. It means that it is going to advance at any moment to conquer.

The reduction in the renewing of membership in the Communist party does not mean a retreat of the masses of the Communist party. If there are elections, the communist will not lose votes and even increase. It shows the enormous maturity of people. If the Christian Democracy would believe otherwise, it would be convenient to have elections now. It would do it now. On the other hand, there is an enormous maturity of the masses who succeed in exerting a pressure in this way, showing their dissatisfaction with the policy of conciliation.

These elections of the communal councils and the councils of the workers areas are going to be an index of this situation, although very small, because the quantity who vote is very small. But the councils of the workers areas are in every way a conquest thus the vote is going to indicate the attraction of people. It is necessary to foresee quite an important increase of the left. It is a proof of the forms of organisms of the principle of dual power. A general mobilisation in the workers area councils is a centre of

very great action. This is not anything. Now it has no importance because it has no function. They are concessions made to contain the population, so that the workers area does not exert a pressure. It is necessary to release these pressures and thus to smother and impede the uprising which the left groups could organise, the radicals. But anyway it is an organ of dual power. Now it plays this function to block, but when it is stimulated, it won't be like this. Thus it is necessary to impel it.

This crisis in Italy is not a consequence of a particular or immediate event. It is very profound and involves the whole capitalist system. At the same time that there is this crisis in Italy, there is the same crisis in France. The crisis in France is very profound from the big bourgeoisie to the workers parties and the socialist left.

When the communists pose the defence of the democratic state, it is because in the depth they believe that through the democratic state they can proceed to suppress capitalism. It is necessary to show that it is not like this, that they are not going to suppress anything of capitalism. What they are doing is to deceive the proletariat and give more opportunity to capitalism. Hence the Christian Democracy does not say a word and lets them continue with this. Thus it is necessary to discuss all this in the Communist and Socialist party.

Even the trade union leadership has had to make a partial retreat in this Congress of the CGIL, because from saying that the CGIL supports the Communist party, they had to weigh to pose that the CGIL is independent. It is a retreat which was imposed not only by the socialist left but by the communists also. It is not a tactic to maintain unity but the communist base has imposed this retreat, because it has seen that there is a capitulation before the policy of the "historic compromise."

It is necessary to analyse that capitalism cannot provide work because it does not have it. It cannot re-orientate investment, because it does not possess it. On the other hand they do not discuss the state of capitalism but that a better administration can be carried out. It is not true. Any better administration cannot invest money. It can manufacture it, but it has no value and there is a tremendous inflation. Then it is necessary to discuss if capitalism can provide employment, to discuss this and the Democratic State.

If capitalism can give increases, can provide work, it would do it without being obliged to. If it is necessary to force it, it is because it cannot nor wants to do it. If it is obliged to do it, it will be at the cost of the population. This is to say it is not going to go against itself. If capitalism makes a law against itself it loses its class nature and then is not capitalism. This has never happened in history and its not like this.

It is necessary to pose a programme of work and of employment together with the unemployed, in which the employed demonstrate, struggle, mobilise, conduct an activity so that work is given to the unemployed. In order to provide work, they have to open factories and it is necessary to develop the economy. Can capitalism be made to do this? Yes or no? Otherwise there is going to be a pressure of the unemployed on the employed. They have to unite together against the capitalist power. This is going to be posed in the Communist Party in a short time, as it is posed in France.

This meeting which they are making in the Communist parties of capitalist Europe has two senses. On the one side, Italian Communist party exerts a pressure on the French communists

to contain them. On the other the French communists meet the Communist Parties and exert a pressure on the Italian Communist Party so that they take the same road as in France. This has to be discussed in the Communist and Socialist party.

Capitalism has no solution and it is necessary to make a deep discussion on the Democratic State, on statifications, and the planning of the economy, on how to make the economy progress and on the resolutions of the CGIL. There is no programmatic resolution of this Congress favourable to the workers movement. The resolution on the sliding scale of wages in work is against the workers and it has to be rejected. It is necessary to plan, taking into account, the elevation of the workers conquests and not to throw out one worker to give to another, so as not to throw out the capitalist which is the depth of this resolution. It is to maintain the competitiveness of the Italian capitalism with respect to the capitalism of other countries. This is the heart of it and this is not the function of the trade unions.

The function of the trade unions is to see how the working class lives and to defend it. It has an interest, it must interest itself to intervene to improve the functioning of the whole country. But this cannot be done with the bourgeois apparatus, while the trade union leaderships do not say that it is a bourgeois state nor do they speak of capitalism nor the bourgeoisie. Thus they make an abstraction to justify their policy of conciliation. They omit the class struggle but the class struggle exists. And this does not have a perspective. Italian capitalism is like French capitalism and North American capitalism. It has no perspective. While the working class, yes, it has a perspective

And there is no possibility of a capitalist reamination to absorb unemployment. On the contrary, they announce more unemployment. It has gone from fifteen to seventeen millions unemployment, because at the same time as unemployment, technological advance occurs. It is paralysed. With technological improvement, unemployment increases. To compete, capitalism, needs more technology, not to give work. Unemployment is the product of an enormously great progress in the class struggle. It means that capitalism cannot contain nor yield to the necessities of the life of the population, because of the nature of capitalism. The workers produce a thousand and receive five hundred. There is the answer to this. Any good administration cannot annul this. If it does not annul it now, it is not capitalism, it is against capitalism. After bad functioning, bad administration, the results are worse. But whatever the administration this situation cannot be suppressed and this is capitalism.

The other discussion which it is necessary to make is on nationalisations. They return to insist state capitalism. It is not like this. State capitalism does not exist. It is the state which exercises the function of one or other capitalist. The historic and concrete reason of capitalism is that it can decide to vary, increase, diminish, extend or abbreviate the functioning of the investment in production. The market determines the course of consumption and consequently and in the last instant of production. These are laws of the capitalist system and any government which wants to regulate the empiricism of capitalist competition fails because capitalism does not admit, does not accept any order. But they do not discuss in this way and they want to put order into the empiricism and the chaos of capitalism.

This is a crisis where this congress of the CGIL is seeking to conciliate with the big firms and is going to receive a lot of criticisms, because this resolution which has been taken is a retreat with respect to the conquests which have been made by the working class. And it does not pose any new conquest but intervention in politics which in itself is no conquest. What policy, what programme, what objective? This is what has to be discussed and it is necessary to intervene in this discussion.

J. POSADAS
13.6.77



THE CRISIS AND HISTORIC FUNCTION OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY. J. POSADAS 18.6.77

It is important to give a very great importance and consideration to the crisis of the British Communist Party, for what it means. It is a small Party and for this reason the division occurs more easily than it would in a large Party, because structure of interests, of leadership and of life in it are very much reduced. In the large parties, the stage of confrontation or the division into two parties is taking place more slowly because of the structure of these parties, their links with the masses and the links of interests which they have with parliament, the local councils, and even with sectors of the bourgeoisie. This break then takes place more slowly. These parties fear to isolate themselves, they are making statements of an electoral order and, in this way, continue. On the other hand, the small Communist parties like that of Britain and of the United States are not held back by the same interests. They fulfil no function. This Party has existed since 1919-20, and it had MPs after the war. Today, however, it says that it has 36,000 members but it only obtained 30,000 votes in elections.

This division means that, in all the Communist parties, there is a discussion which is now developing. The British Communist Party is small; however, it discusses problems which go far beyond Britain itself. The dictatorship of the proletariat and eurocommunism, for example. They are fundamental problems for the world Communist movement which are now being discussed. This means that this break is not just provoked by the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but by something much deeper still. These parties do not express all the depth of the crisis. They do not live the crisis in the sense that they do not show what it is; on the contrary they try to hide it, to repress it to limit it to one point—for example, this divergence over the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a point should not be a matter for crisis, but a matter of simple discussion. But what discussion has there been? There has been no open discussion on this.

This crisis means that there is the need for clarifications, for discussions, for positions to take, and for an alignment on the world problems. This crisis has already penetrated, slowly but irreversibly, the world Communist movement as a whole. The discussion in the Communist Party is not new in Britain, but yes, the division is new. It will be very important to follow the evolution of this process. There were no internal reasons for the division, and there has been no proper discussion on the basis of which to take such a step. The break shows a state of exasperation which is determined by the very profound divergences which there are. And it is not an electoral problem which is now raised, nor even a problem of principle, because the Communists have no programme. The Communists do not discuss principles and, therefore, do not apply any. Thus the cause of this division is much more profound than the motives which have been invoked. It is necessary, then, to expect that there will be further expressions of this crisis.

This is the second Communist Party which breaks, and the Mexican Communist Party will soon do so; and the same also in Uruguay, where there are all the bases for division. These divergences also exist in the large Communist parties, but they do not yet come to light because of the size of the Party and because of electoral interests which impede them.

All this crisis of the British Communist Party must be taken as an expression of the crisis of the world Communist movement. In Britain, the Communist Party has a fairly insignificant weight. It has a certain importance, although it does not have numerical forces it has leaders in the trade union field; it has miners, shipyard workers, who are known and accepted as such. The same thing will happen by the way, in the Swedish Communist Party.

These parties show their weakness, their lack of theoretical preparation, lack of comprehension of the world revolutionary process, when they split on the problem of dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, they take no positions and they do not say of what the dictatorship of the proletariat consists, nor why they break.

One must act so that this situation will influence the Socialist left. This process is unfolding in the whole of Europe. In Germany, at least 70 JUSOS (Young Socialists) have been suspended from the Social Democracy for infringing 'the duties and democratic rights of the German Constitution'. This is going to have repercussions inside JUSOS, in the sense that they are going to see that they cannot wait until they are given permission to start organising the left. The conditions are going to be more favourable for the organisation of the left. In the world, the conditions are favourable. In Germany, they are not so favourable; but the time will come when the economic situation will sour and this will ease the inclination of the country to the left. Therefore, it is necessary to prepare now an organism which will have the ability to intervene when the time comes, when the process will be more advanced, to launch a programme of the left. There is a sharpening of the crisis of German capitalism, unemployment is very large and prices increase constantly, whilst the standard of life decreases and repression elevates. A part of their rights to have a pension is taken away from the old people, and the demands on increase in productivity elevate unceasingly. In many factories, the workers remain in the same number, but they produce double without a single increase in salary. This productivity is not obtained just through new machinery, but by a growth of what is demanded from each worker. You are controlled for the time you take to go to the toilets and the exact time spent to make a commodity is calculated and reduced. All this means that German capitalism is also entering into the spiral of the big crisis. This will later show up when the proletariat is going to start making a sharper struggle against the bourgeoisie. The metal workers already show this, because they have imposed more important demands than the bosses and the government were prepared to concede to them in the last round of negotiations.

This crisis in the left movements in Germany, and also in Britain, must serve to prepare the left in the Socialist parties. The Communist parties do not understand and do not accept this situation; they think they are the representatives of the Soviet Union. Not so. They are sustained, protected and fed by the Soviet bureaucracy which takes this crisis of the British Communist Party and that of the JUSOS in Germany, as a means to intervene in the organisation of the left of the two countries, counting in Germany that the process of crisis is going to propel the petit bourgeoisie which supports Schmidt and the Social Democrat government into an even more acute crisis. In Britain, the crisis is going to be

even sharper between the government and the leadership of the left—a political crisis and not an economic one. In both countries, these crises have the same base, the same origin, but the forms in which they are expressed are different.

In Britain, the economic crisis is very profound. The trade union leadership which serves capitalism through the Labour government, finds great difficulties in its own base where there are public confrontations and the trade union leaderships now break the Social Contract. The Social Contract meant a submission on their part to the interests of capitalism. Callaghan wants to make a new pact so that the workers do not ask for an increase in wages again, with the aim of salvaging the equilibrium of the capitalist profits in the competition which it makes with world capitalism. The trade unions through these leaderships want free collective bargaining. But they do not question the function which is exercised by the Labour Party in defence of capitalism. There are many discussions; they have been discussing for twenty years. But, as yet, the left is not formed in Britain. This is due to the particular conditions of that country, which has a bureaucratic structure like that of Germany and which has experienced relatively favourable economic conditions which permitted capitalism to yield concessions. But now we reach the state when capitalism cannot yield any more, and the pound is devalued each minute that passes.

Another expression of the very deep crisis, and a crisis without solution for capitalism in Britain, is that they have the problems of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. There, separatist movements each demand the right over the petroleum or his bit of North Sea. Such a process indicates the exasperation of the bourgeois leadership which sees no perspective for itself. Then, it is each one for himself whilst capitalism has an interest in showing itself unified in front of the Workers States and the proletariat. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie hopes to divide the workers movement by injecting into it, and stimulating in it, the national sentiments. But, even then, the left is in better conditions than before, to organise itself.

The division of the Communist Party of Britain must be used in order to make the Communist comrades understand their function. Otherwise they discuss that there is an internal crisis of the Party. However, the Party of itself has no force of its own, no weight, because it is not the Party which organises the leadership of the class struggle in Britain. In itself, the crisis of the Communist Party of Britain has no value. On the other hand, the Communist Party has a function to play with regard to the crisis of British capitalism and the need to organise the left. It is the same as in Germany to this extent.

The British Communist Party does not have a consistent trade union policy. However, it has had very important trade union leaders among the miners, in the shipyards. The Vice President of the trade union of the miners is a Communist, but people, when they voted, voted for him as a trade union leader and not as a Communist. In the trade union elections he obtained a lot of votes, but in the political elections he obtained few. This means that the people see him as a trade union leader, and they see that he defends the immediate interests of the workers. That is all.

This situation is the consequence of the history of Britain which has known one of the greatest bureaucratic structures of all. To measure the weight of this bureaucratic structure in the trade union and Labour movement of Britain, you have to compare it with the Soviet Union. The bureaucracy, because of the nature of the Workers State, has less power in the Workers States than it has in capitalism. Whilst Stalin, however, lasted a fairly long time because the conditions were more favourable for the bureaucracy. Now it is no longer so, because there exists a process of struggles for transformations, a process of world crisis of capitalism, a process of ascent of the workers movement. The bureaucracy of before, structured economic, cultural and political relations with a rigidity, a strength, a power of domination which are not completely weakened today. But this structure is full of cracks and it is losing force and assurance, because it no longer has the economic support which it received previously. On the contrary, the conditions of today are weakening it.

British, and in part German imperialism, have utilised much racial discrimination, and the British proletariat would find itself confronting the Hindus, Singapore, Guyanese and West Indian workers. The proletariat of these countries is there in fairly great numbers and British capitalism used to separate it from the British proletariat, in the sense that the British would not take the dirtiest and least paid jobs; the immigrant workers were doing it. This provoked a division among them and it influenced middle layers of the proletariat. The same thing happened in Germany. This situation has created particular relations and exerts an intellectual pressure on the British workers which is not a pressure which just comes from the economic apparatus, but from a whole tradition. In the United States the same thing happened. Immense layers of the North American proletariat are well paid and they, in turn, exert an enormous pressure on the rest of the workers. Such a thing does not exist in France or Italy. French imperialism is the weakest in Europe, and Italian capitalism is so poor that it has to go round begging.

You must expect that the British and German proletariat are going to receive the influence of the world proletariat and, at the same time, they will receive the consequence of the crisis of capitalism. You must also see that the proletariat, and the petit bourgeoisie, have made great struggles in Britain. They invented the 'sit-in', the demonstrations of the 'white collars'. This was after the war, when they organised the movements of the squatters, house occupations, and the trade unions had in their programme that the homeless should occupy all empty houses. But, at the same time, the British monarchy had created a whole institution to integrate the trade union and political leaders and to give them the title of 'Lords'.

It is very important to stress in this historic process that the economy exerts a great weight on the German, North American and British proletariats. The character of the economy of these countries has segregated the proletariat from the most exploited sectors. Take, for example, the dustmen. In the United States they are all Blacks, there is not one white man amongst them, and the same applies to the men who throw salt on the roads in winter. The Blacks are always in the least paid jobs. These discriminations are part of the education of the

conceptions of the proletariat. What is lacking is the class trade union and a real class party of the proletariat.

All this is very clear in Britain. The workers are making formidable strikes and they continue to give support to the Labour Party, which includes an essential part of the proletariat like those who have the hardest jobs, where most of the workers are immigrants. This situation influences strongly the consciousness the class structure and the political capacity of the proletariat. The British proletariat has made great struggles and gained important conquests, but these are the relations which still limit it much in the political conclusions, the programme and the objective of the taking of power.

These mistakes do not come from the proletariat itself, but from the lack of leadership. In this there is the problem of Stalin. Had a revolutionary movement existed in the Soviet Union instead of Stalin, none of this would have happened. In spite of these economic relations which exist, the influence of the Soviet Union would have been stronger than all these economic relations, and it would have helped the education of the consciousness and of the political, programmatic and organisational ability of the British proletariat, the German and the North American proletariat. And, in any case, the proletariat of these countries shows all its class consciousness in the fact that it has built large trade union organisations, which shows that it cannot become an agent of capitalism or remain submitted to it. But what it doesn't have is the leadership, the guide, the policy to lead the changes of society. It has the leaderships which conciliate with capitalism. It is not by chance that in these three countries the Communist parties and the other revolutionary movements are flimsy, with no roots in the in the workers and intellectual movement.

These problems are very important to understand, in order to have a notion of the unequal and combined process. Britain, Germany and the United States form the unequal part, whilst the Workers States and the world revolutionary movement form the combined part of the process. It is not the unequal part which determines, but the combined part. The process has no need to be as slow as it is at the moment. If it is, it is because the leaderships have failed at the time when a Lenin was needed again, and this leadership has not been able to find a continuity of programme and policy. The Bolsheviks have not been continued. The problem is not that North American, British or German capitalism was strong, but that the world Communist movement was weak. If German capitalism still survives today it is because world capitalism needed it: otherwise it would have crushed it. Why has world capitalism made a war against German capitalism as a competitor and then put it on its feet again? It was not by chance but because capitalism was without force and it had to come to the rescue of German capitalism to make it confront the Workers States.

The Communist Party has no other perspective other than that of being a medium to influence the Labour left in Britain. And it is the same also for Germany and in the United States. It could exert a very great influence if it helped to organise the left. The reason why capitalism in these countries is not bothered by the Communist Party is, in part, because the Communists do not fulfil this function.

Proletarian internationalism is for them a slogan, but it is not a programme. However, it is a principle which has to be applied by means of a programme. The Communists in Britain discuss separating Britain from the world. If they were internationalists they would need the experience of the world in order to see the reasons why there is such a process in Britain. They have not made a single discussion about this in the Communist Party which is also very small. They have never discussed why the Communist Party is so small. They throw the guilt onto the Labour comrades, or on the right, or on everybody else; but not on themselves. However, it is their own fault if they do not grow, because they never tried to see why they do not grow.

The unequal and combined character of the process can be measured by the fact that in spite of a great number of Workers States, in spite of the fact that each insurrectional social uprising leads to the Workers State, the Communist parties of the capitalist countries - and particularly of the colonial countries - have remained flimsy. The base for the explanation of such an unequal process is to be found in Stalinism; but today there is an upturn of the revolution and it is the combined aspect which absorbs the unequal one, and it is this combined aspect which now influences the global process.

The conclusion which comes out clearly from this crisis in the small British Communist Party is the weakness of the world Communist movement, because it does not have the ideas, the analyses, and it does not transmit or apply the necessary conclusions to generalise experience. Crises occur and have particular effects in each Communist Party, whilst they all have a common base because they do not have the policy or the theoretical preparation which is needed. These crises show also the weakness of the Workers States, of the leaderships of the Communist parties of the Workers States which do not give orientation, or elevate the richness, the nourishment, in terms of the necessary ideas, the necessary conclusions by means of the generalisation of programmatic experiences. The Workers States do not discuss experiences in order to generalise. If they did, they would say: This is how you apply the dictatorship of the proletariat, and proletarian internationalism means this and that. They would explain what 'pluralism' is. They do not do this. Therefore the Communist movement starts from a situation in which it does not have the experience on which to base itself. It has to deepen the experiences of history, and take up positions of principle; which is what is throwing up all these crises.

This fundamental conclusion is going to be drawn in all the Communist parties, and to be sure in all the nationalist movements, whatever be their point of departure, because these are the general principles for the whole world. For society to progress state control is needed. Private property represents no progress but at best stagnation crisis and regression. To impose state control you need the Party and you need also planning so as to produce for the need of the people and of the whole society and not for the individual interest of each one. These are the principles. The problem is that in the world Communist movement they discuss no principle and no experience.

The books that various Communist leaders are now writing are commentaries, news and statements which are not based on principles, experiences, to feed the world Communist movement with the necessary ideas. It is not true that the capitalist regime still exists now because it has a force of its own. It is because there is not the leadership to finish it. The Workers States, in particular, do not feed theoretically and politically the world Communist and Workers movement with ideas. The literature of the Communist movement, like the book of Carillo, are without importance because they are not making analyses of principles, of historic experiences. All that they do is constant omissions. For example, they say that the construction of the USSR has been a special, accidental case in history. Why is this? It was not like a car accident, was it? It was the event which permitted the throwing out of centuries of private property in a few years only, and besides this, in spite of thirty years under Stalin and in spite of wars which destroyed 70% of what the USSR had! The Communists do not discuss these experiences, they do not make all this known in this way, they lack scientific objectivity. They make discussions on the basis of simple statements, which only show superficiality, the weakness, fear and naivety of these leaderships, who do not base themselves on experiences. But for what concerns art, culture, science, do we not base ourselves on experiences? Why not then in politics?

Still the Communists say: 'We still have to make a study of the actual world to verify if yes or no we can construct a new one'. This is to take no account of human conduct which is determined by social, economic interests, which are the factors from which to understand the conduct of society and of the social classes. Where can you verify that in Italy you can make an 'historic compromise'? Compromise with whom? And why should it also be 'historic'? If it was historic, this would then mean that the bourgeoisie is going to compromise itself, to act against itself. It is true that you must take advantage of the weaknesses of capitalism, and Lenin was the one who did it best. And today we can do this much more than he did, taking the present weakness of capitalism into account. But to take advantage of its weakness does not mean the same thing as to replace the class struggle by an alliance, and to believe that in this way we can literally overpass capitalism slowly, electorally, with a programme without transcendence. It is possible to accumulate slowly the forces which are necessary, accumulating them progressively and even electorally. But the time of confrontation will come in any case. Can we avoid it? The Communists say that, yes, we can. Where can they show that the bourgeoisie yielded to fear? In Rhodesia? In Chile? In the United States or in the programme of the bourgeoisie? The bourgeoisie shows nothing of this. Then what do the comrades of the Communist Party base themselves on to say this? What do they base themselves on to make such statements?

This crisis in the British Communist Party seems to happen in a quite remote part of Britain. This is because the Communists do not discuss what is the situation of the country when this crisis bursts out. Is it that the situation is good, or is it bad? Is the situation in progress or is it in retreat? How do they situate their own crisis? No crisis can be understood in the abstract. Besides, any crisis of a political movement which occurs in history and which represents a progress is united to the reality of progress of the country where it intervenes. This crisis cannot be a foreign body from the whole of the organism, the whole of the movement in this case. It is growing on the whole body itself. Then what is its cause? Why does it grow on the body? What is happening in the whole of Britain? What is to be done? What is the programme? The Communist comrades discuss abstractly and they generalise no experience. Their weakness leads to naivety, which consists in believing that you can do away with the historic experiences. But you cannot do without the experiences of history: particular conditions in each country are the circumstantial result of the relations of forces, they signify in no way that principles should apply differently. A relation of forces which is particular is not a principle. It is a situation which has defined and determined limits. Principles, on the other hand, are unalterable. For example, the classes behave as classes and they yield when they can no longer maintain themselves, in the same way as capitalism had to yield in front of the Russian Revolution. Classes also make concessions. A good example of this is when the capitalist class allied itself with the USSR against Hitler, which meant therefore the retreat of the capitalist system as it happened. The capitalists have made this alliance to be able to survive, because the bourgeoisie as such had no more forces of its own. But, in order to survive now as a whole, it is preparing the war.

It is necessary to discuss like this, comrades of the British Communist Party! And our own Party must discuss collaboration and contribution to the formation of the left in the Labour movement in Britain. It is a process in which the crisis of the Communist Party is a very important factor. Because, if the Communist Party just understood that it is necessary to organise the Labour left, it would not have to be in crisis. It would put itself in agreement with itself, and they would discuss this in the Party. But the Communists are in crisis because they do not know what to do, and they do not have a policy and programme.

Balibar in the French Communist Party defends the dictatorship of the proletariat; and he repeats also some of Marx. He is against Stalin. But he defends everything Stalin did, he does not denounce the fact that Stalin assassinated the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, and that he allied himself to Hitler. He defends 'Socialism in one country' and says that Stalin defended the Soviet Union. So the criticism he makes of Stalin is an invented one. His book is just a list of quotes from Marx, but it does not apply to anything today.

The world Communist movement lacks experiences and discussion. For example, why not discuss in the British Communist Party why it does not develop itself? When there are so many strikes! What are the factors which guide the crisis? This crisis in the Communist Party bursts out on a principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the Party lived up to now without applying it at all, or without elaborating a single principle that stems from it, and without being pre-occupied on the programmatic level. When the process has produced twenty Workers States, why is it that the British Communist Party has no influence?

This comes from a lack of theoretical and political experience, and from a lack of communication on the experiences made by the Workers States; such a communication should be made to show how the Soviets took power. The various Workers States did not take power in the same way as the Soviet Union. They did it as a consequence of the war and of historic circumstances at the time. But the Communist parties were not prepared for the taking of power. Power just happened to fall into their hands. The proletariat, in particular the Soviet and the Chinese proletariat, made power fall into their hands. The British Communist Party does not discuss any of this. It makes arrogant declarations, whilst it has to see that its strength is that of the Soviet proletariat, that of the Soviet Union, that of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of China. No one to this day has yet written the history of the revolution in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Poland. These revolutions have not been led by Communist parties which would have been prepared, and would have utilised the circumstances of the war, to make the revolution. The conditions at that time were such that the structure of world capitalism was weakened and Hitler was an example of this. It is not the United States but Hitler at that time who was the centre of the capitalist system. It was Hitler who sought to confront the Soviet Union. It was him who has to embody the pretensions and the economic and military power of the capitalist system. There is no experience in the world which shows that you can take power through the national road, basing oneself on imaginary differences between these revolutions in Europe and the previous revolutions.

On the contrary, there are twenty Workers States which influence Africa, Asia, Latin America, and it is these which stimulate the colonial revolution to adopt the Soviet forms. Why do the Communist parties not discuss this? The influence of the Workers States on the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even on individuals like Amin, demonstrates well that these principles are universal. At the moment the organisms to adopt these principles do not exist, but the existing organs of the masses have to come to these principles without having foreseen that they would need them. It is on the march that they verify that it is on the basis of these principles that they can build. On the other hand, the the Communist Party discusses a vacuum.

The British Communist Party does not even pose the slogan of 'down with the Monarchy, Long live the Socialist Republic'. In the discussion of their crisis - they pose objectives in a vacuum because they want to be a large party in Britain. There is no room for a large Communist Party in Britain, but there is room for a great Communist Party which should contribute to the formation of the left in the Labour Party, transforming it into a party for social transformations.

The reactionary positions of the Chinese leadership and the need to discuss this in the world communist movement

J. Posadas

title by the Editorial Board 22-8-77

If the leadership of the Chinese Workers State declares that the permanent revolution has ended, it is because it is going to liquidate the struggle for Socialist transformations, and consequently, the putting an end to the revolutionary method. In this way, it wants to consolidate what it has. This was the conclusion of Stalin. All that they have done, indicates that they go to liquidate the revolutionary struggle. There is no criticism by the Chinese, of capitalism, or anything else.

Simply to dispense with the permanent revolution, the revolutionary methods. This is against a tendency. It is an agreement which they have reached which may possibly last a number of years, depending on the world struggle, but this will not just be decided in China. It is not possible, it will be resolved outside.

That is to say, it will not be just resolved in China, but that the factors which determine the revolution are as much external as internal ones. When in China they speak against the permanent revolution, it is because they go against a tendency which may include the 'Gang of Four'.

This is to say that, for them, it means to do away with the permanent revolution and the cultural revolution, and also with all the movements of protest against the bourgeois tendencies which there are in the Party. These tendencies are bourgeois tendencies, bureaucratic and conciliatory with capitalism. What a process in history. All the conditions exist for Socialism, and this leadership believe that they are going to contain the process! Imperialism does not have any force, any strength in order to live. It is this leadership which lacks the resolution to prevent it from living.

