

MARXIST YOUTH JOURNAL

VOL 1 NO 2



INTERNATIONAL

MARXIST

GROUP



Victor Serge On Trotsky

(Victor Serge, born in France of Russian revolutionary emigre parents went to Russia after the Revolution, joined the Bolshevik Party, and fought in the civil war. He became an editor of the organ of the Communist International. In 1923 he joined the Left Opposition, was expelled from the party in 1928 and imprisoned until being banished from the USSR in 1936. He gradually drifted away from revolutionary politics, dying penniless in Mexico in the late 1940s. Among his numerous books are *Memoirs of a Revolutionary* and *The Case of Comrade Tulayev*, both recently published here in cheap editions. The piece printed below was first published in France in 1947)

It was to the cause of the workers that Leon Davidovitch devoted his long life of toil, combat, thought, and inflexible resistance to inhumanity. All those who approached him know that he was disinterested and conceived of his whole existence only as part of a great historic task, which was not his alone, but that of the movement of the socialist masses conscious of the perils and possibilities of our period. "These are bitter times," he wrote, "but we have no other country." His character was integral in the full sense of the world: seeing no gap between behaviour and conviction, idea and action; not admitting that higher interests, which give meaning to life, can be sacrificed to what is passing and personal, to banal petty egotism. His moral uprightness was allied to an intelligence that was simultaneously objective and passionate, and always tended toward depth, breadth, creative effort, the fight for the right... And he was a simple man. He happened to note in the margin of a book whose author alluded to his "will to power": it was another man who wanted power for power's sake. I have never felt this sentiment... I sought power over intelligences and wills..." He felt himself to be not so much an authoritarian--though

without failing to recognize the practical utility of authority--as one who spurred men on; drew them after him, not by flattering their base instincts but by summoning them to idealism, to clear reason; to the greatness of being fully men of a new type called on to transform society.

Those who hunted him down and killed him, as they killed the Russian Revolution and martyred the people of the USSR, will meet their punishment. Already they have called down on a Soviet Union weakened by the massacres called the "Stalinist purges" the most disastrous invasion. They continue on their road to the abyss... A few days after his death, I wrote --and I wish to change nothing in these lines: "Throughout his whole heroic life, Leon Davidovitch believed in the future, in the liberation of men. Far from weakening during the last sombre years, his faith matured still further and was rendered firmer by ordeal. Humanity of the future, freed from all oppression, will eliminate from its life all violence. As he did to many others, he taught me this faith."

TROTSKY ON THE UNITED FRONT

(This text is the complete first section of theses drafted by Trotsky for the enlarged plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International which convened at the end of February 1922. This most important programmatic document of revolutionary Marxism has not to our knowledge been previously published on its own. We have drawn it from "The First Five Years Of The Communist International".

Although Trotsky is referring to the task of the young Communist Parties, the united front tactic is employed daily by us in strike committees and students struggles..However, on the British left the tactic has often been applied unconsciously-- notably in the student movement-- or , in the case of some of the revolutionary groups, consciously misapplied. In both cases the dual, dialectical character of the united front is ignored: its purpose is to achieve both the maximum unity of the masses in struggle and the framework for the clearest differentiation between the various tendencies within the leadership.)

1. The task of the Communist Party is to lead the proletarian revolution. In order to the proletariat for the direct conquest of power and achieve it the Communist Party must base itself on the overwhelming majority of the working class.

So long as it does not hold this majority, the party must fight to win it.

The party can achieve this only by remaining an absolutely independent organisation with a clear programme and strict internal discipline. That is the reason why the party was bound to break ideologically with the reformists and the centrists who do not strive for the proletarian revolution, who possess neither the capacity nor the desire to prepare the masses for revolution, and who by their entire conduct thwart this work.

Any members of the Communist Party who bemoan the split with the centrists in the name of "unity of forces" or "unity of front" thereby demonstrate that they do not understand the ABC of Communism and that they themselves happen to be in the Communist Party only by accident.

2. After assuring itself of the complete independence and ideological homogeneity of its ranks, the Communist Party fights for influence over the majority of the working class. This

struggle can be accelerated or retarded depending upon objective circumstances and the expediency of the tactics employed.

But it is perfectly self-evident that the class life of the proletariat is not suspended during this period preparatory to the revolution. Clashes with industrialists, with the bourgeoisie, with the state power, on the initiative of one side or the other, run their due course.

In these clashes - insofar as they involve the vital interests of the entire working class, or its majority, or this or that section - the working masses sense the need of unity in action, or unity in resisting the onslaught of capitalism or unity in taking the offensive against it. Any party which mechanically counterposes itself to this need of the working class for unity in action will unfailingly be condemned in the minds of the workers.

Consequently the question of the united front is not at all, either in point of origin or substance, a question of the reciprocal relations between the Communist parliamentary fraction and that of the Socialists, or between that of the Central Committee of the two parties, or between l'Humanite and Le Populaire*. The problem of

*French Socialist Party's central publication.

the united front - despite the fact that a split is inevitable in this epoch between the various political organisations basing themselves on the working class - grows out of the urgent need to secure for the working class the possibility of a united front in the struggle against capitalism.

For those who do not understand this task, the party is only a propaganda society and not an organisation for mass action.

3. In cases where the Communist Party still remains an organisation of a numerically insignificant minority, the question of its conduct on the mass-struggle front does not assume a decisive practical and organisational significance. In such conditions, mass actions remain under the leadership of the old organisations which by reason of their still powerful traditions continue to play the decisive role.

Similarly the problem of the united front does not arise in countries where - as in Bulgaria, for example - the Communist Party is the sole leading organisation of the toiling masses.

But wherever the Communist Party already constitutes a big, organised, political force, but not the decisive magnitude; wherever the party embraces organisationally, let us say, one-fourth, one-third, or even a larger proportion of the organised proletarian vanguard, it is confronted with the question of the united front in all its acuteness.

If the party embraces one-third or one-half of the proletarian vanguard, then the remaining half or two-thirds are organised by the reformists or centrists. It is perfectly obvious, however, that even those workers who still support the reformists and centrists are vitally interested in maintaining the highest material standards of living and the greatest possible freedom for struggle. We must consequently so devise our tactic as to prevent the Communist Party, which will on the morrow embrace the entire three-thirds of the working class, from turning into - and all the more so, from actually being - an organisational obstacle in the way of the

current struggle of the proletariat.

Still more, the party must assume the initiative in securing unity in these current struggles. Only in this way will the party draw closer to the two-thirds who do not as yet follow its leadership, who do not as yet trust the party because they do not understand it. Only in this way can the party win them over.

