

CTC
x/60724
35-

THE BULLETIN OF MARXIST STUDIES

CONTENTS

include -

SOME PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME - CADRES OR SECT

THE IDEA OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Vietnam - Cuba - West German Students' Movement - Maoism and Cuba

Vol.1 No.1

PRICE 2/-

Summer 1968.

THE BULLETIN OF MARXIST STUDIES

EDITORS KEN TARBUCK CHRIS ARTHUR

Business Manager Marion Tarbuck

4, Norwood House, Peakes Road, Etchinghill, Rugeley, Staffs.

Vol.1 No.1

CONTENTS

Summer 1968

| | | | |
|------|----|--|--------------------|
| Page | 2 | Introducing Ourselves | |
| " | 3 | Vietnam | |
| " | 4 | Workers' Control Conference | |
| " | 5 | A Grave Development in Cuba | |
| " | 6 | The Escalante Affair and <u>World Outlook</u> | |
| " | 7 | Developments at Sussex | |
| " | 8 | Final Declaration of the Workers' Control Conference | |
| " | 9 | Some Problems of Our Time - Cadres or Sect | by Ken Tarbuck |
| " | 26 | Solidarity With The Polish Students! A Statement by the IEC of the Fourth International | |
| " | 27 | The Idea of the Fourth International | by Chris Arthur |
| " | 32 | The German Students' Struggle | by Godula Castles |
| " | 34 | The Rise of West German Student Radicalism | by Gisela Mandel |
| " | 37 | The Canadian Maoists "Analyse" the Cuban Revolution | by Phil Courneyeur |

All communications should be sent to the above address.

Signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.
Unsigned articles represent the joint viewpoint of the editors.

INTRODUCING OURSELVES

Most journals say something about themselves in their first issue, and we are no exception. The editors feel that perhaps the best reason we can give for our publication is to be found in the article on the question of building a Marxist cadre, which is the major item in this issue. But something more explicit is required to justify the production of a new socialist journal. Basically there are two main reasons. Firstly, the lack of theory generally in the British Labour Movement. Secondly, the need for a journal that will be a discussion forum at a serious level.

Those two points need a little amplification. On the first count we would maintain that there are a number of journals available that do deal with theory but much of what is done is inadequate or badly done. Moreover there is still a tendency for many Marxists to fall back on the texts rather than using them as a springboard for analysis. On the second count we would say that most journals of the left do not carry on discussions - they stage confrontations. Not that confrontations are themselves a bad thing, rather we feel that an intellectual diet composed solely of such fare can be debilitating. Therefore it is our hope that we shall encourage fruitful exchanges of ideas and experiences. As the name of this journal states we want it to be one that will not only stimulate but also one that can be used in a serious manner.

Our aim is that each issue will have a major theme. We shall try to gather material that is relevant to such themes, both contemporary and past. We shall try to include material from past writers, or which has been previously published in such a way that will be relevant to the subject discussed and not as an act of piety. All too often people are urged to study the Marxist classics in a vacuum, as though such study was good for their soul. But such classics must be seen as a storehouse of experience which has to be drawn upon and used in the light of present conditions. Any study of Marx's writing will show that he was continually modifying his ideas in the light of his experience. In this sense he was the first 'revisionist'. This must of necessity be the case unless Marxist theory is to be turned into a set of dogmas.

Having said that we would like to also say that the willingness to explore, probe and dissect new situations is not an excuse for sloppiness. Like any other discipline Marxism has its own fundamental rules.

Finally, on a practical note. We shall be producing The Bulletin on a quarterly basis initially, more frequent publication depends upon circumstances. We are well aware of the disadvantages of such a time lag between issues, this is why we shall attempt to give each one a central theme. Contributions, either letters or articles will be welcome and we shall try to ensure publication of any material submitted. If you want to see The Bulletin succeed the most practical way of doing this is to take out a subscription and get others to do the same. Our major problem, like any journal of the left, will be finance, please help us to overcome this.

VIETNAM

The moves by Johnson towards peace in Vietnam took some people in the Labour Movement by surprise. This should not have been the case.

What were the pressures that led to this reversal of U.S. policy? The first has been the constant and unyielding heroism and fortitude of the Vietnamese people, which is unparalleled in modern times. Not only have they defied the mightiest imperialist power, they have in a sense defeated it. The defeat, it is true, did not come in a dramatic way in the manner of the French rout at Dien Bien Phue. Nevertheless it has been a defeat for imperialism.

The U.S. strategy, as propounded by Westmoreland, was a search and destroy policy. This meant that large numbers of troops had to be deployed in remote parts of the country. The brilliant Tet offensive by the NLF demonstrated that this had been a total failure. Not only were the NLF shown to have a far greater striking power than the U.S. knew about, but it demonstrated that it had the support of large parts of the population, almost certainly the large majority. Such an offensive could not have been mounted in the cities without the active help of large numbers of the population.

Therefore the Tet offensive not only destroyed the military hopes of LBJ, it also removed the last tattered remnants of authority from the Saigon Government.

The choice left to the Americans was a pretty stark one. Either they had to withdraw to the cities, leaving most of the countryside to the NLF, i.e. they would merely hold enclaves ; or they would have to increase the number of U.S. troops several times over the present half million and take over the running of the country direct , instead of using their puppets. The second choice presented problems of such magnitude that they would have become well nigh insuperable. To have increased the number of U.S. troops in Vietnam several times over would have put the whole of the U.S.A. on a war footing and a large increase in the number of draftees. Moreover, the extra expenditure overseas would have led to a big increase in the U.S. balance of payments deficit and in all probability a flight from the dollar that would have made the recent gold crisis seem like a light summer breeze. On top of all this there was the growing problem inside the U.S. itself.

The murder of Martin Luther King highlighted just how precarious social peace has become in the U.S.A. Because of these factors there has been a section of opinion growing within the American bourgeoisie that was in favour of cutting the losses of the whole costly operation in Vietnam. The candidature of McCarthy and particularly Kennedy for the presidential nomination was an indication of this feeling. This hoped to head off the growing anti-war movement in the U.S. and divert the Negro freedom struggle. Thus there was a coalescence of a number

of factors which led to moves for peace.

Therefore we have to recognise that the Vietnamese have shown that it is possible to defeat imperialism, and by so doing they have performed a signal service to the whole of mankind. All those who struggle for national liberation and socialism will be heartened and spurred on to greater efforts. Although peace negotiations seem to be under way it would be wrong to slacken any efforts against this war.

THE WORKERS' CONTROL MOVEMENT

At the end of March the most successful of the Conferences for Workers' Control was held at Nottingham. There was an increase in numbers (nearly 500 were there), in militancy and in representativeness. Most of the left union had representatives there and there was a large group of students - a most significant get together.

The major political difference to emerge was that between those trade unionists that spoke out for capturing the Labour Party and those students who had already written off the Labour Party as a meaningful vehicle for socialists.

This latter stand can be a positive development of course, as long as it is not associated with writing off politics or the working class. (Students of sectarianism may be amused to hear that in reply to the students Pat Wall of 'Militant' launched into such a panegyric of the Labour Party that the left M.P. who followed him to the rostrum was able to say approvingly "The previous speaker said most of the things I wanted to say".)

All sides, however, were able to unite behind the final declaration. Together with the new leader of the A.E.U. Hugh Scanlon - who addressed the conference - the workers' control movement represents the most positive development in the present bleak situation. The demand for Workers' Control is the key transitional demand around which a struggle for power can develop. The present Government is well aware of this and is trying to head off the movement by diverting it into safe channels - the so-called workers' representatives on the Steel Boards for example.

Another important feature of the movement is that steelmen, dockers, busmen etc. have engaged in writing their own programme - setting out the structures of control for their own industry. Whatever its defects the creative energy going into this work, the commitment it generates, is a healthy development. It also gives the lie to those who argue that the working class is incapable of moving outside the pre-suppositions of the capitalist system or of not going beyond bread and butter demands. What the conference showed was that trade union consciousness is capable of being moved and developed in a socialist direction.