This Chinese leadership is trying to cut short a revolutionary wing. This is going to incite the Soviets to intervene politically because this leadership is a sector which is conciliatory with capitalism. This sector seeks to establish principles which link it with capitalism: This is why this sector says that it is necessary to establish "order". This is to develop the economy, and therefore to prevent disturbances and troubles which might prevent them from doing what they want.

The pro-Chinese movements in the world are all supported by the Chinese from whom they receive money. In Italy, they are all falling to bits. All their objectives are against the Soviets whom they call revisionist traitors. There is not a single analysis from the part of the Chinese, not a single political programme or conclusion, and all their policy is reactionary; reactionary and counter-revolutionary like their policy with Chile, Angola and Cuba also. In Cuba, they support the Cuban dissidents. It is a reactionary objective to try and have points of support.

In China, there is a very great tendency for an alliance with capitalism. If they have made the 11th Congress of the Party clandestinely, and if they resolved positions of principles like that of finishing with the permanent revolution, it is because in the top leaderships they have made an agreement to smash the tendency which is against. This means that inside of them, there are people who are in favour of the permanent revolution. If it was not so, they would not have made these statements.

It is necessary to take into account that generals which they have incorporated in the leadership are old comrades of Mao, of 1921. This means old revolutionaries. But they are 80 years old. We do not say this because age determines anything but

they have not made any political activity in the last 20 years. None of them have been active politically, the same applies to Hua Tsao Ping. They are all secondary people who do not have an authority or base of their own and they are manipulated by the bureaucratic layers of the Party. None of these secondary figures have, in their background any important antecedents. It is the same with Teng Tsao Ping who has a fair number of years in the party but has never made any important activity. They are all old militants, members of the Party, with 30 years in the Party but without any important role in it. But today they are utilised by the bureaucratic layers in order to maintain the status-quo. These layers do not mean progress, they seek to develop the economy in order to justify themselves.

The communications of the Congress are very laconic. They have replaced political leaders with technocrats in the leadership. They have put in individuals from the technical apparatus, closely linked to private property, to individual interests and to bureaucratic careerism. When they throw out of the leadership of the Party, the leaders more linked to the masses, to the class struggle, and they put in technocrats, it is to contain and to repress the class struggle in China, and in the rest of the world. This is the consequence of this policy.

This Congress of the Chinese leadership is a temporary agreement and in conditions of very great progress of the struggles of the masses of the world. The crisis of this leadership is a concealed crisis, but not contained: they have covered it up, but they have no possibility of containing it. If it is true that nobody listens to the 'Gang of Four', as they say, then why do not they let them go free, or just bring them to trial? When they have to make a clandestine, a hidden Congress, it is not because they fear the reaction of the population — the population has not appeared or intervened but they fear the reaction of layers of the Party, of the working class and of military layers. If it was not like this, they would not have to make a clandestine Congress. On the contrary, if the reason was that they had an interest in seeking to support one against the other, they would have sought a public activity. But when they make the Congress clandestinely, and all agree to this, it is because they are intent on making a conciliatory policy with the capitalist system. They are seeking to build 'a great China'. In order to make 'a great China' as they see it, it is necessary to have a quiet world, in which the wheel of history must stop turning and remain motionless. Stalin wanted just this. It is the form which makes it possible to conciliate with capitalism, and become 'great'. It is a melodramatic aspiration of the epoch of Euripides.

It is a reactionary layer of the Chinese which seeks to consolidate and develop the economy as such. It is the same intention as that of Stalin. In China, there must be a very great backwardness in the country, equal or even superior to that of the epoch of Stalin in the USSR. In every way, it is more backward because today they have all the experience of the 40 years after Stalin. It is a layer of mandarin origins, landowners, a layer from the countryside. So, they are allied neither to the working class, nor to the base of the army. They are the old layers of the army and the top layers of the apparatus of the Party, therefore they are linked to Stakanovites sectors and landowners or ex-landowners. It is not possible for this to last very long. Their policy necessitates tranquility in the world but the world is not quiet. Indeed it is

Turn to page 2

Inside:— THE CARILLO — MOSCOW DISCUSSION

J. Posadas.

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

269 Friday 16 September 1977

PRICE 10p

EDITORIAL

Break with the policy of conciliation with the government! For a left in the Labour Party on an anti-capitalist programme!

The standard of life of the population in Britain continually falls. The government says prices increase twice as fast as wages and that the workers must accept this. Previously social democratic governments put through reforms, increasing social welfare; today the Labour government is completely open in its reactionary measures. This situation is one of the symptoms that this is the final stage for capitalism. In other capitalist countries it is the same. Sweden was given as the example of stability where the social democracy by way of gentle reforms was opening up a new society. All this is broken, the economic crisis in Sweden is sharpening with financial crisis and a big devaluation of the currency. British capitalism is seeking to obtain reductions in the level of life of the masses. It is in very deep crisis and it is not possible to seek measures from it or to reform it. Constantly the idea of reflating the economy is demanded to deal with unemployment; it is claimed that if more money is put into industry the economy will revive. The government has constantly given vast sums of money to private firms and the factories still remain very old, new ones are not built and the existing ones deteriorate with even worse working conditions for the proletariat. British capitalism cannot compete with the United States or Germany, however much money is pumped into the economy. It is necessary to seek other solutions.

To combat the fall in living standards the workers movement needs to demand that wages rise to compensate for inflation, as a means of defence against the attacks of the bourgeoisie. However if it is just left at this the crisis will continue. To really elevate the standard of life of the masses it is necessary to propose a series of political demands that lead to the solution to these problems. The problems arise from the inability of capitalism to develop anything and the overcoming of this is through measures to suppress capitalism. The workers states show that it is possible to transform society. In the German workers state there is a continual elevation in the standard of the life of the population. The health service expands and the masses do not live under the constant pressures from inflation. In the German workers state, there is an expansion of the economy so that they have developed since the war from practically nothing, to now where they have a higher per capita income per head of the population than there is in Britain. The workers state is able to expand because it is based on an economy that is nationalised and therefore is able to be planned. In the Soviet Union they decide to develop Siberia and all the resources are made

available to achieve this. With capitalism, it is not possible to do this. There are now the possibilities to develop the programme of nationalisations under workers control in the workers movement. When there is such a mobilisation over an issue like the Grunwick factory it shows a state of class tension which means it is possible to mobilise the proletariat and sectors of the petty bourgeoisie around a programme of social transformations.

The masses of the world have a constant readiness to mobilise against capitalism. In France and Germany there are enormous demonstrations against the nuclear installations. Capitalism confronts the workers states, everywhere the capitalist system is driven back by the revolution. Its bases of support in Africa are being liberated by movements that are developing socialism. The atomic arms that capitalism prepares are in preparation to confront this situation and the protests against the nuclear installations are the rebellion of the masses against this. The assassin Yankee imperialism is developing the neutron bomb against the Soviet Union and the other workers states but also for use against the masses in the capitalist countries. The trade unions in the Soviet Union have made an appeal to the United States trade unions to oppose the neutron bomb. The trade unions in Britain and the Labour left need to link with the campaign in the World Communist Movement against a capitalist bomb which is made to destroy the masses but leave capitalist property intact. For capitalism this is a very 'advanced' bomb. It shows they have a mentality which is barbaric. Private property is all they are concerned about. Carter the great defender of 'democratic rights' prepares weapons to kill millions. The Soviet Union is constantly supporting the movements of the world that seek to liberate the human being from the oppression of private property. In the Soviet Union, there is a process of reducing some of the worst aspects of bureaucratic functioning, allowing the population to put more pressure on the leadership. It is this that the 'dissidents' protest against and this is why Carter supports them, for the yanks are trying to impel sectors who oppose the progress of the workers states.

The masses have shown in the parliamentary by-elections their repudiation of policies of the Labour government. By abstaining, the proletariat not only opposes the reactionary policy the government makes in Britain but also the support the government gives to the strategy of imperialism in the world. The

visit of Owen to Africa is a joint initiative with the Yanks to try and contain the African revolution. The masses in Zimbabwe intend to develop the country towards socialism. Owen is seeking to save what is possible of capitalism in Zimbabwe and the rest of Africa. British capitalism has a big link with the Yanks and the Labour government is directly carrying out a joint policy with them to try and maintain the capitalist system in the world. The Labour party gives support to the government and now the national executive of the party drops its policy for withdrawal from the Common Market and opposition to participating in the direct elections to the European parliament. There is a crisis in the Labour party with a constant direct support given to the government and a lack of opposition to the measures that go against the masses.

The proletariat abstains in by-elections but it does not desert its concentration around the Labour party and it is there that the left is going to be constructed. The split in the British Communist party in a distant way shows a rebellion against the policy of reformism of the Communist party. The Communist party can only have a role if it seeks to develop the left in the Labour party. It is necessary for the communists to discuss how in Britain the formation of a left is going to arise. It is true that the revolutionary process is slower in countries like Britain and Germany, than in some other parts of the world; but because of the workers states British capitalism is constantly weakened. At one time British capitalism would not have sent Owen to discuss with the nationalists, it would have sent the army to support the whites. Inside Britain in spite of the abstentions in the by-elections, the Tories have no desire to be the government for they feel the enormous weakness of capitalism and they are totally divided among themselves over how to cope with the strength of the proletariat. They see that if they go to the government their crisis will intensify, so they make no campaign to bring down the Labour government and leave it to carry out the capitalist policy. This situation allows the possibility for the communists and the Labour left to take part in the discussion which is developing in the World Communist Movement, what is the way to construct socialism. Is it by respecting the bourgeois institutions like the monarchy and parliament as being above the class struggle or is it necessary to confront capitalism? The discussion which is now going on in the World Communist Movement is important for the left in this country and will be vital in the organisation of the comprehension of

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
Admiral, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S12DL.

Other party address:—

24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

in turmoil, and not because the Soviets and the Cubans agitate it, but because of the process of the liberation of humanity. The Cubans and the Soviets do no more than follow the process of history itself. The throwing out of the French minister of foreign relations from Tanzania was not provoked by Fidel Castro or the Soviets, but it is a natural conclusion of the revolutionary process. The French minister went in the name of the interests of world capitalism, in order to stimulate a sector of Tanzania to contain the Soviets. It is the same policy they make with Israel. Now they try to extend this to other parts. They are seeking an Israel in Africa.

Soon there is going to be a very great struggle in China. It has no importance that a secret and apparently potent and powerful Congress is held. The world course of the process has already made the Chinese change their policy six times. The Chinese have brought out the policy of the 'Hundred Flowers' of the Cultural Revolution and today they want to retreat from the 'Hundred Flowers'. But this is going to result in a collapse because the world process advances and is going to influence.

The world process is going to have a very great influence in China. It is a very rigid apparatus which wants to freeze the world process, and to compete with the Soviets. This is why China does not have any agreements with any Workers State. Not even with Albania! Albania is their protégé which they sustained against the Soviets. No more than this! The support which China has given, in every way, was for these reasons. Therefore it is necessary to expect that there will be an influence of the world process of the revolution in a progressive and uninterrupted form in China. Because for China, this present policy necessitates that the world be submitted to China, and this is stupid. It is the bureaucratic mentality of Stalin which we have here. Stalin also believed that the world was guided by him and it all ended in Stalin being liquidated. Equally in China, the same thing is going to happen.

This Chinese leadership needs the world to remain quiet, that nothing should happen, and that there is no advance of the revolution, so that the leading bureaucratic layers can be promoted. Inside there is a sector, deeply rooted in the interests and relations with capitalism. The Chinese as much as the Cambodian leaders — as the bourgeois press itself says — are interested in having investment in capitalist countries, something which is not excluded or bad in itself. What counts is what sort of interests, of investments, and to the benefit of whom? Is this a method in order to get money, to influence, to have a base for exerting pressure, or is it for exploitation? For example a year ago, the French newspapers wrote that the Chinese had invested in Formosa and Hong Kong, in race-horses. Moreover, the capitalist press published — afterwards this was suddenly silenced — that the Chinese have interests in the sale of opium. This is not correct for a Workers State. Clearly they have to negotiate to get money and to compete with the capitalist system. To compete with the capitalist system is correct in itself. But how to negotiate? Not for moral degradation.

The Chinese leadership has made a Congress which in a short time is going to be overthrown because it is an artificial agreement made on the basis of bureaucratic interests, common arrangements in order to develop the economy. However it is necessary to consider not only the Congress but what economic planning they have made until now.

Because among the things which they have had to do — which are the things they have been forced to do — is to learn from Stalin how to develop the economy. This is the way they try to give themselves a certain base of support, a certain authority — and in this way to create new bureaucratic layers — by developing the economy. This is why capitalism agreed to support them by investing, giving

History is determined by relations which in their turn are based on the laws of the class struggle. It is not determined by the empiricism of the will of any particular leader. This is what they are returning to discuss and this discussion is not convenient to the soviet leadership. It has escaped them but nevertheless it comes to light, and this is because it is in the structure of the intelligence that it is necessary to discuss this. Neither Carrillo nor Brezhnev want this situation, as it is a public discussion of everything. They try to abbreviate the discussion, to negotiate to make concessions. But the soviets are going to achieve the objective of preventing imperialism using this for itself to divide, to break and to weaken the world communist movement.

At the same time the conditions exist for a much more profound discussion. The fall of Stalin was a stage, this is another. This is not the fall of Stalin. Here no one has to fall. Now for the progress of the communist movement, it is not necessary that any leader falls. It is necessary to discuss. It is another stage and another relation of forces.

This intervention of the soviets is causing a great discussion within the communist parties and the Spanish Communist party, because if it was not like this, at whom is the declaration of the CC of the Communist party aimed? They say that they are all in agreement. At whom is it aimed? First it is aimed at the party itself and afterwards at the soviets.

In the speech that Pajetta made in the Festival of Unita in Sardinia, he is answering this very profound polemic in the name of the Italian communist party. He does not name the Soviet Union nor the Spanish Communist Party nor is that the subject of discussion. He makes an abstraction so as not to have to confront, to define and combine the criticism of the Christian Democracy in Italy with the international problem as though to give it little importance. But the concern expressed in the argument shows that it is to this polemic that he gives more importance. They demand a guarantee from the Christian Democracy. They do not seek it from the world process. This is not a dialectical thinking. But even in this way it shows, that the soviet attack on the policy of the Spanish Communist party has a great echo. They do not animate themselves to reply to it. There is no reply in saying, we are doing this and we will do it.

In this speech they have to take into account the base of the Communist Party and an important part of the leadership, but they do this in an abstract form. They have to change a fundamental concept in which the communists are very much criticised i.e. austerity.¹ Before everything was austerity, but now they have begun to make criticisms of austerity. They began to modify the concept of austerity. If it is necessary to correct it now why did they not do it before? The communists in Italy proceed from austerity to pose that it is necessary to organise the economy, to combat the right and to plan. Moreover now they demand guarantees from the Christian Democracy to be able to reach an agreement. Before they did not ask any guarantee. They only discussed among themselves. Now they speak of guarantees and in that, they reiterate popular intervention, the trade unions, the workers area committee to control the application of such a programme, which is one of investments in Southern Italy, control of state enterprises which have an immense deficit and the planning of production.

It is an important change in the Italian Communist Party. The other important change is that he says its not possible to wait eternally, but its necessary to fix a time. This means that there is much pressure from the communist base. But all this is a fill in, a veil, because the aim is to answer the soviets without conflict. The conclusions are quite soviet, i.e. to respect international conclusions and experiences, to adopt the international experiences but they say also it is another situation. If they say that they respect the international experiences but do not apply them, it is tantamount to saying that they are not necessary for the activity. This creates a great conflict because it imposes a discussion on what are the different experiences and why are they not necessary. If they are to be taken into account, then it is necessary to apply them.

The objective of this discussion in the Italian Communist party is to control and calm the internal conflicts. They have used a local fiesta of the Festival of Unita to make this declaration. They did not do it in a meeting of the Central Committee, showing in this way that it has no great importance. They do it in this way because they fear the conclusions. If it has no importance, it means that the attack on the Spanish has no importance. Everyone is thus free and independent to do what he wants.

This evolution and the form in which they discuss in the Italian Communist Party, has much importance to measure and define the currents and the development of this discussion. With these declarations they do not make any attack on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union nor is there a direct support to Carrillo. Neither do they mention him. Moreover they say that the Communist party is independent in its analysis and conclusions. Why do they have to say this? To whom is it directed? To the bourgeoisie in part. But the argumentation is not for the bourgeoisie, but for the militant. Hence they say we respect historic experiences, Marx lives this in us and we apply in accordance with the needs of today, and the third international was useful in its time but now it is not like this, because it is another situation. They do not say that it is no use, but it is another situation. It is an explanation aimed to justify themselves and at the same time to remain in the margin of the need for social transformations. This is the sense of the speech of Pajetta and of the declaration of the Spanish Communist Party.

In intervening in this process, it is necessary to define the nature of this stage, reiterating that Euro-Communism does not exist or plurality and there is the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat and of proletarian internationalism. It is necessary to discuss precisely and as part of that, euro-communism and the slogan of Lenin "Socialist United States of Europe", because the slogan of Lenin is valid 57 years later. When every historic slogan like "workers of the world unite you have nothing to lose but your chains" have passed the historic proofs of events and are perennial, it is because they answer to the continual needs created by the development of the class struggle, that neither the weakness of capitalism nor the superior relations of forces of the workers movement annul. They are the essential bases of the class struggle.

In this discussion of the communist movement there is not a word of the class struggle. But it is all a class struggle. They do not say why the experiences of the Soviet Union were superseded and China also. China took power and maintains it by force. But the police are occupied in repression and the search for the "four bandits". Thus the Chinese want to show that time is not left to them for construction. Hence they pose now that the most important aspect is to develop the economy to dedicate themselves to the economy, to improve the life of every one and to allow a little also of the class struggle. They do not say this, but this is the road, conciliating with the world capitalist system.

It is necessary in this discussion to combine arguments on theoretical principles and practical argumentation. Proletarian internationalism is a theoretical principle, and a practical experience of dozens and dozens of years and countries. It is a theoretical principle, but it has a practice which confirms this principle. But in turn it extends the principle of proletarian internationalism. Hence it is permanent, not a remnant. This trip of Fidel Castro, which is an expression of proletarian internationalism is superior to that of before. But it is not different from the principle established by the Russian revolution when Lenin and Trotsky said "the Russian revolution is a lighthouse which illuminates the world. We must develop and impel the proletarian revolution throughout the world, although they destroy the

Soviet Union". This is a principle and Fidel Castro has done the same. The other was a principle in a most difficult stage. This is in a more favourable stage. There is an identity of the principles. They continue to be valid and demonstrated through the historic experience, but they have new tasks and objectives.

This in itself shows how the nature of the political activity changes parties and the political life of the parties. It's not only a question of seeing the elections the trade unions, the strikes, the factory occupations, new organs like workers area committees, united front of trade union-party, but of these other problems which are more important that the local problems of any country, because already humanity has an instrument to measure how progress is elaborated, which is the workers states and the trip of Fidel Castro.

Fidel Castro makes a trip through Africa to liberate it, and Cuba pays for this and each communist party confines itself within its national boundary. The proletarian vanguard clashes with this. The communist leaderships retreat in historical understanding, but the communist vanguard advances, and advances a great deal. In a stage in Italy, a sector which believed it was the vanguard, broke with the Communist Party. The Manifesto in 1968, remained isolated, because it did not attain the theoretical understanding the formulation of programme and tactical political conclusion. Then, it retreated. Now they seek what policy to make, what they must do, after ten years wandering about. They have a life because there is food for all. And the food is the class struggle which feeds all the groups from Cohn Bendit to Rudy Dutschke. It feeds them because there is no leadership which answers to centralise these movements to finish with the capitalist system. As the agony of the capitalist system is prolonged, because the workers states do not overthrow it and as there is no leadership which centralises the struggle against the capitalist system it then allows the development of tendencies of every type including the resurgence of anarchism as in Spain.

The principles towards socialism are valid, and in that the class struggle is immovable. The conditions change, thus the tactic changes but not the principle, for example to support Amin with all the clowning which he does, to support Amin and to be ready to be against Amin, to make a united front for progress. Thus the tactic changes, the principle is the same. It is necessary to overthrow the capitalist system.

All these principles the Soviet Union announces. It does not formulate them because if it formulates them programmatically, then the failure and the weakness of the Soviet Union are seen. As part of that, it is the party which says it and not the workers centres, not the trade unions. The trade unions and the party do not intervene. Trade union and party do not lead, in the form of instrument and of organ, the worker masses of the world, the North American masses. This is what Carrillo used also, because he knows that the other side has its limits. Thus the soviets make critical formulations and abstract accusations.

The soviets say that there can be particular conditions in each country but socialism is constructed in a single way, even if making concessions, on the way to win power. There are peculiar conditions, different conditions between one country and another, but this only modifies the tactical bases not the objective, the programme and the end. The tactical bases can be modified to use the crisis of the capitalist system to be able to attract and win the forces and social bases which capitalism organised, leads, or influences. This does not change the objective, the revolutionary tactic and programme.

The change of tactic is with the objective of political progress, not the historic social class conclusion; to overthrow the capitalist system. A prolonged period of the parliamentary stage can exist. But this prepares the conditions for the final impulse to overthrow the capitalist system.

If the Italian communists criticise the soviets in this way and the soviets answer them, they have to bring all this into the light. Hence there is quite an abstract discussion. None of them discuss why concretely it is necessary to take power as was done in the Soviet Union and how the taking of power is inseparably united to soviet democracy. If power is taken without soviet democracy, economic power is reduced, and the social organic power and the social force of the revolution also diminishes. On the other hand even being in the government electorally one can go to power accompanied with soviet organs to suppress the capitalist system and to destroy the capitalist apparatus, allowing the education of the masses with the experience of the capacity to organise the power, the country, the state, the market and the population. It is a question of a historic definition that the masses incorporate themselves in production as another instrument of production. They develop as the conscious instrument of this production and direct production, direct the social relations and direct the state. While the masses elevate themselves in this action, the organs that capitalism and after the workers state made decrease in importance, necessity, and extent. To the extent that they decrease in importance, they disintegrate. Thus apparatuses with particular functions do not exist, but the masses lead society. Why do not the Soviets discuss this? In the coming years, they are going to have to discuss it.

People joked about Marx saying that now is not the epoch for his ideas and Marx already posed that the dictatorship of the proletariat would wither away. Lenin developed this thought with the example of the Soviet Union and when he had to refer to this experience he said: where is the dictatorship of the proletariat? The peasants have made demands for two months and there is no reply. And the bureaucrats demand wine and food. What dictatorship of the proletariat is this, where the peasants do not have an answer to their needs and policy is determined by the necessities and conveniences of some bureaucrats? Lenin said this in 1918.

Today we are not in 1918, that was sixty years ago, but there are the same problems. If the soviets attack the Spanish communist party and the PCI, developing soviet thought, they will say and you? Hence it is a discussion of the second plane which diminishes the theoretical level. It does not have the objective of developing all the points and the living experiences of the Soviet Union and China.

Why don't they discuss China, the experiences in which in China the Communist Party took power and as there are no organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it ends up like this. Why do not the comrades of the PCI discuss China? The PCI does not take positions on China, and gives the impression of saying "This is not my house". They do not say a word on China nor a word on North Korea, which from a level of production and of social relations built on rock went to the workers state and whose the culture and knowledge is superior to that of the United States of North America. It does not have technical means, but all the Korean people is convinced that they are the ones who are constructing history. They have more culture than the United States which has more scientific capacity for production, nothing more. Outside production they are below the least important Korean. All this has to be discussed.

It is a very rich discussion which has acquired a level on which they cannot retreat. The leaders are going to leave the discussion, the masses no. The bases of a problem which they have been hiding come to life. In this way as in the capitalist system, if Hitler had won, in ten years said Trotsky all the contradictions would have broken out. This would have meant a break because the capitalist regime could not continue. For the workers state the process does not have the same effect as in capitalism, in fact it is the opposite. But it is the same situation. Capitalism however is a regime which

moves against the development of intelligence of science, of technology and of production. Hitler did not have to face the children of Angola who in place of begging use rifles to defend their comrades who are struggling for the revolution. This breaks all the schemes of capitalism.

This discussion on Euro Communism between Moscow and Carrillo serves also to conceal the crisis of capitalism. It is not possible to discuss in the abstract. This is not a profound polemic between the two, but it is a situation which allows the expression of a much more profound crisis. Now the polemic is abstract and does not discuss the crisis of capitalism. Capitalism is orienting so that they discuss the crisis of the communist movement and not that of the capitalist system.

These cries of Carrillo speak of the crisis of Stalinism, why does he not speak of the crisis of the capitalist system, why does he not speak of the fall of the capitalist system? But they keep saying, it is the crisis of the soviet leadership. With the right and the need to criticise the soviet bureaucracy, the condition for such criticism and to improve it, is the analysis of the crisis of the capitalist system, and a programme against the crisis of the capitalist system. As Carrillo does not see this and thinks to advance gradually taking positions he puts the enemy on the other side — although this is not his intention, because he hopes to overpower capitalism — he orientates this preoccupation against the workers states developing a lack of confidence in the workers states and not towards capitalism. But when he shouts in such a way, it is because things go badly. When he has to resort to an accusation that is from every point of view false, it is because he hopes to collect the most backward of the communist militants. Any communist militant sees that the Soviet Union has been helping Angola, Cuba, Vietnam, Mozambique, the guerrillas of Rhodesia and this is not Stalinism. This is not a caste which lives for itself. Any militant thinks how is it that Carrillo who has a notion of this, makes such a criticism? It is the criticism born of desperation and not of reasoning. He could have made a very good contribution and intervention to the discussion of the world communist movement.

These declarations of Carrillo are a scream of rage to try to reach an agreement. Because when he says we want to discuss, it is because he is seeking an agreement. If it was true that such conditions exist in the Soviet Union, there would be nothing to discuss. It would be necessary to combat and smash it. On the other hand, after having said it could not be worse he says we are going to discuss. It's like coming to an agreement with the executioners. The communist base does not accept this. Its not true that its like this. Its not a reality which Carrillo analyses but a lie.

The soviets also tell lies and make errors, but at the same time they support Angola, give arms to Ethiopia, Mozambique, Rhodesia and to any country which wants to free itself from imperialism. Stalin did not do this. Stalin means social interests. What is the social interest of this bureaucracy? Is it the same as that of Stalin? What level does it express? What state of world relations is this? If it is not analysed in this way, scientific principle is not defended.

Carrillo says he is marxist and continues being a marxist but the analysis which he makes of the Soviet Union is not marxist. It is an analysis defending conciliatory interests which abandon marxist analysis. It is not possible to push forward the understanding of the Spanish working class or of the Spanish population which is seeking to be led by the working class, when he says in Moscow that there is a ferocious and bestial dictatorship and a team which controls for itself. Well what are the interests of this layer? When and how is this interest expressed in world relations? In Angola, in Mozambique, Rhodesia, Polisario, in Algeria? Is it expressed in the support declared in the new Constitution, to all the anti imperialist movements? Then what is the interest? It means a very great crisis of Carrillo and not of the soviet bureaucracy. The soviet bureaucracy gains more than it had, because any communist militant sees and says that the position is not as Carrillo says. In the Soviet Union, it is not possible to separate the political interests from the social and economic conditions. Who does it represent? What social sector and how are such interests expressed?

This is a false discussion, on the part of Carrillo to stimulate a bureaucratic discussion and not a scientific one. It is a process in which it is necessary to intervene, because it shows the necessity to help within and outside the workers states, the tendencies which seek to reorientate themselves on the road of marxism.

At the same time the proposals of Carrillo are to conceal the failure of the elections in Spain. What has to be discussed now is why the Spanish communists did not get more votes. This should be discussed! After such a wave of strikes, the process of strikes of the defeat of Francoism by the Spanish proletariat, why did they not win more votes? It is not because of the shortness of the campaign, the proletariat had four years of campaigning. This tendency of Carrillo has no basis in the Spanish masses. In the apparatus it can have one because it is an apparatus which lived outside Spain.

The problem is not to discuss it in this way. There is no world directing centre, there is no Communist International. Then each party possesses freedom of action. But what is meant by freedom of action of each communist party? To interpret the local experiences with the local conception, is this the way the world progresses? Is this a lie? In Spain do they just play Spanish music? Do they just have Spanish culture? Do they just develop the science and the technology of the Spaniards? Those speaking Spanish are barely 15% of the world, the language of the Spaniards is now not the high sounding language, the arrogant speech of Charles V. It is quite a modest language. It is not possible to say that in Spain we do what the Spaniards decide. In principle it might be like this, but what determines the decision? The influence of what is happening in the rest of the world organises the intelligence, the capacity for action of the notion of how to work and this determines the independent action of every Communist Party. We are not against the independent action of each party.