4. If the Communist Party had not broken drastically and irrevocably with the Social Democrats, it would not have become the party of the proletarian revolution. It could not have taken the first serious steps on the road to revolution. It would have for ever remained a parliamentary safety valve attached to the bourgeois state.

Whoever does not understand this, does not know the first letter of the ABC of Communism.

If the Communist Party did not seek for organisational avenues to the end that at every given moment joint, coordinated action between the Communist and the non-Communist (including the Social-Democratic) working masses were made possible, it would have thereby laid bare its own incapacity to win over - on the basis of mass action - the majority of the working class. It would degenerate into a Communist propaganda society but never develop into a party for the conquest of power.

It is not enough to possess the sword, one must give it an edge; it is not enough to give the sword an edge, one must know how to wield it.

After separating the Communists from the reformists it is not enough to fuse the Communists together by means of organisational discipline; it is necessary that this organisation should learn how to guide all the collective activities of the proletariat in all spheres of its living struggle.

This is the second letter of the alphabet of Communism.

5. Does the united front extend only to the working masses or does it also include the opportunist leaders?

The very posing of this question is a product of misunderstanding.

If we were able simply to unite the working masses around our own banner or around our practical immediate slogans, and skip over reformist organisations, whether party or trade union, that would of course be the best thing in the world. But then the very question of the united front does not exist in its present form.

The question arises from this, that certain very important sections of the working class belong to reformist organisations or support them. Their present experience is still insufficient to enable them to break with the reformist organisations and join us. It may be precisely after engaging in those mass activities, which are on the order of the day, that a major change will take place in this connection. That is just what we are striving for. But that is not how matters stand at present. Today the organised portion of the working class is broken up into three formations.

One of them, the Communist, strives toward the social revolution and precisely because of this supports concurrently every movement, however partial, of the toilers against the exploiters and against the bourgeois state.

Another grouping, the reformist, strives toward conciliation with the bourgeoisie. But in order not to lose their influence over the workers reformists are compelled, against the innermost desires of their own leaders, to support the partial movements of the exploited against the exploiters.

Finally, there is a third grouping, the centrist, which constantly vacillates between the other two, and which has no independent significance.

The circumstances thus make wholly possible joint action on a whole number of vital issues between the workers united in these three respective organisations and the unorganised masses adhering to them.

The Communists, as has been said, must not oppose such actions but on the contrary must also assume the initiative for them, precisely for the reason that the greater is the mass drawn into the movement, the higher its self-confidence

risers, all the more self-confident will that mass movement be and all the more resolutely will it be capable of marching forward, however modest may be the initial slogans of struggle. And this means that the growth of the mass aspects of the movement tends to radicalize it, and creates much more favorable conditions for the slogans, methods of struggle, and, in general, the leading role of the Communist Party.

The reformists dread the revolutionary potential of the mass movement; their beloved arena is the parliamentary tribune, the trade-union bureaus, the arbitration boards, the ministerial anti-chambers.

On the contrary, we are, apart from all other considerations, interested in dragging the reformists from their asylums and placing them alongside ourselves before the eyes of the struggling masses. With a correct tactic we stand only to gain from this. A Communist who doubts or fears this resembles a swimmer who has approved the theses on the best method of swimming but dares not plunge into the water.

6. Unity of front consequently presupposes our readiness, within certain limits and on specific issues, to correlate in practice our actions with those of reformist organizations, to the extent to which the latter still express today the will of important sections of the embattled proletariat.

But, after all, didn't we split with them? Yes, because we disagree with them on fundamental questions of the working-class movement. And yet we seek agreement with them? Yes, in all those cases where the masses that follow them are ready to engage in joint struggle together with the masses that follow us and when they, the reformists, are to a lesser or greater degree compelled to become an instrument of this struggle.

But won't they say that after splitting with them we still need them? Yes, their blabbermouths may say this. Here and there somebody in our ranks may take fright at it. But as regards

the broad working masses—even those who do not follow us and who do not as yet understand our goals but who do see two or three labor organizations leading a parallel existence—these masses will draw from our conduct this conclusion, that despite the split we are doing everything in our power to facilitate unity in action for the masses.

7. A policy aimed to secure the united front does not of course contain automatic guarantees that unity in action will actually be attained in all instances. On the contrary, in many cases and perhaps even the majority of cases, organizational agreements will be only half-attained or perhaps not at all. But it is necessary that the struggling masses should always be given the opportunity of convincing themselves that the non-achievement of unity in action was to struggle on the part of the reformists.

In entering into agreements with other organizations, we naturally obligate ourselves to a certain discipline in action. But this discipline cannot be absolute in character. In the event that the reformists begin putting brakes on the struggle to the obvious detriment of the movement and act counter to the situation and the moods of the masses, we as an independent organization always reserve the right to lead the struggle to the end, and this without our temporary semi-allies.

This may give rise to a new sharpening of the struggle between us and the reformists. But it will no longer involve a simple repetition of one and the same set of ideas within a shut-in circle but will signify—provided our tactic is correct—the extension of our influence over new, fresh groups of the proletariat.

8. It is possible to see in this policy a rapprochement with the reformists only from the standpoint of a journalist who believes that he rids himself of reformism by ritualistically criticizing it without ever leaving his editorial office but who

is fearful of clashing with the reformists before the eyes of the working masses and giving the latter an opportunity to appraise the Communist and the reformist on the equal plane of the mass struggle. Behind this seeming revolutionary fear of "rapprochement" there really lurks a political passivity which seeks to perpetuate an order of things wherein the Communists and reformists each retain their own rigidly demarcated spheres of influence, their own audiences at meetings, their own press, and all this together creates an illusion of serious political struggle.

9. We broke with the reformists and centrists in order to obtain complete freedom in criticizing perfidy, betrayal, indecision and the half-way spirit in the labor movement. For this reason any sort of organizational agreement which restricts our freedom of criticism and agitation is absolutely unacceptable to us. We participate in a united front but do not for a single moment become dissolved in it. We function in the united front as an independent detachment. It is precisely in the course of struggle that broad masses must learn from experience that we fight better than the others, that we see more clearly than the others, that we are more audacious and resolute. In this way, we shall bring closer the hour of the united revolutionary front under the undisputed Communist leadership.