We reprint on another page the final declaration for the information of our readers.

A GRAVE DEVELOPMENT IN CUBA

For partisans of the Cuban revolution, one of the most encouraging features of it was the absence of many of the repellent aspects which deform other workers' states.

While institutions of proletarian democracy have been developing only slowly, the peculiarly malignant bureaucratic arbitrariness and worse associated with the Stalinist pattern, seemed to have been avoided. The sentencing of Anibal Escalante and his associates to long prison terms was carried through in such a way as to place a question mark over this assessment.

Revolutionaries will view the general line of Escalante with distaste. He is an old-line Stalinist who has opted for Khrushchevist peaceful co-existence. Everyone is well aware that tensions between Moscow and Havana ran high because of the basic difference on strategy. This is the context in which the collision of Escalante and the Castroists took place.

In such situations Trotskyists defend the right of those they disagree with, such as Escalante, to propagate their line, inside the party and outside the party. They may, of course, be expelled from the party if they break its discipline, and if they go as far as to act against the welfare of the revolution, the state may deal with them. The distinction between expressing opinions and taking some sort of action, such as material sabotage, is fundamental.

The worry and concern of the editors is that the Cuban leadership may have lost sight of this fundamental difference.

If one reads Raul Castro's report (1) much of it is simply concerned with the activities of Escalante in developing his tendency. Amongst the verbiage the only point which would seem to count as an offence against the state is that which alleges that Escalante passed confidential documents to the Kremlin with the suggestion that the U.S.S.R. use economic pressure against the Cubans to bring them into line politically. No clear distinction was made between this and the expression of opinions - everything was lumped together.

Having said this one must also say that the report (on internal evidence alone) does not appear to be in any way dishonest. It is possible to obtain a clear and plausible picture of the platform of Escalante from it. It avoids resorting to grotesque distortions and still less to describing the persons aimed at as monsters inspired by the most abominable designs. There is no parallel with analogous accusations in other places. (Without referring to the classical Stalinist documents, it suffices to point to certain documents against Liu Shao-Chi, the false and tendentious character of which is instantly transparent and which present the victim as a frightful monster who had been plotting with capitalism since the twenties.) Nevertheless a disquieting precedent has been set.

(1) see World Outlook Vol.6 Nos. 7-10

THE ESCALANTE AFFAIR AND 'WORLD OUTLOOK'

While this journal opens its columns to anyone making a serious contribution, the editors themselves are sympathetic to the Fourth International and will make available to readers declarations by the United Secretariat and other bodies of the Fourth International insofar as space will allow.

Thus it is with regret that we record some disappointment with the treatment that 'World Outlook' has so far given (as of middle of May) to the developments in Cuba. For a start there has been a failure to make an intervention in the situation. Such influence as the movement has in Cuba, small as it may be, requires some orientation - such as calling for a special representative congress in which the two political lines could be properly discussed and the leadership submit itself and its line to democratic decisions.

As for the details of the 'World Outlook' articles both Livio Maitan and Ernest Germain seem to believe that in spite of the unfortunate presentation Escalante was convicted for his acts, not his opinions. It is disingenuous of them, however, to cite as knock-down proof of this Escalante's own letter stating "I am aware that the leadership of the Party did not turn me over to the State Security because of my opinions but because of my actions". The effect of this is spoiled if we turn to its context and discover that, not surprisingly for an old-line Stalinist bureaucrat, Escalante is himself thoroughly confused as to the difference between opinions and actions. He lists six actions which he considers appropriate grounds for the State to move against him. Only one of these was an action against the State - in veiled, euphemistic terms he refers to the aforementioned allegation of plotting with the Kremlin against Cuba. The other five are purely concerned with his formation of a political tendency.

1. Is "factional activity" - this is a crime in the Stalinist book of course but not one that any Trotskyist would accept!
2. This concerns intervening independently of the party in demonstrations - a trivial party matter, by no means any business of the State.
3. Is taking his opinions outside the Party - again a trivial party question, not one for the State.
4. Contact with Moscow.
5. Related to circulating documents from other Parties (i.e. Moscow-line C.P's) - so what?
6. Amounts to trying to find out what was happening in leadership committees - again not very important.

It is significant that Raul Castro does not laugh at Escalante and his associates for mixing up 'factional activity' and subversive acts. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that he too regards them all of a piece. On balance it appears that Escalante was punished as much for active propagation of a tendency as for the economic sabotage aspect.

However, Maitan believes "we have no reason to revise the idea... of the most positive moves undertaken by the Cuban leaders in the anti-bureaucratic struggle". But is Maitan sure that the Cubans refer to the same thing as he does when they speak about bureaucracy? In our experience the Cubans seem almost exclusively concerned with the bureaucrat as (a) a wasteful red-tape creator and (b) a parasite seeking to gain a higher standard of life than average. While damaging to an extent, a healthy revolution could cope with these tendencies. A more important matter which the Cubans lay little stress on is the bureaucrat as a political being, a man who seeks to monopolise power, to exclude the masses from the direction of the revolution, and to persecute and silence opposition. From this point of view the Cuban revolution may be in balance.

None of this alters the general stand of revolutionaries in favour of the Cuban Workers' State and being for its unconditional defence, nor should it be allowed to detract from such events as the setting up of O.L.A.S. We have nothing in common with ultra-lefts, from the Socialist Labour League, I.S. Group to certain Maoist groups, all of whom maintain that Cuba is still capitalist. By any known criteria for us a Marxists Cuba is a transitional regime, i.e. a workers' state.

DEVELOPMENTS AT SUSSEX

Following lastterm's militant Vietnam demonstration (which unfortunately in many ways, got sidetracked into a discussion on discipline) a February 21st Committee has been set up to broaden and carry forward the movement. A "Fact Sheet" has been produced illustrating the connections of the University with Imperialism, even including direct dealings to the tune of tens of thousands of pounds with U.S. military forces.

Personifying this the Chancellor, Lord Shawcross, a director of Morgan Trust and Shell. The February 21st Committee picketed a ceremony presided over by Lord Shawcross. Shawcross decided to address the picket but could only use infantile ad hominem arguments - "Its nice for you living cosily on state grants, why don't you go and work in the hospitals of Vietnam?". (The Sussex Vietnam Committee raised £2,000 for NLF and North Vietnam medical supplies. Later this term there will be blood donations!) Of course Shawcross would probably be rather pleased if all left-wingers left the country.

Perhaps the most bizarre moment came when Shawcross declared "I am a pacifist". However it does not seem to outrage his pacifist conscience that a million people were slaughtered in Indonesia so that Shell's assets there could be safeguarded.

from a special correspondent

SOME PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME — CADRES OR SECT

by Ken Tarbuck

The present time is a very disturbing one for Marxist in Britain, it is full of questions and many seem inponderable. The election of the Labour Government to office has once again thrown both the Social Democratic left and the Marxist movement into a state of confusion and tension. At a time when advances for socialism seemingly could be made, all is inverted, stood on its head. In a period of acute crisis for British capitalism Marxists stand unarmed, without the means to intervene and not knowing how to. Only the most marginal victories are being won by the left, if any are being won at all. The question therefore poses itself very sharply - 'why is this?'. It is the purpose of this essay to examine and explore certain facets of this question, not to attempt to give definitive answers - few exist in the abstract.

Two other points should be made. Firstly, this essay makes no attempt to argue the need for a revolutionary Marxist party, this need is assumed. Secondly, it does not deal with the more general or objective factors relating to the failure of such a party to emerge in Britain. There have been many such discussions and I have not attempted to pass any judgement on them.

First Approximations

Among those who have attempted to grapple with the present situation have been the New Left Review editorial team. All credit must go to them for their efforts over the past few years in trying to break out of the vicious circle that British Marxists are in. With some remarkable insights and a great elan they have attempted to unlock the present. It is not to their discredit that they have not entirely succeeded, and they would not claim to have done so. However, it is upto those who disagree with certain aspects of their work to take up the issues and discuss them.