It is a discussion still put forward under the effects and conceptions and in part the existence of bureaucratic apparatuses but in all this the lesser bureaucracy is the Soviet Union and it is because it has the need to be the most objective, because it defends the Soviet Union. To defend the Soviet Union, it has to confront the capitalist system and the Yanks and has to think about the world not just about itself. But Carrillo only thinks locally.

There is a crisis in the Soviet Union also because there is a sector which wants to temporise and to negotiate, but in the Soviet Union there do not exist any longer conditions to negotiate. They represent the interest of the world because to survive, the Soviet Union has to represent the world otherwise it does not survive. Hence in the discussion for Carrillo as much as the Italian Communists, the world appears to them as secondary or tertiary and their interest is to articulate this conception.

The world process is a structure which does not have a premeditated or proposed articulation. The articulation is determined by the course of the class struggle which determines the movement of this world process in which the experience is fundamental, as it is science, literature, art and culture.

Capitalism is increasing its preoccupation, Carter increases his concern for the dissidents, human rights. In Belgium there is a united front of left groups, mandelists, and another old Trotskyist group which without declaring themselves anti soviet, are for human rights, and very indignant because there are no liberties in the Soviet Union. They are indignant because they claim to speak in the name of Marx and Lenin. I believe the queen forms part of this committee of human rights. All this movement Carter is making and it shows they give much money to these Trotskyist movements, to the Mandelists. There is much money which comes from Carter to win time, to impede a centralisation of the soviets that organises and centralises the world communist movement. For this reason, all this human rights campaign is happening.

But it is the reverse. The soviets now have the need to expand liberty and

democracy and seek contact with the masses of the world. The support to South Africa is it or not democracy? There are one, five, fifteen intellectual types who cannot speak in the USSR, but it occurs to none of them to say, by not speaking what effect does it have? Is there more social tranquillity? Bukovsky says nothing. What thought does he offer, he just demands liberty? Then they say, with this idiot face, no one takes pity on him. It is a false conception, well what is the reason for this false conception? Mandel for example and the others also, have in front of them Mozambique, Rhodesia and the Soviet Union which intervenes in Rhodesia, which faces the risk that the Yanks react and invade the Soviet Union. They do not make the comparison why the soviets help Rhodesia and do not let Bukovsky speak. What is it that determines the line of the Soviet Union and its relation with the world progress, Bukovsky or Rhodesia? Certainly they say, they have to do this but there is no democracy. Bukovsky cannot speak, yet this one united with the fascists, held a meeting with the fascists! The discussion of these Trotskyist groups has as a centre to criticise the lack of individual liberties but now it is not the epoch where the left opposition was not allowed to speak, no, individual liberties brings all these people together.

A new world centre is coming with Carrillo, if he continues like this. This is the depth of the issue. The Yanks are seeking to organise a movement which impedes a co-ordination of the world communist movement, and thus to orientate the concern towards the Soviet Union that they do not let people speak, the decline of communism. This is what they are after.

It is necessary to make this discussion but to do it on these bases, with everyone, with Carrillo. Imperialism has an interest but until now, not more, because it realises that it no perspective. All the journalists who write on this are secondary, write false things, none can speak on ideas, objectives, thought and progress. They speak of freedom in the abstract, and in the capitalist world there are 17 million totally unemployed and there are twenty five millions half unemployed and they continue dying of hunger, cold and heat. In the capitalist prisons, they continue assassinating prisoners with the story that they forgot to find the key and they were burnt inside. Is not this an attack on dignity, on democracy and liberty? They do not see this. In Moscow a hotel was burnt did they abandon it? It was an accident simply and the soviets did all that was possible so that nothing would be overlooked. A hotel was burnt down in Holland, everything shows a tremendous swindle to cover the truth. They killed twenty five people, and for them it is an accident!

And in Moscow no one had a panic, or shot himself. They sang the International. This crisis in the world communist movement did not begin today nor is it finishing tomorrow. It goes very deep because the essential cause, the point of departure is that the Soviet Union has a need to suppress the capitalist system. To suppress capitalism, it has a need to impede coalitions, alliances, fronts of communist and socialist parties, leaderships of the workers states with capitalism. The essential necessity is the objective interest of the workers state, and secondarily their bureaucratic interest. But now the latter is no longer the centre which decides. If the Soviet Union does not live, they die. And the Soviet Union to live has to extend itself and to extend itself, it has to seek co-ordination with the world communist movement.

These parties who defend themselves from Moscow, what are they defending, what anti capitalist line? No, they are defending conciliation with the capitalist system. This is the reverse of Stalins time. What Carrillo says is a lie which is consciously elaborated to justify himself but to do this is a defeat, because it is an appeal for conciliation with capitalism, an appeal for capitalism to help him. And at the same time it is an appeal to the bureaucratic sectors of the USSR to say "we are going to discuss" It shows that they have understood that the Soviet Union is no longer the epoch of Stalin nor is the USSR Brezhnev.

And neither is Brezhnev a conciliator who tends to smash the movement of emancipation against capitalism. Even conciliating, he impels these movements. This escapes all the basis of conciliation with the bureaucracy. We support every movement of progress, the soviets also. Even co-ordinating with the bureaucratic interest, they are obliged to make this function. Our task is a persuasive criticism to impel to the maximum and to programme in the most complete form possible, support to the movements with an objective programme and one pushed forward by leaderships which transform capitalist society.

The epoch of Stalin created, generated — in the workers states — leaderships with national interests. The bureaucracy saw itself obliged today, even being a bureaucracy, to generate internationalist consciousness, because it has no other remedy than to tend to unify all. Hence between the unification of all and the support to Angola, to Mozambique and to Rhodesia, to Polisario, to Jamaica, there is no difference.

This is the discussion which is opening. Hence we must intervene to open the discussion in the communist movement. Carrillo says "we discuss" after saying that the soviets are the worst there is. If its like this, there is nothing to discuss. When he says "we discuss this, you yield me something and I concede a little", it is someone who does not feel that he is winning and who has to say to his party that he is not against the Soviet Union. All the tenor of his argument is against the soviet leadership so as to make the policy of conciliation. The Spanish Communist Party drew few votes because it pushed forward a conciliatory policy. If it had pushed forward a policy of planning, of statification, it would have doubled its votes and gained more. They and the Socialist were the greater. In not seeing proposals for social transformations, the petit bourgeoisie remained with Suarez. As the CP and SP proposed no social transformations, then the petit bourgeoisie seeks how to arrange matters better in daily life, work, wages and then it gives political support, to consecutive sectors.

¹This refers to the programme of control of living standards in Italy of the CP in collaboration with the Christian Democracy.

J. POSADAS 26.6.77

CHINA

Continued from page 2

them loans and buying from them as a means to oppose the Soviets. But it is not pre-determined that this should be so. Because whilst capitalism sees that it is possible to support this bureaucracy against the Soviets, at the same time a new wing is developing in China which is against them. Moreover capitalism now sees that all this economic progress means an elevation of the resolution of the Chinese people to intervene, and they fear the consequences which will follow. The Chinese proletariat is absent in all this. Neither Canton nor Shanghai have intervened. There is not one single trade union which has made a salute to the Congress or to Hua Kuo Feng.

But the Chinese leadership does not have any other remedy but to sustain itself by developing the economy. This is why they talk of an economic plan of development but they pose it without a planning to confront the capitalist system. If they do not confront the capitalist system, it means that this plan makes agreements with it. If they confronted the capitalist system, it would mean that a part of their economic development would be to stimulate and facilitate the intervention in the world development of the class struggle. But it is all the other way around. Something which shows this well, is the statement which they have put out which shows excellent relations with the Chilean regime. The stupidity of the Chinese is in believing that it is possible to elevate solely in the economic field, whilst imperialism is preparing to launch the war against them. In front of this, it is necessary to elevate the military and political power of the Workers State, and to extend the Workers State to the whole world. It is not an economic problem. It is a political one. The Soviet Union elevated itself when it could get rid of Stalin, and it extended itself in the world, in Europe, in Africa, and Latin America.

The Chinese go out to attract a right wing of the Soviets. It is the wing of the Solzhenitsyns and the tendencies which have a certain force still in the Kholkoz and in the management of factories. In the USSR, they constantly liquidate them, they throw them out from the management of the factories. Now, it is not just a clean-up of managers, they also sack bureaucrats who endanger and impede the development of the relations with people. This is why they now stipulate in the Soviet Constitution a better intervention of the Soviet people.

It is necessary to prepare oneself for this discussion which is on the most elevated problems of the World Communist movement and which are going to impel the Communist Parties to take positions on China. This is why it is necessary to call on the Workers States and the Communist parties to intervene.

J. POSADAS 22.8.77.

European Marxist Review Publication

THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS AND THE CHANGES IN THE SOVIET UNION

J. Posadas

ORDER FROM THE PARTY'S ADDRESS

Price 20p

THE "NEUTRON BOMB" AND THE MURDEROUS NATURE OF CAPITALISM

The fact that Carter and the Congress of the United States have agreed to the production of the "neutron bomb" is an irrefutable proof of the correctness of the analysis of the Posadist IV International that the character of imperialism is that of an assassin. For imperialism and world capitalism the enemy which they face is humanity itself and the progress in every aspect — scientific, cultural, economic and social — of humanity. The solution, therefore, for imperialism is to kill and this is why they produce a bomb which is designed simply to kill people; nothing more, since it leaves property intact! Labour Party comrades, in a resolution to this year's annual conference of the Labour Party, have called the "neutron bomb" the "ultimate obscenity" but, in reality, it is the system of private property which is the "ultimate obscenity" and this weapon it produces for use against humanity is an expression of the fact that this system has no perspective, has no future. The production of the "neutron bomb" is also a positive proof that we live in the stage of the final settlement of accounts between humanity and the system of private property, in which imperialism prepares the war. It prepares to launch the war against the Workers States which, in the form of collective property, in the nationalised planned economy, represent the progress of humanity. It also shows that this is not just a war between two countries but system against system in which imperialism has to confront the masses of the world. It is not possible

to pretend that such a weapon is part of the normal armaments of war because in a war one of the aims has to be to destroy the weapons, military installations and productive capacity of the enemy. If, therefore, a weapon is produced by imperialism which destroys people and leaves property intact it is because they have the intention of using it within their own countries, in North America, Europe, Africa and Latin America.

It is of fundamental importance that the Soviet Trade Unions have condemned the "neutron bomb" and made an appeal to the masses of North America. This appeal should be supported by all the workers movement, by the Labour Party, the Trade Unions, the Communist Party and the "Left Groups" and it should be used as the basis for a campaign — in alliance with the Soviet Union and all the Workers States — against the war preparations of imperialism. It has to be a campaign based on the conclusions which the Vietnamese Communist Party drew at their last Congress that "peace committees" serve nothing and that the only way to advance against war is the struggle for Socialism.

The depth of the total crisis of imperialism and of the capitalist system is social. It no longer feels that it can gain the support of any important sector of the population and it sees that its forces of repression — the army and the police — are either won to the revolution as in Ethiopia, Portugal, Algeria, Peru and many other countries, or are in a state of disintegration. Yankee imperialism was thrown out of

Vietnam by the combined forces of the Vietnamese people, the Workers States and the masses of the United States including large sectors in the army. In general the Yankee armed forces disintegrated whilst millions came onto the streets in the United States to demonstrate against the war. How much more will this process develop in conditions of the war against the Workers States! It is clear that it will be a process of war revolution and imperialism prepares for this.

Imperialism is no longer able to raise big armies and neither does it need to when it has atomic missiles which only need the touch of a button. Therefore it has little need for masses of people. The same is true of production. Automation means to lower the cost of production and it also means that each worker can produce more and more in the same time. Inter-capitalist competition forces capitalism to introduce automation but the world market for imperialism diminishes constantly. The existence of 20 Workers States which are outside of the world capitalist market and 30 Revolutionary States which are largely outside the capitalist market determines this. Also they have to compete with the Workers State in what little market remains to them. The result of all this is that unemployment rises and those who are made unemployed will never be incorporated into production; many now leaving school will never have a job under capitalism. The Tory John Davis has said that "Children should be trained in school for unemployment" and that "unemployment will be persistent and aggravating in the future". Just so! The treatment of old people and the young in capitalism shows what the attitude of the bourgeoisie is to those who have no use in production. The same Tory gentleman also points out that "an increase in investment will mean more unemployment because it would be used to replace the old labour-intensive plant". This is the voice of a

system which has no future, no perspective but to confront the population with violence and repression.

So the capitalist system needs no "reserve army" either for war or production and it now has a vested interest in killing as many people as possible. It has an assassin mentality which is expressed in the killing of people through bad and adulterated food, in the pollution of the atmosphere and the war, in the "accidents" like those of Seveso in Italy or Flixborough and Aberfan in this country. The system kills by accidents at work and through ill-health produced by bad working conditions which are made worse by the introduction of automated methods. This assassin mentality is shown in the inhuman clearances of shanty-towns in South Africa recently. 26,000 men, women and children made homeless and forced to live in the areas of the poorest land and where there is no work. It is only their social weakness which prevents these assassins from preparing the gas chambers as the Nazis did in the '30's and '40's.

As part of this process British imperialism prepares the civil war. The assassinations and terrorism by the army of British imperialism in Northern Ireland is part of a preparation for civil war in this country and Tories are saying openly that the methods used in Northern Ireland by the police and army have to be used here. These methods are the assassination of workers and their families.

There is a necessity for the Workers Movement in this country to join with the Soviet Trade Unions in their condemnation of the "neutron bomb" and Yankee imperialism, and their appeals to the North American masses. However this is not, in itself, enough. What has to be launched is a campaign against all the war preparations of imperialism in which appeals are made not only for the mobilisations of the people of the

United States but also to the Workers States. There has to be an appeal to the Workers State to make a more conscious preparation to confront this and to take preventative measures — by unifying the system of the Workers States and by overcoming the division between the Soviet Union and the Chinese Workers States.

There is already a movement against the war preparations of imperialism in train. It is expressed in the demonstrations in France, Italy, and Germany against the nuclear power stations which produce the basic plutonium for atomic bombs. The same is true of the movement against Windscale in this country although that is a little more distant. The boycott of the mining and export of uranium by the Australian Trade Unions is very important and an example to the Trade Unions in this country. All the revulsion and protests against the weapons of imperialism, against the war preparations which existed in the '60's in this — and many other capitalist countries — has to be retaken and given a political leadership by a Left in the Labour Party. Such a campaign has to be based on this fact, it is not the weapons which determine the system but the system which determines the weapons. The "ultimate obscenity" is capitalism, the system of private property and whilst it is correct to take every measure — including boycotts, strikes, demonstrations and occupations — to throw-out the Yankee bases, to smash NATO, the final solution lies in the overthrow of the capitalist system and the creation of Socialism. Therefore a campaign against the war preparations of imperialism has to have the perspective of social transformations based on a nationalised and planned economy controlled by the workers and the exploited masses. All this has to be discussed in the trade unions, in the communist party and, above all, in the Labour Party.

AVAILABLE NOW:

'The new Soviet Constitution' 29/5/77
J. POSADAS

Editorial

continued from page 1

the need to go outside capitalism. The Soviets are having to raise issues which advance the discussion as for example they now state the importance of the experience of the 1917 revolution and attack the attitude of being submitted to bourgeois parliaments. The level of this discussion is going to increase.

An alternative programme to capitalism has not yet been made in the Labour party and it is this that is required. Sectors in the party including the national executive from time to time call for more money for the N.E.B., but the N.E.B. gives no solution for it is simply a way of providing extra money for capitalist enterprises. In France, the Communist and Socialist parties have the Common Programme which has measures of quite extensive nationalisations which they are proposing for when they are in the government: Having this programme allows steps to be taken against the capitalist system and opens the way for the masses to impel the situation forward. For progress to be made there is a need to develop a programme of nationalisations to be imposed by workers control. There are the conditions to allow the

development of the left in the Labour party but at present there is no programme for it to organise around. The proletariat is not going to come out in support of proposals which seek ways to make capitalism invest more, either by reflation of the economy or by giving subsidies, but if a programme is developed which proposes to transform society the masses will have a centre which they

can develop further the left. At the conference of the Labour party, sectors of the left need to discuss the programme of nationalisations with no compensation and to start a consistent campaign for this. The structure of the party will be against, for they are seeking to make agreements with the government, so the left will have to make its own campaign which will enable it to start developing a left in the party that is concerned to transform society. Similarly a struggle against the neutron bomb can enable it to join in the campaign of the communist movement and therefore gain support from outside Britain. This together with the campaign against the monarchy allows the opportunity to develop a consistent left in Britain.

FINISH WITH THE MONARCHY! FORWARD TO THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

The capitalist social order attaches much importance to the continued existence of the monarchy, although the Empire itself has been liquidated. Thus the recent jubilee celebration was a major effort to reaffirm the role of monarchy as a symbol of the undying stability of British capitalism. It was a failure and for the first time a strong current of anti-royalist sentiment could be seen although limited in expression because of the very structured system of capitalist institutions in this country. All the efforts of the media could not conceal the empty void of the royal circus. Just as imperialism can no longer mobilise chauvinist sentiments as in previous epoch, so now the jubilee was reduced to a social caper, a pompous tea party of little social weight. Capitalism could only get away with it because the Labour party continues to support this most retrograde of institutions, just as it supports the government. A new and decided left in the Labour party has to take a firm position against the monarchy and for the establishment of a socialist republic. To support the monarchy, as the Labour party does is to act to sustain capitalism.

Capitalism and its extensions in the Labour party and the unions fear to discuss monarchy and discourages any such discussion because it poses and what is to replace it? The proposed removal of such a symbol of property, privilege and power inevitably casts a question over all the other aspects of the social order, private property and the organs of coercion. The argument about the monarchy being too costly is at a very inadequate level. Certainly it is a gross waste of resources produced by the masses but so is the whole capitalist system. To talk about waste means to discuss a programme to liquidate all aspects of the functioning of capitalism.

British capitalism likes to conceal itself behind the monarchy, trying to make it appear that the monarchy stands "above the strife of parties". But the interests of monarchy and capitalism are identical. The monarchy functions entirely as an instrument of the capitalist system. When the queen

speaks about ruling over Wales, Scotland and N. Ireland, she speaks directly for the interests of big business who fear the process of decentralisation represented by separatism. Most obviously of all, in the most recent trip to Northern Ireland, she went as directly representing the jackboot of British imperialism, the military repressors of the Irish masses, the brutal assassination of Irish militants and the imposition of a military dictatorship dedicated to the defence of private property and the continued division of Ireland. That was the true face of the monarchy, surrounded by the military apparatus, seeing the selected representatives of the established order. To sustain the monarchy as does the Labour party is to sustain capitalism in all its forms, smiling or snarling.

The slogan "out with the monarchy, for the socialist republic" has very great importance in the process in Britain and for the development of a labour left. There is no possibility for a bourgeois republic giving a new perspective for capitalism. There is no basis for an improvement in the functioning of capitalism. This is why the British bourgeoisie cling with fanaticism to this most absurd of institutions, with all its feudal trappings and ludicrous protocol. For a bourgeois republic to survive in Britain would require an entirely different world situation, that is the absence of the workers states led by the Soviet Union and a vigorously expanding world market. But republicanism save in the time of Cromwell, was always alien to the conservative originators of British capitalism, and now in the time of maximum weakness for capitalism, a real struggle for a republic poses the logical consequence, a socialist republic.

The whole capitalist system is in its death agony, all its organs are withering, police, army and economic system. Thus to touch an institution like the monarchy is to invite them all to dissolve in dust. Only the indecision and conciliations of the workers movement, nationally and internationally have allowed the British monarchy to continue. In one sense it is clear that the

monarchy is supremely useless. What does this royal apparatus contribute in terms of ideas? Nothing emerges from the royal household save banality or reactionary outbursts. The only reason to maintain such an institution is because it is linked so profoundly with everything else that is capitalist, that touch that, and all manner of social demands and questions follow.

The world is in the throes of profound social revolution and transformation. Countries such as Angola and Ethiopia leap from the most primitive conditions to the most advanced social perspectives, from tribalism to the construction of socialism. Royalty is part of the past the world is overthrowing. Dynasties are an anachronism. Monarchy was thrown out in Greece, Ethiopia and Laos and in Spain, it's the feeble instrument of forces who want to delay socialism.

There is no possibility thus of long stages of transition whereby the monarchy is abolished, whilst capitalism proceeds to develop. Britain of all countries has possessed a monolithic capitalist structure: Monarchy, "party system", reformism and Empire. Now Britain is a second class capitalist power. It can no longer guarantee a developing economy, it has to compete with the workers states. Thus it is immensely vulnerable to demands which pose a change of social institutions, apart from those of expropriations and the planning of the economy.

It is important for the Labour left to develop a discussion of the role of the monarchy as part of the anti-capitalist programme. It is a type of intervention which breaks respect for the moribund traditions of British imperialism. The Labour party with its pro-capitalist orientation has in the past refused to undertake such an intervention, but the lack of perspective of world capitalism and the inability of British capitalism to offer any solution to the vast accumulation of social problems imposes new conditions for changes of ideas in the Labour party and the trade unions. The slogan "out with the monarchy, for the socialist republic" will acquire great validity in the coming period.

PRESS COMMUNIQUE ON 11th WORLD CONGRESS AND FIRST EXTRAORDINARY CONGRESS OF THE POSADIST IV INTERNATIONAL

The II Congress and the I Extraordinary Congress of the Posadist IV International was held between 20—29 June, 1977. Delegations from Latin America, Africa and Europe participated. It rendered homage to Trotsky who was assassinated by Stalin thirty seven years ago in August. Homage was made also to cdes Anape, Santiago, Raoul and Manuel of the Chilean and Argentinian sections, assassinated by the dictatorships of these countries and to the comrades imprisoned and kidnapped by the dictatorships of Chile, Argentina and many other countries of Latin America. Homage was rendered to the struggle of the masses of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe for the social progress shown in the anti capitalist struggle and the construction of socialism. Homage was rendered to the audacity of the masses of Africa in confronting imperialism. Congress addressed a salute to the workers states — the socialist countries — to the USSR, China, Cuba etc and to the communist and socialist masses of the entire world and called on them for the united front to lead anti capitalist activity for the progress of humanity.

Congress saluted the new Soviet Constitution and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and called upon the trade unions and the Communist party — autonomously from the government — to organise an activity in the direction of the North American masses and the Chinese masses, appealing to the first to struggle against Yankee capitalism and the second for unification with the world communist movement and in particular the Soviet Union.

The Congress made a general balance of the activity of the International since the 10 World Congress, affirming the objective progress of the authority of the IV International, of its political line and its orientation with the objective of impelling the struggle of the world communist movement in a united front with the socialist parties, the masses of the left, the revolutionary socialist movements to unify the struggle against the capitalist system.

The Congress confirmed the progress of new comrades, and the renewing of cadres, who with passion and communist devotion, develop the activity to impel the world communist movement; the growth of new cadres, of new sections. A salute was made to the new sections of Europe and Latin America.

The Congress made salutes to the struggles of the masses of the entire world and to the progress of the incorporation in the revolutionary movement of the Catholic masses, the nationalist masses of the countries of Africa, Latin America, and particularly Europe.

The 11 Extraordinary Congress of the Posadist IV International discussed and approved all the activity of the International during the past period, the activity of the leadership of the International Secretariat, of the flying IS. It observed how the political line and the application of this line are verified in the revolutionary struggle of the masses of the world. The activity of the Congress developed on the basis of a Political Report and the Organisational Report. The development of new activities was discussed with the object of developing the maturing of the cadres of the International to impel the struggle of the communist parties, the united front of the communists, socialists, nationalists, left catholics, nationalist military sectors, revolutionary sectors to reduce the delays for the extinction of capitalism and to limit the atrocities which the latter is preparing in the atomic war.

The Congress saluted the new Soviet Constitution while at the same time criticising its limitations. But it affirmed the progress which it means, compared with the previous situation, because it opens the new ways to the development of the revolutionary social progress of the Soviet Union. It analysed the need for a world discussion in the communist and socialist movement in order to unify the anti capitalist movement. It appealed to the Chinese masses and to the leadership to intervene in order to unify the world communist movement and discussed at the same time the need to condemn the reactionary policy and counter revolutionary policy of the present Chinese leadership and made an appeal to the Chinese masses and trade unions to intervene. It discussed equally the need for an appeal for the intervention of the trade unions of the United States, in order to exert a pressure to break and defeat the action of the North American bourgeoisie which is the vital centre of the counter revolutionary and reactionary preparations of the world bourgeoisie.

The Congress discussed the consequences of the constant enlarging, permanent consequences of the total crisis of the capitalist system; economic, social, political crisis, involving all the sectors which compose the structure of the capitalist system of the economy, the army and the church. The Congress discussed the need for a policy tending to win layers of the population to revolutionary struggle. It discussed the constant progress of anti capitalist measures in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and Europe. It discussed, analysed and gave its critical support to the intervention of the workers states and fundamentally of the Soviet Union and of Cuba in support of the revolutionary process in Africa, Asia and in part in Latin America.

The Congress discussed and adopted the resolutions on the elevation of the struggles of the masses in Latin America and the retreat of the dictators and the reactionary governments of Argentine, Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, Uruguay, Peru and on the advance of the struggles of the masses of Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela. It appealed for the struggle of the Mexican masses in a united front with the government to confront Yankee imperialism with a programme of economic, social and political development, a very great intervention of the Mexican masses, the total liberty of action of all the parties of the working class, from the communists to the Posadists.

The Congress has analysed the consequences of the backwardness
Turn to page 3

The conditions prepare the way for a left in the Social Democratic party in Germany

CENTRE PAGES

title by the Editorial Board

J. POSADAS

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG



organ of the

REVOLUTIONARY WORKERS PARTY (TROTSKYIST)
BRITISH SECTION OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL (POSADIST)
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS
BRANBOURN STREET

270

Friday 14 October 1977

LONDON, W.C.2
PRICE 10p

Subscribe to RED FLAG
1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications
1 year £2.00

Order from
IV International Publications,
Adminaid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL

Cheques payable to: —
IV International Publications

Editorial

THE ONLY SOLUTION TO THE CHAOS OF CAPITALISM IS THE PROGRAMME OF NATIONALISATIONS AND WORKERS CONTROL

The crisis of all the capitalist parties in Britain is continuously aggravated with that of the Labour government. All find themselves in a complete impasse in front of the resistance of the masses, the resistance of history to the continued existence of the capitalist system. In face of the crises of failing economy and the failure to acquire new supports for the authority of capitalism, it is impossible to develop an authoritative capitalist leadership. Thus the Callaghan government is allowed to continue in office, even if in a minority in parliamentary terms, because capitalism sees no hopes of more favourable results from a Tory administration. Through the Liberals, capitalism supports directly the continuation of the Labour government, Labour in name and completely imperialist in practice. After all, that government reduces the standard of life of the masses with the object of making the economy more competitive with other capitalist powers, and more openly than before via the invented Owen, attacks the Soviet Union as part of the capitalist campaign over dissenters. At the same time it sustains the campaign against human rights in Northern Ireland. Closely linked to the policy of Yankee imperialism over Rhodesia, the Callaghan government is united to the Yankee leadership of world imperialism and participates in all the preparations via NATO for war against humanity and the workers states. The attacks on the Callaghan government by the capitalist political parties are purely formal, arising from the normal inter-capitalist disputes and from the interminable frustrations of capitalism in front of its world and national failures. Thatcher's call for a referendum over the closed shop and the fighting which broke out in the Liberal conference, are all part of the same dry rot. The Tories have no solution to confront the

masses and nor do the Liberals. A whole world is preparing to leave the scene of history. Thatcher's visit to the United States expresses the desire for oxygen from the centre of world imperialism, but back home, signs of the social demise of capitalist policies continue.

NO TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT YES TO THE SOVIET SOCIALIST UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

The IMF, keen to offer support to the continuation of Callaghan's policies, congratulates the Labour government but Murray is obliged to say the TUC are not supporters of only a ten percent increase for the workers. They can offer no guarantees to the government. Unwilling and incapable of organising social changes, they find it more difficult to contain the resistance of the working class, more difficult to satisfy the aristocracy of labour. There is an element of independence in all this, but at this moment more formal than real. However the rift between government and unions acquires more and more basis. It is an inevitable consequence of the fall of the united front of unions, government and aristocracy of labour, in conditions of the inability of capitalism to develop the economy and find new sectors of social support.