Introduction

The introduction of higher education into the industrial complex of neo-capitalism has been achieved in one of two ways. These alternatives are best exemplified in the cases of England and Italy. In the latter country, the necessary output of graduates has been achieved through a policy of open entry; all who are qualified may enrol. This results in a high proportion of every age-group experiencing the frustrations of a university system which is ostensibly open to all, but equipped only to serve a few. Hopeless overcrowding, inadequate facilities and a high drop-out rate reduce the number of graduates as a proportion of the number of entrants. In the English case, the opposite is true. A high proportion of those who enter finally graduate, they enjoy more adequate facilities etc., but of their age-group, even of their ability range, they are a small percentage. As well as contrasting badly with notions of "equality of opportunity", this latter option simply institutionalises "drop-out" situations at lower levels. In order to preserve the purity of the elitist university system it is necessary to provide a number of alternative or parallel structures, which serve to encapsulate within the educational sector the wider social divisions of class and status.

Both university and non-university sectors are expected to expand rapidly in the next few years, but it has become evident that it is the non-university sector which is to take the highest growth rate.⁽¹⁾ It is the lower half of the binary system which expresses the true situation of education under neo-capitalism in a sense, insulating the universities from pressures of numbers, declining standards, poor facilities, cultural sterility, etc. etc. The British student movement must therefore understand binarism if it is to understand its own potentialities.

The Binary System

The various sectors of the binary system are located in the structure of capitalism in different ways, so that the generalised contradictions within education manifest themselves differently in the respective institutions. The diversity of institutional forms which comprise the present binary system reflects the functional adaptation of education to the changing demands of developing capitalism, for new skills, new ideological legitimations, etc., their changing relationship to the state and the relative autonomy of education institutions/ideologies once established. Specifically, the determinants of localised contradictions are:-

a) System of Authority

Ultimately, this is a question of the relationship of the institution to bourgeois state power; however, it is the precise mediations which are more important. The mystificatory role of the University Grants Committee in relation to the university sector is the obvious example. The U.G.C. does, however, express a historical reality that the universities have been unplanned⁽²⁾ and are thus today less subject to the vicissitudes of public spending and state planning than are the new non-university sectors. These are firmly under Government or local authority control. The immediate reality of State or political control by no means clarifies the situation of students in the new colleges. At present the situation is one of considerable division of authority. If we take for instance a Denominational Teachers Training College, the situation is complex. Financial control is exercised by the Local Authority, cultural control by the denominational hierarchy and academic control by some distant university or examination board. Within the college itself, the students' union and administration may serve as delegates of outside authority in a real sense, and yet in times of crisis may appear as phoney targets, though tempting ones, for attack by students. Thus

not only does the student teacher find himself enmeshed in three authoritarian bureaucracies, but in the course of the struggle he must anticipate their different reactions. Any satisfactory analysis of the binary system must seek, at least in terms of the major divisions in higher education - Universities, Polytechnics, Colleges of Education, etc. - to point out the enemy. At the lower end of the system this is increasingly local business interests, which exercise considerable influence over the education given to day release apprentices, with regard to conditions (terms, teaching times, etc) and occasionally with regard to content.

b) Relationship to the Market and Class Structure

The various levels of the binary system "fit in" to the market and class structure at different levels, and thus the potentialities and direction of struggle must differ. To locate an institution within the structure of the market and social classes, we need to consider the "job relevance" of the training, its ideological relevance, the social destinies of those who pass through it, the social class from which they come. Nicolaus (3) in his analysis of the San Francisco State College strike, shows the importance of orientating demands in the light of a clear understanding of the location of the college in the American binary system, in relation to local attitudes to racism and the local labour movement. Precisely because higher education is fragmented, we have the opportunity to exploit "different channels" and thus make "a political jump". Of full-time post-A level students at Polytechnics a considerable proportion is recruited from a working class background, and of course this proportion increases significantly at lower levels of study, and when part-time and day release students are considered. It has also been found that such students retain a strong contract with their social class background. As would be expected, their political views mirror those of their class: corporatism, anti-intellectualism and conservatism are the chief traits. At present the educational situation does nothing to challenge this;

on the contrary, the cultural sterility, utilitarian values and "vocational" orientation strengthen the conservative strain in British politics. The political pay-off of Red Techs could be very significant, however, precisely because the tech. is not insulated from the reality of class and market.

c) Institutional Autonomy

We must understand the "integral culture" of educational institutions, and the importance of liberal academism as the prevailing ideology of the system as a whole. Though this has been to a large extent determined by the previous two factors, it cannot be reduced to them, for it is essence a particular historical mode of adaption to general determinants. The universities are insulated both from the state and the market; they are also insulated from the dominant cultural values of bourgeois society, which express themselves in most vulgar forms within Techs. Here the values are vocational as well as the subjects; pragmatism, social mobility, etc. are tempered by liberal studies, a pallid reflection of the more sophisticated articulations of bourgeois values within the liberal universities. Yet at the same time the predominance of the elite university at the top of the structure, and its related values of "academicism" and "liberalism" exercise a fatal fascination over the lower levels. Hence the polytechnics offer "a unique opportunity to synthesis liberal and vocational education" to combine "practicality" with maintenance of "academic standards" etc. Thus despite the imperatives of the market and the intentions of the Government, the top end of the binary system has inevitably tended to ape the universities, a tendency which exposes the ideological functions of the "equal but different" "comprehensive" argument. Within colleges it is evident that ideological and cultural factors are important elements in any strategic calculations. Staff and student pressure groups, levels of consciousness, studnet unions, must all be taken into account.

Strategy

a) The Red Base

It follows that the red base should not be seen as the strategic goal in every sector of higher education. The object of the red base is the distinction of the bourgeois university and thus also of the role of the bourgeois university student. As a strategy it is premised upon the peculiarities of universities in their relation to the market and the State. The same conditions do not apply in all colleges and tech.s throughout the country. Universities, the State and the market are insulated from each other to a considerable extent. From this derives the potentiality of an isolated student movement to challenge power inside the university without at the same time contesting the whole fabric of bourgeois society. This also explains the ambivalence of such concepts as "academic freedom", "free speech" etc. In that they express the mediated integration of the university with bourgeois society and are thus liberal, yet they can be used to protect the revolutionary movement from the State, and are thus revolutionary. But it is important to realise that this insulation can also contribute to the isolation and containment of the student movement by the ruling class.

b) Extra-mural Studies

In other sectors the Red Base strategy may not be correct for the reason that the conditions upon which it is premised do not exist. Student teachers, technologists, day release apprentices, do not experience their situations in the same way as do university students; often they do not identify themselves as students at all. In general, their college environments are culturally and theoretically sterile, they have different experiences of authority within it, and their market chances are relatively circumscribed. Thus their primary problems, the problems to which such students seek a solution, are outside the college, i.e. their roles are produced in the work place, or in anticipation of future work situations. Hence the importance of

"vocational" education - its referent lies outside the educational system. It follows that if we are to intervene meaningfully in the areas of binary education, we must develop theory orientated to the particular struggle and problems faced by these youth, as they experience them themselves, not as we experience them through the imposition of "the twofold abstraction of Revolutionary Student and Revolutionary Worker" (4).