To help clarify matters I intend to carry out a part of the discussion around the article by Perry Anderson entitled "Problems of Socialist Strategy". +

Let us begin with a quotation from this article -

"Two strategic models have dominated our history, and divided the socialist movement in Europe from the turn of the century to our time. The momentous schism between Social-Democracy and Communism directly derives from them. They can be called the parliamentary and the insurrectionary roads to socialism." (p.233)

+ See "Towards Socialism" London 1965

Perry Anderson posits these two paths as being the basic difference within the socialist movement, and much of his analysis seems to be grounded on this one point. Unfortunately this cannot be accepted as a tenable thesis. The division that runs deep within the labour movement, not only in Britain but also internationally, is not predicated upon such a simplistic dichotomy. The real and fundamental difference is related to the need, or otherwise, for a thoroughgoing and basic change within society. That is, whether as socialists we want to abolish wage slavery and its accompanying alienation, and establish a free human society in which man is truly his own master and not the adjunct of capital. If this was not immediately apparent before 1945 (and I would argue that it was) then it has become increasingly so since. With the advent of relatively full-employment and the amelioration of certain aspects of poverty, the real and substantive differences between reformists and revolutionaries has become increasingly clear. That this is not apparent to many is an indication of the vulgar economic materialism that passes for Marxism in many quarters, not least amongst the bourgeois 'Marxologists'. Those who want to smooth down rough edges, establish 'good industrial relations', etc., etc., are the reformists. Those who want to abolish industrial relations and replace them with human relations are the socialists, the revolutionaries.

This, above all, is the essence of the dispute, not insurrectionary versus parliamentary roads. Not that such disputes are unimportant, on the contrary, they sometimes become crucial. But at this point of time to allow oneself to get bogged down in what would be an essentially abstract dispute would be fruitless. No one who considers themselves to be Marxist could quibble over the question of violence. We do not live in an age of peace, the violence of imperialism is endemic, it cannot survive without it. However, one must realise that such disputes are secondary and subordinate to the key question - "do we reform capitalism or do we build socialism". Moreover, a dispute over methods very often only serves to cover a dispute over aims.

Even before 1914 this was a subject of controversy within the labour movement, when Bernstein wrote his "Evolutionary Socialism". Rosa Luxemburg saw this distinction clearly in 1900 when she wrote -

"...the final goal of socialism constitutes the only decisive factor distinguishing the Social-Democratic movement from the bourgeois democracy and bourgeois radicalism, the only factor transforming the entire labour movement from a vain effort to repair the capitalist order into a class struggle against this order, for the suppression of this order - the question of 'Reform or Revolution?' as it is posed by Bernstein, equals for the Social-Democracy the question 'To be or not to be?'. In the controversy with Bernstein and his followers, everybody in the Party ought to understand clearly it is not a question of this or that method of struggle, or of the use of this or that set of tactics, but the very existence of the Social-Democratic movement." (from "Social Reform or Revolution?")

These words still hold true today over half a century later, only perhaps more so.

The year 1917 and the October revolution drew a line - an indelible one - through the labour movement. It is true that old habits are hard to shake off, e.g. German Social-Democracy only finally sloughed off the vestiges of its Marxism in the late 1950's. But the truth was that Bernstein only articulated existing practice when he began his attack, as the first world war revealed. In the same way the struggle in the Labour Party over the attempted revision of clause four of the constitution saw a defeat for Gaitskell, so in Germany earlier in the century Kautsky came out to defend the prevailing orthodoxy and won. In neither case was the victory real or enduring, both parties today are open proponents of the mixed economy and the rule of market economics, i.e. both parties openly proclaim that they only want to reform capitalism, that is if they deign to mention such an 'outmoded' expression. To pose the question as did Perry Anderson is to have a wholly pre-1914 conception of Social-Democracy, and is to try to grapple with ghosts of those long since departed.

THE PARTY

Centralism v Democracy?

Following through this line of thought Perry Anderson examines the question of the role of the party in the struggle for socialism. True, this is done obliquely, rather than directly, nevertheless there does emerge a concept of the Leninist party that is erroneous. Unless this problem is cleared up no discussion on socialist strategy can be meaningful.

What does Anderson say?

"For Lenin, the road to socialism was short but sheer: it required the armed insurrection of the proletariat against the established state, its capture and destruction." (p.224)

"Leninism has been... a success in its own terms and context.

It won power in Russia, carried out the expropriation of capitalism and totally transformed the economy and society of the largest country in Europe ... What was the secret of this success? The answer is surely this; Leninism was almost perfectly adapted to the specific conditions of its time and place.

It is precisely in backward inchoate societies, dominated by scarcity and intergrated by the state, that such a strategy has its meaning." (p.227-8 emphasis in original)

"But its very adaption to its Eastern environment, which has been the secret of its success, radically disadants it from the Western milieu where capitalism remains supreme today. For the societies of Western Europe constitute a wholly different universe from those of Eastern Europe... For the moment it is important to emphasise that a Leninist strategy

in the West is fundamentally regressive: it threatens to destroy a vital historical creation..." (p.230 emphasis in original)

What is this heritage that Leninism allegedly threatens? Without doubt Perry Anderson means liberal-democracy, as a reading of his essay indicates. I think he is completely mistaken in this assumption; and in also assuming that liberal-democracy is the pattern for Western Europe. At the time that he wrote the essay it would have only been necessary to point to Spain and Portugal to show the error of such an assertion. Moreover, the France of De Gaulle is not a liberal-democracy, but rather an authoritarian regime with electoral plumage. Western Germany cannot be blessed with the accolade either, since the Communist Party is legally banned. And of course since the essay was written the military regime has been installed in Greece, and on the bones of a regime it would have been difficult to describe as liberal-democracy. The universe of liberal-democracy becomes contracted under examination.

Does this mean there is no validity in Anderson's contention and concern? Yes, there is validity, in the sense that no Marxist would wish for any diminution of the civil and political liberties that have been won within certain countries. Therefore we can share his concern, insofar as it is legitimate. However, it would be exceedingly naive not to understand that such liberties are conditional and somewhat precarious. One has only to look at the mounting attack on the trades unions here in Britain to understand this. And equally the threat to radicals and revolutionaries implied in the Race Relations Act, e.g. the imprisonment of Michael X.

The answer to the question must be no in the sense that Leninism as such is not and never was a threat to civil liberty for the working class. To attempt to equate the Stalinist police regimes with Leninism is to fall into the same trap as many bourgeois liberals have done. For them the terror directed against counter-revolutionary White Guards was the same as the terror of the Stalinist buresucracy against the Bolshevik Old Guard. The whole spirit and ethos of Leninism is directly antithetical to any suppression of liberty, indeed it was directed towards the release of enthusiasm and tremendous self-activity. Any reading of "State and Revolution" should clear this matter up because Lenin there visualised a workers state which was only a semi-state, one that was beginning to prepare the ground for its own demise.

