

# WORLD POLITICS

## A REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S TROTSKYIST AND REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

NOVEMBER 1966

### CONTENTS

Page	1	After Brighton - a new period opens.
"	5	14% swing to the left in NEC elections.
"	6	A comparison of voting at the 1965 and 1966 Labour Party conferences.
"	7	The latest developments in the International situation. (a resolution of the I.E.C. of the Fourth International).
"	17	Bimonthly <u>International Socialist Review</u> announced.
"	18	Alienated labour and the Soviet Union.
"	24	Developments in the world Trotskyist press.
"	25	Campaign in Italy for Hugo Blanco's release.

It is as well to start this assessment by saying a few words about the purpose of such papers. The main point is that once having worked out our basic conceptions, i.e., our estimate of the general international situation, the role of social democracy, the declining position of British capitalism, the role of the colonial revolution, the nature of the Soviet Union etc., such questions as the tempo of events, nuances of policy of the Government, the mood of the left, are decisive. This approach sharply differentiates us from the sectarians: for them it is merely necessary to learn slogans and formula, recite them by rote and apply them to all situations. "Centrists betray, therefore all centrists are traitors"; "Labour rules in the interests of the ruling class, therefore Harold Wilson was bound to take the path he did"; "Only a struggle for socialist policies can take us forward"; "The only answer is to build the revolutionary party"; these are the stock phrases of the sectarians. In a very generalised sense they are true. But in the art of politics such questions as exactly when the centrists betray (to use the emotional vocabulary of the sectarians); at what stage do Wilson's policies start alienating the working class; what kind of socialist policies are most likely to evoke a response in the mass of the population are all-important.

One is reminded of what Trotsky had to say about the German Communist Party of the early thirties, in the period when Hitler was coming to power:

"In fact....the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany proceeds from the idea that it is impossible to defeat fascism without first defeating social democracy. Is this idea correct? On the historical scale it is unconditionally correct. But that does not at all mean that with its aid, that is, by simple repetition, one can solve the questions of the day. An idea, correct from the point of view of revolutionary strategy as a whole, is converted into a lie and at that into a reactionary lie, if it is not translated into the language of tactics. Is it correct that in order to destroy unemployment and misery it is first necessary to destroy capitalism? It is correct. But only the biggest blockhead can conclude from all this that we do not have to fight this very day, with all our forces, against the measures with whose aid capitalism"(operates the system). (From Germany: the Key to the International Situation).

It is useful in analysing the situation in the Labour movement today to compare the 1965 Blackpool Labour Party conference with the one this year in Brighton. Several quite fundamental differences can be gleaned:

(1) The completely different atmosphere of the conference and in particular the attitude of delegates to Wilson. At Blackpool he was king: when he came into the hall the only people who did not give him a hysterical ovation were the very hard left and the trade union opposition - notably the TGWU. At Brighton his image was completely tarnished and the platform had to work hard to get applause for him. In general the conference was less enthusiastic, less passionate and expressed the deep anxieties which even those who

voted consistently with the Government feel.

This change in attitude reflected both a change in the mood of the country as a whole and in the mood of Labour activists in particular. In the country as a whole whilst there is general support for the Government's policy including the wage freeze, people feel that Labour is in a mess. In particular even though Wilson is still popular he is no longer regarded as a super-politician. Among Labour activists, Wilson is now no longer unchallenged. At Blackpool he was the man who had taken Labour to power after all those years of Toryism, he symbolised a deep feeling in the Labour movement of elation because of that success. Even many of those who criticised the platform and voted against it felt that Wilson had won the election for Labour. Today, although the majority of Labour supporters feel they need Wilson, they express this in the negative sense rather than positive (who would take his place? They will ask).

(2) Although the voting figures only show a small shift to the left ( a useful yardstick is to compare the vote gained against the Government's <sup>economic</sup> policy and for disassociation from the Americans over Vietnam at the two conferences)\* the platform suffered some defeat: This amounted to a very simple thing: while the conference was prepared to support the general lines of the Government's policies, when skilful opposition concentrated attention on the worst and most concrete results of the policies it was a different matter. While conference was prepared to vote for the economic policy of the Government it was not prepared to vote for the extreme result of the policy: the deliberate creation of unemployment: hence the defeat over work-sharing. Similarly, it could vote not directly to support the American bombing of the north.

This fact makes for a completely different situation: after Blackpool, the platform seemed unbeatable and militants could easily get into a state of mind where they thought the struggle inside the Labour Party was hopeless and pointless. After Brighton there is at least a perspective of being able to beat the platform.

Under these circumstances we can call upon people to come into the struggle inside the Labour Party. The coming months will see thousands of people stimulated into industrial action; these new forces can now more easily be brought into the Labour Party.

Other features of the Blackpool conference were:

(1) the position of the TGWU being the "official" and even institutionalised opposition to Wilson was further developed and deepened. This factor has gained significance wider than before: it is now seeping into the minds of millions of ordinary people into this country. In particular the militants and those affected by the Government's policies are beginning to identify themselves with Cousins: after the car workers who came down to lobby conference, booed and shook their fists at Wilson they cheered Cousins.

\* See Appendix 2

Again we have to note that opposition to the Government on Vietnam was more successful than on incomes policy. This is in apparent contradiction to all that we have ever said about the relationship of opposition on foreign and domestic subjects. The most likely explanation is that the CLPs are moving to the left on Vietnam, especially after the bankruptcy of all Wilson's peace missions, but that, by and large, they tend to be confused by the Government's propaganda on incomes policy.

(2) That the political capital of the so-called lefts who have remained within the Cabinet is still substantial. Despite the campaign of Tribune and others, all the members of the Cabinet who stood for the NEC were successful. There was an important but not dramatic loss of votes (See appendix 1)

The main reason why the Greenwoods and Castles can still pose as lefts is that no real alternative to them has emerged on the parliamentary front. The extremely weak response of the back-bench lefts has been quite unable to arouse opposition or act as a focal point for anti-Government forces. It is precisely on the latter point where the Parliamentary lefts are weakest. They have refused point blank to pose themselves against the Government; instead they seek to advise it to "mend its ways".

(3) There is a tremendous fund of support for democracy in within the Labour Party as was indicated by the very <sup>wide</sup> sympathy gained over the John Palmer, Ken Coates and Nottingham cases.

(4) That despite everything, conference, in essence, gave Wilson a mandate for his policies. A fact the right wing will not be slow to use.

The prime political tasks facing revolutionary marxists:

These are:

(1) Helping to build a left wing united front which understands the fundamental nature of the Labour Government.

(2) Working out a correct and working relationship with the TSWU/5-union opposition to the Government.

(3) Maintaining and developing our own organisation in this situation.