Students and Workers

That binary education "captures class divisions in its most privileged sector" does not mean that student-worker links can be made by virtue of a common involvement in the process of education. That the physical proximity of workers and students within the same institution will produce a political proximity, is an inadequate conception.

To overcome the divisions both among students and the revolutionary movement as a whole, we must develop the theory and practice which transcends the divisions of capitalist oppression. In terms of perspectives for RSSF, what this means is the creation of dual power within the universities, challenging the functioning of the university and the role of the bourgeois university student. The creation of Red Bases is the participation of students in the class struggle and therefore is objectively linked to the revolutionary proletariat. This remains the most important single task for the student movement. The process of continuous contestation within the university system, because of the very importance and predominance of the university within the binary system will have an effect in changing the climate of politics within the lower levels. As organs of containment, NUS, etc. move to the left to head off revolt within the universities, they precipitate ideological re-evaluation in the predominantly conservative colleges. It is too soon to estimate the importance of these recent developments.

RSSF

The important but very strategic role that is here assigned to RSSF should not obscure the importance of non-university struggles, or the inability of RSSF to relate to them given its present organisation and theory. It is here that the lack of a wider youth movement in British politics becomes apparent. Such a movement should be able to incorporate cadres from various sectors, but who are not theoretically deprived; by virtue of this sectoralism, this neglected field presents an important challenge to the British revolutionary left.

(1) Between 1961-8 university places expanded by 48%; in the same period, full-time, post-A level places in higher education, excluding colleges of education, expanded by 164%.

(2) Robins Report.

(3) M. Nicolaus: "Blacks: Students: Workers", N.L.R. 54.

(4) New Society: "Who are the Polytechnic Students", 29.10.69 - 46% of engineering students in the survey were educated at Secondary Modern or Comprehensive schools.

(5) Brewster et al. "Red Base Strategy and Struggle Amongst Youth", RSSF.

Read regularly VIETNAM

the monthly Journal of
the Vietnam Solidarity
Committee (VSC)

to find out what's
happening in Vietnam and
the World wide anti-Vietnam
War movement.

Correspondence to John Suddaby
Room 1, 13 White's Row
London, E.I.

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

Weekly revolutionary marxist
international news service

Subscribe through Pioneer Book
Service
2/- per issue

PUBLICATIONS YOU SHOULDN'T MISS

Read and subscribe to
INTERNATIONAL - a survey
of British and World Affairs
Price 1/6 per issue - monthly
10/- for six months
£ 1 - a year

To IMG publications
8 Toynbee St. London, E.I.

A new pamphlet by

ERNEST MANDEL

"The Inconsistencies
of 'State
Capitalism'"

4/6, p.p. from IMG
Publications.

Other pamphlets by Ernest
Mandel...

THE REVOLUTIONARY STUDENT
MOVEMENT - THEORY AND PRACTISE

** 5/6

AN INTRODUCTION TO MARXIST
ECONOMIC THEORY

** 8/6

Order from Pioneer Book
Service 8 Toynbee St
London E.I. Tel. 247-9845

The following report is translated from a supplement of "Rouge" the paper of the Ligue Communiste - the French section of the Fourth International, to give readers the experiences of French revolutionary youth

Understand the actual situation

The ruling ideology is the ideology of the ruling class. In a general sense it rules this ruling class: thus the bourgeoisie also thought that in the developed capitalist countries a revolution was impossible. If there was a danger it saw it rather coming from part of the communist Party. The traditional police retained its past analysis. In spite of that, May and June 1968 have shown us that a repressive arsenal the bourgeoisie has at its disposal. It is better to prevent than to cure. The revolutionary uprising of May 68 revealed two facts to the bourgeoisie:

1) The socialist revolution is an actual danger, contrary to what all its theoreticians have told us recently, and which finally they believed themselves.

2) The danger comes mostly from groups to the left of the CP (more so since they have international relations)

What has to be considered is the fact, that in the future much more considerable means will be used to avoid the repetition of May/June 1968. Certainly the actual relationship of forces does not allow regression on a large scale. We don't see anything spectacular. But we can be absolutely certain that the police do not spare any effort whatsoever to accumulate the maximum amount of information, an indispensable condition to ensure efficient repression tomorrow.

Evidently the police operate on a field which is difficult for us to understand: The difference between a Maoist and a Trotskyist appear to them as subtle as the ones between different Buddhist sects. They view them as "red bastards" "Viets" or "Jews" (cop with colonial past, lower grade) or anarchists (Paris cop). Moreover police personell are often of mediocre culture and

Intelligence, incapable of understanding the political logic of organisations (although they have specialists to study these problems). These gentlemen operate on the basis of raw material evidence. The results are evidently very weak and this weakness if multiplied by a 100 when ex-revolutionaries collaborate with them. Unfortunately the police realise this...

You should not underestimate the police

Because the police seemed particularly disarmed in the field of culture (see complete works of M. Marcellin, Minister of the Interior), a dangerous tendency develops, mainly in the intellectual milieu, to despise the police because they are stupid. Amen. But in the service of this relative stupidity there is an extraordinary apparatus reeling thousands of counter revolutionary militants, who work perhaps without imagination, but methodically without petty-bourgeois deviations and who accumulate over a period mountains of information. Certainly each policeman taken individually has very little significance, but their total sum has a stable value for these gentlemen.

A comment

Here is not the place to develop the juridical aspect of this type of police activity. It always violates its own legality (if not this article would be purposeless). Thus all the remarks of the kind, "they have not the right to listen in on phone calls, to read letters" etc., have no practical implication whatsoever. The same goes for what constitutes juridical proof. Neither the truth nor what the militants think the cops should think counts. What counts is what the cops believe. (For example these gentlemen of the police think that it might be an accident if someone is picked up once in a demonstration but if it is twice it is certain that he is dealing with a leftist.

Certainly, one can use a second time the irregularities of police investigations and explain that one has to deal with class justice: The constitution for instance guarantees postal secrecy and this serves the capitalists for their bank, commercial and industrial secrets and probably even to smother their personal scandals, but in relation to the revolutionary militants the "law" is evidently interpreted otherwise. The same is true for conditions of arrest house searchings etc.

2. Some police procedures

To accumulate data, the police utilise our own weaknesses because technical information spreads quickly - although this is not so true for political information.

Advice: Don't speak even about organisational questions even inside the organisation which don't directly concern the comrades.