A further error creeps into Perry Anderson's explanation of Leninism, he seems to suggest that Lenin's concept of the party was predicated on the fact of Russia's backwardness and the autocracy of the Tsarist regime. This is misleading and blurs the issue. It is true that the specific conditions that Lenin visualised, and created, the Bolshevik Party under were conditions of repression. Therefore, Lenin emphasised certain features because of these particular conditions, but it is an error to construe certain facets as the whole of Leninism. In this context we should also note that Gramsci - that most neglected of Marxists -

is also misunderstood because he wrote under conditions of Fascist dictatorship. Neither Lenin or Gramsci predicated their views of the party on these conditions of backward economies or autocracy. Rather the leitmotif of their views is to be found in their struggle against economism and theories of spontaneity, and their emphasis of the role of consciousness. This is the inner logic, core and historic value of their contribution. The role of consciousness assumes tremendous significance in the struggle to create a Marxist party. Those who today demote the role of the conscious elements within the working class would do well to ponder these words of Lenin -

"Any belittling of the role of 'the conscious element', of the role of Social-Democracy, means ipso facto (quite irrespective of whether the belittler intends it or not) the strengthening of the influence of the bourgeois ideology upon the workers. All those who talk about 'over estimating the importance of ideology', about exaggerating the role of the conscious element, &c, imagine that the purely workers movement by itself can and will work out an independent ideology for itself, if only workers 'tear their fate from the hands of the leaders' ... the spontaneous development of the labour movement leads precisely to its subordination to the bourgeois ideology, ... because a spontaneous labour movement is trade unionism. .. This does not mean, of course, that the workers do not participate in working it the ideology / out. But they participate not as workers but as theorists of socialism, Proudhons or Weitlings; in other words, they take part only when, and in so far as, they succeed to a greater or lesser extent in acquiring the knowledge of their age and in advancing this knowledge. And in order that working men may succeed in this more often, it is necessary to concern oneself as far as possible with raising the level of consciousness of the workers in general; it is necessary that the workers should not confine themselves to artificially restricted limits of 'literature for workers', but should learn more and more to master the general literature. It would be even more correct to say confined instead of 'confine themselves', because workers themselves read and want to read everything that is written for the intelligensia, and some (bad) intellectuals think that 'for the workers' it is sufficient to tell them about factory conditions and chew over and over again what has long been known"

(What Is To Be Done? pp.70-71 emphasis in original)

Two very important points emerge from this. Firstly, the spontaneous drives of the working class are only capable of producing trade union consciousness. Yet trade unions, by their very nature, are an expression of the division within existing society between capital and labour; and are a recognition of this division. Capitalist commodity production here, it must be emphasised, is not a given set of techniques

but a set of social relations, therefore any attempt to overcome them must of necessity be a partial withdrawal from these relations. Trade unions on the contrary must take them as given and seek to obtain a better bargain for the sellers of labour, and only by a tacit or open acknowledgement of these relations do they carry out their functions as trade unions. This trade union mentality is not confined to narrow trade union affairs, on the contrary, it spills over, pervades and dominates the whole labour movement. Its political expression is reformism. Therefore, secondly the question of the role of intellectuals becomes a key one. These intellectuals must bring socialist consciousness into the working class. But, these intellectuals must be of a new type. One of the misunderstandings current on this point is that such intellectuals must of necessity come from the traditional intelligensia. It is true that initially members of the intelligensia can and do play a vital role in bringing conscious socialist theory into the ranks of the working class; and as the Petofi circle of Budapest showed in Hungary in 1956, they can act as a catalysing agent at times of crisis. However, note what Lenin said above. Such intellectuals 'of the new type' must by definition have broken with bourgeois ideology in all its forms, but they can equally come from the ranks of the working class as from the ranks of the intelligensia. Moreover, without these intellectuals being drawn from the ranks of the working class any attempts at creating a vanguard solely from the intelligensia will end in 'intellectualism' of the worst kind. Those who think that Lenin had any great affection for intellectuals or accorded them some special place should familiarise themselves with 'One Step Forward - Two Steps Back', it is littered with withering phrases about 'whining intellectuals', 'unstable elements' etc. etc. These should be understood in the class context in which they are used. Lenin was using the term intellectuals here as a social description indicating the general characteristics that intellectuals displayed as a social class.

The role of the intellectuals of the new type is not to satisfy their own ego or literary ambitions, but to concretely challenge the ideological dominance of the bourgeoisie and to prepare the instrument for its demise. Gramsci points this out when he says -

"Marxism does not seek to sustain 'simple people' in their primitive philosophy of common sense, but instead to lead them to a higher view of life. If it asserts the need for contact between intellectual and the simple people it does so, not in order to limit scientific activity and maintain unity at the low level of the masses, but precisely in order to build an intellectual-moral bloc which makes possible the progress of the masses and not only for a few groups of intellectuals."

(The Modern Prince" p.66)

Herein is the significance of the concept of the intellectuals of the new type. Members of the intelligensia and the working class have to be re-made into revolutionary intellectuals. And this re-moulding is not a process carried out on 'inert' material, it has nothing in common with the 'brainwashing' so beloved of the vulgar Marxologists. It is a process

that can only succeed to the extent that the individual participates and furthers it.

What Are Cadres?

I want now to pose this question - 'what do we mean when we speak about Marxist cadres?'. If the new type of intellectuals are the cadres of a Marxist party, what has been the practice of all those groups on the left that claimed to be creating cadres?

Gramsci lays down three essential elements for building a Marxist party, they are -

"(1) A widespread element of common, average men, whose participation is provided by discipline and faith, not by creative and highly organisational spirit. Without these the party would not exist, it is true, but it is also true that the party would not exist 'only' with these. They are a force as far as there is someone who centralises, organises, disciplines them, and in the absence of this force they would break up and cancel each other out in scattered impotence.

(2) The principal cohesive element, which centralises in the national field, which render effective and powerful the totality of forces which left to themselves would count for nothing or very little; this element is endowed with a highly cohesive, centralising and disciplinary power which is also, perhaps because of this, inventive (if what is meant is 'inventive' in a certain direction according to certain lines of forces, certain perspectives or certain premises). It is also true that this element alone would not form a party, but it would do so more than the first element. They would be generals without an army, but in reality it is easier to create an army than to create generals....

(3) A middle element, which links the first element with the second and puts them into contact, not only 'physically' but also morally and intellectually..."

(The Modern Prince pp.49-50)

Let us now look at my question in the light of what Gramsci says. It is my contention that all the present groups of the revolutionary left in Britain have upto now been intent on producing the third element, yet they have little or none of the second. Moreover, it has to be understood that a party can only emerge from a movement, one that embraces wider and more heterogeneous elements than a party.

Concretely this has meant that it is activists or agitators that have been produced, and not cadres or intellectuals of the new type. Gramsci, here, has refined Lenin and brought this question into a closer focus. Looking at the question from this standpoint one can see that the quest to build a revolutionary party by many small groups has foundered

to a large extent because of a lack of understanding of this key question, (there are other factors and some are discussed later). It may be objected that the Communist Party has had (relatively) large numbers of intellectuals within its ranks, this is true and these were largely from the intelligensia. However, at no time have these been in any position to fundamentally influence or guide the party, even if they so desired. Moreover, most of them have been in the grip of Stalinist orthodoxy and because of this were mental cripples. Those that broke with the C.P. in the middle fifties have, in the main, been destroyed as Marxist cadres, either dropping into passivity or - in reaction to Stalinist orthodoxy - become enamoured with populism. (A certain small segment of this generation having taken their intellect out of pawn from King St. went with all due haste to Clapham High St., unfortunately for them with similar results to their previous visit to 'uncle'.)

No other group on the Marxist left has collected any appreciable number of intellectuals, either from the intelligensia or the working class. This is not surprising since none of these groups have the concept of building Marxist cadres in the Leninist or Gramscian sense.

Indeed one of the characteristics of all these groups is that they are anti-intellectual in the 'best' British tradition. Because of this they are all to some extent prisoners of the corporative consciousness of the working class, deferring to it and taking it as the level of their departure. In this they are fatally mistaken. Marxists cannot start at the level of consciousness of the working class, they must be the bearers of the highest and most advanced theory and consciousness. Certainly any Marxist must take cognizance of the level of consciousness of the mass of the people, otherwise one falls into the crassest voluntarism. However, this does not mean that one accepts this level. It is the acceptance of this level that has meant in practice that all the Marxist groups have been content to 'produce' the third element of Gramsci. Trotsky was well aware of this problem when he wrote - "A pedagogical adaption to the more backward layers of the proletariat must not become transformed into a political adaption to the conservative bureaucracy of the trade unions." + No doubt many will be offended by my saying this, and there will perhaps be cries of 'prove it'. The answer is all around you, unfortunately in a negative form. Where is the cadre that should be challenging Wilson's Government, or that has even cracked the shell of the British working class's corporate world? To ask the question is to answer it. And sad to say even our 'generals' of the left are almost indistinguishable from the army.