We should not confuse a general opposition to Wilson with an opposition which will inevitably develop and reach a higher consciousness. The general opposition to Wilson could easily be diverted by demagogic measures; already Brown is 'proving' his independence from the American by demanding that China be admitted to the United Nations. A sound opposition which has the perspective of developing a real alternative to Wilsonism can do only on the basis of understanding the essential nature of the Wilson Government. Moreover, the only way to work out an alternative policy and leadership is to reject completely Wilsonism, the Labour Government must be regarded not as merely being mistaken but as the enemy. It has to attack the working class, because resistance by the working class is the most important obstacle to the capitalist rationalisation of the institutions, industry and economy of Britain. The Government must, having rejected the socialist option, try to change decisively the relationship of forces between the working class and the employers to the favour of the latter,

On this point we must recognise the confusion which exists in the minds of a large proportion of the existing left wing opposition to Wilson, and especially the leadership. In practical, political and social terms even Cousins and Jenkins are saying that they could and would make a better job of rationalising British capitalism and without attacking the working class. Wilson and co, are quite correct to point out the contradictions in their position. Of course the very positions the TGWU/5 union opposition has taken will tend to evolve along a different path. However, we must face the enormity of the ideological job which needs to be done. A task which is made all the more difficult because of the prestige and loyalty which Cousins and Jenkins et al will be able to command.

This is of course, intimately tied up with the job of defining a correct relationship between ourselves and the union opposition. To hold any position other than that of critical - and even on occasions enthusiastic - support for this opposition would be suicide. On the other hand the very strength of this opposition, the resources which it has at its disposal, etc., creates a powerful basis for opportunist adaption. This is all the more the case because all kinds of people, including many disappointed right wing careerists will be attracted by the new union opposition (witness Mayhew, and Cousins' ready acceptance of Mayhew as the seconder of his resolution on defence costs).

To arrive at this correct relationship we need first of all to have an objective sociological assessment of this tendency; one free from wishful thinking on the one side and negative, sectarian conservative thinking on the other. We need to analyse this trade union opposition<sup>not</sup> in terms of the individual psychology of its leaders ( a common subjectivist mistake made by the oh-so-marxist/ist sectarians) but in terms of the social forces operating upon them. The starting point of this analysis is the fact that because of the dual nature of the trade union bureaucracy: - the fact that it rests upon workers organisations as well as being the instrument of the employers pressure on the working class - it is bound, in a period of crisis, to differentiate into right and left tendencies. These tendencies reflect in an often indirect and complicated way the pressure of the two class forces on the bureaucracy. It is no accident that the TGWU has within its ranks dockers and busmen who for particular reasons have a tradition of militancy. On the other hand, the five technical unions organise, big and growing sections of the new working class. There is moreover in both cases a powerful inducement to be militant because in that way membership and organisation can be facilitated in new sections of industry.

to be continued/

NEC VOTING: THE FIGURES SHOW A 14% SWING TO THE LEFT

An analysis of the votes at the Labour Party Conference for the Constituency Section of the National Executive Committee reveals two interesting conclusions.

The first is that there was a swing of about 14 per cent away from Ministers and to Left-wing lay members. That's a very considerable swing: if it happened in a parliamentary general election, or even in a parliamentary by-election, a swing of that magnitude would be considered sensational.

Of the Ministers who stood both in 1965 and in 1966 every one except Mervyn Rees lost votes. Here are the detailed figures:-

	Votes, thousands		Percentage change	
	1965	1966	+	-
Castle	628	590		6.0
Benn	562	517		8.0
Crossemann	532	474		10.9
Callaghan	542	447		17.5
Greenwood	561	445		18.9
Rees	86	97	1.3	
Davies	137	74		46.0
Thomas	98	55		45.0
Total	3146	2699		14.2

In contrast, of the Left-wing lay members who stood both in 1965 and in 1966, every one except Sydney Silverman and myself gained votes.

Again, here are detailed figures:-

	Votes, thousands		Percentage change	
	1965	1966	+	-
Driberg	475	525	10.6	
Mikardo	475	433		9.7
Allan	239	331	27.8	
Silverman	300	246		18.0
Zilliagus	130	167	28.3	
Orme	82	154	87.8	
Jenkins	84	140	66.7	
Mendelson	98	140	42.9	
Total	1883	2136	13.4	

This, as I say, is a large swing. If there were a repetition next year of this movement of votes, the election results would be startling.

APPENDIX TWO - COMPARISON OF VOTING AT THE 1965 & 1966  
LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCES

I have tried, so far as possible, to make a comparison between roughly equivalent resolutions. On the issue of Vietnam, the key vote 1965 was the resolution, moved by John Mendelson, which called for the Government to dissociate itself from U.S. policies and military action in Vietnam, it also strongly criticised the American bombing of the North. It was lost by:

4,065,000 votes to 2,284,000.

This year the nearest comparable resolution, from Epping, called upon the Government to dissociate itself entirely from the present American policy in Vietnam and urged peace negotiations in Vietnam, to include the representatives of the N.L.F. This was lost by:

3,899,000 votes to 2,473,000.

Thus we see a small switch of votes, but the switch would have probably been bigger if it had not been for the fact that some smaller unions could claim that they carried out conference policy by supporting the F.B.U. resolution. This called for the ending of the U.S. bombing of the North and urged the Government to bring all pressure on the U.S. to end the war. It was passed, against the advice of the platform, by:

to  
3,851,000 votes/2,644,000.

On the incomes policy question, it is more difficult to make an assessment for a number of reasons. The most comparable resolutions are firstly, the 1965 emergency resolution from the TGWU disapproving the decision to enforce advance notification of union claims, this being lost by:

3,643,000 votes to 2,540,000;

and the 1966 TGWU resolution protesting at the interference with free collective bargaining, this was defeated by:

3,925,000 votes to 2,471,000.

This apparently shows a small shift to the right, but there is a simple explanation for this: in 1965 the AEU voted for the emergency resolution. This year they voted against the TGWU resolution. As readers will know the AEU delegation has some degree of democratic control, and it tends to reflect rank and file opinion more accurately than the mandate it receives. Thus when the TGWU emergency resolution this year, on work-sharing, was voted upon the AEU delegation voted against the platform. The resolution was carried by:

3,289,000 votes to 3,137,000.

The vote on cutting overseas expenditure should also be noted. The resolution, moved by Cousins and seconded by Mayhew, called for substantial cuts in overseas military expenditure, withdrawal from Malaysia, Singapore and the Persian Gulf by 1969-70. It was carried against the platform by:

3,899,000 votes to 2,473,000.

## THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

(The following is the text of a resolution adopted by the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International)

\*\*\*\*\*

The object of this resolution is not to examine the world situation as a whole, this having already been done in the political resolution passed at the last World Congress,<sup>1</sup> but rather to bring that resolution up to date, in the light of the events that have taken place since the World Congress and on this basis to see whether we have to modify our conclusions and our tasks.