Theorem: The less one knows, the less one can tell and the better it is for everybody. This is not abstract. Each time the "one" has a name. Even if it is someone with whom you have a very close relationship with.

To collect information the cops use a) spies: of two kinds; one consists of young police inspectors who change their uniform and moustache for a pull over and long hair and go into the coffee houses of the Latin Quarter and inside demonstrations where if the occasion arises they can play the role of provocateurs.

Advice: Don't give details about your life, no matter where, and only obey instructions coming from responsible comrades.

On the other hand they try to infiltrate some of their functionaries into the revolutionary organisations themselves. (that's generally easier to do with the anarchists than with us.) For new comrades this is not to create an atmosphere of "cooptation" but to

but to understand that in the last analysis the guarantee is a political one. It is very difficult for a cop, especially if he is young to behave as a revolutionary militant.

Advice: All new members should be observed by one or two members of the cell or group who go to visit the comrade at his home, when he leaves his place of work and who follow his political behavior (theoretical education, lectures, political activity trade union activity) By this we are not trying to transform ourselves into counter police, we cannot beat the police at something they are expert at, but to use our political "superiority" which allows us to understand the logic of the behavior of a militant (This being so, one can be perfectly nuts without being a cop - though for a revolutionary organisation the first isn't much better than the latter.)

The most dangerous spy however, is one who is recruited by the police while already a member of the organisation and if possible a member with responsibilities. It is of course never a question of comrades who can be taken by the attractions of bourgeois ideology and very exceptionally of comrades who are corrupted (money or a place to live) but almost always of comrades who are blackmailed. It can vary (morals, alcoholism, petty criminal offenses, "innocent" information given stupidly in the hope of getting off the hook cheaply, confidence in dad and mom etc)

Advice: The political and private life of militants should not give the police openings on this score. If some blunder is made it should be told to the responsible official of the organisation. (better to pass as a nut than risk becoming a pig) The same holds everytime the gentlemen of the police come around asking for someone.

b) Listening in on phone calls. First a myth should be shattered. If your phone is tapped you have no way whatsoever of knowing it. (neither the safety catch nor "small sounds" no frequent break ups of calls due to the scandalous inefficiency

the French telephone system, nor the regularity of the sound of the speakers (both sides.)

With the exception of crisis and important personalities the police don't use the means to listen in directly (lack of qualified personell etc). They use on tape the phone number called in the conversation. Miles of tapes can be stored in the archives. The interest is obvious. For one reason or another the gentlemen of the police are interested in the private life of a militant who has a telephone. In two days work a score police officers can build up the profile of his comrades, friends, the friends of his friends, his political responsibilities and his favourite meeting places without forgetting the habitual alternative names he is called.

Advice: It is evident all conversations should be as natural as possible (for example to avoid confusion one must use the first name of the person whom one calls) The principle is very simple. To all honest citizens we can repeat without getting a red face everything we have said on the phone - in case they don't already know it.

Comment: It is not true that it is always useless to call from one phone to another under the assumption that they are being tapped. (it is their logic and not ours) More important, two phones can be used independently and we have no reason whatsoever to give one more connection to the gentlemen allowing them to complete their list.

Opening letters: At the present time it seems less grave here than in the other democracies. But it can always be used.

Warning: Spoken words (if they are not written over phones can pass - written words stay down,

House searchings: At present they seem to be in vogue. You are not only responsible for yourself and your own things. You are also responsible for

your organisation.

Down with petty-bourgeois individualism which has nothing to do with courage.

Get rid of the collectors mania.

Never collect names and addresses of your comrades at home or in your pockets. Take care other comrades do the same.

e) Miscellaneous: In detective stories you hear of micro gadgets in cleverly selected points meeting places and of tailing individuals. In certain exceptional cases the police use these effectively. A comment about tailing. It is easy to tail a near relative and a girl or boy friend to the person the police are interested in. The police know it. So do we...now.

Conclusion: To accumulate information the police can only use what we give them. We have no reason at all to help them. In the final analysis the struggle against police penetration means raising the political level of militants rather than by "coptomania".

3. Repression

Repression can show itself in various forms from those which we know to those which have been experienced by our Greek Argentine or Spanish comrades. Don't forget that the period of repression can be modified very quickly. We live in a revolutionary epoch and from the moment the bourgeoisie feels its social order in danger it doesn't hesitate to trample on its legality (Coup d'Etat). We should not be taken by surprise.

If the repression cannot destroy the revolutionary groups, it paralyses them in a certain way. This is in any case inevitable, and those who want to go on working as though there were no repression (because it is easier, quicker etc) risk in a short time not to be able to work at all. The whole question is to know what kind of limitation and rules we accept consciously (small and less frequent conferences, limitations of internal organisational democracy, renouncing certain forms of

public activity etc.) It is impossible to explain this without giving concrete situations.

Let us say some words on how to behave when you are arrested. Here again much depends on the conditions of the arrest of what is apparent and what is not. Don't mix what is in your head with what is in the heads of that marvellous intellectual collective called the police. In all these cases let their brains function.

Comment: It is easier to think before than afterwards, i.e. it is better to avoid improvising inside a police station.

1) There are certain rules concerning arrests and house searchings. They are forbidden between sunset and sunrise and cannot be done without a warrant. Under certain conditions these guarantees are tossed aside by the police. Don't have any illusions about the protection the law gives you at this level. The cops are no bourgeois lawyers. They understand in their way that the law codifies a certain relationship of forces. This does not mean that we cannot exploit violations which they make of the law, which they are supposed to defend.

2) In relation to arrests in the street it is usually not a juridical error. If you happen to be picked up in the area of a "left" demonstration or you are picked up lighting a cigarette, or meditating at a corner only a 100 meters away where some "leftists" are sticking posters on a wall it is useless in such cases to go to the police station. If your innocence is apparent you should protest energetically in front of the policeman.

3) In the police station: The essential thing without any exception is Don't lie and don't co-operate.

Sure this is well known to all militants, but it is rarely seriously applied.

Let us give an example. Imagine a country where democratic guarantees were strongly restricted. Let us further imagine that leaflet distribution was

illegal. You are arrested while distributing leaflets.

You give your name, address, profession age and place of birth. After that STOP.