Now whilst it is true that the revolutionary party creates intellectuals, it is only done on an expanded basis. Initially it is the intellectuals who create the party, even if this is only an embryo party. They constitute the grain of sand around which the pearl forms. Therefore the most critical task is to assemble this grain of sand

.....
+ In Defence of Marxism p.146

This cannot be done on an activist basis alone, it can only be done on the basis of ideas, i.e. of theory. But this theory must be expounded in practice, and at a number of levels not in a single issue campaign. The 'mere' literary exposition of theory leads to intellectualism. This may sound as though what is being said is that the 'chicken and the egg' arrive simultaneously, but this is not so. One of the truisms of the Marxist movement is that there should be unity of theory and practice. This is a necessary and valid truism, nevertheless the danger is that activism is equated with practice, and theory becomes subordinated to activity. When this happens theory becomes a badge, an adornment, a suit of clothes, which can be changed to fit the mood. Theory then becomes *ex poste* a justification for practice or has no relation to it. However, for Marxists theory is not something that is empirically made up as we go along, past experience provides an approximation which we abstract and turn into theory and this should guide our present practice. The badge approach to theory is a bowing to the division of labour imposed by class society. This is because intellectual activities are not seen as activities as such, but as something that takes place outside of the collective. There arises in small political groups the practice of each having its own 'theorist' who hands down the 'line'. It does not occur to such leaders that a major part of their task is to train people to replace them.

For Marxists, within the concept of practice is embodied theory, therefore the truism 'unity of theory and practice' can become a barrier to our understanding of this. Let me elaborate this point a little, was Marx theorising or practising when he was writing Capital? Were Castro and Che practising or theorising when they landed from the Granma? These are, of course, dramatic examples, and few of us can aspire to reach such historical proportions; yet unless we envisage a revolutionary party in this way we do not have the perspective of revolutionaries. Therefore, it is very necessary that in the process of gathering the 'grain of sand' a vulgar interpretation is not given to the word activity. Practice must be understood as encompassing many, many things. It must be a genuine praxis.

Which Crisis of Which Leadership?

One of the factors that has contributed towards an activist concept of cadres has been the phrase "the working class suffers from a crisis of leadership". What is understood by this, and what should be understood by it? A mechanical and undialectical application of this idea implies that the working class is straining at the leash, only waiting for the call to revolution or on a more mundane level only waiting for the right charismatic leader to speak at a Labour Party conference to rout the demon Wilson. Now it is true that at certain times this can be and has been correct because the mass of the working class has moved further and faster than its existing leadership, and at such times these leaders become an absolute brake. The Spanish civil war was one example of such a situation. But such situations are rare, pre-revolutionary or revolutionary situations do not come round like the date on the calendar in orderly succession to be waited for with patience.

Such situations have to be 'made', not in the sense of exploiting favourable situations, that is an elementary task for Marxists. No, revolutions have to be 'made' by a process that stretches far back beyond particular situations.

Yet even in 'normal' times this crisis of leadership does exist. This particular crisis manifests itself at these times by the reformist leadership accurately reflecting the false consciousness of the masses. Seen in this way it is not the reformist leaders who have to be 'exposed' rather it is the corporate consciousness of the working class, (needless to say the reformists need to be opposed tooth and nail). But our task as Marxists is not to denounce reformists as though the working class had a clear sighted vision of socialism which was being impaired by using reformist spectacles. Rather it is our task to convince the working class of its 'defective' eyesight. Only in the process of doing this does the question of using Marxist 'spectacles' arise. But this should not be seen as a series of stages, both tasks have to be carried out simultaneously.

If one does not understand this process one falls into a world of demonology and good men v bad men. This is the world of the super-voluntarist, who thinks that if only he can blow his trumpet loud enough the walls of reformist Jericho will fall down.

The crisis of leadership is much more complex, pervasive and subtle, resting on the mystification engendered by bourgeois ideology. To combat this much more than activism is required, there has to be an ideological assault on the institutions that mediate it.

The dialectical novelty of the crisis of leadership is that it besets all groups and organisations of the working class. Each of these reveals an inner dynamic and rhythm of development which - unless it is able to burst assunder the integument of bourgeois hegemony - reaches an apogee and then declines, leaving it subject to that which it set out to destroy. This subjection may take many forms, each of them expresses a failure to grapple with the reality in which they exist, and an adaption to the false consciousness of that reality.

Sects and Sectarianism

Much of the foregoing helps to explain why, instead of Marxist cadres being created, there has been a proliferation of sects. Most of the existing groups started their life as a fraction within an already existing organisation. This gives us part of the reason for the subsequent evolution.

A fraction is a grouping that arises within a party or group often over single issue and is turned inwards hoping to achieve a clear-cut ideological resolution of that issue. For this reason a fraction should be considered to be a temporary and shortlived formation. Initially there is no counterposing of an entire programme to that of the existing formation. The issues are seen as being the correction of an error of tactics or strategy, or even merely the consistent and energetic application of an existing programme.

The party, in contrast, sets out to group within its ranks all those who subscribe to its programme, but at the same time allows wide divergences of opinion on tactics and strategy, always with the proviso that the dissentients should subordinate themselves in activity to the majority decisions. This in no way demands of the dissentients that they should renounce their views, merely that they accept majority decisions and work in accordance with them. But a fraction has a different internal regime to that of the party. Because of the narrow basis for its existence it draws the dividing line between members and non-members with hair-line precision, even transitory tactical differences can make it impossible to co-exist within the same fraction. For example if there arises a difference within a party over a tactical orientation, e.g. whether an election should be boycotted or not, then two fractions may arise and many in the party may be undecided. Obviously the question of adherence to one of the fractions is a very clear cut matter, any wavering immediately puts one outside of the fraction. There is no need for a formal decision in that situation, the doubter is just dropped from the fraction; which itself may not be a formal one.

Very few parties start out in life as such, they normally begin as fractions within existing organisations. But such fractions become parties in the process of political struggle; and because of this it is an objective fact, and not their own subjective view of themselves, which makes them parties.

A sect is usually a fraction that has failed to become a party, and has maintained the internal life of a fraction. That discipline which is necessary for an internal struggle is carried over into its independent existence and because of this it becomes burdensome and repulsive as the sect takes shape. The specific features usually take the form of near hysteria to the raising of any meaningful criticisms (not to be confused with the type of 'self criticism' sometimes practiced) of the strategy or tactics being pursued. Because at this stage the initial reasons for the sects existence (in reality as a fraction) has become ossified into dogma, they manifest violent reactions to any challenge. To be present at such confrontations is to witness a most bizarre scene. The critics will be subjected to such treatment as one would think only the class enemy deserves. In such an emotionally charged atmosphere nearly all differences can lead, and usually do, to an eventual split or the expulsion of the minority opinion.

Such situations and results have little to do with the personalities involved. Certainly, the personal characteristics displayed can exacerbate or moderate the clash, but only to a degree. The basic response is structured within the subordinated and alienated life of the sect. Even those fractions which consciously set out not to perpetuate the regime of a fraction, and hence to slide into a sect existence, will fall prey to this condition if they fail to transform themselves into parties or embryo parties. Good intentions are not enough.