The main question facing us arises from the present escalation of the Vietnam war by American imperialism. The escalation points dangerously towards an extension of this war in the direction of a war against the People's Republic of China. Taking into account the setbacks suffered by the colonial revolution in this last period, the most fundamental change in the world situation has taken place in comparison with the preceding period. More precisely the question posed is whether the colonial revolution which started after World War II, which received an enormous impulse through the victory of the Chinese revolution and which has been the main sector of the socialist revolution in the course of the past twenty years has exhausted its energy and entered a period of ebb and decline.

### I.

#### The Colonial Revolution.

The almost continuous development of the colonial revolution during a period of several years was the expression of the will of the colonial masses who wanted to put an end to foreign domination of their countries and to their poverty, all of which stem from the economic and social underdevelopment of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The weakening of the colonial powers during and after World War II, as well as the greater weight of the workers' states in the world made possible almost everywhere the conquest of political independence, as imperialism retreated either immediately or after bloody colonial wars, to indirect forms of domination enabling it to maintain the essential part of its economic position.

On the other hand, the native ruling classes then exercising political power were unable to stimulate an overall economic development of their countries, which in the end stimulated the process of permanent revolution, bringing to power, after the conquest of formal independence, bourgeois and petty bourgeois nationalist leaders who used the aroused mass movement and the pressure it generated to obtain more or less important concessions from imperialism.

---

<sup>1</sup> See International Socialist Review, Spring 1956.



During the whole of this period the major confrontation took place between the old colonial powers and the colonial revolution. With the exception of some Latin-American countries the great sweep of colonial revolt did not come up directly against the power of American imperialism. On the contrary American policy at the time was designed to achieve an alliance with the colonial bourgeoisie. It intervened in several of the colonial wars to pressure the old colonial powers to make concessions to the revolution; it did not hesitate to side openly with Nasser against the British-French aggression during the Suez crises. Its fundamental orientation was that of trying to canalise the colonial revolution in favor of "progressive" layers and governments which would maintain themselves within the framework of the world capitalist market with the help of American capital. Even the "neutralist" course adopted at Bandung did not cause a fundamental change in Washington's course.

The change that has occurred followed in consequence of two experiences. On one hand the development of the Cuban revolution into a socialist revolution -- something unforeseen by Washington -- has taught it the logic of permanent revolution, the danger of allowing the development of a revolution even under the leadership of liberal and petty-bourgeois forces running the risk of being overthrown by the masses. The "Johnson doctrine", proclaimed at the time of the intervention in Santo Domingo, clearly means that American imperialism will intervene militarily not only in the case where the masses led by Communist forces are advancing towards power (this decision has been theirs since the beginning of the cold war) but also where these masses are still under the leadership of non-communist "liberals".

On the other hand the incapacity of traditional nationalist leaderships that have come to power to resolve the economic and social tasks of the colonial revolution led to a progressive loss of support by the masses and therefore a loss of their usefulness in the eyes of imperialism. The latter prefer the substitution of open neocolonialist agents who claim less concessions for their services.

The direct confrontation between the colonial revolution and imperialism which was during the fifties a confrontation between the old colonial powers and this revolution has, since the experience of both the Cuban revolution and the Algerian conquest of independence, become more and more a global confrontation between American imperialism and revolution. The closeness of victory of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam (bringing the risk of a loss of all of Southeast Asia for imperialism); the tactical weakening of the position of the workers states in consequence of transferring the Sino-Soviet conflict into state relations; the shamefully weak responses of the workers states' bureaucracies before the escalation of the imperialist aggression against Vietnam has led to a more resolutely offensive and aggressive policy on the part of Washington, a policy of support to the indigenous reactionary forces in the semicolonial countries. The succession of setbacks undergone by the colonial revolution can be fundamentally explained by this passing over to a general counteroffensive against the colonial revolution on the part of American imperialism in the face of mass movements without any international coordination, without an effective leadership or correct political orientation, without a leadership prepared to step in and replace the traditional nationalist leadership of the earlier stage which is now openly bankrupt.

The initiative during this last period has entirely favored American imperialism. What objectives has it attained? What reactions have these setbacks produced in the mass movements? In no single sector of the colonial revolution which suffered a setback has the reaction been able to establish a stable power not even where the masses received the severest blows. Moreover nowhere in the colonial or semicolonial countries have the objective causes desiring the masses to action tired and again been recovered.

In Latin America it is in Brazil where the resistance and the revival of the mass movement is more difficult. Here the military junta passes from one crisis to another and can rely only on feeble support from the people. In Bolivia the attempt of the military junta to destroy the mass movement has ended in failure. In Chile the Christian Democratic experiment of Frei clashes with the combativity of important sections of the masses (miners strike). If the Peruvian guerrillas seemed to have received grievous blows and suffered serious losses, and if also in Venezuela the movement has suffered serious losses, the guerrillas in Colombia and Guatemala continue their struggle with inevitable hazards, but without the governments of these countries being able to reduce considerably their capacity of action.

In Latin America the "reformist" policy of the Alliance for Progress has been exposed as bankrupt for a long time. The policy of force which has seen its greatest success in Brazil has not stabilized anything. The mass movements continue to shake the unstable social equilibrium there. Thus American imperialism has been unable to gain a decisive victory. Signs of regrouping and a recovery of the mass movements in several countries are beginning to appear.

It is in Africa that imperialism seems to have gained the most spectacular reversals of the situation. First of all we have to underline the overthrow of Bon Bella and then of Nkrumah and the temporary suppression of the left wing in Mozambique. The segregationist regimes of Smith in Rhodesia and Verwoerd in South Africa are consolidating themselves. In the big section of Africa important political changes are now possible because of the extreme fragility of the old forms of rule and the steady decomposition of the old structures without anything new taking their place. To this must be added the big weakness of the leaderships, cadres and political movements. In general the evolution has been to the right. However, the events in Nigeria, the most important country in Africa, were first of all an attempt by the military to prevent a mass movement by attacking the feudal forces. After its initial success the new power was quickly challenged by the popular forces that continue to press their demands. In Uganda a similar attempt was made to eliminate the feudal forces. In Congo Brazzaville the attempt to eliminate the left-orientated regime failed. Moreover the fact that the revolutionary forces are far from being crushed is shown in Algeria where Boumedienne's government was forced, less than one year after the coup d'etat that brought it to power, to proceed toward important nationalizations. The regime continues to be submitted to the pressure of the masses principally expressed by the UGTA (Union Generale des Travailleurs Algeriens).

The developments in the Near East show a maturing towards decisive tests in this part of the world. The struggle between the reactionary forces and the progressive forces goes on in Yemen. The struggle is gaining in intensity in Aden and in a number of emirates of South Arabia. Iraq is still unstable and the

struggle of the Kurdish people continues. Finally and above all in Syria the revolutionary movement led by the Syrian Baath party, after purging its right wing, has advanced a program of struggle against imperialism that is to a certain extent anticapitalist, marked however by vacillations and conciliations bearing some similarity to the experience in Algeria at the time of the decrees of March 1963.