Understand why and how necessary this is. To deny that you distributed the leaflets is obviously absurd. You don't convince the cops who arrested you with your hand in your pocket. You could not hold this position for long and after a certain time you would "open up". The cops would have won a point. Furthermore to claim that "there has been a legal error". "I am here for nothing" "I am not involved in politics" etc would mean that you would quickly lose your own self confidence - you become obliging to feel at ease and begin to cooperate (or seem to cooperate) with the police. This point should not be neglected with the excuse that it is psychological. It is impossible to keep your self respect, especially when they hold you for a long time (and you don't know when it will end, and it is useless to ask the cops since they don't usually know and this is proof of weakness). An attitude which is not insolent, but courageous is needed to avoid a lot of trouble. Finally an attitude of cooperation precludes political support from the outside.

To admit you distributed leaflets and to talk doesn't bring you a step forward. "Who gave you the pamphlets?" Don't give the impression that you want to answer but you can't remember the name and invent some story about a tall brown fellow you met by chance at the station. This is a type of lying and cooperation. Simply say that these leaflets were given to you by a friend and that you distribute them because you agree with it. That it is a perfectly normal (or legal according to the situation) thing to do. You state that you were given a completely normal (or legal) job and that the police are looking for fleas on your head. Don't give any information to the police that could lead to the arrest of your friends:

reason, especially in the present conditions, is not part of your life, c.

Let's take another example about the danger of that dialectic "co-operation - lying". These gentlemen show you a series of photos to identify. You accept, to show your good will, at you decide, of course, to lie. A clever cop, when he understands what you intend to do will show you some photos. You don't know the people; happily, you say so. They were photos of police in plain clothes. Its perhaps "natural" that you know them but you still say: "No!" The next photo shows you in discussion with the fellow you've just denied knowing. You are cornered". The cops have gained a point - you are a liar. The most correct thing to do from the beginning is to refuse to play this little game, even if they show you a photo of your mother! Neither yes nor no; you don't co-operate (see previous explanation).

In principle, your "general philosophy" is the following one: on the "penal" level it is useless to take on responsibilities you don't have; you say, for example, completely ignore the contents of a parcel found in your flat or on you. But when the police tell you what it contains, you know.

On the political level, you should bear your responsibilities. In general, you stay polite (there is nothing to be gained from getting involved in an argument)...and shut up.

To lie in front of cops who are professionals in this field is extremely difficult. Practically (for defence) this is of no help whatsoever. Politically and psychologically, the results are almost always negative.

Conclusion: In the hands of the police, and having established your identity, you add: "I have nothing to say." You do not sign anything. It is necessary to understand why: for a variety of reasons (some practical and some to do with the attitude of the police) it is almost impossible to get down what one has said exactly; and a bad state-

ment can be used against you. It may be possible to a very short statement which you have vetted.

You must insist, without lying, because it is true, that you haven't done anything wrong. If the police think otherwise that's their affair; they should charge you, then. And only after having seen your lawyer, do you agree to answer the charge in front of a magistrate. Refuse to answer in a police interrogation.

After having been in custody where you have practically no rights whatsoever, but where on the other hand you may in all legality say practically nothing, there are two possibilities:

a) You are released, and that's - for the time being the end of your troubles;
b) you are charged. You then have the right to avail yourself of a lawyer. You demand that immediately! You should know the name and addresses of lawyers.

If you are released on bail, which you should demand, the question of fleeing from "justice" or using your freedom to suppress facts is for us, as revolutionary militants, a political one.

Conclusion: If you are in the hands of the police, the essential thing is not to know this or that trick, but to act in such a way that your comrades outside can support you. What matters is not the relationship of forces you can create between yourselves and the cops, but the relationship of forces generally.

DON'T LIE!

DON'T CO-OPERATE!

Section A

Bourgeois and Proletarian Economics

1. The bourgeois critique of rent and the emergence of socialist economics.

It was not until about 1850 that the British industrial bourgeoisie had completed the assault against the landowning class. From the late 18th century onwards bourgeois economics reflected and continued this struggle. The bourgeoisie needed a theory which justified its place in the world and undermined that of the landowners. They had to contend with the fact that the world was very different from feudal times. To explain the dynamic of the system and to explain it critically, as a weapon against the landowners, they focused on the origin and nature of value and price. Ricardo developed the theory of value as far as it could be taken within the limits of a belief in an ongoing bourgeois society: all labour was productive of value; what was parasitical was rent, the passive drawing off of value through property rights. Ricardo did not expose the difference between the activities of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and although other economists such as Sismondi quarrelled with the ideas of Ricardo, it was left to Marx to show the bourgeoisie to be also an exploiting, parasitical class. He did so through his crucial analysis of surplus value and exploitation.

11. The zenith of bourgeois economics.

Once it had fulfilled its role as a critical weapon, bourgeois economics became largely apologetic. From the mid 19th century it developed as a very academic study and one concerned with low level disquisitions into the formation of price on the micro level. The bourgeoisie no longer needed a theory antagonistic to the landowners, but protection against the rising strength of the proletariat. Ricardo's work marked the zenith of bourgeois

economics as a science. Thenceforth it became an ideology ever more estranged from social reality, and engaged with rebuffing attacks from the Marxist movement. Under the guise of being "value-free" it avoided mentioning the exploitation of labour and tried to justify profit as a "reward" (for investing and not spending the money immediately); as if the capitalist had somehow made a sacrifice by investing his money! An economic model was constructed in which not only labour but machines were said to create value. (See section B, para.V)

111. World War 1, the slump and the economics of intervention.

The state became progressively more than a mere committee of the bourgeoisie. Previously, the tendency of the state to bureaucratically inflate itself was resisted and the achievement of a balanced budget was regarded as ideal governmental behaviour. Economically, the government was to be regarded as another unit in the economy like a firm and not as a determining factor. It wasn't necessary for it to intervene decisively according to the state of the trade cycle. It could let things ride confident that nothing could harm the interests of the big bourgeoisie. Economic theory only changed with the changing needs of the bourgeoisie. The old remedies of Pigou and the laissez-faire classical economists could not survive the Great Slump. In the USA the old policies of retrenchment as practised by Hoover before the New Deal proved useless, since they served only to exacerbate the situation. Money had to be pumped into the economy to buoy up profits, and reduction in wages and prices brought about by deflationary measures had little effect by themselves. It was Keynes, who fought the battle with the old economics and his ideas about governmental intervention, which were to provide the theoretical background for the development of bourgeois economics in the next period.

IV. Bourgeois economics today.

Bourgeois economics has become nothing more than an empirical tool. It can less and less be distinguished from the day to day needs of the administrators of bourgeois society. The concerns of the academic economist are the problems of the ruling class: how to maintain the rate of profit. The problems appear in many guises, as problems of restricting wages, of combating the disorganizing effects of inflation, which has such a baneful influence over the capitalist's attempts to organize world trade (balance of payments and currency problems).