Each fraction announces itself to the world by flourishing certain characteristics that proclaim its identity. At its inception these may

be valid and legitimate weapons to free itself from a past that had acted as a brake. The transformation into a sect, which may be a long or short period of time, witnesses a transmutation of these points, characteristics or attributes into totems or fetishes. The closer any criticisms come to these totems the more violent is likely to be the reaction. This, I believe goes some way to explain that strange phenomena of the left, i.e. the closer two groups appear to be in programme the more bitter the hostility displayed, either publically or privately to each other. Lest anyone feel smug, let me point out that no group or organisation, no matter how large, is immune from this process. Nor has it ever been known for a sectarian to recognise himself in the mirror. Only life and political activity can say, after the event, which is and which is not a sect.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

Any group or party that sets out to be revolutionary must break out of the corporate shell of the working class and adopt a hegemonic, world-wide vision of reality. Only conscious elements can do this, not merely consciousness of the poverty, misery and inequalities of capitalism and imperialism, this consciousness must also incorporate knowledge of the precise ways in which bourgeois hegemony is exercised; not merely in the general sense but in the particular and concrete conditions of a given society. Although Marxism arms one with a universal and hegemonic viewpoint this, if it is to be transformed into an instrument of liberation, must be applied in the particular situation one is confronted with. It is not sufficient to understand that capitalism is an irrational and contradictory society, one must know how and where these irrationalities and contradictions exhibit themselves within any particular society. The most general contradiction in any capitalist society is that between labour and capital. However, one must also understand certain structures within any society gain a certain relative autonomy. Because of this autonomy the basic and determinant contradiction may well express itself through the apparent over-determination of subsidiary contradictions. It is by an evaluation of these relatively autonomous structures and their relationship to the basic contradiction within society that Marxists are able to develop a programmatic perspective.

The hegemony of the British bourgeoisie is mainly, but not wholly, maintained by the mystification of the realities of the world we live in. This, at a vulgar level, takes the form of common sense and Galbraith's 'conventional wisdom'. Therefore, the false consciousness that we speak of is not something that appears to have been imposed from outside of the individual, but rather it manifests itself as internalised norms etc. As such - because they are unconsciously imbibed - they present themselves as spontaneous expressions of 'human nature'. This process is continually reinforced by the manipulation of the means of communication. This mystification is mediated by intellectuals of all ranks, who operate in the educational system, the press, television and radio etc. In present day conditions the organs of repression, which some Marxists unfortunately see as being the main or only instrument of bourgeois hegemony, are subordinated in their role. They only are brought into play when other means have failed to produce the required results. This is not say that these organs

are unimportant, or that they can be dismissed, on the contrary it is likely that they will be used more in the coming period than has been the case during the last twenty years or so. There has certainly been a weakening of the fear of those in authority since 1945, and this is indicated in a number of ways. Perhaps the most commented on aspect is the attitude of workers to authority within the factories, but this is only a particular expression of a more general phenomena. But this phenomena is at best inchoate, and has yet to find a generalised positive expression; common sense still rules the mental universe of the working class. Such a situation is no doubt irritating for the 'establishment' and even at times worrying, but as yet not decisively so. Such situations are manifestations of the general crisis of British capitalism, which has been chronic since 1945, and the particular conditions relating to full-employment. Such a crisis can drag on for decades, as Gramsci points out, unless a cohesive and well organised force appears to challenge the hegemony of the ruling class.

Regis Debray, in his book "Revolution in the Revolution", makes the point that it is important to strike at the enemies' elite troops, because ^{are} they/the key element in holding all the forces together. The question for us here in Britain is 'who are our enemy's elite troops. I have pointed out that the mystification process is mediated via the intelligensia, and this group constitute the 'elite troops' of the British bourgeoisie. This strata carry out this role in a very concrete manner, at many levels of society, but it is in the higher reaches of the educational system, communications system and industry that it constitutes a real caste. It is in the sphere of the production of these intellectuals that the state plays an important role. It is important in this context to understand why there is such hostility displayed towards those students who demand a voice and vote in the running of institutions of higher learning. This area of life is one of extreme sensitivity for the dominance of bourgeois ideology.

The aim of Marxists in this situation must be the creation of cadres (intellectuals of the new type) drawn both from the working class and the intelligensia who will 'attack' this elite corps. Such an attack must not only have the element of destruction but also one of positive affirmation. To do this there must be a separation, dividing lines must be very sharply drawn. A weak cadre cannot afford to enter alliances, because it will be absorbed by its allies. This weakness does not only refer to numbers but also to ideological quality. Only in irreconcilable struggle can Marxist cadres be gathered and maintained. Lenin said "...we declare that 'before we can unite and in order that we may unite, we must first draw firm and definite lines of demarcation..' + Note the phrase "and in order that we may unite", this process of demarcation does not mean a withdrawal into isolation and literary Marxism, it means that one must be very clear on who is an ally, who is a cadre and who must be opposed. All alliances seen from this point of view must have the aim of enlarging the numbers and influence of the Marxist cadre. But for this to take place there must be a period of separation. In practice, here in Britain this means that the Marxist cadres must be ideologically formed in opposition to and outside of the Social-Democratic milieu. This is not to be construed as a rejection of the need for Marxist cadres to participate in the labour movement as we

+ What Is To Be Done? p.56

find it. But one cannot properly carry out the ideological struggle necessary by only using aesopian language or looking over ones shoulder in fear of expulsion.

The key areas for the gathering of the 'grain of sand' (not to be confused with the building of a mass movement), must be where the material is most likely to be found, and these are in the educational system and the rank and file activities of the working class. These areas are very sensitive. Within the educational system students represent a volatile and impressionable segment of society, because of their age and the fact that they are in the process of equipping themselves with certain techniques. Many of them today are seeing themselves as workers who have to fight for better wages and conditions. It is no accident that in an age of mass technology the intellectuals are becoming proletarianised. Far from becoming a substitute for the working class they are becoming a part of it as never before. The rank and file militants on the other hand represent the best and most active section of the working class. Because of their experiences these militants have begun to react to the bureaucracy in the trade unions. Such people must be gathered and have their ideological vision widened and a fruitful interaction brought about.

Marxists should not allow the enemy to dictate the field of action, when this happens one can be sure that it is done because the enemy feels confident of victory. Bourgeois morality must be used and transgressed. All of the existing Marxist groups, in practice, accept the dictation of the field of action by the bourgeoisie. In doing so they accept their subordination. The monopolist control of the means of communication is accepted, and Marxists only participate on such conditions as to usually emasculate their message. What are needed are open and unfettered means of communication which are outside the present monopolist system.

Regis Debray analyses the idea of the revolutionary foco within the context of Latin America. Briefly, the foco implies that the cadres choose their own field of battle away from the ruling class strongholds and concentration of fire power of the cadres so that the superiority of the enemy is lessened and possibly overcome. However, it should be clear that such foco's are not intended to defeat the enemy on a military level but rather to act as sparks that set the inflammable material surrounding them alight. Is there a lesson for us here? I think so. Firstly, in the first stages of gathering together a cadre there must be a concentration of the few available people. Secondly, a concentration enlarges the 'fire-power' of such a cadre. Given sufficient concentration there is a qualitative enlargement of the abilities of all the component members. In a period of 'social peace' the spreading of cadres over large areas, either geographically or in spheres of activity inevitably leads to a dilution of effort and effectiveness. The concentration must not be seen as being for the cadres comfort and mutual solice, it is for its external effects in acting as a polarising force that it must be undertaken.