In Asia imperialism secured its greatest success in the victorious counterrevolution in Indonesia. We have given the reasons for this setback in the documents adopted at the last World Congress and the declaration made by the United Secretariat. The subsequent slaughter of hundreds of thousands of Communists opened up new political possibilities for the new leaders. They came to agreement with the neocolonialists of Malaysia and then turned to begging of aid from American, Japanese and West German imperialism. But despite the significance of the new overtures, the agreement with Malaysia remains secondary in face of the gigantic economic problems of unemployment, inflation and widespread misery existing in Indonesia.

On the other hand the stability of the Indian subcontinent has been shaken. The divisions within the ruling Congress party have increased steadily since Nehru's death, reflecting the pressures arising from the failure to solve any of the great problems facing India, as well as the pressure now coming from the poor peasantry raising their demands. 1966 saw the greatest mobilization of masses (Bengali movement against famine) that India has known since the struggle for independence.

Finally in that part of the world the struggle of the Vietnamese people against American imperialism is a testimony above all to the power of revolution despite the material weight of the forces thrown against it. Thanks to its intervention imperialism avoided the defeat that seemed imminent eighteen months ago. It has no real prospects of victory and that is why the prospect of an escalation driven as far as a war against China has become an actual danger.

## II.

### The Workers States

The twenty-third Congress of the CPSU and the congresses of the other CP's in the Eastern European workers states confirmed and illustrated several points made in the resolution of the last World Congress of the Fourth International;

- The general slowdown in economic growth in the past few years.
- The ruling bureaucracies seeking solutions in reforms of the Liberman type; i.e., reforms that imply besides administrative adjustments, measures favorable to the bureaucracy at the managerial level of the enterprises.
- At the same time tendencies have developed in several states for independent action separate from the other workers states both with regard to the capitalist world and to China (Rumania).

-- Not only have we not seen any further progress in "liberalization," but the twenty-third congress confirmed the line of the ruling circles of repressing even the most timid positions of the intellectuals and the university students in favor of democratic liberties.

The end of the Khrushchev period corresponded to the end of a period in which "de-Stalinization" raised new reformist hopes concerning both material welfare and the democratization of Soviet society. Khrushchev's successors are attempting to adjust the situation on the economic level, but at the same time they attempt to tighten control politically and socially. They collide and will continue to collide even more with the demands of the workers and with the more politicalized oppositional currents of intellectuals and students.

The Sino-Soviet controversy has not been taking spectacular forms during the past period, but has been developing to the advantage of the Soviet leadership (Castro's attack against the Chinese; the crisis within the Chinese leadership). But in this dispute the aspect of an "ideological conflict between parties" (which favored the decomposition of Stalinism) has tended to recede and give way to a full-blown "conflict between states" which brings grave consequences on the international level. It weakens the defense of the Vietnamese revolution and encourages American imperialism to adopt a more aggressive stance toward China.

In Cuba some serious economic problems as well as differences within the leading team have given rise to a certain bureaucratic development, of which Che Guevara's leaving and Castro's violent attack against the Fourth International at the Tricontinental Conference have been partially at least the objective expression. However both in this conference's decisions and in the subsequent behaviour of the Fidelista leaders (Armando Hart's speech at the twenty-third Congress of the CPSU, Castro's speech against Frei and his speech on May 1) it has clearly appeared that the Fidelista current maintains its positions in favor of the revolutionary road and of the socialist nature of the Latin-American revolution. In practice, in almost all Latin-American countries the followers of this current differentiate themselves from the neo-reformist official CP's.

In China a serious process of purge and suppression of differences appeared and has struck successively at the cadres of the army, the literary and scientific circles, the youth organizations and the party; at the present time it has culminated in the elimination of a core of leaders grouped around Pong Chen, a member of the Political Bureau. From all evidence this is an interbureaucratic struggle, but like all conflicts within the bureaucracy in workers states without workers democracy, these necessarily reflect actual social tensions in the country. Although we lack information about the actual content of the differences it is highly likely that they not only encompass problems related to internal life of the party and country (freedom of criticism for the ranks, agricultural policy, etc.) but also international

policies (the tactical line toward the Soviet government; the line on the colonial revolution). The terrible defeat suffered by it in Indonesia cannot help but raise controversies within a party whose leadership shares in large part the responsibilities of the leaders of the Indonesian Communist party in this disaster. The blind sectarian refusal of a united front with the Soviet government for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution considerably weakens the positions of the Chinese CP in Asia, and at the same time Chinese diplomacy has suffered important setbacks in Latin America (Castro's attack) and in Africa. The internal struggle has been taking place in such a way as if the Chinese bureaucracy would like to be on the safe side in order to crush an opposition before it adds to its strength through the setbacks to Mao's international policy as well as setbacks in internal politics which seem imminent.

The attempt to maintain a monolithic image before the masses, the stifling of dissent by Stalinist-type violence and the frantic construction of the Mao cult make impossible the free discussion of the actual differences and the difficult problems that the Chinese revolution faces at this stage and cannot but cause grave prejudice to the interests of the revolution.

However, the propaganda of the Chinese leaders against the formation of material privileges, such as those existing in the Soviet Union during this internal struggle, testifies that despite the Mao cult and the avowal of Stalin there is not a pure and simple reproduction of the dictatorship of Stalin and the pattern that developed in the USSR. China's objective position in the world, the aggressive preparations of American imperialism against her are in the same direction. By avoiding any declaration of solidarity with China in the face of the imperialist menace, the leaders of the Soviet bureaucracy encourage this aggression, the ultraleftism of the Chinese leaders on the question of the united front with the Kremlin and their attempt at militarizing the whole of social life in China which is their bureaucratic attempt to secure the defenses of the revolution in the face of the threat from the Pentagon.

### III.

#### The Imperialist States

The economic situation in the imperialist states has not changed fundamentally during the past period. The war in Vietnam continues to strengthen the American "boom" and at the same time weakens the stability of the dollar and the pound. It has also helped to overcome the recession in Japan. Signs are now appearing of the exhaustion of the West German "boom".

In the United States the continuation of the escalation in Vietnam continues to provoke differences within the bourgeoisie and in their two major political parties. Certain important sections of the American bourgeoisie are aware of the fact that in the absence of a fundamental modification of the

relations of force on a world scale, this escalation brings increasing hazards for American imperialism. While these differences are only tactical they make it difficult for the government to resort to a McCarthy-type repression against opposition at least on the scale of the fifties. The existence of this difference in turn helps encourage the growth of a popular opposition against the war in Vietnam.