In this situation, the development of a left is accelerated in the Labour party. Earlier lefts had the conception of using the Labour government to put through changes and make concessions. Now this no longer works, so where to go? Now the NEC is faced with elevating a socialist alternative to the Common Market or submitting to the European parliament. Already union leaderships have shown willingness to submit to the needs of capitalism in this respect. The European parliament has nothing to do

with the interests of the masses. It is simply a debating society of the different interests of competing capitalism. Has anything come from it that would improve the standard of life of the masses or eliminate pollution? It is an arm of NATO against the Soviet Union. It contains the most reactionary sectors and representatives of capitalism. It cannot be changed from within, because it is institutionally part of capitalism. The European Common Market is a necessity of capitalism and corresponds to the needs of capitalism. Nor is it a common market, it is one for the benefit of the few main concerns. To speak of the "left working within it" is specious reasoning. One might as well work within General Motors "in order to change it".

There are many contradictions within the Common Market and there are contradictions between the Common Market and the rest of world capitalism, but that is of the nature of capitalism. It is not possible to abolish them by legislation. All such conceptions which belong to what was traditionally called "left reformism" when applied in this situation, are just submission to capitalism. Such also applies to the question of the programmatic alternative to capitalism. Inability to pose the programme of the workers state ie. nationalisations, planning, workers control is the inability and the lack of preparation to confront capitalism.

THE ADVANCE OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

It is fundamental for the progress of the labour left that it bases itself on the advances in the discussion in the world communist movement. The ambience for the development of an anti-capitalist left is better than ever before. World capitalism no longer decides in the world and the workers

Turn to page 3

FULL SUPPORT FOR THE SOVIET INTERVENTION IN ETHIOPIA!

The conditions prepare the way for a left in the Social Democratic party in Germany

title by the Editorial Board

22-5-77

J. POSADAS

The course of the political process in Germany is in general one of passivity but the world is not passive. It is a passivity which is not complete because in the world there is a process which influences Germany a great deal. These demonstrations for peace and against war are an example of this and means that they live politically.

In Germany, there are Spanish, Italian, Greek, Arab workers of various nationalities who have a political life. It also is very small but improves. The Spaniards and the Italians have now a more dynamic life and the problems of the world demand a dynamism superior to that which exists at the present, with the passivity of the communists and the socialists.

There is considerable passivity which the world process constantly disrupts. The social democratic leadership with Schmidt like Brandt, tries to keep the party in an inanimate condition, where only the apparatus discusses and the others obey. The relation between the social democratic leadership and the party is that of patrons and clients. Patrons pure and simple. They are patrons representative of capitalism and the party is a base of support for capitalism. But the socialist masses believe less and less in this. They are going to accept less and are going to react more against it. The abstention in the elections is a very eloquent symptom of the concern of the base, but also it is a method of struggle and of reply which is negative, because it does not give an impulse. It is a method, a reply and a reaction of the masses.

The situation of German capitalism is that of a world strategic and economic centre. But militarily it is not very important. It has no organised military force of weight. It has a very great number to mobilise but militarily it is not a great power. It has little military force at its disposal. On the other hand it is a centre of assembly and concentration of world capitalism economic rather than military.

The social democracy cannot change nor can all these people change. A new leadership is necessary for the German masses. Neither Schmidt nor Brandt can play this role. Brandt can be a little more to the left, but the masses of the left of the Socialist Party and of the Socialist youth, see him involved with all the others. There exist social and political conditions — not economic — which impel the socialist masses to see that the world is going towards communism. If the immobility of the political leaderships exists, in the rest of the world, on the contrary, there is a process constantly advancing, dynamic, anti capitalist in essence and conclusion, which influences the German masses. It does not influence them by mobilising them, but it influences layers of the youth and certain sectors of the party who receive this influence.

The movement which exists is still very limited. They do not discuss ideas, positions, programme, policy. Everything is still very limited to the discussion of the apparatus, as is the example of JUSOS which is a discussion of the apparatus. There is still not a resonant or important force which allows the influence of ideas, nor in the trade unions. There are more than two million non German workers who have no life or trade union rights. They hardly have any rights as workers. This is a very great weight against the revolutionary German vanguard, because the bureaucracy utilises all this number of workers, which has no political weight to whom they give no political rights, who live under the constant threat of being expelled, as a pressure against the tendencies who seek social transformations.

The communists do not push forward a pure, living anti capitalist activity. They have a bureaucratic policy, even if criticising German capitalism but very limitedly. The left groups the Trotskyists do not have any important activity, programmatically or politically. They have an attitude of criticism of the leaderships, of opposition to capitalism, of anti capitalist reactions in a disordered form, but there is no leadership which is concerned to discuss ideas, positions, analysis. This does not exist.

Hence the problems which exist in the world are little discussed in Germany. But to pass from this situation, the German masses feel and live the world process. They do not have leadership nor organs, trade union or political, which make them live the problems of social transformations, of the relations with the workers states of the intervention of Cuba, but the masses read and advance maturing politically quite a lot.

With the immobility of the capitalist leadership of the social democracy from Brandt to Schmidt, to the immobility of the communists who do not make a class movement, the masses find difficulties in understanding, in living the world process in receiving influences. As a consequence the conduct of the masses is determined by the life of the country. But even so they read, and listen to the radio. They hold discussions, receive information and are preoccupied to see the world process of the anti capitalist struggle. But this cannot be given in a consistent form, organically consistent, to continue advancing, progressing, because there is no leadership which unifies the understanding of the world anti capitalist process, the need for social transformations and the need to see that this power of German capitalism is transitory. Even if it is the most powerful capitalism together with the North Americans and in part with Japanese capitalism, the German proletariat feels the influence of the revolution. It lives the problems of the workers states. It does not live them as a class, because there was no leadership which made them live it. There is no leadership which pushes them forward to be concerned with these problems. But constantly the reaction and preoccupation against the bourgeois leadership of the social democratic party is expressed in a partial form, in the abstentions, the refusal to vote.

It is necessary to consider then the form in which the political activity is developing in the country. The structure, the solidity of German capitalism is apparent, very apparent, because German capitalism now does not depend on Germany only, but on the world. In this process of confrontation it is more and more dependent on the totality of the world capitalist system. It is no more the previous stage in which it was possible for one capitalist power to benefit, from the difficulties of the others. No, now they are all in the same sack of system against system, and the power of German capitalism is economic, but nothing more. It is not social, political or military. Socially it has no power, because its power is very unstable. It must determine everything through the social democracy. And it has to utilise the bourgeois policy of the social democratic leadership to regain sectors from the petit bourgeoisie and to achieve the triumph of the Christian democrats through the abstention of the proletariat. This is totally unstable, because the world relations of forces are not favourable to capitalism and it is in Germany, as in Japan where this has the most rapid repercussion, because they have no autonomy, they do not have bourgeois independence of action. They depend on the world military apparatus of the capitalist system. On the other hand, France, in part Italy and Britain have a certain independence, because they have their own military apparatus. The Germans and the Japanese do not have it. All their economic power does not have a military base. They have to depend as a consequence on

the world relations of forces. Economic power serves them for economic competition. At the same time it protects them, because world capitalism and in this the most powerful, Yankee imperialism, needs Germany as a counter, a centre of dispute against the workers states, this means in particular against the Soviet Union and as a centre, to contain the progress of the workers states in Europe before and during the war.

In these conditions the social democracy live a life completely remote from this, and the communists also. There is no literature which explains these problems. There is nothing. The vanguard of this country cannot be formed, cannot develop living the world problems of the revolution, of the economy, of the class struggle, of the conflict of capitalism with the workers states. There is an absolute absence of knowledge. The proletariat, the petit bourgeoisie do not live any of these problems. The daily newspapers, the reviews of the bourgeoisie make jokes, tell stories, anecdotes, commentaries, analysis to entertain the petit bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The daily newspapers of the social democracy say absolutely nothing. They are bourgeois papers which defend and sustain through the socialist trade unions, corporate demands, economic demands and nothing more.

There is no trade union, political, scientific life nor knowledge. It is a task which looks complicated because there is no field for political life. It is necessary to create this field of life and interest, and particularly there is no Communist Party which lives these problems. On the contrary to try to make careerism, the communists live an erroneous policy of wanting to compete with the social democracy, with the same policy as that of the social democracy. It is not a competition on the basis of a revolutionary programme for social transformations, analysis to make the proletariat and the petit bourgeoisie live scientifically. We are the only organisation which does this. The groups do not do it.

But this is a stage which is not going to last. Capitalism is developing in a stage of very great insecurity, in which problems are being constantly created. Thus the triumph of Begin in Israel alters the plans of imperialism, although limitedly, because it was already in their sights. But it does not allow them relations with the workers states and in particular with the Soviet Union and it alters the possibilities of agreement with the Arabs. Israel is a source and a basis of counter revolution for the Middle East and a centre for the negotiation with the Arabs to impede the development of the workers states in the Middle East.

In these conditions the party has to mobilise relating and organising its intervention to organise the most urgent task of the country, a conscious left with a programme, of transitional demands, immediate demands, together with a programme of social transformations. As such a conclusion is not immediate, it is necessary to have the resolution and the patience to await the stage.

The economic condition of German capitalism allows it still to maintain the social democratic apparatus. But this is not going to last much longer. The crisis of capitalism is not the same, not uniform. Not all countries experience the same consequences, the same result from the paralysis of the economy, of unemployment but there are differences and divergences.

The vanguard in the factories, in the Social Democratic party, in the Communist party, in the groups discuss transitory demands, of better wages and conditions of work, against the atomic bomb, against the production of atomic energy. They organise mobilisations to impede the

pollution of the air with atomic fall out. They are all very partial mobilisations, of regions and they do not include all the problems nor all the preoccupations of the population of all Germany, of the proletariat of the poor petit bourgeoisie, but local problems which affect the life of people, of thousands, of people or their economic interests. But when such mobilisations have the depth and the very great weight which they have, it is because there is a very elevated understanding of the risk, of the danger of the atomic war and of the uncontrolled use of atomic energy. That is to say there is a very limited reaction, enclosed in local interests but it shows that these movements if they are made in an independent form have no echo unless they are united to the proletariat, to the peasantry, to the petit bourgeoisie. Now these problems are discussed in a marked way. They are an aspect of the capitalist crisis.

But in itself, this is not a problem which can give an important result for the growth of revolutionary authority. It is necessary to show

They are all expressions not of the power of the social democratic leadership, but of the competitive capacity of German capitalism which cannot last much longer because the crisis is dragging along all the rest. Capitalism is not going to absorb the manpower, on the contrary, it proposes an increase in unemployment in France and in Italy also. Capitalism in order to overcome this stage of inflation and of crisis, the development of automation, productivity, utilises also atomic energy to increase productivity. The backward countries like Brazil and Argentina want the use of atomic energy also to compete with the capitalist system, and not to make arms for themselves to confront capitalism or fight among themselves — although this also they can do and it is in their intention. They want to have a means of energy which lowers the cost of production enormously, to compete with imperialism and to develop limitedly.

All this creates for German capitalism certain frictions with Yankee imperialism, because they compete in the sale of the structures of production, of atomic energy with Yankee imperialism. French imperialism, with their announcing of the utilisation of nuclear energy in a "reasonable form", if it is true that it is like this, is going to create a crisis in the world capitalist system and is going to be an enormous stimulus to unemployment. Its going to lower a great deal the cost of production and at the same time it is going to increase the competitive capacity of the backward nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America which with a very cheap form of energy and one easy to install, to control and to utilise, is going to lower the cost of production enormously. This is going to create new problems.

The German social democracy is remote from this process while the rest of the social democracies of proletarian weight and revolutionary influence like France, Italy, Japan and in part Britain have to turn to the left, less so in Britain, where there is a left wing but not of the leadership. In the rest there are leaderships which are to the left; France, Italy and Japan.

These conditions in which German capitalism exists, are conditions of the total crisis of the capitalist system which allow a centre of theirs, German capitalism, advantages at the cost of the rest. This is a strength which it cannot employ to develop because it needs military force and it does not have it and world capitalism is not going to give it to them.

Military force is controlled by the Yanks, the French and the British, so that it cannot be utilised by German capitalism for its own account, because then it would increase its pretensions, its economic and social weight in the world. Hence they impose military controls.

All this creates peculiar conditions in Germany that are not discussed and it is necessary to impel a discussion. All this has to be discussed with the communist, socialist vanguard, because they ask why do not we grow? Why is there no left? They are all the peculiar conditions of Germany but they are not special standing above the world. They are transitory conditions. But within these transitory conditions which allow German capitalism to sustain itself, the social democracy shows that it is in constant retreat. The trade union movement is not like this. Layers of the petit bourgeoisie above all the petit bourgeoisie, which voted for the social democrats, return to vote for the Christian democrats because they see that the problems are resolved in a parliamentary way. The socialists push forward no activity no campaign nor agitation nor policy of political education of political confrontation of the masses with capitalism, but one of adaptation to capitalism. Then it is natural that the

need for social changes, not only to impede the utilisation of nuclear energy to make atomic arms and launch war, but so that atomic fall out and waste which poison people need not exist. The benefit which the use of atomic energy means, does not mean also the danger of death and pollution.

These are problems which arise now and which concern an important part of Germany. The German masses feel themselves in part without communication with the rest of the world proletariat. For example the trade unions and the German parties are the ones with less relations on a world scale. They live isolated. This is part of the policy of the social democracy which keeps them isolated, to prevent them receiving the influences of the workers movement and the world revolutionary movement, whether from the workers states or the capitalist countries. The workers movement and the communist parties and the Socialist party of Germany are not in contact save very superficially with Italy, France, Britain and a little with Spain.

petit bourgeoisie oscillate from one vote to the other. It is not that it retreats and becomes capitalist and defends the CDU (the Christian democracy), but it seeks a transitory solution, because there is no political life, there is no political explanation above all of the progress of the world. Hence capitalism as much as the CDU and the SDP (Social democratic party) continue falsely slandering all the problems of the workers states as if they were all a tragedy. It is not necessary to discuss in this way.

It is necessary to discuss the immense progress of the workers states even under the present leaderships or the previous leaderships, developing didactic explanations aimed at the workers vanguard, at the cadres of the workers movement, the petit bourgeoisie combined with the taking of immediate positions of immediate demands. This means not only to say that it is necessary to make a programme but to give the reasoning for this. If it was in other countries where the class struggle is most acute more intense and the confrontation more decided, the explanation would be simpler. But in the richest capitalist country, together with North America, it is logical to expect that there may not be constant responses, immediate responses of the workers vanguard for these tasks which it is necessary to make. The socialists, communists and groups are all paralysed. They have all failed, in what they did in the effort to develop the competition with the social democracy, to drag people away from it, to break and destroy it. The JUSOS. (Social democratic youth) with all its crises has not

succeeded in forming a current which is based on scientific knowledge, through lack of internal political life, of publications, of analysis, of scientific political development. Hence after the recent expulsion and accusations appeals were made as for example that of Beneter (Secretary of the JUSOS) but somewhat in the void and like an apparatus without political preparation.

The Social democracy expels, combats, threatens, because on this its life depends. But in the previous activity of the social democracy, it had more decision and more echo. Now it encounters more resistance and more rejection. As there is not a political life in the trade unions nor in the country and what discussion there is, is a discussion identical with the bourgeoisie, by a bourgeois leadership, why the political maturing? It is because the youth, the workers vanguard, socialist, communist vanguard live the world and this educates and gives them security to live. But as this activity which they push forward is very limited, understanding is very limited also.

Above all because they take from the conciliatory positions of adaptation, capitalist, German nationalist positions of the communist leadership which does not allow the communist vanguard to understand and makes them live an enclosed life.

Hence the slowness of the progress of a left to an anti capitalist position which finds difficulties of this nature, the wealth of the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois social democratic leadership and the absence of a communist party with class positions. The German Communist Party

In front of this situation the conditions constantly change. The Socialist Youth which wants to advance feels the influence of the world, of the progress of the revolution and of the workers states. It is not prepared theoretically or politically, neither the Communist youth nor the Communist Party. There is no political or theoretical preparation. There are discussions now with changes. In the Communist party now there are changes which go towards the understanding in general correct, of the need for the class struggle and anti capitalist struggle and that the programme must be anti capitalist. Also this is the case in the communist party of North America and they are reactions which show they are the result of the influence which comes from the relation of forces favourable to the workers states, from the failure of capitalism and from the fact that the workers vanguard attracts the world proletariat to anti capitalist positions. In Germany also this happens. Although it may not be immediately, this is the perspective of the process. It is necessary to intervene to prepare the vanguard consciously in the essential programmatic points, accompanying them with the transitory demands of the factory etc. It is necessary to seek to influence and to win by means of the influence of a layer of socialist origin, communist origin of the groups to this understanding of the need for social transformations for the progress of Germany and of the transitory character of this capitalist power in Germany. It is necessary to know then to wait. This power and this social tranquility of German capitalism is transitory. There is a certain social tranquility and there are no great mobilisations of the masses, great mass movements. But even so, mobilisations like that of the struggle against the war, have a very great significance because they are sectors of the vanguard which are attracted by the leadership of the Communist Party, confronting the social democratic government, the agent of capitalism, which means a profound and very great influence and the possibility to develop it.

The groups do not understand this, and hence they are paralysed. They are critics of the capitalist system but partially critics. They are not criticisms of principles nor do they offer a programme of principles. They are criticisms of the consequences of capitalism not of the structure, and functioning. They do not have an understanding of what the capitalist system is and consequently they do not propose a programme of social transformations. If they propose one it has to be a soviet programme, of expropriation, planning, stratification and functioning under workers control.

There is a very great field in which to intervene. The change is not immediate but neither is there a paralysis. Even without movements, these demonstrations recently against the war, show that there are sectors who want to activate, to militate and to develop their capacity for activity.

The perspectives are not an affirmation of the Social Democracy nor of the CDU. The CDU if it goes to the government has to make a policy in every way of relations, of conciliation with the workers bureaucracy. And it is going to confront also the Catholic masses which voted for the CDU hoping for the development of the country and there are no conditions to develop the country. All the meetings of the great capitalist countries show that they are a failure, because they cannot co-ordinate the economy, and they are confronting a common crisis but cannot make the war when they want, where they want and how they want. The visit of Carter and the meeting with the other presidents has

accompanied Euro Communism, pluralism accompanied all the positions of the capitulation of the world communist movement, in front of the bourgeois conception. If it has not had a material effect, it is because the masses and part of the leadership of the communist parties in practice rejected it. Hence they do not have a programme. Moreover because Euro Communism does not have a reason to exist, they cannot provide a theory nor a programme, neither theory or practice. Eurocommunism does not exist. It is a transitory political measure of convenience, nothing more, one of class conciliation. Hence there cannot be theory. If it had been possible, there would have been theory to show the principles, to apply and generalise the programme. But it does not exist either among them or the social democrats. There cannot be a theory of this policy of the social democrats, because it is a bourgeois policy. On the other hand the socialist parties of Europe are to the left of them and pose social transformations, and the communist parties pose social transformations. Carrillo himself poses social transformations.

This is the level at which it is necessary to discuss to prepare later bases. Hence the slowness of the progress of the revolutionary tendency in Germany. It is not necessary to regard in a fatalist way, the capacity of the socialist leadership. The social democratic leadership is simply a defender, representative and co-administrator of the power of the German capitalism. But it does not have the possibility of being able to continue for many years. The crisis of capitalism affects them all.

not achieved any effect. Carter came to try to co-ordinate a common policy against the workers states, against the progress of the revolution in Africa, but at the same time also to try to dump in Europe the products which they cannot sell in the United States, that is to say to transport the crisis of the United States to Europe, whether in industrial or agricultural products, to impose the agricultural prices of the United States and the immense agricultural surpluses which exist in the United States. All this has failed. There has not been a progress. The uneasiness of capitalism is evident and is seen also in Germany.

The Socialist parties are going to the left. The most backward of all is the German Social Democratic party, more even than the Labour party in Britain, in which the trade unions anyway have a left which is forced in a certain way to confront capitalism with some demands. In Germany it is a rigid apparatus, immobile which could only last, in the stage of sustaining the development of German capitalism.

In the social democracy there are already the conditions for a theoretical, organisational and practical discussion. When there is such a demonstration for peace, it indicates a very great depth of crisis. When social democracy has to go to meetings with the French and the Italians who are to the left and has to disguise itself and cannot impose its policy whereas the Italians and the French pose stratifications, this is going to have an effect in quite a short period.

Now there is a certain resistance in the engineering trade union to the

PRESS COMMUNIQUE

continued from page 1

which the conception of Euro communism and of pluralism with the capitalist system represents for the world communist movement and the need for a discussion in the world communist movement to extirpate such positions and to overcome them by means of discussion and understanding. The Congress addressed a salute to the communist and socialist parties of the entire world and appealed for the unification of the world communist movement and the union of the latter with the socialist parties. It appealed for a united front of the parties of the working class, of the socialist, communist and left nationalists, left catholics to pose an anti capitalist programme answering to the crisis of the capitalist system and a programme to confront the war which the capitalist system prepares. It appealed equally to the Catholic masses of the big capitalist countries to break with the bourgeois leaderships and constitute left catholic movements to push forward a socialist, communist anti capitalist programme.

The Congress elected a new International Executive Committee and a new International Secretariat and re-elected Cde Posadas as general secretary of the IV International.

The Congress approved with unanimity the activity conducted by the IS and the measures of expulsion of some members of the International for reasons of corruption and immorality.

The Congress saluted the activity realised by the International, the incorporation of new members, of new sections and the preparation of the coming incorporations, of new sections. It approved a plan of the Cadres of the Posadist IV International, to intervene in this world process of social transformations and in particular to answer to the most vital necessity of history which means the unification of the world communist movement, of China and the USSR, of the world communist movement with the socialist movement, the revolutionary movement of the catholic masses and the other sectors.

The Congress saluted the comrades who by reason of their activities have not been able to participate in this meeting and established a programme to form the cadres in the activity as the International leadership and the leaders of each section.

The Congress finished with salutes to the world communist movement, to the Soviet Union, Communist China while condemning the latter's present leadership and its reactionary and counter revolutionary policy — to the world socialist, left catholic, revolutionary catholic, revolutionary nationalist and military movement and with a fraternal appeal to the communist movement to develop a discussion on all the problems of Euro Communism, of plurality, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, internationalism, a fraternal discussion to exchange experiences and teachings realised since the Russian revolution of 1917 until today, a fraternal discussion to impel history. The best way to do this is the unification of the world communist movement.

The Congress made a salute to the workers centres for the great struggles that they are in process of leading and made an appeal to them to intervene, also in this process, in a united front with the socialist, communist parties, of the workers states and an appeal to the trade unions and the workers centres of the workers states to call upon the North American masses and the Chinese masses to intervene in the anti capitalist struggle and hinder the capitalist system in its agony, making a massacre in the war which it is preparing and to shorten the length and consequences of the war. Also it made an appeal faced with the complete crisis, economic and social, moral of the capitalist system, to struggle for a programme of social transformations, combining the electoral, trade union activities with the struggle to reach government and power and to transform the capitalist state into a state which allows the development of the economy, on the basis of the stratified economy and the planning of production.

The Congress resolved to address a salute to Cde Posadas, to the IS and the flying IS and to push forward discussions to prepare new activities until the next World Congress.

30 July 1977.
IS IV International.

Out Shortly

EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW No: 4

containing :-

THE POLITICAL REPORT OF THE WORLD CONGRESS

J Posadas

Editorial

continued from page 1

states led by the Soviet Union have proved their viability and at the same time throughout Europe the forces of the left advance. The Socialist and Communist parties in Spain reject participation in NATO, and in France the Communist party asserts the need to extend the Common programme of nationalisations and engages in polemic with the Socialist party. This means they are no longer dominated by reasons of parliamentary opportunism, but struggle to advance, in a principle way the anti-capitalist programme. This programme with its nationalisation of some of the principle industrial concerns in France still lies within the orbit of capitalism, but it makes such a serious intervention in the normal functioning of capitalism that it is incompatible with the interests of French capitalism. Such a programme does not exist in Britain although it was broached at one time with "25 nationalisations" which was quickly buried. All the discussion around the Enterprise Board, the planning agreements and massive subsidies to industry have proved to be simply props to capitalism. It cannot be "capitalism with a human face" but capitalism given vast sums to rationalise itself at the expense of the mass of the population.

FOR A CONSISTENT ANTI-CAPITALIST LEFT IN THE LABOUR PARTY

The crisis of the Labour party, the crisis of its membership, of its policy and programme is profound. All the social democratic parties are in this situation. The German SDP, the French socialists, Palme in Sweden etc. But for the left to advance requires that they look to and study the polemic in the world communist movement. Here the Soviet Union intervenes even if incompletely to stimulate the elimination of conciliation with capitalism. Krasin of the CPSU for example has urged the need for the communists to develop a dynamic discussion with the socialists and to strengthen the Common programme.

To develop the confidence to confront the capitalist policies of the government means to be based on the world and on the capacity of the workers states to advance. There lies the triumph of nationalised property, the ability to emerge from backwardness and transform whole economies from enormous poverty to continuous progress. It is the opposite of capitalism which only knows decline. Planning based on nationalisation of the economy means that the objectives are for collective progress. The plan responds to the assessed needs of the population. Planning for capitalism means the objective of profit, the liquidation of manpower following automation and the total destruction of resources as a result of competition. Such massive elimination of human creative capacity flows from private objectives. "Socialism" has meant concretely in Britain "to make capitalism pleasant". But capitalism to survive has now to compete with nationalised economies and their social relations. It cannot do

Turn to page 4

1917 TODAY MEANS THE EXTENSION OF THE WORKERS STATE TO THE WHOLE WORLD

On the Anniversary of the 1917 Russian Revolution, we salute the masses and proletariat of the Soviet Union who are those who threw up the most complete leadership ever known in history, the Bolshevik Party with the most audacious human will to construct the planned economy as an experience for the whole world, the whole of humanity, not for Russia itself; the same masses who later defended this nationalised and planned economy at the cost of millions dead. It is the same masses and proletariat who today, having overcome Stalinism, appeal in the name of the Soviet Trade Unions to the masses of the United States to denounce the neutron bomb. We salute the Soviet masses as the most cultured of human history, those who have known how to build the soviets, on the basis of the nationalised property, and who have had the patience to defend the nationalised economy waiting to return to the soviet functioning, not as an experience in human culture in the Soviet Union but for the whole of humanity. Having defeated private property for the first time in history, then triumphed over two devastating world wars, then Hitler, and then Stalin, the masses of the USSR clearly show the ability of mankind to triumph over the nuclear war which imperialism is preparing. The extensions of the nationalised and planned economy to the whole world, Mozambique and Angola, soon South Africa and Rhodesia, this is 1917 today. It means that what decides in history is not one leader or another, but the form of property which a state defends. The centralised and planned economy, which comes from the consciousness of the Marxist interpretation, is also the constant impulse for a return to Marxism. Therein lies the great beauty of this stage of history. The return to soviet functioning in the USSR is integrally bound with the need of the Workers States to spread to the whole world. This is what is happening today, this is the continuation of 1917 today.

THE WAY AHEAD IS THE WORKERS STATE

The Russian Revolution was a complete break with the years of private property before it. Always in private property before, intelligence had been excluded from human organisation and human relations, because the ruling classes utilised inventions so as to further their own interests, defend their property and privileges by means of weapons and wars. The Workers State is the basis for the harmonisation between the economic organisation and human relations because it eliminates private property. This is not yet complete, because the Workers State is a transition to Socialism; there still exists bureaucracy which impedes this full harmonisation. The complete harmonisation will be in the soviet functioning in the Workers State, thus allowing the removal of all bureaucracy. But in spite of the bureaucracy, the fundamental conquest of having removed private property, is the basis for unlimited human development, in the economy, in human relations and in thought.

Bureaucracy is an impediment to this unlimited development and it will be removed by political revolution. But it is not the antagonistic force against progress which private property is, therefore the expropriation of the land, of the industries and of finances for the first time in the USSR, was and is the basis for human development. This is what the Anniversary of 1917 must mean for the Labour, Communist and trade union vanguard in Britain. It must mean that the way ahead is the Workers State in the British Isles.