The process of forming such an initial cadre will not be an easy or short task, it can only be achieved by a continuous and conscious effort of

will. If this sounds like voluntarism, the answer is that all Marxist activity at this period has a large element of this, without it we remain captives of 'common sense'. Gramsci makes the point -

"Too much (and therefore superficial and mechanical) political realism often leads to the assertion that the man of State must only work within the sphere of 'effective reality', not interest himself in 'what should be' but only in 'what is'. This would mean that the man of State must have no perspective longer than his nose" Engels' phrase "freedom is the recognition of necessity" cannot be understood in a passive way, recognition here implies an active and creative participation in the making of that freedom. In this way, to have a perspective or knowledge of the future implies action that is incorporated in it. If one refuses to take positive and meaningful action, one remains passive in the face of the objectivity that dominates instead of being transformed and transcended by revolutionary praxis. In the sphere of building a Marxist cadre this means that old, subordinate and anti-intellectualist methods have to be replaced. The cadre will not be built by drawing a large periphery around an indeterminate centre, but like a pearl which is built up layer by layer around a hard core. It is because the process must evolve in this way that a confrontation with bourgeois ideology must take place in all spheres. Lenin made this point when he said -

"In order to bring the worker political knowledge, Social-Democrats must go into all classes of the population, must send out units of their army in all directions." +

All directions means in all spheres of life, and that Marxists do not only concern themselves with the problems of the working class but with all the oppressed. It is only by creating a mirror of the whole society that the working class can perceive itself. The Marxist critique must be articulated at all levels of society, in history, science, economics, sociology, art, sport etc. etc. Any such critique must be creative, not formalised or ritualised. Lenin said that Marxists have to impart a very clear idea of the totality of the universe we inhabit -

"And this 'clear idea' cannot be obtained from any book. It can only be supplied by vivid pictures and arraignments compiled on the basis of fresh evidence of what is happening around us at a given moment, of what everyone is talking, in his own way, or at least whispering about, of what is expressed in such and such events, such and such figures, such and such court judgements, etc. etc. These all embracing political arraignments are a necessary and fundamental condition for educating the masses in revolutionary activity." *

Unless one starts from this premise then one loses one's way, for a cadre - even a 'grain of sand' - does not start its activities from an abstract and remote plane, but from the very real and material pre-requisites that already exist; even though at times it is necessary to raise these to the level of abstraction to reveal their inner content. Such a critique can only start with the material at hand both objectively and subjectively,

. + What Is To Be Done? p. 102 * pp.95-96

i.e it is not possible to cover the whole range of possibilities initially. First and foremost a Marxist cadre must be consistently oriented towards the working class. The struggle against bourgeois ideology must be fought in that sphere above all. It matters not one whit if one only defeats bourgeois ideologists in well mannered debates before middle class audiences if this is not transmitted to the working class. Marxist ideology must become a living material force within society and it must seek this force within the working class.

Any process of clarification means sloughing off the old outworn elements. Similarly, to achieve as pure a product as possible it is necessary to exclude impurities. Therefore cadres can only be built on the basis of the strictest selection. This selection must be emphasised. In the recruitment of new people there has to be a high standard of competence demanded. The door to membership of a Marxist cadre organisation cannot be wide open. If the cadre is to do its work properly there must be a deep rapport. This rapport must be very different to the type of uniformity imposed by subordination to one or two 'theoreticians'. Such rapport must arise from a meticulous attention to theory and education, plus meaningful activity. Such education cannot be seen as something handed down, rather it must be seen as a continuing process for all concerned. Moreover, such education whilst having as its basis the texts of the Marxist movement must have its content continually enriched by actual struggle.

I want now to briefly mention the question of internationalism. No Marxist cadres can be created on a narrow national basis. It is true that we have to work in the situation in which we move and much of our experience will be drawn from this. But there can be no relapse into narrow national solipsism. Lenin, again, has something very useful to say on this point -

"...the Social-Democratic movement is essentially international. This does not only mean that we must fight national chauvinism, but also that a movement starting in a young country can only be successful if it absorbs the experience of other countries... it is not sufficient merely to be acquainted with it, or just to copy the latest resolutions. It requires the ability to treat this experience critically and to test it independently." +

There you have three key words - absorb, criticise and test - only thus armed can one approach the question of internationalism, any undue weight given to one of them leads to a one-sided and stunted appraisal. Internationalism is not a one-way process, the benefits that accrue from international collaboration will increase manifold only to the extent that each participant contributes. The need for a mass revolutionary international is more pressing today than it was in 1919. As in other matters, its creation will not be completely dependent on objective circumstances, the recognition of the need implies active work for its creation now. (This subject will be given a more extended treatment in the next article.)

+ p.59 What Is To Be Done?

IN CONCLUSION

There may appear to be a lack of very concrete propositions for action put forward in this essay. This, of necessity, must be the case because concrete and detailed propositions relating to the subject matter can only be made after thorough discussion of the main postulates, and these have been to some extent a critical analysis of the past. The tasks that need to be carried out will not automatically present themselves from this analysis, but the main areas of activity have. Moreover, tasks cannot be discussed in a vacuum or suggested to dis-embodied spirits, they can only be discussed with real people. Certainly the most concrete action initially is the publication of this essay with the intention of beginning a discussion around the analysis. But this can only be a first step, although a continuing one, as the discussion unfolds actions will be initiated.

Precisely because I have attempted to raise the discussion along unfamiliar lines it may appear to be somewhat abstract, nevertheless it is grounded, indeed very firmly so, in the actual conditions that have been traversed and still face us here and now. What we make of these depends on each and every one of us.

=====

Make sure you receive the next issue of The Bulletin.

Take out a subscription now. Fill in the form below.

To the Business Manager, 4, Norwood House, Peakes Road, Etchinghill,
RUGELEY, Staffs.

I wish to subscribe to The Bulletin of Marxist Studies.

I enclose 9/- for 4 issues. I enclose 18/- for 8 issues.

Name

Address

.

.

Please use block letters.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE POLISH STUDENTS!

(The following statement was issued on March 15th by the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International)

The revolutionaries and workers of the entire world must support the students of Warsaw, Cracow, Poznan, and Gdansk who have courageously demonstrated for basic democratic freedoms. They must support these students who are calling for real enjoyment by all citizens in a workers state, of freedom of opinion for socialist tendencies and of freedom of artistic and literary creation, for the right to exist in a workers state of all political forces opposed to a restoration of capitalism, for respect for rights formally written into the constitution but which has never been honoured.

The conservative bureaucrats are slandering these students by accusing them of being tools of "Zionism". In this way, they are trying to mobilize against them the anti-Semitic prejudices which persist in a section of the Polish people. The Fourth International, which extends full support to the Arab revolution and denounces the pro-imperialist, expansionist role of the state of Israel, brands with infamy this shameful maneuver. This tactic links up the methods of the bureaucratic government in Warsaw with those of all reactionary regimes which have ruled Poland in the past.

No less shameful is the Gomulka-Moczar team's demagogic attempts by this means to appeal to the workers against the students. This team liquidated the gains the workers made in October 1956. It drained the workers councils of all content. It has held down the workers buying power. It has encouraged a high cost of living, the black market, speculation, and corruption.

To win socialist democracy in the Polish workers state and to strengthen the bases of the socialized economy, the Polish workers must join in the students battle and fight for a transfer of all power to democratically elected and centralized workers councils and for improving the workers standard of living through the abolition of all bureaucratic privileges, the reduction of all income inequalities, and by a thoroughgoing reorganization of the nationalized economy, basing this on workers management, which would eliminate bureaucratic waste and theft.

The struggle of the Polish students is an integral part of the struggle of the students of Europe, North America, and Japan against authoritarian bourgeois power and the imperialist aggression in Vietnam. It is an integral part of the worldwide upsurge of revolutionary forces which seek to create a new socialist world by coordinating the struggles against imperialism, capitalism, and the usurpation of power in the workers states by a privileged bureaucracy. It is highly symbolic that the Czech students organized a march against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam which at the same time was directed against the bureaucracy in their own county, as the Yugoslav students had done before them.

(cont. on page 39)

THE IDEA OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

by CHRIS ARTHUR

It is extremely significant that Trotsky should have spent the last years before Stalin's axeman cut him down, striving to build a new International. Furthermore it is my belief that t'e achievement of Trotsky in struggling against the stream to found it, makes a contribution to his stature at least equal to his earlier distinctions.(1) This essay will provide the theoretical framework for this struggle.

The Marxist notion of the unity of theory and practice means that truth is developed out of practice and proved in practice. Theory without practice is empty and practice without theory is blind. The two sides must constantly be brought back in harmony with one another. Without the experience of action, theory degenerates into sterile dogmatism; neglect of theory leads to directionless pragmatism.