In this same period the principle new element has been the NATO crisis, made public by de Gaulle's decision to withdraw French troops from the 'integrated' command. This decision is taken at a time when the situation within the capitalist world after the war has been modified on one hand because of the economic recovery in capitalist Europe and on the other because of the lessening of the war danger in Europe in the immediate future. The NATO crisis may result in a certain reorganization of the forms of alliance in the capitalist world, adapting the relations of political-military force to the reality of the changed economic relations of force; but it is excluded, contrary to the wishful thinking of the workers state bureaucracies, that it will be dislocated let alone mean the creation of a 'neutralist' Europe. The widespread 'anti-American' feelings and moods can be used for certain political manoeuvres within the different European states, but no European bourgeoisie can permit itself to 'go it alone,' nor can the European capitalists allow the loss of the military protection of the US. It suffices to appraise exactly de Gaulle's policy to see how even he stops before certain limits (maintenance of the Common Market, keeping of French troops in Germany).

The new developments in the internal situation in the various imperialist countries have been many and contradictory. In general they have helped encourage a politicalization of the young generation in a direction hostile to the reformism of the old traditional parties; this is true both in America and in Western Europe. Even though the objective effects of this new movement are still limited they have great importance for our movement and ensure its growth at this time. It is above all in the United States (and to a certain extent in Canada and Australia) that this politicalization has taken dimension with the development of a mass opposition against the war in Vietnam, an opposition that is growing and which begins to influence mass currents and essential forces of American society (antisegregation movement as well as 'liberal' fringes of the trade-union movement).

We must underline the importance of the antiwar movement in the United States, which constitutes today one of the major centers of anti-imperialist struggle in the world and whose strength has grown steadily during this past period. The interconnection between the colonial revolution and the growing anti-imperialist mass force in the United States has become evident. The antiwar movement in the United States stimulates in turn anti-imperialist actions in other parts of the world and radicalizing the emancipation movement of the American Negroes threatens the stability of bourgeois society in the United States.

In the European Communist parties the tendency toward a right-wing evolution has been accentuated. In Italy, at the congress of the Italian Communist party the center grouping adopted to all intents and purposes the political position of the right wing. In France, since the Mitterrand campaign the leadership of the French Communist party has, if anything, increased the

tempo of this evolution, even if it conflicts with the attitude of its expected "allies" (concrete motion against de Gaulle's policy on NATO) in the field of foreign politics and on domestic issues (refusal to elaborate a common program for the 1967 elections). It comes as no surprise then when the Finnish CP carries this evolution to the point of participating in the bourgeois government, something which has not been seen in Europe since the Prague "coup" eighteen years ago.

The evolution of the situation in Europe has had contradictory effects on the Social Democracy. While the British Labour party, brought to power with a largely increased majority, is launching into a policy of renewal of British capitalism at the expense of the working class, which is beginning to show a growing resistance against such a policy (seaman's strike) the Austrian elections put the Austrian Social Democracy into opposition for the first time since the restoration of Austrian independence. This will have as a consequence the encouragement of the workers struggles despite the resistance of their leadership which is seeking to confine and limit the class struggle to their despicable parliamentary shadow boxing. In Germany after the failure of the Bad Godesberg orientation (which envisaged accession to power through identification with the bourgeois parties) the Social Democracy has turned toward differentiation from the bourgeois parties; this can give a little more elbow room for the development of the left-wing currents which have been crushed during the past several years. Meanwhile there is the serious risk that the trade-union bureaucracy will yield without a struggle before the "emergency laws" (Notstands-Gesetze) which would be a serious blow to the workers movements.

#### IV.

#### The Balance Sheet of World Developments

The balance sheet we can make out of the foregoing is that the colonial revolution despite the setbacks suffered in the last period is not at all exhausted and remains what it has been for the past twenty years - the main sector of the world revolution. The defeats suffered have not been the result of the weakening of the combativity of the masses or the result of some modification of the objective conditions, but are due rather to the absence of a qualified revolutionary leadership at a time when American imperialism after some hesitation has taken a stance all the more aggressive since it has the advantage of the disunity of the two leading workers states. The increasing war danger does not come for a decisive change in the relationship of forces but rather from the limited success that capitalism has had against revolution. It is this limit and especially the victorious resistance of the Vietnamese revolution that pushes capitalism onto the road toward escalation which unfortunately to date has had no vigorous and united response.

The cumulative effect of the defeats suffered by the colonial revolution in the last period is not of such weight to neutralize the decisive influence

that economic and social instability has on the mass movement. It is still in this sector where the most likely probability exists of highly explosive social and political conflicts.

However, the key to the world situation remains at present in Vietnam. It is the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people against the imperialist aggression which largely neutralizes in the eyes of the colonial masses, the demoralizing effect of the setbacks suffered by the revolution on other fronts. It is the bogging down of the mobile forces of the American army in Vietnam which make it difficult for Yankee imperialism to intervene on a large scale on other fronts.

Up to now the setbacks suffered by the colonial revolution have not at all led to a modification of the relations of forces on a world scale. But a defeat of the Vietnamese revolution by the forces of imperialism could bring the gravest consequences. This is why the number one task of the world proletariat is the campaign to aid the Vietnamese revolution on every front and in every way.

Among the workers states one can see the first signs of a political renewal after ten years of relative stabilization, the "de-Stalinization"; that is to say, the policy of self-defense of the bureaucracy by means of limited reforms. Finally, in the imperialist states, though the economic level and social stability have not shown any fundamental damage there can also be seen signs of political renewal which promise much for the future.

With regard to the preceding years, when the colonial revolution in particular had the most spectacular success it is the problem of leadership and of an International that show themselves as the imperative necessity, to insure victories. The Vietnamese war at present stresses this need even more in face of the single leadership of imperialism (only contested in a small and limited way) while the world's revolutionary mass movements suffer the burden and monstrous handicap of rival state leaderships in the U.S. and China to say nothing of the opportunist political orientation of the traditional organizations including the mass CP's under pro-Imperial leadership.

The imperative necessity to make up for this terrible lack breaks through with varying consciousness and intensity in mass movements and even in various contrist currents; this explains the origin of the Tricontinental Conference of Havana (January 1966) whose object was to find the means to coordinate the efforts and struggles of the peoples who are at present directly at grips with world imperialism.

The conference at Havana revealed the difficulties on the road towards a coordination of the struggles on an international scale, showing the weight of the state apparatus of the workers states and of the petit-bourgeois forces still leading the anti-imperialist movement in most semicolonial and colonial countries. It confirmed once more how illusory is the hope to see these state bureaucracies and petit-bourgeois forces take a correct political position "under the pressure of the masses and the objective conditions." It confirmed that the revolutionary victories snatched from the enemy by surprise thanks to objective conditions so favorable that they could accomplish this even without a revolutionary



Marxist leadership represent an exception and not the rule and that the building of a new revolutionary leadership is the most important task of our epoch.

Finally, the main lesson that can be drawn from the latest vicissitudes of the world revolution confirms the message that the Fourth International has advanced since its foundation to the revolutionary vanguard; there is no lasting definitive victory against capital on an international scale without the building of a new revolutionary Marxist International.