Stalinism was not a result of 1917 but of a process of temporary retreat in the revolutionary process. It was a transitory phenomenon and now the conditions that enabled Stalinism to develop in the Soviet Union no longer exist. The structure of the workers state has proved itself capable of developing in spite of all the problems it has faced, this is because it represents genuine progress. It is this structure that the Russian Revolution established. Stalinism was able to limit the full force of the workers state for a period but the force of

the workers state overcame these limitations in the conditions of the advance of the world socialist revolution. The appearance of Stalinism was an immense set-back for the world masses. It gave to left reformists in the Socialist parties, in the Social democracy, forces which they do not have themselves, thus complicating the process of breaking the Social Democracy in the advance towards the Communist future in this country for example. In the world Communist movement, it confused comrades, subjecting them to the pressures of the bourgeoisie of each country because the 3rd International was dissolved. It gave rise to idealistic and bourgeois notions of "democracy" in abstract, like "pluralism" and "euro-communism" in the Communist parties. The method of thought and interpretation, dialectical materialism, was lost and the right and reformists of the Socialist parties took advantage of this to evade the pressure of the proletariat and the Communist movement. They used it to attack the Soviet Union, making it appear to the masses as a monster of despotism. They confused the dictatorship of the proletariat with Stalinism, and today, we are still suffering from this, and it is a fundamental impediment in the construction of a revolutionary left in the Labour Party.

CENTRALISED PLANNED ECONOMY DECIDES, NOT BUREAUCRACY

The planned economy in the USSR, triumphed over two devastating wars, in which tens of millions died. It triumphed over Hitler, and in spite of Stalin, continued to advance, overcoming the poverty and backwardness of generations before the revolution, and now has overcome all the problems of unemployment, of inflation, exploitation, alienation, human despair, fear of death which are the features of capitalism today. Stalin was the greatest pluralist of all because he sought for a coexistence of systems, the capitalist system in the world and Socialism in one

country. It meant a policy which sustained elements going back or trying to go back to private property in the USSR, and in this he assassinated the whole Bolshevik leadership and the most prominent Bolshevik fighters and leaders of the world revolution. This was a dictatorship yes, not of the proletariat; but against it. In this sense it is no different from the 'democracy' of the bourgeoisie. However, in spite of this, the USSR continued to progress, and today it is the centre of support to the world revolution, the most elevated organ for the liberation of the masses of the world. This means that "Socialism in one country" could be abolished and a return to the Leninist principle of support to the world revolution, on the basis of the nationalised and planned economy.

The immense set-back which Stalinism has been is partially being overcome. Audacity is the quality of the revolutionary. The audacity of Lenin and Trotsky resided in that they based their confidence fully on the ability of the masses to lead their own destiny and to rule themselves through the soviet functioning which they demonstrated they were capable of constructing in 1917. The leadership of Lenin and Trotsky was based on the preparation to launch the struggle at a calculated time, and to take the risk of being defeated because humanity would learn from their experience. In spite of bureaucracy, the USSR, as with Fidel Castro today impels the world revolution. In front of the nuclear weapons which directly threaten Cuba and the Soviet Union, Fidel Castro sends soldiers to the revolutionary comrades of Angola. And now he turns back towards the American continent preparing to intervene there in Costa Rica and other countries. This is not blind audacity, but audacity based on the objective course of the process.

FOR THE WORLD UNITED FRONT

Divisions exist in the world Communist movement, which

cannot be resolved organisationally but politically by means of the theoretical clarification of the problems which separate USSR and China, and which create pluralist and eurocommunist tendencies in the world Communist movement. This impedes the development of the left in the Socialist parties, and their unification on a world scale with the Communist parties and the USSR. When the USSR supports Mozambique and Angola, it is because the nationalised and planned economy needs extending to the whole world so as to become a fully planned economy on a world scale. This is not imperialism, it is the spread of intelligence with the full consent of the world masses. The basis for this change in the conduct of the USSR since Stalin to today, is not determined by Brezhnev, but by the nationalised and planned economy and the world process of the revolution.

It is the nationalised and centralised planned economy which has allowed the progress of the Workers State, to triumph over all the proofs of history, and now clearly it is also this which provides the basis for the regeneration of the political leadership in the USSR. More than all this still, it is this form of economy which extends itself to the whole world, thus creating the conditions for the overthrow of what is left of capitalism in all the world. Imperialism sees this and prepares for war. Today 1917 means that it is necessary to unify all the world Communist movement, to give a rational explanation of why all the movement has to be centralised and that in itself is not an imposition. The appeal by the Soviet trade unions to the masses of the United States show that there are constant changes for progress in the workers states. This will be increased with appeals for the world Socialist, Communist and trade union United Front, to take power everywhere and construct socialism. The nationalised and planned economy is the source of progress. This is the way to apply 1917 today in the British Isles.

The conditions for a left in Germany...

Continued from page 3

bureaucracy and an effort to draw near to the workers states. In the other trade unions and in the Ruhr also it has to exist. It is not a complete passivity, it is the leadership which is passive. One can expect very great progress in a short time. The proletariat lives the world and hence there are these rebellions among the socialists.

It is necessary to develop a tendency of the left. Scientifically the conditions do not exist to maintain this policy of the Social democracy or the policy of the CDU if it goes to the government. The social crisis increases. There is no possibility that capitalism can recover the dominion of the economic process. In the communist parties also the conclusion that it is necessary to change capitalism advances. This can be seen in the Communist parties of Spain, Italy and France who have to reiterate that they are for plurality, but it is necessary to make social transformations. It is not that

they propose it, but there is no place for reformism in history. It is necessary to intervene and to give scientific orientation so that the left current is formed tomorrow. Today there is no possibility to do it but tomorrow, yes. But it is not a distant tomorrow. Tomorrow is today, now. Today, now it is developing.

Also at the same time, the soviets even tending to seek agreements with the Yanks cannot retreat from the level that has been achieved, because there is no place either for this. The Yanks can say to them, to the Soviets "stop, do not advance anymore and we will not advance". They cannot do it because the two are swept along and the Soviets are integrated in the future of history. The Yanks, no., The Soviet economy coincides with the future of history, but the Yanks, no.

J. POSADAS 22.5.77

Editorial

Continued from page 3

so. British capitalism has to confront the workers states, at the same time that it is exhausted by inter-capitalist competition. It has exhausted its interest in the expansion of production. Compared with German capitalism it is senile and effete. Objective dis-

cussion in the Labour party to promote a left current is a necessity and the conditions are going to impose it. The conceptions of the old left, Bevan etc were essentially superficial, a very distant echo of the desire of the masses for social change and the old left

refracted standpoints of the bourgeoisie in a left guise. The immense crisis of the social democracy in Britain demands and will find the programme of social transformations and revolution.

PARTY PUBLICATIONS OBTAINABLE FROM . . .

Prometheus Bookshop, 134 Alcester Road, Birmingham 13.
Books, 84 Woodhouse Lane, Leeds LS2 8AB.
Bookshop, Union Building, The University, Leeds.
Grass Roots, 109 Oxford Road, Manchester M1 7DU.
Union Shop, Students Union, Percy Gee Building, Leicester University, Leicester.
Leicester University Bookshop, Mayors Walk, Leicester, LE1 7RD.
The Polytechnic Bookshop, Newark Pedestrian Subway, Newark Street, Leicester, LE1 5XT.
Collet's London Bookshop, 66 Charing Cross Road, London WC2.
Rare and Racy, 166 Devonshire Street, Sheffield 3.

Editorial

FOR MASS DISCUSSIONS IN THE FACTORIES AND WORKERS ORGANISATIONS TO DEVELOP THE ANTI-CAPITALIST LEFT IN THE LABOUR PARTY

The assassinations of the Baader-Meinhof militants in Germany show the criminal intentions of the bourgeoisie in front of the very profound social disorder against their system. It has been an act blatantly carried out, a continuation of the murder of Ulrike Meinhof previously, a measure of civil war to confront the German masses in their elevating struggle against the reactionary social democratic leadership. As in Mogadishu, the world capitalist class made a united front in collusion for assassination. Assassination provides the only response that the capitalist class can make, because there is no perspective for them to attract sectors to the system of private property. The desertion of even the sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie away from their own regime, which in Germany economically still has a certain strength, to carrying out an anti-capitalist struggle against it, shows why the fear of the ruling class is justified. The result of their insecurity is that they have to suppress democratic rights. In the name of "democracy" the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is reinforced and the quality of life of the masses is further reduced.

DEMOCRACY CANNOT BE DISCUSSED IN ABSTRACT

What is the nature of democracy under capitalism? Does it provide true freedom for the population? With the continuing chaos of decomposition of capitalism, democracy is shown to be the right to live under the constant threat of unemployment, the right to be killed or injured at work, the right to enjoy polluted air and food; there is a parliament and elections, but did the population vote for all these things? How can democracy exist, when the masses in Ireland face the guns, batons and shields of the British army every day? Certain concessions have been gained by the masses in Britain in the past, such as the Health Service, but now even these parliamentary reforms are being taken back. It becomes quite striking that the so-called democracy is a charade, an illusion, which with the powerful past of British imperialism could appear to be "freedom", because capitalism was able to give these few reforms to certain sectors. A whole apparatus was created which could incorporate layers who enjoyed a privileged social status, such as the Lords, or the trade union aristocrats. Britain was thus proclaimed a democracy, even though the mass of the population was still, exploited and there was still poverty and bad living conditions, because this extensive apparatus could contain social rebellions by incorporating different sectors in different ways. However when any serious revolt developed, it would still be put down with force. Parliamentary democracy exists, but the bourgeoisie has always been in power and no government has ever been able to give "democracy" to all the population. Democratic rights have been given, but now more and more repressive laws are passed, precisely because the system can no longer give reforms, it can no longer rely on this method to contain the growing rebellion against it. Capitalism cannot give democracy, it has never given it even at the height of its expansion. Democracy, under the system of private property finally ends up as the right to develop the neutron bomb, which kills people but leaves property intact.

IT IS NOT A NORMAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

The masses of the world have

thrown out British imperialism from the colonies and it is this situation which provokes the intensity of the crisis of capitalism. As the masses have no intention of allowing imperialism back, capitalism is faced with no possibility of reanimating itself. For capitalism to reanimate, it would require extensive investments, restructuring of an old and decrepit industry, the development of industrial capacity. All these are essentials which capitalism has no potential to do. This is because the system no longer has any dynamism or initiative, its markets are contracting, vast areas of the world are a desert as far as capitalism is concerned because they can no longer plunder the resources for themselves. The purely speculative nature of capital illustrates the insecurity of capitalism, no area of the world is free from the developing revolution with its inherent dangers for the bourgeoisie of expropriation. Truly the system of private property is in its death agony! Thrown out from the colonies, the enormous alternative system of the workers states confronting it every day, this is why it is not the normal cyclical crisis of slumps and booms, where capitalism could say that a boom was round the corner, even of short duration. Now it is slump, slump, slump, accompanied by the decomposition of the system. This situation allows the possibility for a functioning of a tendency of the left in the Labour party and trade unions, because the conditions demand a programme of social transformations, as the only solution to the crisis.

Nor is the electoral strife between parties a 'normal' one. The crisis would usually provoke considerable electoral competition between all the parties. The reality is that all the parties, from Labour to Tory, are completely united behind the government's policy to sustain the capitalist system. The Tory party has shown no enthusiasm to campaign against the government; their conference demonstrated much rhetoric which did not challenge the government, thus allowing the government to continue because it carries out most effectively the policy they want. The bourgeois parties disintegrate because they have no programme or perspective. This has reached an enormous level in the Liberal party with the allegations against Thorpe.

THE CRISIS IN THE LABOUR PARTY IS VERY PROFOUND

Social democratic parties, such as Labour which support capitalism, at a time when it can no longer give reforms are being shaken to their roots. This is particularly so with the Labour Party, in which there is no prepared team able to propose a way out of the crisis. This was the most fundamental conclusion of the Labour party conference. How to deal with Ireland, the economy, the regions? How to increase the standard of life of the masses? These questions received no answer. The crisis of the Labour Party remains very deep and is unresolved because there has been no tendency explaining the need for social transformations. In face of the problems, the National Executive Committee proposes to end programmatic discussion for a year! But all the pressures which stem from the system being exhausted, will not go away but will accentuate sharply.

What is essential to develop in the workers movement is a discussion on how to develop Britain so that it can give democracy for all the population, so that the masses do have a decent standard of living. Discussion is particularly important in this country

Turn to page 3

STALIN, THE WORKERS STATE AND THE ATOMIC WAR J. POSADAS (Inside)

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

271 Friday 11 November 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year..... £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year..... £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
Adminda, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S12DL.

Other party address:—

24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM, THE SOVIET UNION AND THE LEFT IN THE LABOUR PARTY

J. Posadas

9/7/77

The crisis of British capitalism has deepened and extended in the last months and is expressed above all in the crisis inside Labour. The crisis of capitalism is expressed as much in Labour as in the Conservatives, as in the Liberals. But when Labour, which is the wing of the capitalist system in the workers movement, is shaken, unstable and insecure, it is because the crisis is very profound. It is not economic, nor monetary, nor is it a problem of saving the value of the pound.

This crisis is where all the centralisation of the decline in the power of British imperialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America is concentrated, and now also inside the country. The British proletariat is an expression of the will of the European proletariat to liberate itself from the capitalist system. But, this has to express itself through Labour and the trade unions, and it is through this process that the forms of the crisis of the Labour Party and of British capitalism are to be found.

The present crisis of the Communist Party is very deep. It has divided publicly into two wings. One is for and the other is against the Soviets. But, in reality, neither have the correct programme. The British Communist Party does not have any perspective as a Communist Party. The British proletariat, on the other hand, yes, it has a perspective, starting from Labour and going to Communism. Therefore, the British Communist Party has to know how to wait, it has to learn how to walk on a path which will unite it to the Labour Party in Communism. The Communists are not going to accept this, it is going to disgust them because they feel negated by this. But they have to discuss this. There is no perspective for the Communist Party in Britain. It is a small party which has neither influence, nor authority, nor political and programmatic preparation; and the process in Britain is well elevated.

You cannot pose for Britain what we pose for Italy or Greece. They are situations which are within the same process of capitalist crisis, but in a particular form. They have national characteristics, because of the different relation of forces internally. It is so for these reasons, and not because they are different countries with different languages.

The Communists must aim at the Labour left, posing a programme of state control, of planning, and also of the federation of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland which have to unify. This stage is throwing up racial, regional differences. The discovery of an oil well is claimed by three sectors. This prevents planning. The problems of the economy and cultural development of Britain cannot be solved within British capitalism. And this problem of oil — like the problems of Ireland — is part of the economic, cultural and social problem of how to unify. If all this bursts out, it is because they all oppose, resist and reject the continuation of centralisation under the command of big British capitalism.

The political demand for regionalisation is a retrogression. But the revolt is not a retrogression. The revolt is good because it permits a base on the revolt to attack British capitalism. But the demand no, because it seeks a division into zones, into nationalities and languages.

This does not mean that the Mandelists, the Trotskyist groups, the Communist left and the Labour left, and our own party should, therefore, just wait on the sidelines. They can and must grow in the political activity to influence more in a centralised way. But the objective must not be their own growth, to dispute over the leadership of the Labour Party. This is not possible. There is no time, nor historic conditions, and there are no immediate political possibilities for this. Above all, because the tradition of the Communist Party is to be amorphous, completely amorphous. Remember that they are those who have rectified Marxism, they threw it out, and they said that you don't need it because Britain is a special case in history. However, Marxism continues being the method of interpretation for Britain.

These are not problems of trade unions, of elections, or of economy, or oil wells. They are the problem of the dry wells of capitalism which no longer give anything. What is missing in Britain is programme and policy. In the case of Ireland, what is the policy of the parties? They pose more or less liberty. It is necessary to discuss with the Labour left, with the Trotskyist groups and with the Communists of the left, proposing to them a programme for the development of the left in the Labour Party. The Trotskyist groups and the Communists must intervene with programme, policy and agitation to influence inside the Labour left. When they do this more, then they will influence more and there will be a greater result.

It is necessary to understand why there is all this uproar, all this agitation in Britain. Neither the Communists nor Labour, nor any of the Leftist parties discuss this. They explain it by the normal crisis of capitalism. No, in Britain it is not only the normal crisis of the capitalist system, an economic crisis. The crisis is the consequence of the expulsion of British imperialism from the colonies, from the base of economic and social stability of British imperialism; and essentially, because of the development of the world Socialist revolution and of the Workers States. But inside this process,

Turn to page 3

STALIN, THE WORKERS STATE AND THE ATOMIC WAR

J. POSADAS

5th March 1977

The basis of Stalinism was the absence of scientific thought, of the application of marxism, of marxist comprehension, of marxist education. When such a basis exists it is because it responded to social interests. The social interest of Stalinism came from layers which were thrown up by the revolution.

Stalinism perverted scientific thought, it destroyed and replaced it by bureaucratic thought in order to defend concrete material interests. These concrete material interests supported themselves on the Workers State. They were not the counter-revolutionary concrete material interests as in a capitalist country but in the Workers State. Thus the bureaucracy had to adjust the usufruct it makes from workers state, with the functioning of Workers State. The bureaucracy uses the contradictory character of the Workers State, and this resides in the fact that the base is revolutionary and in part socialist, that is: state owned property, planning of production and it is the state which controls and leads all the activities. But in distribution, in the Workers State the social relation is bourgeois. It is still bourgeois now in the USSR because the social relation is based on salaries, that is to say it is a relation between the workers, the Workers State and property made through the bourgeois conception of 'to each one according to his capacity'. This contradiction creates, created and developed and still creates in a diminished form, an abnormality, a contradiction which tends to either develop towards antagonism, or towards the disappearance of the contradictory factor and unification. Whilst this contradiction has been maintained, the Workers State however, has not retreated.

Stalin because of the circumstances of history, could develop a bureaucratic apparatus. He himself did not create it or plan it all, but such were the circumstances of history. All those who endow Stalin with the ability to have created the bureaucracy, give to him a genius that he did not have. Had Stalin had the genius to this, he would not have made counter-revolution, he would have made the revolution, because it would have meant that he was an intelligent, capable man. But it is enough to look, to see that what he did was stupid, and intelligence is not stupidity. Intelligence is living, it is open progress, not retrogression. No, they were circumstances in history which Stalin did not foresee. Neither could the Bolsheviks have foreseen the level to which the process developed. They foresaw it, but not the level which it reached. It was the first historical leap of the revolution. Supported by the world process of the revolution, a bureaucracy arose which developed therefore the character of the State and all these states. The workers state expanded and so did the swindling, but capitalism was incapable of destroying the workers state. Stalin weakened the Workers State. He destroyed the Bolshevik leadership, he assassinated them all, he persecuted all the revolutionaries, put the opponents in gaol, even opponents of the right like Bukharin. He eliminated any theoretical political marxist life, and the relations with the past of the Russian Revolution. He isolated the Revolution from its very support, from its origins, therefore he stimulated careerism, from this basis of the bureaucracy. It was not somehow hidden sections of society existed who were disposed to be bureaucratic. It is stupid to say that Stalin had a mountain of hidden bureaucrats. The bureaucracy is a social consequence and there were the conditions for this and a team, to do it. When such a bureaucratic body like that of Stalin arose it is because there was a development of layers which had a bureaucratic position. They had the limited, nationalist, Russian, Russophile attitudes. There, the bureaucracy was to be found. If the Bolshevik Party became bureaucratic, it is because these people dislodged the Bolsheviks and this is why Stalin killed all the Bolsheviks. He isolated himself and remained in his turn, dependent on the bureaucracy. But the bureaucracy could not liquidate him, even though it could profit in doing so and in putting directly one of them to negotiate with capitalism, because Stalin represented at the same time the link with the Bolshevik past. He had been a Bolshevik. Therefore, they needed Stalin to use him as a prop for themselves.

At the same time, they needed Stalin because they feared the reaction of the Soviet proletariat, if they started liquidating Stalin. They would have had to confront the proletariat, because this would have meant a rupture between the masses and the past. Therefore they kept Stalin as a bonus to the masses, the one with a Bolshevik past, or the appearance of the Bolshevik past.

Stalin was the first to liquidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, the first to make 'plurality'. He said that the dictatorship of the proletariat was terminated, that we do not need

development of the new Party.

All this is being lived in the Soviet Union in a very fragmented way. It is not on the order of the day to discuss this. It is not the theme, nor is there the preoccupation for it. But these problems in a very concentrated form, were those which the Soviet Union itself developed.

The Workers State is contradictory by essence, because whilst state owned and planned property eliminates competition, it does not eliminate the market but softens it. The capitalist market is the direct consequence of competition which is the avidity for profit on the part of the bosses. It finds its expression in competition and in sales, the surplus-value is actually materialised. In the world wide and national competition you find the real battlefield. The formation of the so-called multinationals — starting from the monopolies which later led to trusts — means the function of imperialism economically, socially and militarily. Today, the multinationals amount to this. They are more concentrated societies which include the national ones, but they are more ephemeral, they are more rapid in developing and in liquidating themselves, because the function of the multinational is not to extend the economy. It is not even like the stage of the monopolies before. We are in more feverish, more insecure, more uncertain and transitory stages which are expressed by the multinationals. They have their own network of links between raw materials and the armaments for war preparations.

Capitalism is antagonistic with the Workers State and contradictory within itself. It is antagonistic with the Workers State because they are opposed regimes of property. They are antagonistic because there is no basis for true communication. Capitalism is contradictory of itself, because even though the capitalists all have the same interest in the state, in the regime of property, they clash in the market. The market annuls 30% of the total production created. This production is eliminated through competition which rejects what is produced at higher cost. The least competitive is eliminated, and all the cost of the lost production is later transferred in the prices of other commodities.

It is a social effort which is lost. The capitalist system just transfers it into prices. The prices of the world put together, are the quantity of labour power which was necessary for all production. This includes what has been wasted. It is an immense waste. Therefore there is an antagonism. It is a contradiction which is expressed in antagonism with human need. The Workers State is not antagonistic like this.

There is a contradiction in the Workers State between state property, and the social relations, between state, property, production and the need of the workers expressed through wages. They are contradictions, but they can be eliminated in the process of advance of the Workers State. Capitalism cannot do this because the capitalist system means contradictions, competition, and no more.

In the Soviet Workers State competition exists. The market economy exists. You buy for a price, and the price is in any case, determined by the hours of work contained in what you buy and competition, but it doesn't have the character of competition as in capitalism, because the Workers State is state controlled and planned. Being state owned and planned, it is possible to fix a price which is not determined by profit but by need. Therefore, this softens the aspects of the market.

The market is no longer the brute which imposes on production, and commerce. It is the State which decides the competition which there is and it mollifies it a great deal.

This is why the Workers State endured Stalin, the assault of the Stalinists, and it is why the working class — in spite of Stalin and in spite of the monstrosity of Stalin who assassinated the Bolshevik Party — constructed a new Soviet Union in 4 years. That is to say the working class assimilates, not the backward aspects of the experiences which try

to turn back to the past like Stalin, but opens its arms to the future.

The working class of the world takes and assimilates the most complete experiences. The working class which doesn't go to college, draws its culture and its understanding from its function in production and society, where it acquires the notion of its importance in history. It acquires the notion that it is the essential centre of production, and up to Socialism, production will be the essential base.

It gives security to the proletariat that it has a function which no other class has in history. The social function of the proletariat — which cannot become a new proprietor gives it the inclination to be objective.

The Soviet proletariat is this, and it lives all this without being able to express it. Because it does not have the sort of life which would allow it to express it, with meetings and congresses. There are congresses in all the Communist Parties, but they are congresses organised from the top in which the line put forward was already decided a year in advance. Now it is less than a year, because before there was no political and theoretical life, and now there is much more.

In the Soviet Union the will, the preoccupation of the working class has to be expressed in order to see what is happening in the world and how to intervene. The Soviet proletariat has to express the desire which it has to participate, to give its opinion, to demonstrate against Euro-communism, to defend the dictatorship of the proletariat, defend the Soviet Union and the CPSU and also defend the leaders of the Soviet Union. It is not that the Soviet proletariat simply follows them but it feels that the instrument which it has raised to that level, has to let it reason and speak, and they feel that it does not have to be broken in order to be reconstructed. The working class feels that this is not necessary. It has the security that it has been capable of imposing changes on Stalin. If the working class had let itself be smashed, the bureaucracy would have ousted Stalin and imposed itself. The working class was not smashed, it continued forward firmly.

No Communist Party has taken this into account. The Soviet Union has. It has the most complete proletariat of the world, it is the most youthful. It is the most complete because it has made the experience of the life structured by the Workers State and it went through the stage of Stalin. They defeated the Nazis and not just to proclaim victory but as a necessary function. It was necessary to crush Hitler and they did it. It was necessary to finish with Stalin and they did. Twenty-three million Soviet people died, of which seven million were women, and very large numbers of orphaned children who spent weeks without food, did not dedicate themselves to crying with pain. Seven year old children, their whole family dead, picked up grenades and threw them back. This is not a particular example of the Soviet Union but the consciousness which the Workers State gives, as that which the Paris Commune and 1905 gave. To give consciousness does not mean that a text gives it but the intervention, the magnitude, the function of the proletariat to transform society, gives it a notion of its function in history. And the objectivity which it has, permits it to exercise its function. No other class could do this and at the moment, the Soviet proletariat is allowed to intervene little, very little, practically nothing. There are declarations of the Soviet Trade Unions which are very distant and belated and there are those of the CPSU and the other leaders. But the Soviet proletariat does not intervene and has the desire to intervene.

By nature of its function, of its resolution, the Soviet proletariat does live all these problems. If it lives them why is it that it doesn't participate? Why is it that it does not make known its judgements and its opinions? Why does it not weigh in the world, for example, directing itself towards the CGIL of Italy and the CGT of France, supporting the organisation of trade unions and workers centres in China which do not exist. And directing themselves towards the trade unions of the United States in which there is a centralised tendency in opposition to the AFL that is to say in opposition to the trade union of bosses' agents, now there are two trade unions proposing workers control of production.

Stalin was liquidated but the consequences of Stalin remain. For example the Bolshevik Party was destroyed, and the old Bolshevik Party no longer exists. It is another Party which it is necessary to construct, because of the bureaucratic structure which has taken over from the Bolsheviks. It is bureaucratic structure which is made up of careerists who prevent the Party from reasoning, from receiving experiences, from communicating experiences, from living internally dialectically. Therefore it is necessary to construct a new Party. We are supporting this. But in turn, they have to make this experience of a new Party in the Soviet Union itself. People have to discuss, exchange

ideas, and the proletariat seeks to intervene. In a text, Posadas posed that, "in this process, the Soviet masses particularly the Soviet Trade Unions, the Soviet proletariat are going to tend to intervene, to seek to intervene, to give opinions, to seek to hold meetings, to seek to participate in this process and to make its thoughts clear".

These last resolutions in Moscow show that there is this pressure on the part of the proletariat because the resolution is aimed to answer to this need.

The Communist party of the USSR admonishes the militants and the leaders because they do not discuss with the population, do not give opinions or do not answer to the disquiet, to the need of the population. It is a bureaucratic resolution but one which tends to correct mistakes against the development of the USSR. Tomorrow another resolution is going to come out, that the workers must give their opinion to intervene directly.

The changes which they are producing are still very partial changes, but changes of intervention of the soviets in the world are now very frequent, continual but partial. They are going to be continued but in a more revolutionary form, more openly.

One of the essential conditions, necessary for the development of history is soviet democracy, not because they can speak of the dissident lunatics, but because it is necessary that it weighs and attracts the rest of the world, so that the working class can weigh on the North American working class, the Japanese, the German, the British, the French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish also, but essentially North American, British, German and Japanese. The democratic soviet functioning allows the workers state to intervene and develop the workers state to the maximum possible, when today it is the minimum possible through bureaucratic management.

Capitalism has no perspective for continued life, nor fascism. Berlinger says that "if fascism comes it will be a retreat, which will lead to the most terrible epochs of fascism of feudalism". We say not that fascism is going to triumph but that fascism to triumph would have to do this. Trotsky said "if Hitler triumphed it is going to be a stage in history, but even so it will be very short". We say that it is possible that fascism makes coups. Coups are of different types, one of which is made and collapses, pronto. This is appropriate for fascism and capitalism also. They prepare to launch a coup and it collapses because it does not have the historic strength to succeed. There are 14 genuine structural workers states, structured and in total twenty workers states, although they do not have all the requisites like Somalia, South Yemen, Algeria, China, Vietnam, Laos, Angola, Mozambique, they have still not achieved all the structure but already they are workers states. Then how believe that in an epoch in which

humanity resolves all the problems through the workers state, that fascism has a place in history. What we are doing is not a socially interested calculation with a competitive conclusion but a scientific conclusion.