V. Myths and fallacies of bourgeois economics.

Many economists believe their own lies. Economics we are told is a positive science. It is value free. The government, acting on the wishes of the people (which in any case is another subject called politics) makes the choices of value. Economists simply project these choices into the future and forecast the likely result of different courses of action. Lost is the possibility that there just might be a little more to a science than the needs of government. Enquiry into the wider implications of what economists are doing, of what function in society they are playing is efficiently castrated by forbidding hands at every corner, banning further progress because it would transgress into the realms of politics or sociology, which are different and highly compartmentalized subjects. To be a good economist is to assure oneself of lucrative seats on government commissions. It was an academic economist, who played the role of "negotiator" in the Talbot steel strike.

VI. The development of Marx's Economics

The proletariat has accumulated

a store of information on the workings of transitional economies, on the problems of pricing and investment. The degeneration of the World Communist movement has seen a corresponding theoretical decline. Marxism only lives at the point of critical action. His analyses have been dogmatized at the hands of the bureaucracies. An inevitabilist mechanical Marxism has under the influence of the bureaucracy taken the place of dialectical thought. The bureaucracies can no longer capture and reproduce in theory the postwar manoeuvres of capital. It is sheltered from awareness of the cycles of capitalism and the attendant possibilities of revolutionary action by its own preconceived sectarian requirements. Marxism is the living theory of those engaged in active struggle. To attempt to use it in isolation from the struggle of the vanguard sections of the class is to distort history and provide a rationalization of one's own inactivity and not a theory.

VII. The bourgeoisie in Britain and Marxism

The British section, most cunning of all the bourgeoisies, ignored Marxism until the 1930s. The need for macro terms prompted Keynes to talk of Marx's ideas of cycles and periodic slumps. The capitalists to survive had to become a little more aware of the nature of their system. Very few economics faculties take Marx seriously, however. At Essex in a three year course just half an hour was devoted to Comrade Marx. It was a special course called Economic History to provide background information on how the science reached its present pinnacle.

Marxism is cut into many bits by educational institutions with full use being made of the distortions of theory occasioned by the activities of the bureaucracies. The economic predictions are taken as a reified lump, falsified and then used very often as evidence against Marx. Absolute immiseration is not something, which Marx

ever predicted for the working class but which his bourgeois interpreters take great delight in erecting as an Aunt Sally to take pot shots at for the greater vilification of Marx. The absence of a strong living movement imbued with a Marxist tradition allows academics to commit any number of atrocities with impunity. Marx's sociology is hung up in the air as if it were an idealism and his ideas given equal values with so many later sociologists, disguising the revolutionary nature of his thought. His students are often introduced to Marxism the better to be inoculated against it. Even the most well-intentioned teacher of Marxism will inevitably convey a somewhat undialectical understanding if he does not root the thought of Marx in the ongoing struggle and in the economic development of Capital. (1)

II The concepts of Marxian Economics a. Surplus Labour and Surplus Value

Crucial to Marxism is the idea of surplus, surplus labour and surplus value. The worker works for his master for say 8 hours a day producing products that can be sold at a certain price. He is paid by his master for his labour that day but in every case will be paid at less than the value of the products, which he produced in that day. At least if the master does not conduct his business on this basis he will very soon go bankrupt. The rest of the workers' products represent a surplus; an amount of money when sold, which is appropriated by the capitalist and which we call, surplus value.

Necessary Wage

The amount of cash that the worker receives is determined by the minimum he needs to keep himself alive and to reproduce himself. This minimum is a socially determined minimum, however. It can fluctuate within certain limits, according to the stage of the trade cycle and the expectations and combativity of the working class. The essential point, however, is that the worker receives not enough to enable him to cease to be a wage slave and gain control of his own means of production, thus ceasing to be a proletarian.

c. The polarisation of classes

Often the rise in the standard of living is cited as an indice of the incorrectness of Marx's hypotheses. What he predicted, however, has in its essentials come into being. The rise in living standards is ~~not~~ not part of the necessary development of Capital but only a superficial and incidental phenomenon. Marx predicted that fresh strata would continually be thrown into the proletariat. This is in fact what has ~~happened~~ happened. The petit bourgeoisie is a fast declining class. The small shopkeeper is rapidly squeezed ~~at~~ out by the supermarket. A teacher and a factory worker are both wage slaves. More than ever before wealth is concentrated in very few hands. Extreme impoverishment would exist in the reserve pool, in a permanent sub-proletariat, as in the U.S.

d. The origin of surplus

Surplusses existed in precapitalist societies. Only in the most primitive of societies did the question of the distribution of the surplus not arise. Then the society would have produced only barely enough for its members to survive. Everything would have been necessary product. The origin of surplus product initiated the end of primitive egalitarian matriachal society. With the appearance of surplus groups would begin to detach themselves from the labour process to live off the rest of the society. The expropriation in earlier societies would take the form of a direct expropriation of labour or products, the former being typical of slavery or serfdom, the latter of tribute given to a lord. It is in capitalist society that expropriation becomes mystified throughout the society by money and takes a money form.

e. Property is Theft

There are many objections to this view of the economy as robbery. The bourgeois will talk of the legitimate return to his capital. What, however, does this Capital consist of? Who was it that built his machines and the machine and the machines in turn which built those machines. It was of course past labour that worked on inanimate materials to build them and his machines are nothing but dead labour.

There is also talk of the returns on entrepreneurial skill. This is to make a virtue out of necessity; however, much of the capitalist's skill is not directed to production but to profit-making. The workers could exist well enough without the capitalist but the same could not be said for him. In any case it is a moralistic view of price formation, which is a strictly scientific process.

f. WHAT IS VALUE ?

Value represents stored labour. When we sell something we exchange a good for its equivalent in money. The ground of these exchanges is the labour time socially necessary to produce an article. This is the reason why prices differ, why a watch is different in price from a piece of cheese. It is the LABOUR THEORY OF VALUE.

g. USE VALUE and EXCHANGE VALUE

All objects produced in society must have a USE VALUE. It simply means they fulfil some function for somebody. When that use is given monetary expression, we use the term EXCHANGE VALUE. In capitalist society all goods on the market have exchange values. The productive activity of a housewife baking bread for her family has only a USE value, however.

h. WHAT DIFFERENTIATES CAPITALIST SOCIETY FROM ITS PREDECESSORS ?