## V.

### Our Tasks

The conclusions of this analysis are evident; revolutionary Marxists must concentrate their efforts at the present stage on defense of the Vietnamese revolution and on organization of maximum effective aid to this revolution. To secure the victory of this revolution; to check the aggression of American imperialism is the surest way of discouraging the most aggressive forces of this imperialism which dream of a preventive attack against the Chinese nuclear centers. It is also the surest way of giving to new revolutions in other parts of the world the possibility of consolidating without being forced immediately to face the certainty of a military intervention of Yankee imperialism.

This concentration of efforts implies in particular:

(1) The continuation of the efforts of revolutionary Marxists to involve in the struggle against the war of aggression of imperialism in Vietnam the largest possible mobilization of the workers and anti-imperialist movements on the basis of a united front without exclusion and with every organization maintaining its right of criticism within the united front.

(2) The attempt to create everywhere where they are not yet in existence ad hoc organizations of struggle against the war of aggression of American imperialism and of defense of the Vietnamese revolution, organizations able to respond immediately to new stages of the escalation as for example the recent bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong.

(3) The attempt to involve progressively in the struggle against the war of aggression the organized forces of the workers movement and particularly the trade-union movement on the basis of a genuine united front without any confusion of program with reformists, neoreformists, Khrushchevites, Maoists, etc., but with a concentration of effort on the part of all militant forces in the struggle against imperialist aggression.

(4) The attempt to internationalize the struggle against the imperialist war of aggression, beginning with the countries or the movements which because of the similarity of objective conditions make possible such an effective international (above all the students on a world scale and the youth organizations on a European scale).

(5) A strong denunciation of the shameful role played in the war by the workers bureaucracies; particularly a reformist bureaucracy like the British, which act as shameful agents of American imperialism; the Soviet bureaucracy which gives limited aid and cannot find it possible to respond to the escalation even with the responses of its old leader Khrushchev. They are the only ones who have the technical means that would enable the heroic Vietnamese fighters to stop the imperialist aggression; the Chinese bureaucracy whose refusal of a united front with the USSR for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution makes the deception of the Kremlin much easier and accentuates the purely verbal character of its denunciations of the "Soviet-American plot" against the colonial revolution.

Our primary slogans today:

For a united front on a world scale of all forces of the workers and anti-imperialist movements against the American aggression in Vietnam.

For the defense of the Vietnamese revolution.

For maximum aid to this revolution.

#### BIMONTHLY INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW ANNOUNCED

The latest issue of the International Socialist Review carries the following announcement:

"We are happy to announce that beginning with our next issue International Socialist Review will be published bimonthly. This will give us 6 issues per year instead of four...The subscription rate for the bimonthly ISR will be \$2.50 per year (There is a special reduced British rate: 15/6 per year) ...Increased frequency of publication will give us greater flexibility in the choice of subject matter than was possible in a quarterly magazine. We shall be able to deal with many important conjunctural developments, domestic and foreign, which were practically excluded under a quarterly publication schedule.

"It is encouraging to note the steady increase in the circulation of the ISR throughout the world. In the past period our foreign circulation has continued to climb to the point that at present approximately one half the total circulation of the ISR goes to subscribers abroad. Our magazine now goes to all five continents and to most major cities. Our subscription list comprising libraries, educational institutions and individuals continues to grow. This steady growth testifies to the expanding interest in the views of the world Trotskyist movement, and to the growing recognition that the ISR represents the authentic voice of Trotskyism as a distinct tendency in the world labor and socialist movement. In addition, the bimonthly ISR will provide a more effective medium for making available to the English speaking world the complete texts of important documents, declarations and statements of the reunified Fourth International founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.

"We view the bimonthly ISR as the first step towards the resumption of publication on a regular basis, a monthly. Our predecessors, The New International, and Fourth International were monthly publications until financial difficulties attendant on the prolonged period of prosperity-reaction and McCarthyism forced a retreat...."

Subscriptions to I.S.R. can be placed through Pioneer Book Service, 8, Toynbee St., Toynbee St., London E.1.

## ALIENATED LABOUR AND THE SOVIET UNION

By C. Cross

(Note. The impetus to write this article comes from two directions. From the ultra-left we have the C.L.R. James review of Trotsky's 'Revolution Betrayed' reprinted by International Socialism (No 16), in which he argued that alienated labour exists in the U.S.S.R. and therefore characterised the system as State Capitalist. On the right, bourgeois industrial psychologists have discovered the notion of Alienation in the early Marx, but usually argue that the condition is endemic in modern society and industry in general and hence is not specifically capitalist. They concentrate on alleviating the situation of the worker without changing the property relationships.

However what follows can be understood without reference to these discussions.)

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

One major source of Marx's writings on alienation is the Paris Manuscript of 1844, and it must be said that this suffers from several defects. Firstly Marx was still very affected by his Hegelian upbringing and thus writes in a peculiar jargon - expressions like 'species-life' abound. Second, the work is not prepared for publication and hence is extremely untidy and ambiguous. Thus Marx here discerns several aspects of alienated labour, but not all of them are of the same level of historical specificity.

For example he seems to suggest at one point that any labour necessary to secure a man's physical existence counts as alienated labour, but clearly such labour is necessary in all epochs, even, Marx notes in Capital III, in communist society.

"Freedom in this field" he adds, "cannot consist of anything else but the fact that socialised man, the associated producers, regulate their interchange with nature rationally, bring it under common control, instead of being ruled by it as by some blind power; that they accomplish their task with the least expenditure of energy under conditions most adequate to their human nature and most worthy of it. But it always remains a realm of necessity. Beyond it begins that development of human power which is its own end, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can only flourish upon that realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its fundamental promise."

Thus this realm of necessity is not specific to capitalism, but the form it takes varies in each epoch. It is one thing to do unpleasant tasks as a slave, another as a serf, another as a wage worker, and another yet again as a participant in socialised production governed by the associated producers.

What is it then, which is specific about labour in capitalist society? It is not that it is unpleasant, something more is needed. If we return to the Manuscripts of 1844 we find that Marx characterises Man's 'species being' as free creative many-sided production.

"In creating an objective world by his practical activity, in working-up inorganic nature, man proves himself a conscious species being ..... An animal produces one-sidedly, whilst man produces universally. It produces only under the dominion of immediate physical need whilst man produces even when he is free from physical need and only truly produces in freedom therefrom."

Physical existence is, for animals, an end in itself, but for man it is merely a condition for the free development of further potentialities. A system which cuts off for a large part of mankind their possibilities of development, and makes their life activity a means to their physical existence, is therefore a system which perpetuates un-freedom. Thus in estranged labour the worker has no interest in the product, it belongs to another; he has no interest in the work, it is "forced labour" which he must do to earn his means of life.