Humanity has already seen that the social problems are resolved through the Soviet Union, because humanity sees that it endured Stalin and advanced. How believe that people are so stupid as not to see this. The fear that it is not so answers to another need, not to objective need. It is the fear of someone who does not have theoretical security, not through bad intention. Fascism is going to make a coup, but it is going to fail and it is necessary to say this. Also we want to avoid the war, can it be done? Who can believe that Lenin did not wish to avoid the war? Marx also wanted to avoid the war but its not possible to prevent war that comes as a consequence of the relations of the capitalist system. This is not because they insult, attack and make an aggressive activity, but because it is a consequence of capitalism. Capitalism is war as Marx said and Lenin. The communists do not say that capitalism is war but that capitalism can make war, not that it is war. It means that their competition and antagonism is war. The relation of the bourgeoisie is one of war. They seek to smash each other. Let them all die like Seveso. This is capitalism. Seveso is an example of making war.

It is necessary to proclaim the war is coming and to prepare for it. But it does not mean just to put the helmet on and prepare the atomic weapon, but it means to have the theoretical foresight that capitalism is going to make the war and it will be an atomic pool. The image of an atomic pool because it is of short duration but very deep and damaging like a pool. The pool is small, but it means also rotten water, with every type of waste and the atomic war will be this, very soon. They are going to kill millions and we cannot impede it. Its like the surgeon who has to cut off a leg. He has to do it although he does not want to, otherwise the patient dies. It does no good to close the eyes, and not see it. They still have to cut off the leg. By closing the eyes to historic and concrete analysis, does this impede the war? Can capitalism seek another solution that might not be war? Can it allow itself to be dislodged? Can we win and impede it?

The means which impede them, is to take power everywhere. It is a way to impede it but when capitalism sees that we take power everywhere it make the war, before we take power everywhere. For example a specific fact, if in Spain and Italy there is the workers state, capitalism will hasten the war. But if in Italy, although there might be an attempt of fascism, its the soviets who will launch the war. The soviets are not going to let Italy be transformed into a fascist state which afterwards becomes a base of imperialism for the war. Cuba went to Angola which is quite far, sent by the Soviet Union. The Yanks said "so many men per day" by means of a satellite. They made a calculation very approximate of the forces which Cuba sent and they could see the ships come out. But if they were strong why did they not prevent them? If they have strength and possibility, material forces, they have little social force to make the war without consequences for them. They do not have this, hence they did not make it. Then it is necessary to show the weakness of capitalism which is preparing the war.

The soviet leadership fears to confront such a reality, it fears to see that it is like this because as it does not represent genuinely, integrally the necessary process for the development of the Soviet Union, it does not feel that it is a representative factor. As it makes a usufruct it is afraid. Hence it is not objective, but subjective. It sees and reasons in accordance with the bureaucrat which usurps. It is necessary to define this conclusion.

Another aspect is that it is possible to advance in the anti capitalist struggle without capitalism launching the war when it wants, where it wants and how it wants. These are principles which it wants to discuss.

The intervention of the Soviet Union publicly is going to stimulate the North American proletariat, the North American masses to intervene to prepare to organise the class.

The proletariat of Europe is ready to take power. The elections, the great strikes, the trade union concentrations, the growing development of the trade union concentrations show it is ready to overthrow capitalism. In Germany capitalism is sustained with the Social Democracy. The Social democracy contains, in its turn, the proletariat by a bureaucratic apparatus which corresponds to the old Yankee or British type but also with the promise of socialism. The proletariat does not create it, but like all the apparatuses it is in the hands of the bureaucrats, of very well paid workers, thus the proletariat cannot make their opinion felt. But there was a series of very important strikes. As part of this the German communist party brought out a resolution, where they did not attack Trotskyism which is a change showing that they are correcting themselves under the pressure of the masses. If in Capitalist Germany which is less sensitive to the world process than elsewhere there are preoccupations like this how believe that in the USSR the workers and militants do not seek to understand, discuss and read.

The problems of the partial regeneration need the intervention of Posadism and the circulation of the texts of Posadism. And the Trotskyists Posadists intervene in this process.

J. POSADAS.
5th March 1977.

Editorial

continued from page 1

because there is no cultural political life. It is prevented by the apparatuses of the Labour Party and trade unions who have accepted the norms of bourgeois thought. Hence any discussion on 'where is Britain going?' would take on an anti-capitalist form and would not be in the interests of the apparatuses. Why not develop open public discussion on the need for social transformations? Discuss in the factories, workplaces, in the universities and schools — if this crisis is not a transitory one, if it is not going to pass, then it is necessary to find a solution to the crisis. As capitalism does not have the possibility to reanimate, then it is necessary to change the system. Private property can develop no more. The longer it remains, the more damage it can do to humanity. A workers state therefore has to be constructed in Britain, based on a nationalised, planned economy. Subsidies, like those to Leyland, do not increase the quality of life of the working class. Only the elimination of all private interests will enable the planning of the economy, to be controlled for the first time, instead of being left in anarchy and chaos. Discuss in this way a programme to transform the economy. If the Dutch Socialist party can pass a resolution at their conference against the monarchy, why cannot the throwing out of the queen be discussed in Britain? Holland has a rigid bureaucratic structure also but this has not prevented the monarchy being discussed.

Discussion on a programme provides the best way for the formation of a left to take place. It enables an exchange of experiences, opinions, allows the influencing of sectors who are not convinced; it develops the ability to reason and persuade, qualities which are essential for the formation of new cadres in the Labour party and trade unions. With increasing confidence in an alternative programme as a result of discussions, the left would become more firm and resolute to challenge the bourgeois leaderships in the party and unions. We appeal for a united front of the Labour party and trade union militants, intellectual sectors, communists and members of the left groups to develop a public discussion on the need to nationalise and plan the economy, the need to make a socialist republic, to carry out a series of measures immediately to defend the living standard of the masses, as a way to take Britain out of the cultural backwardness which has been its heritage.

CORRECTION

Red Flag 269. Article on China (22.8.77) J. Posadas. Page, 2 Line 27, should read:—

"It pushed them from the "hundred flowers" to the cultural revolution and now they want to return to the "hundred flowers".

THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM, THE SOVIET UNION AND THE LEFT IN THE LABOUR PARTY

continued from page 1

its expulsion from Asia, Africa and also Latin America, has a particular importance.

The formation of the multi-nationals is not just the result of the economic process inside the capitalist system. It is not just the result of the accumulation of capital and of competition. This is the end product. But the formation of the multi-nationals results from the fact that capitalism was made to accelerate the process of its internal composition because it was rejected by the world Socialist revolution in every part of the world. Britain is the result of this. Capitalism was rejected in all parts of the world and therefore capital concentrated. Because of this, what they call the multi-nationals have appeared. It is the present form of the monopoly of the capitalist system.

The masses of the world have rejected Britain and the Queen. Why cannot we overthrow the Queen and make a Socialist Britain? The slogan has to be for a Socialist Britain, Socialist democracy, the Democratic Republic of Britain. This does not mean democracy in the abstract; democracy in the abstract means the Queen which we have.

Another thing to discuss in the Communist Party is that Communism is the objective of humanity. It is a natural conclusion of the objective process of history. But it is not natural in human society. The economy, science and technique are creations of human society. But the human being created science and intelligence, and created class conflicts also. Science, intelligence and the economy go much further than this; but today intelligence goes much further than all the economy as a whole. This is Marxism and this is represented by the Workers States. The Workers States are the material expression of the progress of humanity and Marxism. Marxism is not Karl Marx, nor is it his statue, nor his texts. Marxism is the Workers States. Even if they say that there is no liberty or that they don't allow Biermann to sing, it is like this.

We are in agreement with the right to criticise the Workers States, but the criticism has to be for the progress of humanity. It is said that you can see what Stalin was through what exists today. And what is it that exists today in the Workers States? Is it that Biermann cannot sing, or that Medvedev and Solzhjenitsyn, and some other types cannot speak? But has the Workers State been checked? Have science, technology, the economy and society been checked? No, they have progressed. Economically, technologically, scientifically the Workers States have advanced. Socially they have advanced more than technically, scientifically or economically, because they have liberated Angola and Mozambique. How can one close the eyes to such a process?

Communist comrades, comrades of the Communist left — which is not very left — the Soviet Union cannot just be measured by the fact that Medvedev was prevented from making a funeral oration, but you measure it as a whole. These people cannot speak, but the workers of the Soviet Union are allowed to speak — even if they have not spoken directly through the trade unions, through the Communist Party and the government, and they supported Angola and Ethiopia. This has more effect than all the songs of Biermann. You must discuss like this.

We are in favour of Soviet democracy. Soviet democracy is represented neither by Medvedev nor by Solzhjenitsyn nor by Biermann. We are in favour of Soviet democracy in the Soviet Union, which is consent and the right for all the revolutionary tendencies to exist, and it is a scientific principle to develop science. The Workers Party, the programme for the Workers State, the Bolshevik Party, the Soviet Union and the Workers States are the most elevated and necessary expression of science. We can do without knowing about Mars or Venus, and we can do without oil and humanity will find substitutes. But you cannot do without the conquests of the mind and human resolution. This is what Marxism gives. It gives the security to be able to speak, to discuss, to discern and to polemicise. To polemicise doesn't mean to oppose, to dispute or to crush. To polemicise means the interchange of ideas, as Lenin and Trotsky and the Bolsheviks did. This is the democracy which there must be in the Soviet Union. This means the discussion for the scientific progress of the Soviet Union and the world. This is full democracy!

All the tendencies which correspond to revolutionary, which are determined, which support and which base themselves on the need of revolutionary progress, must have full rights. Clearly, none of these will rise against the Workers State. But this Biermann, this Solzhjenitsyn, this Medvedev: what do they have to do with the Socialist progress of the Soviet Union? What is that democracy and pluralism which they pose? It is the democracy and the pluralism that consist of being able to oppose the Workers State. We are against this, yes, we are. Like the doctor is against killing the sick person, because he seeks to cure him. Medvedev seeks to kill the Workers State. And Solzhjenitsyn also. Ourselves, we don't want to kill the Workers State; we want to improve, develop it, so that it reaches its fullest extent. And the basis for it to reach its fullest extent, is the working class. This is what it is necessary to say: Democracy in the trade unions. The trade unions must make pronouncements, aimed at the masses of North America openly and as Soviet trade unions. The Soviet Workers centre must direct itself to the proletariat of the world, calling on it to crush the capitalist system. This is democracy. This is pluralism; but in reality it is not pluralism, it is just Marxism, and this is the Workers State.

One has to discuss like this in the Communist Party, not discussing with the ambiguity which unites them all: Mandel, Grant and all the Trotskyists of Britain, with the Labour left and the Communist Party. All of them are united by their divergency with this democracy in the Soviet Union. They are all united against it, because they have the petit bourgeois democratic conception, not the democratic conception determined by the Socialist Revolution.

To put oneself on the side of the dissidents, as the British Communists have done and also the left, the Trotskyists, all this is idealism. It is not dialectical materialism. What do the dissidents want? Is it that they want Soviet democracy so that the Soviet Union could weigh more in the world — which is the aim of Soviet democracy? No, they want democracy for themselves: and they, what are they? What do they propose? Is it that they propose ideas for the development of the Soviet Union? No, they are ideas for themselves. It is the democracy of coteries where they wander about. They masturbate with the void of ideas, to impede the progress of rational thought. It is necessary to discuss like this.

In principle, this is going to be pretty well rejected, but later it is going to receive support, because the process does not favour these groups nor the present Labour left, nor does it favour the Labour government. The process favours the need for dialectical thought in order to interpret it.

It is necessary to support the Labour left to organise itself on the basis of a dialectical materialist programme, on the basis of state control, planning, workers control, and the abolition of the Queen, and in favour of the installation of the Socialist Republic and for territorial unification in a Socialist programme. It is necessary to discuss self-determination. We ourselves agree with self-determination, but our criteria for it is that it must impel progress and not backwardness. Any unification, reunification or self-determination which is not on the basis of economic, social and political progress is no use. You cannot measure by discussing and analysing the cultural problems of languages, country, provinces and regions, in the form of separate interests, as the Communists and Labour people are doing. It is necessary to discuss as a united instrument, because history has demonstrated that this is progress.

J. POSADAS

OPEN LETTER TO THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY

We make this appeal to the British Communist party to allow us to participate in the Congress of the party and the discussions that the party is having over the draft programme of the party. This discussion in a distant way refracts the discussion the World Communist Movement is engaged in and it is important for the development of marxism in the Labour movement, particularly for the developing of a left in the Labour party.

We particularly think it important as it is the only place in Britain where a discussion has arisen on fundamental principles such as dictatorship of the proletariat. This discussion needs to be developed with meetings allowing the participation of the Labour left, the left groups and ourselves to discuss what political programme to confront the total crisis of capitalism in Britain. The crisis in the Communist party has occurred because the party has not understood what role there is for it in this country and also it has not had the correct political programme. It is a historic fact that the masses concentrate around the political parties they have and seek to create leaderships of the left in those parties. In spite of all the errors the leaderships make, the masses continue their centralisation. In Germany the leadership of the Social Democracy acts openly in the interests of imperialism, as with the assassinations of the Baader-Meinhof militants, and yet the German proletariat does not change its votes to the German Communist party. It is not that the proletariat supports Schmidt, any more than the British masses agree with Callaghan, the votes of the masses are a demonstration of their

resolution to develop the left in these parties.

There is no possibility of the British Communist party developing as a mass party or of it being the party that leads the masses. In France and Italy the communist parties are already the parties of the proletariat, but in Britain, as in countries like Germany, this is not the case and there is not any possibility of the Communist parties replacing the Socialist parties. What then can the communists do? There is in fact a role the communists can play, that is to assist in the task of the constructing of the marxist left in the Labour party. The way to elevate the left in that party is by proposing a political programme that is able to make social transformations. So far there has been a lack of this in the discussions in the Communist party, and the sector that broke to form the New Communist party also has developed no programme which sets as its objective the ending of capitalism.

British capitalism is in a very deep crisis and it is not the normal crisis of the past where by a series of measures it will be able to get out of the economic recession. British capitalism once had enormous power and the queen of England looked after colonies all over the world. The masses in these colonies have thrown British capitalism, and the queen with it, out of their countries, it is the revolutionary movements of the masses that has broken this previous power. The masses are delivering constant blows to British capitalism and all the other capitalist powers and they are not going to recover from this. This change in the world

situation means that capitalism is not just in an economic crisis but socially also it is breaking up. The Liberals are in crisis where the ex leader of the party is accused of gangsterism, there is degeneration and chaos in all the bourgeois parties and institutions because none of them have any programme to offer to the problems of their system and the only solution to all this is the development of anti-capitalist measures. The queen has been told to go from India, the masses of Asia have thrown her out, are the masses in Britain going to be any less responsive to the proposal to throw out the queen and make a Socialist Britain? The British proletariat has continually shown itself willing to make transformations, they have made the miners strikes, and big interventions like U.C.S. The proletariat has made constant strikes demonstrating their desire to confront capitalism. There are layers of the upper proletariat who have been developed during the time that British imperialism was very powerful and they were given a privileged position from the wealth that capitalism accumulated. This labour aristocracy has had a material interest in not changing the system and capitalism has used them to maintain itself. The apparatus in the trade unions rests on these sectors and it all acts as a structure containing the intervention of the most exploited sectors of the proletariat. Capitalism has no power to create new layers of the labour aristocracy and its lack of ability to give anything constantly weakens them.

The calls from trade union leaders for more reflation to stimulate the economy are the demands of sectors that seek to make capitalism give more; as it cannot do so, there is a crisis of the Labour party for they were previously able to rest on the ability to extract reforms. Now that reforms are basically unobtainable, the perspective for social democratic ideas disappears. The Communist

party has not proposed any programme substantially different from the social democratic programme, therefore the party enters into a crisis. The communists can advance by proposing a programme of state ownership of industry to allow the economy to be planned, to make a constant campaign towards the Labour left for the need for this programme. If the economy is left in the hands of capitalism the conditions of life of the masses deteriorates! If capitalism controls unemployment grows! To solve the crisis it is necessary to plan the economy, to do this it is necessary to nationalise! The weakness of capitalism means there is now the possibility to develop the programme of social transformations in Britain. There is a revolt in Scotland against the central power of England. The demand for devolution is not progressive for the claims for a separate parliament is led by bourgeois sectors in Scotland who want to control the oil for themselves. However the revolt against the central power in Britain can be used to weaken British capitalism and to propose a Federation of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. A unification of all of them in a Federation based on a centralised planned economy. This can attract the petty-bourgeoisie and left sectors in the nationalist movements and use this crisis of British capitalism.

The fundamental factor that has changed the situation in the world making the balance of forces immensely favourable to the revolution, is the existence of the workers states. It is possible to criticise limitations in the functioning of the workers states but not in any way to use the criticism to weaken them. We wish to see soviet democracy in the Soviet Union, for the workers to intervene more so that the Soviet Union supports more fully all the revolutionary movements. Soviet democracy to impel a greater

development in the leadership so that it confronts capitalism more consistently. Solzhenitsyn and Medvedev call for "democracy" so that the Soviet Union stops supporting Angola and Mozambique. They are not interested in helping the workers state to fulfil better its function but they want to halt the progress of the workers states, the constant advances threaten their privileges and they wish to oppose this. Solzhenitsyn prefers Yankee imperialism to Angola what democracy is this? If criticisms are to be made of the workers state it must not be to join in the campaign of these sectors but it has to be a persuasive criticism to make them advance to develop their full capacity to crush capitalism. It must be to unify the World Communist Movement so as to strengthen it. All Revolutionary tendencies in the workers state to be able to openly discuss, all those who seek to exchange ideas to progress to socialism to freely speak. These "dissidents" want to destroy the workers state and make history go backwards, this is "democracy" for them, this is why Carter supports them.

To get Britain out of the crisis it is necessary to get it out of capitalism. To develop a programme of the left to nationalise and to plan so as to construct a workers state. To have discussions of the Communists, Labour left, the left groups and Posadists on a programme of the left. For nationalisations under workers control, to abolish the monarchy, for a Socialist Republic. To have a federation on the basis of this centralised economy. We reiterate our appeal for a discussion on this programme and for us to be able to participate on the discussions in the Communist party and at the Communist party congress.

Political Bureau, British Section
of the Posadist IV International.
29.10.77.

The Popular Union in France and the necessity of the Labour Party/ Trade Union United Front based on the anti-capitalist programme

Despite the lack of a conscious, marxist leadership in the Labour Party and despite the lack of the means by which the working class and the masses can intervene, the world process of the Socialist revolution weighs and influences in this country. Clearly the defeat of British imperialism by the masses of the ex-colonial countries - an essential fact in the total and final crisis of British capitalism - has a particular importance, as does the existence and advance of the system of 20 Workers States. However, among the important development which influence - and which are going to influence increasingly in the future - is that of the Popular Union of the Communist and Socialist parties in France: At this moment there is a discussion in the Popular Union, a programmatic discussion which has to be observed, analysed and extended to this country by the Labour left and by the comrades of the Communist Party - both the "new" and the old one - and by the left groups: It is, in essence, a discussion of a programme for the solution of the total crisis of French capitalism by nationalisations in order to plan the economy for the benefit of the mass of the population.

The Popular Union is more than just an electoral alliance, it is, in fact, a unification of the worker and popular forces, of the workers parties - and the two trade union centres, that of the Communists (CGT) and that of the Socialists (CFDT) - on the basis of an anti-capitalist programme of nationalisations. Thus the Popular Union is able to attract, increasingly more powerfully, the mass of the exploited population; the peasants, the poor petit bourgeois, the students, the police and the soldiers.

It is an electoral alliance, of course, but it is not the electoral interest which determines the Popular Union. Not that we are opposed to electoral activity or to a Popular Union government, it is just that this is not the most important aspect of the struggle for Socialism. And the proof of the fact that it is not the electoral interest that decides is that whilst the Socialist have the greater electoral weight (30% of the electorate), it is the Communists (who have 20% of the electorate) who have maintained their

positions and influenced the Socialist leadership. Above all the Communist Party is seen as the extension of the Workers State in France and this fact is not changed by the elements of hostility to the Soviet Union which the Communist leadership displays.

The Workers State gives the proof of the superiority, in every aspect - social, economic, cultural - of the system of nationalised property and the planned economy; the Popular Union has been impelled by this. It is almost ten years since the French "May" (the revolutionary general strike of May 1968) and it was this action of the students, peasants and petit bourgeoisie, led by the proletariat, which laid the foundation for the Popular Union. In May 1968 all the objective conditions for the overthrow of capitalism existed in France - so much is clear. What did not exist at that moment was the necessary, conscious, marxist leadership with the programme and policy for power in the workers parties; The Popular Union is an advance on this road.

At the centre of the Popular Union and what, in a sense, determines its existence is the anti-capitalist programme which gives a perspective for the solution of all the problems imposed on the masses by capitalism in its death agony. This is an important conclusion for the Labour left and for the Communist comrades in this country.

The "Marchais/Mitterrand discussion" - we call it this because this is the limited form it takes - is vastly important because it is on whether - as the Communist pose - to nationalise the majority of industry as the prerequisite for a planned economy or to nationalise a sector of industry within the context of the capitalist economy which is what the Socialist leadership proposes. We cannot overestimate the importance of the fact that in France the leaderships of the workers parties are discussing fundamental questions of programme and policy for the advance to Socialism. It is a discussion which does not exist anywhere else in Europe at this level and it is going to influence the workers movement in all capitalist Europe, in Italy, Spain, Portugal and this country.

In this discussion it is the Communist Party which has maintained its positions and has been able to attract big layers of the population. This is reflected by the fact that there are tendencies in the Socialist Party (the CERES for one) which support the Communist positions. Mitterrand has attacked the CERES for "always supporting the Communists". He attacks them verbally but he has to allow them to remain and to function in the Socialist Party. Above all the Communists find a strength in the Workers States and when the Soviets say, as they have done recently, that the advance of the Popular Union is determined by the Soviet Union, they are, essentially, right. However the process demands an elevation of the political and programmatic intervention of the Workers States.

It is also important to see the way in which the Communists have discussed with the Socialist Party. This is the way in which they have been able to influence the Socialist base. In this they have the support of the Soviets. As Soviet comrade, Krassin, wrote recently; the programme of the Popular Union is good, if limited and it has to be extended but that the discussion with the Socialists had to be maintained. This is how it is necessary to intervene towards the Labour left, in order to stimulate a programmatic discussion in the Labour Party.

All this is not to say that the Communist Party provides a fully conscious, marxist leadership or that the Popular Union has solved all the problems of leadership. There are many weaknesses in the CP leadership which come, essentially, from the previous stage of Stalin. They do not, for example, pose the necessity to overthrow the bourgeois state but equate going to government, with going to power. They do not see that the state is based on the relations of ownership in society, on the class which owns the means of production. They do not see the correctness of what Marx and Lenin posed; that the bourgeois state cannot be used by the working class but has to be smashed. This is not to say that the Popular Union government in France will not be an advance, as the government of Allende in Chile was but the

bourgeoisie is not going to allow itself to be expropriated - constitutionally or not - without using force to try to prevent it. The force it will use is the state apparatus - it has nothing else.

Another example is the position of the French Communist Party on the "Force de Frappe" (the independent nuclear force of French imperialism) and on the atomic power stations. They pose the necessity to retain both because in government they would control them. Well it is not true. The Popular Union government would no more control the armed forces of French imperialism than Allende controlled the Chilean army. They do not show the difference between weapons in the hands of the masses, in the hands of the Workers State and those in the hands of imperialism. They do not have the dialectical method, the dialectical materialist method of thinking. The scientific method which allows them to see that the actions of a class are determined not by the character or whim of one or another individual but by its position, as a class, in relation to the means of production. Thus they are unable to give a leadership to the masses who demonstrate against the nuclear power stations and who see in them - and more obviously in the "neutron bomb" - that imperialism prepares the counter-revolutionary war against the Workers States and against the masses in the capitalist countries.

There are other weakness in the Popular Union leadership, among them the fact that whilst they discuss "the lack of democracy" in the Soviet Union, they do not elevate democracy in the Popular Union. And democracy means the intervention of all the masses, of the working class to discuss, to make decisions and judgements and to apply the decisions. It means a discussion in the trade unions for them to participate in the planning of the economy, for a programme of all wages to rise with the cost of living, for the sliding scale of hours of work, for improved working conditions. And, in any case, the level of democracy is higher in the Soviet Union than anything capitalism can provide. The Workers States have solved the problems, the basic problems of economic need and created a superior level of human relations.

On top of this in the discussion on the "New Soviet Constitution" the demand was made that all delegates to the Soviets (the MP's) should answer to the people who elect them, should hold meetings to discuss all decisions that are taken. Is this not - as the Soviets say - superior to the "democracy" of capitalism which allows the "freedom" to be assassinated, to be unemployed, hungry and without housing?

For all its limitations the Popular Union is a fundamental advance for the French masses and an example which is going to influence in Italy, in Spain, Portugal and this country in a powerful way. It is necessary for the comrades of the Labour left, the trade unions, the Communist Party and the Left groups, to participate in this discussion in the Popular Union and to extend it to this country; to draw the conclusion that in the face of the "death agony" of capitalism, in face of the total crisis of the system a programme for the nationalisation of major industry, the land, banks and insurance companies and the land, workers control and the planning of the economy on this basis is the only solution. Democracy without the social transformations based on state ownership of the economy is a fraud and a swindle, or, at best, an abstract conception.

The anti-capitalist programme is the centre for the Labour Party/Trade Union united front against the essential bourgeois nature and policy of the Labour government, a united front in action which incorporates also the Communist comrades and those of the Left groups. This is a necessary part of the advance to Socialism in this country but it is not the central aspect. The central aspect is the construction of a new, conscious leadership in the workers centre - which is the Labour Party - and this goes through the organisation of the left as an anti-capitalist tendency in the Labour Party. There can be no anti-capitalist tendency without the anti-capitalist programme and, therefore, a programmatic discussion has to be initiated in the Labour Party. The Popular Union and the Marchais/Mitterrand discussion are important points of support for this.

Editorial

The only road to progress is the workers state in Britain

The process of the sharpening class struggle in Britain, as exemplified by the anti capitalist sentiments around Grunwick, the intervention of the population in support of the firemen, and the growing unrest in the police and the army, comes decidedly from the elevation of the world process of the revolution, system against system. In this polarisation on a world scale, it is imperialism which loses economically, socially and politically. This is shown by the vote for socialism in Greece, the continued check of the attempts at counter revolution in Portugal, and the fear expressed of the left in the Social Democratic Congress in Germany. The force that keeps world imperialism constantly on the edge of unleashing world war against humanity, is the readiness of the masses to accept the most elevated conclusions of human progress. The masses of Greece show this maturity. Greece has voted against eurocommunism. This influences this country, against the backward, pro bourgeois and idealistic discussions and hopes in the Labour Party, the Communist Party, and the trade unions. It is this world process which has given the conditions in the Labour Party when sectors like Kitson feel that there is an ambience to speak in favour of the U.S.S.R. This intervenes in the programmatic crisis of the Labour Party and the Communist Party in the sense of providing ideas for a more elevated appreciation of the importance of the USSR and the nationalised and planned economy. The problem now is to develop a consistent pro-soviet, pro-Workers State current in the Labour Party and trade unions. Otherwise, the right and the centre continue to dominate the Party, and submit it to the pro-capitalist electoral perspectives. The construction of the Workers State is not an electoral matter. It is a matter of changing the property relations, to nationalise and plan. This is the road to progress in Britain.

OPPOSE THE GOVERNMENT BY CONSTRUCTING THE ANTI CAPITALIST CURRENT IN THE LABOUR PARTY

Capitalism lives dominated by the fear of the Soviet Union. It constantly tries to prove the Workers State is despotic, bureaucratic and dull. However it hides the fact that there, they have built more houses than the whole of the capitalist system put together in the last 20 years. Their youth goes to work to develop the country for nothing, without expecting reward, because for them, reward means building the Workers State, which translates quite directly the advances in technology into a constantly higher life for the masses. The nationalised and planned economy provides the basis for leisure to be used for culture, sport, research and invention. In capitalism, technology is used to reduce man power, increase profits, competition and unemployment. In this country the discovery of the oil, not only represents no progress for the mass of the population, but it is going to be used by capitalism to increase profits and sack workers. The demand that the oil revenues should be used this or that way, has no effect if one does not question who holds control over them. The Labour government sustains the market economy which uses the oil revenues for its own objectives, and this means that a few large capitalists and investors are going to enrich themselves and will compete better with cheaper fuel. This in turn means further concentration of industries, and the corresponding loss of jobs.

The Labour Party makes a discussion on the oil revenues which allows it to remain submitted to the bourgeois mode of thought. It is not a matter of the revenues going to the English or to the Scottish bourgeoisies. This discussion does not interest the proletariat. It is against the proletariat, because either solution means unemployment and the continuous rise in prices. It is necessary to pose in the Labour Party: As long as we accept the need to compete on the world market, we accept the present use of the oil revenues. To oppose competition, one has to build an alternative social order, not based on competition. This means to oppose the market economy and propose the planned economy.