Capital has existed for some 3000 years in the form of hoards of usurer's capital, merchant capital, financial capital and latterly industrial capital. The distinguishing feature about capital in capitalist society is that it has penetrated the means of production. In pre capitalist days production would primarily have been production for use rather than exchange. Primeval society was then characterized by the production of use values. This society was gradually broken up, however, by the gradual introduction of trade. The presence of a social surplus product makes it possible for an increasing division of labour to take place. Within feudal society, for instance, groups of people are no longer involved in the food producing process

but are gathered in towns to perform specialist tasks. At first these tasks are to service the wider community. The products produced in the town are produced for exchange and not for immediate use. They are produced to sell and to survive, the merchant must make a profit, on each transaction. Surpluses begin to accumulate in the towns, but they are essentially islands in a sea of use value production. It is the era of PEASANT COMMODITY PRODUCTION. It is when the accumulators of capital in the towns become sufficiently powerful to think of wresting control from the feudal landowners that capitalism proper begins. (Surpluses are also accumulated by trade which often takes advantage of the different levels of development of different isolated regions. In the latter days of feudalism too of loans to the parasitical landowner, who finds himself increasingly in pawn to the finance capitalist). Capitalism proper begins then with the penetration of capital into the means of production, with the general production of exchange values. It is GENERALIZED COMMODITY PRODUCTION.

i. THE PROLETARIAT

A Proletariat was created from the sixteenth century in England onwards. The serfs had been freed but freed from their means of subsistence as well as their bond to their lord. This landless and poverty stricken proletariat provided the labour force for the rapidly growing towns.

j. UNIVERSAL COMPETITION OF CAPITALS

The early days of capitalism saw many competing capitals. Universal competition between these capitals existed. To survive a capitalist had to sell his goods to recoup his cash and to repeat the production run. If his price was not competitive, therefore, he would soon go to the wall. He could his price low by various means. He could and did exploit his workers viciously. He also make his factory more efficient by installing more and better machines. For the same labour cost he could produce more commodities at a lower price. He was forced to spend money on machines because if he did not do so his competitors would

and drive him out of business. Capitalism showed strong centralizing tendencies, therefore. The less inefficient firms disappeared to be swallowed up in larger more heavily capitalized firms. The older industries are the most capitalized and monopolized. As the amount of capital in an industry becomes larger so it becomes more expensive and difficult for newcomers to break into it. The only industries which escape this monopolization are those whose nature precludes the use of capital. In this late stage of capitalism, however, these are few. In a lot of areas traditionally the arena of small capitals, mechanized production is monopolizing the producers-supermarkets, chain bookstores, chain newsagents etc.

k. THE CONSTITUENTS OF CAPITAL

The three constituents of capital in Marxist Economics are Constant Capital, Variable Capital and Surplus Value. Constant capital represents depreciation charges. In a production run, the value of a machine reconstitutes itself to form part of the price of the product. It is called constant capital because it reconstitutes itself exactly. It can add nothing to the value of the product. It is that, a part of variable capital that the capitalist must lay out on wages each production run. More labour will always be incorporated into each production run, and the increase in value after the end of the run of the products over those of the previous run will reflect the increased incorporation of labour. Surplus value refers to the amount of cash that the capitalist extracts on each production run from his workers. The difference between the price of labour and its value, between wages and the price the capitalist gets for what is produced.

L. THE RATE OF PROFIT AND THE RATE OF EXPLOITATION

$\frac{S}{V}$ = the rate of exploitation
(rate of surplus value).

$\frac{S}{C+V}$ = the rate of profit.

On each production run the relative shares going to labour and expropriated from labour in the form of surplus value give us an equation for comparing rates of surplus value.

The rate of profit represents the amount of clear cash that the capitalist accumulates on each production run in relation to the total amount of cash expended. Theoretically, aggregate figures could be derived for an economy wide figure.

M. THE DECLINE RATE OF PROFIT.

Capitalist firms become ever more highly capitalized. Hence their depreciation charges become higher on each production run. The C element in the profit equation becomes larger, which means that in order to maintain the rate of profit, the rate of exploitation must go up. This can happen and does by continuing technical improvement. It also occurs by intensifying the workload of the worker, by lengthening his hours etc. Capitalism, however, is faced with the continual need to bolster profit and there is some evidence that these other factors are not in fact holding in check the declining tendency due to the mounting constant capital (see Mandel "Marxist Economic Theory").

N. PERIODIC CRISES.

Because of the anarchic organization of capitalist society, periodic crises of overproduction occur. The biggest crisis was that of the 1930s., of course. The failure to sell products has a cumulative effect throughout the system, and once started a slump can be difficult to check with the cutting back of one firm hitting another and so on. In a slump prices fall and value is liquidated, until the rate of profit rises (because of falling 'C' and 'V') that it becomes profitable for some firms to reverse the process and pull the economy out of slump again. Periodic crises had occurred since the earliest days of capitalism. The bigger firms rode them-they ruined the small and inefficient.

With the increasing importance of depreciation charges, investment expenditure becomes an important part of the state of the economy. Investment has to be very rigidly controlled because of the huge amounts involved. The state has to guarantee profits in advance and to attempt to remove all random variables such

as workers' resistance by productivity agreements, incomes policies etc. Since the last world war the worst effects of the trade cycle have been shielded by large special security payments and arms expenditure by the Government independent of the state of trade. The crisis of capitalism has expressed itself through continuous inflation. It is this

inflation that has caused the continuing instability of the world money market. The crisis continues albeit in changed form from that of the 30s. The basic situation remains of a mode of production that is historically ready for the grave and needs but one hard push from the organized working class.

A loss of awareness of the logic of "Capital" can lead to some very undialectical consequences. The theories of state capitalism bear witness to this development. Comrades should study Kidron's review of Mandel's Economy Theory in I.S. no:36 and Mandel's reply in the "Inconsistencies Of State Capitalism" to gain an understanding of the superficiality of the idea of a state capitalist society.

BASIC TEXTS:

- Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy.
- Wage, Labour and Capital
- Wages, Price and Profit
- Capital volume One
- Introduction to Marxist Economics
- Mandel's Introduction to Marxist Economic Theory.
- Althusser on How to Read the Capital (Marxism Today Volume 13no:10 October issue)
- Trotsky: Living Thought of Karl Marx.

EXPOSE WILSON

as a
WIR CRIMINAL

For further information etc

A mass action to protest against
the Government's policy on Vietnam
and against Wilson's servile trip
to Washington, is being planned
by the Vietnam Solidarity Committee

about the "Marxist Youth Journal"
write to 75, York Way
London N.7.

This will take place on the eve
of his trip.

For books, pamphlets, newspapers,
etc., on the revolutionary youth
movement throughout the world,
get in touch with:

For further information contact:
V.S.C.
Room 1, 13 Whites Row, London E.1
Tel: (01) 247 9845

Pioneer Book Service,
8, Tynbee St.,
London E.1.