However even this is not enough to get to the nub of Marx's concept of capitalist society as a system based on alienated labour, for after all the slave and the serf have their product taken from them. This loss of the product may be called exploitation, but something other than this is required to make this situation an alienated one.

The clue has already been provided in the quote above from Capital where Marx talks of men "being ruled as by some blind power." In the 1844 Manuscript Marx says "The product of labour does not belong to the worker ... it confronts him as an alien power ..." An alien power! In this lies the breathtaking kernel of the Marxist concept of alienated labour. It is not just that the worker is degraded, not just that his product is lost to him, not just that he is powerless, reduced to the level of a commodity forced to sell his labour power in order to live, but that the very products of his labour turn round and dominate their producer.

This concept of alienation had already been applied by Feuerbach in his critique of religion. He argued that Man first of all creates the Gods by alienating his human qualities into something 'external' and then is dominated by his own creation and falls down and worships it.

Marx applies the concept to Commodity production with illuminating results. In The German Ideology Marx states it is "an empirical fact that separate individuals have, with the broadening of their activity into world-historical activity, become more and more enslaved under a power alien to them .... a power which has become more and more enormous and, in the last instance, turns out to be the world market." "The social power, is the multiplied productive force which arises through the cooperation of different individuals determined within the division of labour, appears to these individuals, since their cooperation is not voluntary but natural, not as

their own united power but as an alien force existing outside of them, of the origin and end of which they are ignorant, which they thus cannot control, which on the contrary passes through a peculiar series of phases and stages, independent of the will and action of man, nay even being the prime governor of these."

Marx has here noticed the extraordinary fact that, though economic phenomena cannot be anything but the product of Man's own activity, nevertheless economic movements seem beyond anyone's control. Instead of the producers controlling the results of their own activity we find boom and slump, unemployment, inflation, etc., treated by political economists as objective phenomena, following their own laws, as if men were as incapable of deciding their own destiny as is the moon of evading the laws governing its orbit.

The analysis of this strange phenomena finds finished expression in 'Capital' particularly in the section on the Fetishism of Commodities (II4) He has here stopped talking in semi-philosophical form of 'alienation', but it is derived from this source.

In commodity production, he says, "the labour of the individual asserts itself as a part of the labour of society, only by means of the relations which the act of exchange establishes directly between the products, and indirectly through them, between the producers. To the latter therefore, the relations connecting the labour of one individual with that of the rest appear, not as direct social relations between individuals at work, but as what they really are, material relations between persons and social relations between things."

The peculiar relations between the products of labour which stamp them as commodities have no connection with their physical properties; it has little to do with their use values; but it is determined by the exchange value current on the market which is outside the control of one man and indeed of all men. In commodity production "it is a definite social relation between men that assumes, in their eyes, the fantastic form of a relation between things."

The subservience of men's production to "social relations between products" is perhaps a little clearer when contrasted with feudal production. Marx says:

"...For the very reason that personal dependence forms the groundwork of society there is no necessity for labour and its products to assume a fantastic form different from their reality. They take the shape, in the transactions of society, of services in kind and payments in kind. Here the particular and natural form of labour, and not as in a society based on production of commodities, its general abstract form is the immediate social form of labour ..... every serf knows that what he expends in the service of his lord is a definite quantity of his own personal labour power .... The social relations between individuals in the performance of their labour

appear at all events as their own mutual personal relations, and are not disguised under the shape of social relations between the products of labour."

Again Marx contrasts commodity relations with a picture of a community carrying on their work with the means of production held in common, in which the labour power of individuals is consciously applied as the combined power of the community. Here the total product is a social product. Labour-time would be apportioned in accordance with a definite social plan tailored to the real needs of the community.

"The social relations of the individual producers, with regard both to their labour and its products, are in this case perfectly simple and intelligible.."

However in a capitalist society resting on alienated labour we find that the mystification of commodity fetishism allows commodities to assume a power of their own and the relationships set up between them to determine production, instead of the needs and wishes of the producers. By depending upon such imaginary concepts, the members of modern "civilised" society are really like the savage and his fetish, controlled by the work of their hands.

The whole revolutionary aim of Marx's thought can be seen in the need to overcome this subordination of man by his own economy.

Engels sums up powerfully at the end of 'Socialism Utopian and Scientific', as follows "The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to and dominating him will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organisation, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by nature and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces which have hitherto governed history pass under the control of man himself .....It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom."

To see how pervasive is the subordination of man by his product we only have to note that not only does the worker suffer insecurity and misery from this but the capitalist also is enslaved. If he misjudges the state of the economy his profit turns into a loss - his investment sacrificed. Of course the capitalist's ulcers cannot be compared to the misery of the proletariat!

Furthermore a second aspect of alienated labour we have not yet touched on crucifies the worker but gives the capitalist a feeling of power and "a semblance of human existence." This is the relationship whereby the product confronts the worker not as a mysterious commodity but as Capital. For, why is the worker dominated in the factory? Because he has no capital and the boss has. But whence does the capitalist derive his everincreasing store of capital? Why, from the surplus value made when he exchanges the product on the market. But who made the product? Only the worker!

What a situation the worker is in then! The more he works, the more he produces, the more surplus value the capitalist makes; and hence the greater his store of capital and with it his dominance over the worker. The worker is creating the very means of his own continued enslavement! The greater the riches he produces, the poorer, relatively at any rate, he becomes.

Marx's characterisation of capitalist society as a system of alienated labour therefore rests on the double dominance of the worker by his product; first in the form of fetishised commodity relations, and second as Capital.

Now we are in a position to ask - 'What of the Soviet Union?' I say straight away that it seems to me incontestable that, however degraded the Soviet worker, however dominated, however unjustly or arbitrarily he is treated, however many irrationalities occur in the economy, however great the social differentiation, the worker is not dominated by his product, by commodities, by Capital. The source of his evils must lie elsewhere; and therefore it would be a great mistake to designate the system as capitalist. The irrationalities and waste in the Soviet economy have quite a different source from those in a capitalist economy. 'hereas in capitalist society the waste and absurdity occur without anyone being held particularly responsible for them, because everything is enveloped in the veil of commodity fetishism; in the Soviet Union, if, e.g., a sudden shortage or surplus of some product occurs everyone knows that 'the bureaucrats have messed it up again.' There is some individual, identifiable in principle, who was too busy lining his own pockets or ensuring his political survival, to perform his role in the planning system efficiently. 'hereas a capitalist economy is dominated by 'relations between things', by the Commodity system; in a 'workers' State, resting as it does on proletarian forms of property, human political decisions are paramount. - Shall we go for heavy industry? Or light? Shall we build cars, or buses? Develop Siberia, or the Ukraine?

Of course the system is not yet socialist. For that, these decisions must be taken by the 'associated producers'. Instead a self-perpetuating clique of bureaucratic gangsters has usurped this function. But it nevertheless represents a fundamental change from capitalism. The incredible progress made by the U.S.S.R. since the war, to become the second power in the world is proof of the superiority of the system, in spite of bureaucratic bungling and the stifling of the initiative of the masses.