The Labour Party has to be preoccupied by the problems of the workers not of that sector or other sector of the bourgeoisie. The debate on the oil revenues is conducted on the basis of being concerned whether the Scottish or the British should have them. The question of the assembly for Scotland, for and against, leaves no room for a position to be taken by the Labour Party in favour of the working class. Either way, the assembly leaves power into the hand of private property, the finances and revenues in the hand of private owners.

The left needs to discuss that in the poorest of the Workers States, like Cuba, in the Workers States like Poland where there is most private property in the land and therefore a large bureaucracy, even in these countries, the masses do not suffer any unemployment whatsoever, and the standard of life continues to rise. Whilst at the same time, these countries find also the strength to send arms, money, soldiers and support of all kind to Mozambique and Angola. How not be moved by this? Besides the masses of the world seek the support and the fraternity of the Workers States whilst they oppose and reject the monarchy of England and send it back home. The British proletariat supports this, the proof of it is that the fireman said that if the palace of the queen burned down, they could not care less. We call on the Labour comrades to judge the level of consciousness of the workers in this way.

Turn to page 4

NUCLEAR ENERGY MUST BE PLACED AT THE SERVICE OF THE POPULATION

(Inside)

Workers of the World, Unite!

RED FLAG

organ of the

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

272

Friday 9th December 1977

Subscribe to RED FLAG

1 year £2.00

European Marxist Review
Publications

1 year £2.00

Correspondence for Red Flag to:—

IV International Publications,
Adminaid, Weston House,
West Bar Green,
Sheffield S1 2DL.

Other party address:—

24 Cranbourn Street,
London W.C.2.

PRICE 10p

THE LABOUR PARTY AND THE CRISIS OF BRITISH CAPITALISM

28.8.77

In Britain there are two fundamental problems to discuss which are the crisis in the Communist Party and that in the Labour Party. They are distinct crises because of their consequences, but when they occur simultaneously in the two parties — and the Liberals, too, are in crisis, and the Conservatives also — it is because there is a complete crisis of capitalism, of the political parties of capitalism, and of the Labour leadership. The nature of this crisis is not new, it is quite old, but it is accentuating. Because the crisis of world capitalism itself is deepening. There develops a movement in which the Communist Party also enters into crisis. This is not because of reasons which come from the Communist Party itself, or internal reasons, but because of the world situation impelled by the Soviet Union. The crisis of the Communist Party is not the result of local situations but, above all, it is the result of the situation in world Communist movement. Then it has repercussions through the characteristics of Britain itself, which are about programme, policy, the smallness (of the Communist Party), all these things.

The crisis of the Labour Party is an old one, it is the continuation of the previous crisis. It is necessary to measure the character of the crisis of the Labour Party in the formulation of the programme. What is the programmatic character of the crisis? In the previous years, in the years '53, '54, all the Socialist parties entered in crisis. The German Socialist Party liquidated Marx in 1951, and it declared in its Congress that the time of Marx has now passed and that he was irrelevant for Germany. The Labourists liquidated him long before that. Later the French Socialist Party liquidated him too. This includes Mitterrand, who was a Minister at the time of the war against Algeria. They all buried Marx, which means to bury programme, policy, objective, and the Socialist development of the progress of history. In front of the fear they had of the influence of the Workers States, they proceeded rapidly in shutting the doors to that influence. All this hap-

pened after new Workers States in Europe were constituted. And three or five years later, China also became a Workers State.

These parties shut the door quickly to prevent that influence from coming in, and to impede the internal life in which all these problems could have been discussed, to impede that the influence of these problems should come in. And 25 years later, where are we? These parties have now to open the window and say to Marx, 'Come in!' Even though they do this silently, secretly, they have to say to him: 'Come in!' Because the objective they have now is to show that they are not anti-Marxists. And Willy Brandt starts to show that it is thus, because he who buried Marx, who favoured the burying of Marx, now says that Marx was right, but that he is badly interpreted and understood by the Communists, and that it is different from what the Communists say. He does not say what the Soviet Union is, what is China,

what is Cuba, what is their function in history, how they resolved the essential problems of the economy. He says, 'Marx is badly interpreted; we interpret him well'. In this way, he puts Marx next to the director of the largest financial corporation of Germany.

German capitalism has to keep the house of Marx open and well maintained, even though with little interest. They keep open the museum of Marx, which means to be open also to the wind coming from Marx. This is to show to the Communist masses, to the Socialist left, that they are not the enemies of the progress of history. This is the depth of why German capitalism leaves the door of the house of Marx open.

It is necessary to consider that this crisis of the Labour Party and of the Communist Party has developed in a stage of the mortal crisis of capitalism which is very profound. It is not a normal crisis of capitalism. It can't reconstitute itself. It is an agonising crisis. Trotsky said in 1938, 'The world agony of the

J. POSADAS

capitalist system'. And it is still in agony today. From 1938 when Trotsky said this, until today, it is pure decline for capitalism — decline and decline! Even Trotsky could not foresee the course of history. When he posed the mortal agony, he saw that capitalism no longer had any reason for existing. If it still existed, it was because of the limitation and errors of the Soviet Union, of the Communist parties and the Socialist parties. Trotsky diagnosed very well, he was a good doctor of history. He saw that the body no longer had any life. If this body carried on living it was not because of its capacity but because it had not yet been finished with, and so the dead body of the capitalist system still lingered on. And, today, it is the dead body of the capitalist system which is around.

After they assassinated Trotsky, the process of history showed the ascent of the Workers States, of the colonial revolution — in the semi-colonial countries also — and the liquidation, in practically the whole of Asia and in part of Africa and Latin America, of capitalism, imperialism and the reactionary movements. This is to say that Trotsky was right; it was the mortal agony of the capitalist system. Trotsky analysed this very well even though he could not foresee the general course of history. We base ourselves on this for our historic security, and always we have underlined, we underline, and we will continue to underline this forecast of Trotsky: 'The mortal agony of the capitalist system!' Trotsky directed this to us, to give us security, confidence in analysis, not to see just what is in front of us as the Trotskyist groups of the time of Trotsky — who were a catastrophe — did. All the groups of that time were a catastrophe. The proof is that not one of them remains. The intervention of Trotsky was to give security in the method of analysis. He analysed very well, as the analyses in very profound forms in the manifesto of the foundation of the IV International, and in the introduction to the book 'The living thought of Marx'.

Turn to page 2

THE LABOUR PARTY

continued from page 1

In the manifesto of the foundation he gave the basis of the mortal agony of the capitalist system without being able to be precise on how it was going to be, but in order to give theoretical security to the few revolutionary cadres,

THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT IS CONVENIENT FOR CAPITALISM

Today the mortal agony of the capitalist system acquires forms which are very decisive, that is, the crisis in Britain together with the 'neutron' bomb. In Britain this crisis of Labour is not a crisis comparable to all the others. Britain prepares itself like Germany; for this reason Carter says that the first concentration of atomic weapons is going to be in capitalist Germany, because it is the nervous, economic and social centre of Europe. It is not a centre politically, but it is a centre of the decisive weight in the economy of Europe. In consequence it has social effects. The crisis of British capitalism can be measured in the way in which it expresses itself in Britain where everybody can see that there is a total crisis. At the same time, there is the minute carefulness, the prudence with which the Conservatives are confronting the Labour government. Had they wanted, they could have made manoeuvres, they could have made agreements with the Liberals in order to overthrow the Labour government and, in this way or in another, they would have brought the government down. But it doesn't suit them to bring it down.

In the Conservatives there is the murmur, 'What do we do?' It is one thing to have Labour in government which subjects strikes and represses the movement — and, in consequence, sectors of the petit bourgeoisie are not mobilised; it is another thing to overthrow the government. British capitalism feels that it is a very great crisis which throws the whole of the capitalist system into war preparations. This behaviour of the Tories in Britain is the same as that of the Christian Democrats in Germany. In Germany they could have overthrown the government. They are winning electorally, they present themselves in elections, and they could overthrow the Social Democrats, but it is not convenient to them. They want to keep them in government so that they contain the masses and, at the same time, the capitalist system does all that it has to do — which is the war preparations, the preparation for repression and the continuation of the crisis. The government of Britain and of Germany, through Labour and the Social Democracy, are doing what a capitalist government would do. This is one of the effects of the crisis. If it were not such a

THE CRISIS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

The Communist Party has entered into crisis for reasons which apparently could have taken place six or ten years ago. The reasons for the crisis today are the same reasons as ten years ago. Why does it burst out now? When it bursts out now, it is because a series of factors are coming together; among them that it is a total crisis of the capitalist system. Because of this, the programme of the 'New Communist Party' without differentiating itself very much from the Communist Party has essen-

conscious of the world, who existed at that time, and in order to give the security and confidence of knowing how to hope for the stage after the war when the activity could develop.

crisis, the Tories of Britain and the Christian Democrats of Germany would return to power in order to impose a series of measures against the masses. On the other hand, they feel that if they go to government and seek to make these measures, they are going to awake a social mobilisation which they could no longer control and which would mobilise the petit bourgeoisie.

It is necessary to start from this consideration and that it is not a crisis from which capitalism is going to emerge. It is a total crisis of the capitalist system, economic, social, political, cultural; it is complete. Today the Soviets are saying this, they did not say it before. Also today, the Italian Communist Party says, 'It is a complete crisis of the capitalist system'. They do not make great proposals and they do not propose anything different from before, but, yes, they qualify the crisis as the total crisis of the capitalist system.

The nature of this crisis also perturbs the Labour left because it is a crisis determined by political positions and not just by economic relations, for an increase in wages, for better working conditions, for a struggle against unemployment. But it is a crisis which encompasses more, encompasses the crisis of the capitalist system. The Labour government is making a policy which is squarely, absolutely conservative. The Conservatives could not make a better policy than that of the Labour government. The Labour government is defending the capitalist system in competition with the rest of world capitalism and with the Workers States. This is the policy of the Labour government. There is no difference, there is no variation from what a Conservative government would do. It is the same.

It is necessary to see that it is a total crisis because, in the previous crises there was a difference and today there is none. The capitalists are aware of being drowned. Therefore it is necessary to start from the fact that this is going to have an impact, influence in the political behaviour of the vanguard, of the masses, and also in the perspective of Britain. You have to count on this and, because of this, you have, at the same time, the crisis of the Communist Party.

tial points against the old Communist Party, in a general character, not in a concrete way. For example, on the dictatorship of the proletariat, on pluralism, on the state; but they do not precise a programme. There is no precise programme, they do not have one. They are the echo of a world objective of this crisis in which these problems are posed. Where is the capitalist system going? Therefore it is necessary to intervene in a dual form, posing the general problems of the capitalist crisis, the problem of the defence

of the working class, the economic measures, the political measures of state control, together with a discussion in the Communist and Labour movement. All this is discussed in the Communist movement, in the world Socialist movement, and it has an effect on the Labour vanguard even though at the moment it does not have immediate consequences. The Labour vanguard is learning to resolve the problems which before it could not resolve. And, therefore you have to write much, to speak much, in order to seek to influence on the essential problems of the country which are not the trade unions, even though in the trade union struggle part of these problems are expressed. The essential problems are: where is Britain going? Why is there a crisis in the Communist Party? On what points? Is it a crisis over the dictatorship of the proletariat? Over proletarian internationalism, or what else?

When the crisis of the British Communist Party comes out it is because there is a sector which is already committed to British capitalism. It is a sector of the Communist Party which already has lost the perspective of reforms, of progress, and already it is sclerotic. They really are thick-headed and the absence of theoretical and political life leads them to accept the rudimentary form of life. 'We have always acted like this, and we continue to act like this.' But, at the same time, you have to consider that the Belgian and Greek Communists used to say the same. The Communist Party of Holland also. And there are various Communist parties which are small, which before were in favour of pluralism and now are against pluralism. They have become pro-Soviet.

It is necessary to feel that this crisis of Labour is developing at the same time as the struggle for power in Britain and the crisis of the Communist Party is going to influence the Labour left. One of the essential bases for the continuation of British capitalism is the absence of dialectical materialist understanding of the process. The Labour leadership does not have any understanding of the process. And even though it has to advance, it proposes a series of economic measures, of wages and so on, which, at least in part, respond to some necessity but programmatically they do not have any notion, and the Communist left hasn't either.

The Communist left, even though it is important, does not have any notion of this because already they should have come out with a programmatic difference. 'Where is Britain going?' Again we are going to repeat. 'Where is Britain going?' The crisis is very profound, the life of the working class of Britain has diminished a great deal, the pound from 2.75 dollars has sunk to 1.70 dollars. If the value of money is considered to be a measure of the economic power of a country, then this shows the situation. In consequence, the conditions of this crisis have to be seen as irreversible. Capitalism cannot recuperate. This means that the Labour leadership cannot recuperate either.

The going of Wilson was a flight, he escaped. And this new prime minister does not escape because everything is falling on him. British capitalism is man-

oeuvring in order to impede a political debate from breaking out in the country. A debate and a political discussion. Therefore it leaves the leadership in the hands of Labour, it lets them do the manoeuvring to impede discussion. They discuss about wages and the cost of living, about the cost of butter, of meat, of the European Common Market, about the participation of Britain. They discuss minor problems without consequence. This is to avoid the discussion on the fact that British capitalism cannot give any more. British capitalism is exhausted and each time, in a form which is more acute, it is posed that there is a greater division inside British capitalism with a tendency which is pro-EEC and another one which is against. The tendency which proposes to support the EEC is not so clearly from high finance or large industry; in part big finance supports it. The tendency which supports the EEC is placing in the EEC the hope for the future of the capitalist system. Sectors of high finance believe it possible to maintain the capitalist system even at the cost of competition with the EEC and the Workers States. However, there is a tendency of high finance which supports the Common Market but which is divided because a sector of it does not particularly want the Common Market: as its interests are on the side of the United States, the Common Market is not convenient to them. But they have to support it because otherwise they would remain isolated. Therefore they offer no resistance to the Workers States. The sector which is close to the United States, of high finance, believes that it is possible to offer a resistance to the Workers States and to support the war. They are discussions of a depth which does not come out into the light.

Today in Britain, the Labour Party is divided between supporting the European Common Market and supporting the British market. They do not discuss the cost of living, the sliding scale of wages, the sliding scale of working hours; but they discuss the EEC, the problems of capitalism. And for British capitalism the Common Market is not identical to the interests of Britain. Because of the nature of British capitalism there is quite a big difference. Be it the Conservatives or Labour, it is the same. In the Conservatives there is a division also over the Common Market, this is why the Common Market means a relationship which is united to the need for defence against Yankee imperialism, in competition with Yankee imperialism, but at the same time it is a relationship of antagonism with the Workers States. Therefore the bourgeoisie of Britain divides on this because of this there are divisions in the Labour Party and there are divisions in the Conservatives. This is the final settlement of accounts. If there was a policy which had some perspective they would find a way and they would seek an agreement. In this case, they don't. They feel that it is the final settlement of accounts and, because of this, the European Common Market is vital to them. Because of this, it is high finance which, in the last instance, is going to have to accept the European Common Market. This is because the Common Market permits it to compete with the Workers States and to compete with the Yankees. A sector of capitalism is united to the Yanks and

represents the Yanks. But there is another sector which is not linked to the Yankees. High finance is united to Yankee imperialism, but also competes with it; and these are those who prepare the war. They are those who prepare the war in the most direct manner. They are those who, together with the Yankees, have threatened to withdraw from Europe.

It is necessary to measure this discussion in the Labour movement for and against the Common Market. It is not in the interest of the working class. It is in the interest of big capital. To be against the Common Market is not a policy which is directed to satisfy the need of the future of Britain, of the Socialist future. And to be part of the Common Market is not either; so much so that it is necessary to give other perspectives. Instead of the Common Market to pose the Socialist Unity of Europe. They do not discuss this now, but they will have to discuss it and in a short time. Even Marchais will have to discuss this Socialist unity of Europe, because the Common Market is not a guarantee for anyone. For capitalism, yes; but for none of the Workers parties or the masses of the Workers parties, it is not a solution. This is one of the aspects of the crisis of Labour.

The other aspect which is essential is the will for progress and the struggle of the masses. The impact on the British masses of the world process of the revolution can no longer be carried ahead by the Labour Party as it stands. Therefore, it has to take reactionary measures which is a thing they did not do before. They take reactionary measures in policy, economically, and socially. They have no perspective for the development of reforms and there is no perspective either that the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie are just going to accept these measures. This process is not determined over a period of one week, or one month or a year, but it is a process in which capitalism does not have any more capacity of initiative.

CAPITALISM CANNOT RECOVER

As the workers parties do not have initiative either, because they do not have an answer to the crisis, then the crisis continues. The nature of this crisis is that the bourgeoisie does not have the perspectives, it just goes on from day to day because it is preparing solutions of historic class confrontation. This is not an immediate perspective, but the 'neutron' bomb indicates that capitalism is conscious of the advance of the revolution.

When we characterise that this is a profound crisis of British imperialism and that this is expressed in the Communist Party it is because there is a necessity for discussions, for articles, for positions to be taken, for concrete programmatic and political analysis.

When the crisis of the Communist Party comes together with the crisis of the Labour Party which is profound, it is because there is a programmatic pressure of the crisis. It does not come from a momentary problem of tactics. The crisis of the Labour Party comes from a long time ago, from 1945 when already there was a crisis of the Labour Party. But the crisis extended itself because capitalism could give in,

it could give work, it would give increases in wages, and now it cannot give any of this. Today capitalism prepares to confront the Workers States and it is eliminating sectors even inside of capitalism. It eliminates them. It concentrates the economic, financial and productive capacity of capitalism but it diminishes its social powers. Therefore it increases its military power, not as a compensation but as a natural form. Because of this, the discussion on the Common Market and on regionalisation in Britain is a false discussion, it is totally false. Britain will go into the Common Market whether it likes it or not, because it is in the interest of capitalism to unify itself in this way.

FOR A SOCIALIST EUROPE

It is a very rich situation to intervene in — and combining this intervention with demands for wages. For example: Discussing the Common Market, showing that we are against the Common Market and we are against being in or being out. We are for a Socialist Europe. Showing that the European Common Market is a necessity for capitalism to compete with the Workers States and with Yankee imperialism. It is true that there is a competition within capitalist Europe with Yankee imperialism. This is obvious, but it is a competition which is inferior to the common interest and need of the capitalist system against the Workers States. It is inferior! For this, the opposition to the Common Market does not at all mean a defence of the British working class. It is just

With regard to the Yankees, the Common Market does not interest them, they are against it and there is a sector of British capitalism which is making a policy of opposition to the Common Market, together with the Yankees; but the Yankees are going to have to admit the Common Market because, in the last instance, even in spite of the inter-capitalist economic competition, the Common Market means the social centralisation of capitalism against the Workers States. For this reason, the Soviets, in previous stages — and even now — are making a policy of supporting themselves on one against the other. But now this is no longer very useful.

a position which is taken as a function of the defence of one or other sector of British capitalism, one or the other tendency of British capitalism and no more. Those who are in favour defend a sector of British capitalism and those who are against defend another sector of capitalism. None of them pose in their opposition an anti-capitalist programme, but they seek — as Marx posed 'from the empiricism of capitalism, that capitalism will find a solution to these problems'.

We are in favour of the Socialist United States, the Socialist Soviet United States of Europe, we are in favour of the Socialist union of Europe. And we are in favour of this, not because it is a programme which opposes capitalism only, but because it is the historic solution in order to ad-

vance Europe. If not, we remain in the hands of capitalism and competition.

Those who are against, just like those who are in favour of the Common Market speak in favour of the bourgeoisie — they do not speak in the name of the Socialist future of Britain or of the Socialist necessity of Britain. This discussion is more important than the trade union problems; the problems of Britain are not going to be resolved by a strike or a movement of strikes even though these are very important. The problems of Britain are going to be resolved with fundamental positions in the economy and in policy. Therefore it is necessary to intervene in strike movements as a secondary part of the activity. On the other hand, it is necessary to put all the force into this task, to influence currents, tendencies, which can give us the conditions for a greater influence, even in the Labour Party. Therefore it is necessary to intervene in any important strike, it is necessary to intervene correctly and to come out with positions, but this will not be what decides. The strike is the accompaniment of this process. It is necessary to tend to form currents in the Labour movement, among the Communists, in the two Communist Parties, in the left groups also. Currents which show the necessity of what is to be done, which analyse and lead to the conviction that the outlet for Britain will be reached in a short stage. The progress for Britain is in the struggle for state control, nationalisations. Therefore, it is necessary to create a current of understanding of this. It is not true that there is a prejudice against the Workers State because of the time of Stalin. This is a lie! It is British capitalism which does this. Those who are against the Common Market in the name of whom are they against? Not in the name of Socialism, because they are opposed in the name of the British bourgeoisie. They do not have any position in the name of Socialism against Stalin and against the Soviet bureaucracy, but they have positions in the name of the interest of British imperialism. In spite of the fact that they support one or the other measure of progress, they do it because it forms part of their electoral manoeuvring. None of these people have adopted any programmatic formulations.

We repeat that it is not a trade union crisis, it is a programmatic crisis of the Labour Party and the decisions are not taken by the trade union movement, but they will be taken through a political road. The trade union movement is dominated by the Labour Party, by the bureaucracy of the Labour Party which is in no way different from the bureaucracy of the epoch of Stalin. It rather tends to be worse than it. It is bureaucracy which is maintained by British capitalism. The trade

union bureaucracy, the bureaucracy of the Labour Party are those who maintain British capitalism. One must feel that it is necessary to make a struggle in order to develop the programmatic understanding. This includes also that sometimes we supported the actual Labour left in one measure or other which they were taking, but we posed that these were not the representative of the programme of social transformations in Britain; and that this left was a superficial one, weak and without anti-capitalist consistency.

It is necessary to feel that the difficulty to organise the left in the Labour Party has the same nature as the difficulty which determined that a left did not develop in the Communist Party. It is because of a great deal of previous strength on the part of British capitalism, and the errors, the capitalist policy of Stalin. The external policy of Stalin was reactionary, it was counter-revolutionary, which did not permit, did not support the organisation of a current in Britain. The strength of British capitalism was very great, but today it is being dismantled; all of it. This is expressed in the devaluation of the pound to practically half its former value.

One must intervene in programmatic discussion, political discussion, as much in the Labour Party as in the Communist Party. The crisis of the Communist Party is of the same nature as that which is in the Labour Party, it is a crisis of programme. It is not expressed as much in the Labour Party because it is a mass movement and those who are called left cannot just go away. If they did, they would lose their electorate. Therefore, they maintain themselves this way in order to retain their electoral support. And, at the same time, the right and the centre support it because this left is a screen which just keeps things going, no more. It represents a flag which is being flown but politically and programmatically it decides nothing. It is the right which decides. It is necessary to take into account that the crisis of the Communist Party, even having the same nature as that of the Labour Party, is distinct in its conclusions. In the Communist Party they have to discuss, inevitably, the method of struggle, of objectives, of programme and tactic. In the Labour Party, however, they discuss nothing of this. Therefore through the intervention in the Communist Party it is necessary to try to influence in the Labour Party, in the discussions of a programmatic character. For example: The process in Britain, what is to be done? Is it necessary to hope

that the Labour Party is going to nationalise, to instal state control? No, they are not going to do it! To hope that the trade unions are going to raise a programme of the elevation of the conditions of life, of wages, of work? No, they are not going to do it! They are not going to do it!

The Communist Party doesn't have the force to do it; and no programmatic force. But, today, there is a crisis which permits to discuss. The discussion elevates itself in spite of the fact that they try to hide it, it is necessary to elevate it.

I repeat the essential principle of a programmatic character which it is necessary to uphold. Those who oppose the Workers State are in the leadership of Labour, in the bureaucracy, the workers aristocracy. It is not the working class. We cannot say precisely in what way the working class is not opposed because there is no means by which the working class is allowed to respond but, yes, we can measure

The working class has a political behaviour, it seeks to impel anti-capitalist movements, it demonstrates that it is united to the perspective of the Soviet Union. Therefore, it is necessary to see that the resistance to the Soviet comprehension of the process is the aristocracy of labour, the bureaucracy and the sectors which are linked to the apparatus of the government and of the Labour Party. This is an apparatus! It is an apparatus as powerful as the Soviet bureaucracy was in the past and this is where the force of British capitalism rests.

In front of this apparatus, do not think that it is not going to be defeated. It is necessary to organise a layer, a sector which develops and which is going to develop comparatively quickly in the understanding of the need for social transformation. Take into account that there is a leading apparatus which is enormous. Besides, it is a leading apparatus which is quite as powerful as the Soviet bureaucracy was, made up of the workers aristocracy. They are not white collar workers, but they are sectors — as in the mines — in which there is a workers aristocracy. It is a whole structure which allows the workers movement to be dominated. The Section does not direct itself to this sector, it directs itself to organise cadres which are comparatively new. But also sectors in the Labour and Communist parties which are being moved to wonder how to advance in Britain, what is the economic base in order to be able to advance in Britain.

J. Posadas.

TO BE CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE OF RED FLAG

No to the European Parliament!

Yes to the Soviet Socialist United States of Europe!

NUCLEAR ENERGY MUST BE PLACED AT THE SERVICE OF THE POPULATION

J. POSADAS

We are not against nuclear energy. We are against the form in which it is produced and utilised, because it kills people. We are in favour of nuclear energy but how to do it? What they are doing is like Seveso and it means Seveso for all Italy, France and Germany.

Nuclear energy is a progress of science but in the hands of capitalism it does not mean any progress. It diminishes the cost of production, it allows a greater use of light and energy but it kills and poisons a great number of people. Moreover enormous areas are polluted. Then what has to be proposed is nuclear energy in the service of the population and this means control by the population over nuclear energy, control by the trade unions, the workers areas, the organs of the parties, by the workers. Let them control it and not parliament which shows that it cannot do it.

Nuclear energy has to be for the population and not at the cost of the population, at the cost of a polluted environment. Capitalism cannot do this. Only a workers government can do it, whose interest is the health of the population and not to lower the cost of energy at the cost of poisoning of the population.

Moreover every factory that it is not controlled is in potential a factory of atomic arms. It is necessary to pose this because it is the reason for the distrust of the population in Germany. People say they are not against nuclear energy but see that atomic weapons are in preparation. Under the pretext that they are producing nuclear energy, in Germany, they are making atomic weapons. The German scientists themselves denounce this. It's the same that they are going to seek to do also in Italy.

People are concerned with this problem, and it is necessary to show that this is not against progress. But this situation is not a progress but a utilisation of science and technology for the capitalist system at the cost of the population, as they did in Seveso. And we do not want new Sevesos. It is not capitalism which can use nuclear energy for social benefit.

Today now there are superior forms of energy among them solar which do not cause any damage and do not require such investments. But the capitalist regime cannot do this, because it is not within the process of profit and accumulation. The guide has to be the benefit for the population. The capitalist regime cannot do this, nor can any programmatic agreement with the Christian Democracy do it, because those who control the C.D.U. are the capitalists. They make programmatic administrative agreements which do not damage the functioning of capitalism. It is this that it is necessary to discuss.

30.9.1977

J. POSADAS.

Subscribers' Rate to

RED FLAG

£2.00 a year.

obtainable from the Party's address.

Editorial

continued from page 1

It is necessary to discuss on the basis of the programme of the working class, in the Labour Party, not the brutal needs of the capitalist class which are solely those of competition and constructing weapons like the neutron bomb to smash the workers, liquidate the masses, so as to survive as a system. When the crisis of capitalism reaches such murderous levels, it cannot be but a total crisis for any perspective of reforming it. The government therefore, just runs it. There is not a shadow of reform in the government's policy. It is straight forward murderous preparations against the USSR, against the Irish and British masses, connivance with the criminals who assassinated the Baader-Meinhoff militants in the jail, and now connivance, with the SS assassins who stayed a day in London, giving press Conferences. The government represents capitalism and it is necessary to discuss in the Labour Party the speech of the Tory Heseltine who said that Callaghan "is the best Tory Prime Minister we've got". This is an unavoidable issue to discuss in the Labour Party which has to lead to the conclusion: Full support to the nationalised planned economy, against the market economy, against the pro-imperialist Labour leadership and government, for the organisation of the alternative to them in the Labour Party.