Let us remember again the way Marx contrasts the clarity of social relations in Feudalism, with the 'disguised' character of social relations within capitalism which assume the fantastic form of a relation between things.' That is relations between men in capitalist society are mediated and mystified by the commodity system.

Now is it not clear that Soviet Society can be contrasted with capitalist society in exactly the same way? Social relations in Russia are no mystery. Every worker knows who it is that is pushing him about - from the factory manager up to the Presidium. It is precisely because the bureaucracy

cannot cloak its privileges with the mystifications of commodity fetishism that the need for a huge apparatus of repression arises. Given ordinary democratic norms of freedom of discussion, association, etc., and their privileges and power would be swept away in a day - so transparently parasitical are they.

As for the dominance of the worker by capital, how can anyone say that this mechanism is the source of bureaucratic power in the U.S.A.R. You do not join the bureaucracy because you have capital! It is recruited, supplemented and renewed in the manner of any administrative hierarchy, independent of any special property relations of its own. Neither can you inherit a place in the bureaucracy. (For further characterisation of the bureaucracy one can refer to Trotsky's analysis of its dual character in the 'Revolution Betrayed' or elsewhere.)

Finally a brief word on the most likely objection to my thesis, namely that I have made too much of planning. For after all are the capitalists not know planners? So what can be specifically proletarian about it?

Shortly, there is all the difference in the world between socialist planning and so-called planning or 'programming' in capitalism. Capitalist planning essentially consists in the extrapolation of the way the economy is moving so that the individual enterprises can coordinate their activity with it and hence stand less risk of investments going sour. No questions about ends are raised except the very general one of "growth" perhaps - and if that is taken too seriously the plan becomes so much moonshine like Brown's miserable effort.

One grotesque example of the essence of capitalist 'planning' was the Tories' Plan for the South East. This simply consisted of an estimate of the numbers likely to drift to the South East so that some provision for housing development, services, etc., could be made. The 'Plan' does not raise the questions of whether we want these people in the S.E. or whether they want to come, of whether it wouldn't be better to build industry in Scotland. The 'Plan' simply capitulates to the trend, treats it as an objective phenomenon, and tries to adapt behaviour to it.

Even with capitalist "planning" and Gov.t interference in the economy it still remains true that the law of value is the prime determinant of production - as it must be if a commodity system is to work. In a Workers' state, on the contrary, the nationalisation of the economy means that the operation of the law of value becomes subordinate to political decisions. That is, investments will not now flow towards "high profitability areas" but will be consciously determined by real social needs.

A crude illustration may make this clear. Imagine a roulette game. Now imagine that the players have gained some sort of knowledge of the way the ball is running and place their bets accordingly, and hence lose less often. Now imagine that someone comes in and simply picks up the ball and drops it in the hole he wants it in. The analogy is obvious. The first sort of planning still leaves the ball following its own laws with the



players adapting their behaviour to it but with less risk than usual. It is still roulette. The other case is not roulette at all. It is the end of the domination of man by his product.

XXXXXXXXXX

Of course it is still true that calculations of relative efficiency will be made and taken account of in taking decisions. Also, in so far as the economy is orientated towards the world market the law of value cannot be disregarded completely though it need not be the final arbiter. For a fuller discussion of such points in the transitional period, see Germain in Fourth International 18.

### THE WORLD TROTSKYIST PRESS

Reflecting the growing influence of Trotskyist ideas in the world's labour and socialist movement, a number of important steps forward have been made by the world Trotskyist press.

Bandiera Rossa, the organ of the Italian section of the Fourth International is to be published fortnightly in an improved format. This largely reflects the impact of Trotskyism on a growing section of the Italian Communist movement - especially in the trade unions.

World Outlook, a labour press, which carries the statements and declarations of the Fourth International, is now appearing in a litho format. This is an extremely important step forward because it cuts down the weight and enables more material to be carried. Being a weekly and going by airmail to all parts of the world to service various socialist papers, the weight/words equation is of utmost importance. World Outlook has been so popular and successful that French, Italian and Spanish editions are now published.

Details of subscription rates to these journals, and of many other Trotskyist papers can be obtained from Pioneer Book Service, 8, Tynbee St., London E.1.

### SOME PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST

#### Healy reconstructs the Fourth International

Since the Newsletter grimly warned that "peddlers" of this vile publication will be dealt with in an "appropriate manner", it has become a best seller! It contains a selection of the correspondence between Healy and people who attended his recent ill-fated "international" conference. The letters and documents speak for themselves, and is no wonder that leaders of the S.L.L. are so embarrassed by them that they make threats of physical violence against people who sell them. Available 3/- p.p. from Pioneer Book Service.

#### How the S.L.L. defends the Vietnam Revolution

A special issue of World Politics which contains the complete text of the correspondence between Healy and the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, including those parts the Newsletter chose to delete. Available 1/3d post paid.

Despite the silence of the big daily press, the campaign of solidarity for Hugo Blanco and his comrades is developing in Italy and has achieved encouraging results.

In Rome hundreds of signatures were obtained on an appeal demanding that elementary juridical rights be upheld in the case and that the trial conducted by the military tribunal in Tacna be nullified. Some local sections of the Communist party participated in this action as well as members of the PSIUP (Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity) and, of course, the leaders and members of the Italian section of the Fourth International. The appeal with the attached signatures was lodged with the Peruvian embassy in Rome.

A special action was undertaken by the provincial leaders of the Communist Youth and the left-wing Socialist Youth in Piacenza, a town in Emilia. A letter was sent to the Peruvian ambassador demanding the release of Hugo Blanco and his comrades in the name of a large majority of the youth and people of Piacenza. "We deny that the military tribunal, which is a direct expression of the Peruvian regime in the service of imperialism," declared the letter, "has any right to try Comrade Blanco." The Piacenza organizations sent their letter and an appeal for the release of Blanco to all the federations of the Socialist and Communist youth, asking them to join in the campaign.

The Piacenza appeal met with a favorable response in Bari, among other places, and signatures were obtained there among Communist party and youth circles.

In Trieste, a document of protest and solidarity was signed by leaders and members of the PSIUP. The left-wing socialist circle in Follonica (Grosseto) in the center of the country.

In Sicily an appeal was sent to the Peruvian embassy by the provincial federation of the left-wing socialist youth of Ragusa and a campaign is underway thanks to the activities of members of a left-wing cultural circle, "Luigi Pintor". In Palermo various university professors, including Giuseppe Montalbano, Ideale del Carpio, Massimo Mineo and Luciano del Chiara, together with students and trade unionists, including a regional secretary of the CGIL (Italian General Confederation of Labor), signed a letter demanding the immediate release of Hugo Blanco.