BUILD THE ANTI-CAPITALIST ALTERNATIVE

The speech of Kitson in the Soviet Union, shows that there are the conditions in the Labour Party and trade unions for a programmatic discussion. For example: If the Soviet Union is so superior to the capitalist system, if there is no unemployment there (indeed there is a shortage of manpower in front of the vastness of their enterprise of progress), how did they come to this? How does one achieve this in Britain? One of the first things to say is that this is done with nationalisations, workers control and planning and state monopoly of foreign trade. Besides, it is necessary and absolutely indispensable to pose that the labour government is opposed to this perspective, it continues the administration of the dying and criminal regime of private property, and its war preparations against the workers states.

The world process sustains the forces for social transformations in Britain. It is not the British process which brings these changes with such a speed. The beginning of a pro-Soviet tendency, (even if unorganised) in the Labour Party has not appeared because of the new quality of the left in the Labour Party, but from the USSR and its increasing attractiveness and progress, combined with the total crisis of capitalism. This in turn stimulates the forces of the left in the Labour Party and give rise to a debate (and dispute) in the Labour Party which can only be resolved with programmatic conclusions: To do as in the USSR, we have to nationalise and plan.

The Communist comrades have discussed in their Congress as if there was no world around Britain. They have therefore disregarded the most important conclusion, which is that even the Eurocommunist Marchais no longer just submits to the French Socialist Party. Carillo has had to go to the USSR. There is no room for another road outside of the class struggle, and this class struggle is world wide. There will be structural changes and breaks in the Labour Party, starting from the nucleus of the Labour Party. The tendency of the Labour Party to link itself to the Workers States shows this. The declaration of Kitson, 'to maintain and increase the links between the Communist Party of the USSR and the Labour Party' confirm this. If there was no room and welcome for such a declaration, it is not Kitson who would have made this. The progress of Britain is deeply influenced by the world, and by the progress of the USSR. The stages to progress are shortening and the USSR looks for support in the changes in the Labour Party. The road the British communists have taken in their last congress, of reaffirming that they want to be a mass Party, and the eurocommunist position, shows that the Communist Party is eliminating itself from progress, it is disintegrating. The world goes to Communism, and even the bourgeoisie anticipates in the relationship of the Labour Party with the Spanish and French Communist parties, the signs of an increasing alliance with the world communist movement in which the eurocommunists have no perspective. The proof of it is that they cannot agree among themselves and keep trotting back to Moscow. The proof is the Greek elections with the big triumph of the Party which supports Moscow and much loss for the Party which supports eurocommunism. The conditions elevate in the Labour Party for a consistent debate on the nature of the total crisis, the inter-bourgeois crisis and its reflection in the 'devolution' issues, in the Labour Party. When the army grows more and more concerned with its conditions and Mulley is obliged to offer approval for trade union rights in the army, it is an irrefutable sign of the development of anti-capitalist sentiment in the coercive apparatus of capitalism. The conditions are favourable for the construction of a pro Soviet, pro Workers State, tendency in the Labour Party, against the imperialist and assassin policies of the ultra capitalist Labour government.

THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEMS OF SCOTLAND, WALES, IRELAND AND ENGLAND IS A SOCIALIST FEDERATION

The continuous dispute over devolution in the camp of capitalism and the repression in Northern Ireland, are all part of the decomposition of British imperialism and the consequences of the loss of Empire. In the past it never solved the problem of Ireland but it contained it and it had apparently incorporated Scotland and Wales into the process of capitalist industrialisation without any great problem. Now all this has changed. The unionist monolith in Northern Ireland has completely disintegrated and British imperialism puts its trust in brutal repression (part of this has been artificially created in order to prepare the army for repression in Britain). Movements have arisen in Scotland and Wales which claim that "Whitehall centralisation" is against their respective populations and that these countries should have their own parliaments and conduct their own affairs.

The total crisis of capitalism as a social system brings all the contradictions of capitalism to the point of agony. The competitive war between capitalist economies increases, the large

businesses destroy the small and medium enterprises and every sector seeks to save itself. With the enormous contradiction of the capitalist system in front of the advance of the workers and revolutionary states, the normal process of "every man for himself" reaches extreme proportions. This is the reason why the local bourgeoisie in Scotland and Wales seek their own solutions. They make use of the discontent, particularly of the petit bourgeois masses, with the miserable conditions of life in large areas of Wales and Scotland which capitalism has left to rot, because it has no interest in developing them. But they do not propose a programme of social transformation or social revolution, simply "we want to develop our area for ourselves". This is a total impossibility. There is no chance for Ireland or Scotland or Wales or England to develop without a programme which liquidates private ownership of the means of production and exchange. Capitalism has brought disaster to Ireland, Wales and Scotland. There is no possibility for a local capitalism to achieve what a centralised capitalism has failed to do.

DEVOLUTION IS A BOURGEOIS DISCUSSION

The discussion over devolution in the Labour, Tory and Liberal parties is totally bourgeois. They are seeking to regulate inter capitalist dispute and they all disagree so widely and are in such confusion, because within the terms of capitalism there is no solution. But it is necessary that the cadres in the Labour party who find that capitalism can no longer provide solutions, take an independent position and do not submit to the bourgeois character of the discussion. All that is posed in the most false way. It is not possible to discuss the solution to the problem in the terms of capitalist centralisation or capitalist decentralisation, of "saving the United Kingdom or not". This expresses the dilemmas and the problems for capitalism. We do not participate in the solution of their problems set in their framework. Capitalism as in the case of the Common Market, tries to involve the organisations of the workers in its problems, in order to nullify the independent role of the working class. They hope to turn to their own class advantage, any problems that arise. Thus by stressing the need for concessions

to local and regional interests, they hope to promote dissension in the population and limit the centralising role of the proletariat in all these countries. That is why "devolution or not" is not the real issue.

In Scotland the local bourgeoisie want to grab North Sea oil for themselves — but with the disintegrating character of the capitalist system that is of no benefit to the masses. A Scottish parliament is just another debating ground for another group of local and provincial interests alien to the interests of the masses. It is true of course that these separatist movements are in depth quite fragile, in the SNP a republican tendency exists and they feel obliged to talk about taking over the big landed estates in Scotland but that is the mark of their social weakness. They represent wings of a bourgeoisie in decline who no longer have world perspectives.

It is right to put forward the right to self determination for all these countries including obviously the unification of Ireland in a socialist republic, but at the same time there is no

justification for completely independent economies at this stage of history. There is no independent solution for Ireland economically, there is no place for "socialism in Ireland alone". That is why the conception of a Socialist Federation of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland with the right to self determination is the only solution to the total decomposition and degeneration of the capitalist system.

CENTRALISED PLAN — DECENTRALISED APPLICATION

Capitalism is using the argument that only by "devolution" is it possible to make a balance between the "tyranny" of centralisation and the "democratic" wishes of the local populations. But the centralisation of a workers state that operates without the usufruct of a bureaucracy in no way impedes local initiatives or the intervention of the masses. A centralised workers state can only operate well and with maximum effect if the centralised decisions are applied on the basis of mass decision and decentralised application. When the Bolsheviks discussed the plan for the whole economy, there was no obstacle to initiatives from whatever sector of the population provided it was on the basis of developing the workers state.

In the last stages of its existence capitalism tries to utilise all manner of means to impede objective discussion on the need for social transformations. It is the impotence of capitalism which leads to the separatist tendencies in Scotland etc. Now to make the separatist issue the most fundamental is to substitute backwardness for progress, to remain entrenched in local concerns and also to prevent discussion over the need for social transformations which link countries together, not drive them apart. The process in the world is one of massive centralisation against the particular interests of capitalism. Socialism places the accent on federations of socialist states, allowing the right of self determination, and real self determination means association in federations of socialist states on the basis of centralised planning. The Soviet Union is an example of the social superiority of the centralised economy which has not impeded the development of all areas of the Soviet Union. The cadres who want to advance in the Labour Party have to base themselves on this experience.

EUROPEAN MARXIST REVIEW No: 4

containing extracts of

THE POLITICAL REPORT OF THE WORLD CONGRESS

30p

J Posadas



THE CRISIS AND HISTORIC FUNCTION OF THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY. J. POSADAS 18.6.77

It is important to give a very great importance and consideration to the crisis of the British Communist Party, for what it means. It is a small Party and for this reason the division occurs more easily than it would in a large Party, because structure of interests, of leadership and of life in it are very much reduced. In the large parties, the stage of confrontation or the division into two parties is taking place more slowly because of the structure of these parties, their links with the masses and the links of interests which they have with parliament, the local councils, and even with sectors of the bourgeoisie. This break then takes place more slowly. These parties fear to isolate themselves, they are making statements of an electoral order and, in this way, continue. On the other hand, the small Communist parties like that of Britain and of the United States are not held back by the same interests. They fulfil no function. This Party has existed since 1919-20, and it had MPs after the war. Today, however, it says that it has 36,000 members but it only obtained 30,000 votes in elections.

This division means that, in all the Communist parties, there is a discussion which is now developing. The British Communist Party is small; however, it discusses problems which go far beyond Britain itself. The dictatorship of the proletariat and eurocommunism, for example. They are fundamental problems for the world Communist movement which are now being discussed. This means that this break is not just provoked by the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but by something much deeper still. These parties do not express all the depth of the crisis. They do not live the crisis in the sense that they do not show what it is; on the contrary they try to hide it, to repress it to limit it to one point — for example, this divergency over the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a point should not be a matter for crisis, but a matter of simple discussion. But what discussion has there been? There has been no open discussion on this.

This crisis means that there is the need for clarifications, for discussions, for positions to take, and for an alignment on the world problems. This crisis has already penetrated, slowly but irreversibly, the world Communist movement as a whole. The discussion in the Communist Party is not new in Britain, but yes, the division is new. It will be very important to follow the evolution of this process. There were no internal reasons for the division, and there has been no proper discussion on the basis of which to take such a step. The break shows a state of exasperation which is determined by the very profound divergences which there are. And it is not an electoral problem which is now raised, nor even a problem of principle, because the Communists have no programme. The Communists do not discuss principles and, therefore, do not apply any. Thus the cause of this division is much more profound than the motives which have been invoked. It is necessary, then, to expect that there will be further expressions of this crisis.

This is the second Communist Party which breaks, and the Mexican Communist Party will soon do so; and the same also in Uruguay, where there are all the bases for division. These divergences also exist in the large Communist parties, but they do not yet come to light because of the size of the Party and because of electoral interests which impede them.

All this crisis of the British Communist Party must be taken as an expression of the crisis of the world Communist movement. In Britain, the Communist Party has a fairly insignificant weight. It has a certain importance, although it does not have numerical forces it has leaders in the trade union field; it has miners, shipyard workers, who are known and accepted as such. The same thing will happen by the way, in the Swedish Communist Party.

These parties show their weakness, their lack of theoretical preparation, lack of comprehension of the world revolutionary process, when they split on the problem of dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, they take no positions and they do not say of what the dictatorship of the proletariat consists, nor why they break.

One must act so that this situation will influence the Socialist left. This process is unfolding in the whole of Europe. In Germany, at least 70 JUSOS (Young Socialists) have been suspended from the Social Democracy for infringing 'the duties and democratic rights of the German Constitution'. This is going to have repercussions inside JUSOS, in the sense that they are going to see that they cannot wait until they are given permission to start organising the left. The conditions are going to be more favourable for the organisation of the left. In the world, the conditions are favourable. In Germany, they are not so favourable; but the time will come when the economic situation will sour and this will ease the inclination of the country to the left. Therefore, it is necessary to prepare now an organism which will have the ability to intervene when the time comes, when the process will be more advanced, to launch a programme of the left. There is a sharpening of the crisis of German capitalism, unemployment is very large and prices increase constantly, whilst the standard of life decreases and repression elevates. A part of their rights to have a pension is taken away from the old people, and the demands on increase in productivity elevate unceasingly. In many factories, the workers remain in the same number, but they produce double without a single increase in salary. This productivity is not obtained just through new machinery, but by a growth of what is demanded from each worker. You are controlled for the time you take to go to the toilets and the exact time spent to make a commodity is calculated and reduced. All this means that German capitalism is also entering into the spiral of the big crisis. This will later show up when the proletariat is going to start making a sharper struggle against the bourgeoisie. The metal workers already show this, because they have imposed more important demands than the bosses and the government were prepared to concede to them in the last round of negotiations.

This crisis in the left movements in Germany, and also in Britain, must serve to prepare the left in the Socialist parties. The Communist parties do not understand and do not accept this situation; they think they are the representatives of the Soviet Union. Not so. They are sustained, protected and fed by the Soviet bureaucracy which takes this crisis of the British Communist Party and that of the JUSOS in Germany, as a means to intervene in the organisation of the left of the two countries, counting in Germany that the process of crisis is going to propel the petit bourgeoisie which supports Schmidt and the Social Democrat government into an even more acute crisis. In Britain, the crisis is going to be

even sharper between the government and the leadership of the left — a political crisis and not an economic one. In both countries, these crises have the same base, the same origin, but the forms in which they are expressed are different.

In Britain, the economic crisis is very profound. The trade union leadership which serves capitalism through the Labour government, finds great difficulties in its own base where there are public confrontations and the trade union leaderships now break the Social Contract. The Social Contract meant a submission on their part to the interests of capitalism. Callaghan wants to make a new pact so that the workers do not ask for an increase in wages again, with the aim of salvaging the equilibrium of the capitalist profits in the competition which it makes with world capitalism. The trade unions through these leaderships want free collective bargaining. But they do not question the function which is exercised by the Labour Party in defence of capitalism. There are many discussions; they have been discussing for twenty years. But, as yet, the left is not formed in Britain. This is due to the particular conditions of that country, which has a bureaucratic structure like that of Germany and which has experienced relatively favourable economic conditions which permitted capitalism to yield concessions. But now we reach the state when capitalism cannot yield any more, and the pound is devalued each minute that passes.

Another expression of the very deep crisis, and a crisis without solution for capitalism in Britain, is that they have the problems of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. There, separatist movements each demand the right over the petroleum or his bit of North Sea. Such a process indicates the exasperation of the bourgeois leadership which sees no perspective for itself. Then, it is each one for himself whilst capitalism has an interest in showing itself unified in front of the Workers States and the proletariat. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie hopes to divide the workers movement by injecting into it, and stimulating in it, the national sentiments. But, even then, the left is in better conditions than before, to organise itself.

The division of the Communist Party of Britain must be used in order to make the Communist comrades understand their function. Otherwise they discuss that there is an internal crisis of the Party. However, the Party of itself has no force of its own, no weight, because it is not the Party which organises the leadership of the class struggle in Britain. In itself, the crisis of the Communist Party of Britain has no value. On the other hand, the Communist Party has a function to play with regard to the crisis of British capitalism and the need to organise the left. It is the same as in Germany to this extent.

The British Communist Party does not have a consistent trade union policy. However, it has had very important trade union leaders among the miners, in the shipyards. The Vice President of the trade union of the miners is a Communist, but people, when they voted, voted for him as a trade union leader and not as a Communist. In the trade union elections he obtained a lot of votes, but in the political elections he obtained few. This means that the people see him as a trade union leader, and they see that he defends the immediate interests of the workers. That is all.

This situation is the consequence of the history of Britain which has known one of the greatest bureaucratic structures of all. To measure the weight of this bureaucratic structure in the trade union and Labour movement of Britain, you have to compare it with the Soviet Union. The bureaucracy, because of the nature of the Workers State, has less power in the Workers States than it has in capitalism. Whilst Stalin, however, lasted a fairly long time because the conditions were more favourable for the bureaucracy. Now it is no longer so, because there exists a process of struggles for transformations, a process of world crisis of capitalism, a process of ascent of the workers movement. The bureaucracy of before, structured economic, cultural and political relations with a rigidity, a strength, a power of domination which are not completely weakened today. But this structure is full of cracks and it is losing force and assurance, because it no longer has the economic support which it received previously. On the contrary, the conditions of today are weakening it.

British, and in part German imperialism, have utilised much racial discrimination, and the British proletariat would find itself confronting the Hindus, Singalese, Guyanese and West Indian workers. The proletariat of these countries is there in fairly great numbers and British capitalism used to separate it from the British proletariat, in the sense that the British would not take the dirtiest and least paid jobs; the immigrant workers were doing it. This provoked a division among them and it influenced middle layers of the proletariat. The same thing happened in Germany. This situation has created particular relations and exerts an intellectual pressure on the British workers which is not a pressure which just comes from the economic apparatus, but from a whole tradition. In the United States the same thing happened. Immense layers of the North American proletariat are well paid and they, in turn, exert an enormous pressure on the rest of the workers. Such a thing does not exist in France or Italy. French imperialism is the weakest in Europe, and Italian capitalism is so poor that it has to go round begging.

You must expect that the British and German proletariat are going to receive the influence of the world proletariat and, at the same time, they will receive the consequence of the crisis of capitalism. You must also see that the proletariat, and the petit bourgeoisie, have made great struggles in Britain. They invented the 'sit-in', the demonstrations of the 'white collars'. This was after the war, when they organised the movements of the squatters, house occupations, and the trade unions had in their programme that the homeless should occupy all empty houses. But, at the same time, the British monarchy had created a whole institution to integrate the trade union and political leaders and to give them the title of 'Lords'.

It is very important to stress in this historic process that the economy exerts a great weight on the German, North American and British proletariats. The character of the economy of these countries has segregated the proletariat from the most exploited sectors. Take, for example, the dustmen. In the United States they are all Blacks, there is not one white man amongst them, and the same applies to the men who throw salt on the roads in winter. The Blacks are always in the least paid jobs. These discriminations are part of the education of the

conceptions of the proletariat. What is lacking is the class trade union and a real class party of the proletariat.

All this is very clear in Britain. The workers are making formidable strikes and they continue to give support to the Labour Party, which includes an essential part of the proletariat like those who have the hardest jobs, where most of the workers are immigrants. This situation influences strongly the consciousness the class structure and the political capacity of the proletariat. The British proletariat has made great struggles and gained important conquests, but these are the relations which still limit it much in the political conclusions, the programme and the objective of the taking of power.

These mistakes do not come from the proletariat itself, but from the lack of leadership. In this there is the problem of Stalin. Had a revolutionary movement existed in the Soviet Union instead of Stalin, none of this would have happened. In spite of these economic relations which exist, the influence of the Soviet Union would have been stronger than all these economic relations, and it would have helped the education of the consciousness and of the political, programmatic and organisational ability of the British proletariat, the German and the North American proletariat. And, in any case, the proletariat of these countries shows all its class consciousness in the fact that it has built large trade union organisations, which shows that it cannot become an agent of capitalism or remain submitted to it. But what it doesn't have is the leadership, the guide, the policy to lead the changes of society. It has the leaderships which conciliate with capitalism. It is not by chance that in these three countries the Communist parties and the other revolutionary movements are flimsy, with no roots in the in the workers and intellectual movement.

These problems are very important to understand, in order to have a notion of the unequal and combined process. Britain, Germany and the United States form the unequal part, whilst the Workers States and the world revolutionary movement form the combined part of the process. It is not the unequal part which determines, but the combined part. The process has no need to be as slow as it is at the moment. If it is, it is because the leaderships have failed at the time when a Lenin was needed again, and this leadership has not been able to find a continuity of programme and policy. The Bolsheviks have not been continued. The problem is not that North American, British or German capitalism was strong, but that the world Communist movement was weak. If German capitalism still survives today it is because world capitalism needed it: otherwise it would have crushed it. Why has world capitalism made a war against German capitalism as a competitor and then put it on its feet again? It was not by chance but because capitalism was without force and it had to come to the rescue of German capitalism to make it confront the Workers States.

The Communist Party has no other perspective other than that of being a medium to influence the Labour left in Britain. And it is the same also for Germany and in the United States. It could exert a very great influence if it helped to organise the left. The reason why capitalism in these countries is not bothered by the Communist Party is, in part, because the Communists do not fulfil this function.

Proletarian internationalism is for them a slogan, but it is not a programme. However, it is a principle which has to be applied by means of a programme. The Communists in Britain discuss separating Britain from the world. If they were internationalists they would need the experience of the world in order to see the reasons why there is such a process in Britain. They have not made a single discussion about this in the Communist Party which is also very small. They have never discussed why the Communist Party is so small. They throw the guilt onto the Labour comrades, or on the right, or on everybody else; but not on themselves. However, it is their own fault if they do not grow, because they never tried to see why they do not grow.

The unequal and combined character of the process can be measured by the fact that in spite of a great number of Workers States, in spite of the fact that each insurrectional social uprising leads to the Workers State, the Communist parties of the capitalist countries — and particularly of the colonial countries — have remained flimsy. The base for the explanation of such an unequal process is to be found in Stalinism; but today there is an upturn of the revolution and it is the combined aspect which absorbs the unequal one, and it is this combined aspect which now influences the global process.

The conclusion which comes out clearly from this crisis in the small British Communist Party is the weakness of the world Communist movement, because it does not have the ideas, the analyses, and it does not transmit or apply the necessary conclusions to generalise experience. Crises occur and have particular effects in each Communist Party, whilst they all have a common base because they do not have the policy or the theoretical preparation which is needed. These crises show also the weakness of the Workers States, of the leaderships of the Communist parties of the Workers States which do not give orientation, or elevate the richness, the nourishment, in terms of the necessary ideas, the necessary conclusions by means of the generalisation of programmatic experiences. The Workers States do not discuss experiences in order to generalise. If they did, they would say: This is how you apply the dictatorship of the proletariat, and proletarian internationalism means this and that. They would explain what 'pluralism' is. They do not do this. Therefore the Communist movement starts from a situation in which it does not have the experience on which to base itself. It has to deepen the experiences of history, and take up positions of principle; which is what is throwing up all these crises.

This fundamental conclusion is going to be drawn in all the Communist parties, and to be sure in all the nationalist movements, whatever be their point of departure, because these are the general principles for the whole world. For society to progress state control is needed. Private property represents no progress but at best stagnation crisis and regression. To impose state control you need the Party and you need also planning so as to produce for the need of the people and of the whole society and not for the individual interest of each one. These are the principles. The problem is that in the world Communist movement they discuss no principle and no experience.

The books that various Communist leaders are now writing are commentaries, news and statements which are not based on principles, experiences, to feed the world Communist movement with the necessary ideas. It is not true that the capitalist regime still exists now because it has a force of its own. It is because there is not the leadership to finish it. The Workers States, in particular, do not feed theoretically and politically the world Communist and Workers movement with ideas. The literature of the Communist movement, like the Book of Carillo, are without importance because they are not making analyses of principles, of historic experiences. All that they do is constant omissions. For example, they say that the construction of the USSR has been a special, accidental case in history. Why is this? It was not like a car accident, was it? It was the event which permitted the throwing out of centuries of private property in a few years only, and besides this, in spite of thirty years under Stalin and in spite of wars which destroyed 70% of what the USSR had! The Communists do not discuss these experiences, they do not make all this known in this way, they lack scientific objectivity. They make discussions on the basis of simple statements, which only show superficiality, the weakness, fear and naivety of these leaderships, who do not base themselves on experiences. But for what concerns art, culture, science, do we not base ourselves on experiences? Why not then in politics?

Still the Communists say: 'We still have to make a study of the actual world to verify if yes or no we can construct a new one. This is to take no account of human conduct which is determined by social, economic interests, which are the factors from which to understand the conduct of society and of the social classes. Where can you verify that in Italy you can make an 'historic compromise'? Compromise with whom? And why should it also be 'historic'? If it was historic, this would then mean that the bourgeoisie is going to compromise itself, to act against itself. It is true that you must take advantage from the weaknesses of capitalism, and Lenin was the one who did it best. And today we can do this much more than he did, taking the present weakness of capitalism into account. But to take advantage of its weakness does not mean the same thing as to replace the class struggle by an alliance, and to believe that in this way we can literally overpass capitalism slowly, electorally, with a programme without transcendence. It is possible to accumulate slowly the forces which are necessary, accumulating them progressively and even electorally. But the time of confrontation will come in any case. Can we avoid it? The Communists say that, yes, we can. Where can they show that the bourgeoisie yielded to fear? In Rhodesia? In Chile? In the United States or in the programme of the bourgeoisie? The bourgeoisie shows nothing of this. Then what do the comrades of the Communist Party base themselves on to say this? What do they base themselves on to make such statements?

This crisis in the British Communist Party seems to happen in a quite remote part of Britain. This is because the Communists do not discuss what is the situation of the country when this crisis bursts out. Is it that the situation is good, or is it bad? Is the situation in progress or is it in retreat? How do they situate their own crisis? No crisis can be understood in the abstract. Besides, any crisis of a political movement which occurs in history and which represents a progress is united to the reality of progress of the country where it intervenes. This crisis cannot be a foreign body from the whole of the organism, the whole of the movement in this case. It is growing on the whole body itself. Then what is its cause? Why does it grow on the body? What is happening in the whole of Britain? What is to be done? What is the programme? The Communist comrades discuss abstractly and they generalise no experience. Their weakness leads to naivety, which consists in believing that you can do away with the historic experiences. But you cannot do without the experiences of history: particular conditions in each country are the circumstantial result of the relations of forces, they signify in no way that principles should apply differently. A relation of forces which is particular is not a principle. It is a situation which has defined and determined limits. Principles, on the other hand, are unalterable. For example, the classes behave as classes and they yield when they can no longer maintain themselves, in the same way as capitalism had to yield in front of the Russian Revolution. Classes also make concessions. A good example of this is when the capitalist class allied itself with the USSR against Hitler, which meant therefore the retreat of the capitalist system as it happened. The capitalists have made this alliance to be able to survive, because the bourgeoisie as such had no more forces of its own. But, in order to survive now as a whole, it is preparing the war.

It is necessary to discuss like this, comrades of the British Communist Party! And our own Party must discuss collaboration and contribution to the formation of the left in the Labour movement in Britain. It is a process in which the crisis of the Communist Party is a very important factor. Because, if the Communist Party just understood that it is necessary to organise the Labour left, it would not have to be in crisis. It would put itself in agreement with itself, and they would discuss this in the Party. But the Communists are in crisis because they do not know what to do, and they do not have a policy and programme.

Ballbar in the French Communist Party defends the dictatorship of the proletariat; and he repeats also some of Marx. He is against Stalin. But he defends everything Stalin did, he does not denounce the fact that Stalin assassinated the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, and that he allied himself to Hitler. He defends 'Socialism in one country' and says that Stalin defended the Soviet Union. So the criticism he makes of Stalin is an invented one. His book is just a list of quotes from Marx, but it does not apply to anything today.

The world Communist movement lacks experiences and discussion. For example, why not discuss in the British Communist Party why it does not develop itself? When there are so many strikes! What are the factors which guide the crisis? This crisis in the Communist Party bursts out on a principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the Party lived up to now without applying it at all, or without elaborating a single principle that stems from it, and without being pre-occupied on the programmatic level. When the process has produced twenty Workers States, why is it that the British Communist Party has no influence?

This comes from a lack of theoretical and political experience, and from a lack of communication on the experiences made by the Workers States; such a communication should be made to show how the Soviets took power. The various Workers States did not take power in the same way as the Soviet Union. They did it as a consequence of the war and of historic circumstances at the time. But the Communist parties were not prepared for the taking of power. Power just happened to fall into their hands. The proletariat, in particular the Soviet and the Chinese proletariat, made power fall into their hands. The British Communist Party does not discuss any of this. It makes arrogant declarations, whilst it has to see that its strength is that of the Soviet proletariat, that of the Soviet Union, that of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of China. No one to this day has yet written the history of the revolution in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, in Poland. These revolutions have not been led by Communist parties which would have been prepared, and would have utilised the circumstances of the war, to make the revolution. The conditions at that time were such that the structure of world capitalism was weakened and Hitler was an example of this. It is not the United States but Hitler at that time who was the centre of the capitalist system. It was Hitler who sought to confront the Soviet Union. It was him who has to embody the pretensions and the economic and military power of the capitalist system. There is no experience in the world which shows that you can take power through the national road, basing oneself on imaginary differences between these revolutions in Europe and the previous revolutions.

On the contrary, there are twenty Workers States which influence Africa, Asia, Latin America, and it is these which stimulate the colonial revolution to adopt the Soviet forms. Why do the Communist parties not discuss this? The influence of the Workers States on the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and even on individuals like Amin, demonstrates well that these principles are universal. At the moment the organisms to adopt these principles do not exist, but the existing organs of the masses have to come to these principles without having foreseen that they would need them. It is on the march that they verify that it is on the basis of these principles that they can build. On the other hand, the Communist Party discusses a vacuum.

The British Communist Party does not even pose the slogan of 'down with the Monarchy, Long live the Socialist Republic'. In the discussion of their crisis — they pose objectives in a vacuum because they want to be a large party in Britain. There is no room for a large Communist Party in Britain, but there is room for a great Communist Party which should contribute to the formation of the left in the Labour Party, transforming it into a party for social transformations.