This unity of theory and practice and the dialectical relationship between them, in ongoing purposeful activity, must be understood when I refer, for short, to praxis. Now the scale of the praxis must be adequate to the subject matter of the activity. This factor has profound significance for working-class politics. At bottom the scale depends on the level of the productive forces. Clearly in the middle ages, based on domestic handicraft and agriculture, events on one side of the world had normally no influence on those on the other. To all intents and purposes social and political praxis needed to develop only within a national scale. However, the extraordinary development of the productive forces brought about by capitalism, for the first time, brought all of humanity within the comprehension of a single system, the world market. Yet modes of thought and action, methods of making history, remain frozen in forms which do not measure up to the requirements of the expanded productive forces, in forms which have become increasingly ineffective and counterproductive.

Human praxis must and can now become commensurate with the reality of the situation it finds itself in. It was for this reason that Marx stressed the necessity for the transcending of national boundaries, and the need for the universal appropriation of the means of production. In the German Ideology he said "...appropriation is first determined by the object to be appropriated, the productive forces, which have been developed to a totality and which exist only within a universal intercourse. From this aspect alone therefore, the appropriation must have a universal character..." (p.83 full ed. L&W)

"Empirically communism is only possible as the act of the dominant peoples 'all at once' and simultaneously,....."

(1)That a recent critic of Trotsky, N.Krasso, should fail to see this and dismisses Trotsky's efforts in the cavalier way that he does, is itself symptomatic of a large lacuna in the political consciousness of much of the Marxist movement today. (See New Left Review 44.Also a reply NLR 47)

"The proletariat can thus only exist world-historically, just as communism, its activity, can only have a "world-historical" (p.47)

In a pathetic note attached to the G.I. the institute of Marxism-Leninism attempts to explain away Marx's trenchant remarks by saying that they were correct only for "the period of pre-monopoly capitalism", but that "in the epoch of imperialism", "the socialist revolution could be victorious... in a single country". This is clearly an attempt to save the revisionist position of 'socialism in one country'. It is obvious however, that the advent of imperialism makes the victory of socialism in a single country less and not more likely. The law of combined and uneven development cited by the authors does not help. Lenin and Trotsky only used this idea to revise the perspective of where and when the revolution would break out first. Neither of them expected that socialism could be consolidated, victorious and secure, in a single country. The replacement of Lenin's 'holding operation' by Stalin's "socialism in one country", may seem just a question of phraseology, especially given a holding operation of several decades. In fact, these phrases reflect different conceptual universes, and issue in entirely different politics.

With Stalin, Marxism collapses from a world-historical praxis into that of a single country. Communist Parties outside the U.S.S.R. became mere adjuncts to Soviet diplomacy, often willing to betray the workers for the sake of maintaining peaceful co-existence and the status-quo. However this attempt to ensure the safety of the U.S.S.R. by smothering the contradictions was always doomed to be broken down by reality. Stalin's defence of the increasing oppressiveness of the State by reference to 'Capitalist encirclement', 'spies' etc. contradicts, though he refused to recognise it, the socialism in a single country perspective.

The attempt to maintain the status quo in an inherently developing antagonism just does not work. Just when the Stalinists have have all their own men in line along comes a Castro, making trouble, making revolution, and jeopardising the cosiness of peaceful co-existence with Imperialism. Or perhaps the Imperialists themselves take a mean advantage of the passivity of the Kremlin to leap in and try to batter a small workers' state to death.

The adoption of this anti-internationalist position made nonsense of the idea of the Third International, and after it was served up by Stalin as a burnt offering to his imperialist allies during the last war, this seems to have been tacitly conceded.

For it is from the world-historical character of our epoch and the need for communism to be based on a universal appropriation that there flows the need to build a movement truly universal in scope, consisting of nothing less than the international working class, whose purpose is the achievement of a world-wide communism, and whose praxis must be commensurate with that purpose. The instrument of this revolution, the revolutionary party, should therefore be an International, a world party of revolutionaries, unified in praxis.

"...the emancipation of labour is neither a local nor a national but a social problem, embracing all countries in which modern society exists, and depending for its solution on the concurrence practical and theoretical, of the most advanced countries..."

(Rules of the I.W.M.A. 1864-71. My emphasis)

Never before has it been so plain as it is today, that the politics and economy of capitalism, its markets, its crises, its wars - all have an international character (1)

Just as socialism cannot be realised in one country without world revolution so no revolutionary national grouping can develop completely without a world party. The world-historical character of events today means that the correct analysis of the world situation is more complex than ever before. This analysis cannot be developed abstractly in a single head. Such would be sheer idealism. Only analysis of the world situation, constantly re-examined and tested in the light of practical action, can enable all the sectors of a world movement to feel the pulse of history in the making. Only an International based on democratic - centralism, permitting different tendencies to confront each other democratically while uniting them in action, can allow experiences from all corners of the world to become properly weighed and translated into revolutionary tasks on a world scale. Only a universal praxis will suffice.

"What is involved is the construction of something qualitatively different from the mere sum of the national organisations. By pooling national experience and opinion in accordance with the rule of democratic centralism, it is possible to build an international leadership much superior to anything within the capacity of a single section. The basic concept is not that of assembling a staff of intellectuals, however valuable and necessary this is, but of combining on an international scale leaderships that are deeply rooted in their own national soil and connected in a living way with the masses of their own country. An international lead-

(1) Krasso's above mentioned dismissal of Trotsky's efforts to found a new International flows from his failure to see this. How in the middle of the Vietnam war can Krasso believe that history keeps "different times in Paris, Rome, London or Moscow"? It has been said that historical time is not a unitary flow - there are only specific structures with specific histories (see Gareth Stedman Jones NLR 46). Quite so, but even in Marx's day he was able to recognise the structural opposition of capitalism itself. By the time Trotsky formulated the theory of Permanent Revolution it should have been plain for all to see that we live in one world with one history. (One grants of course that different countries entered World History at different stages of their development and in different ways so that the ensuing totality is clearly complex, and there is always the necessity to study very carefully the precise way a country fits into the whole and the specific relation of its dialectic to that of the whole.)

...ership of that kind is capable of performing the difficult dual task of keeping theory up to date and of working out viable policies of revolutionary action on the great world issues of the day."

(Seventh World Congress of the Fourth International)

Such an International cannot be at all a mere association of national parties having independent programmes, held together merely by loose ties, an association of a 'federative' or 'polycentrist' character. Still less will a mere 'feeling of solidarity' with other oppressed peoples engaged in struggle do. There must be a common international programme on the basis of which the national sections develop answers to the particular problems of their country. Their experience is then fed back into the international organisation.

This must not be misunderstood.(1) It is not a question of a number of parallel structures, keeping parallel times, with parallel agendas so that lessons learnt in one place apply ipso facto in another. It is a question of building up from a total experience a totalisation of world history, a picture of the links binding the subordinate structures at various levels, an understanding of the dialectic between various epicentres of world revolution.

Only such an analysis and such a programme can lead to the most meaningful actions being undertaken in particular places - and of course the concrete application will depend upon the revolutionaries' situation in the articulated whole. Outside the Fourth International, in the whole Marxist left, it seems only Che Guevara has understood this, in his last message 'Two or Three more Vietnams'. He has been subjected to the same scorn and misrepresentation as Trotsky was, for it.

The best way of developing revolutionary cadres with a correct analysis and an internationalist outlook and practice, lies in their being part and parcel of a living International, democratic in organisation and unified in action. For not a single minute during his political work should such a revolutionary forget that what he is doing is essentially one with his comrades all over the world, with whom he shares a common purpose and praxis.

How do we stand today on the question of building the International? The Second International is nothing but a joke, and of course nothing so sinister looking as a Third International must be allowed to disturb peaceful co-existence with Imperialism. Only the Fourth International strives to build a revolutionary International.

The abdication from this task by the traditional social democratic and Stalinist parties has had catastrophic results for the workers movement.

(1) As Krasso misunderstands Trotsky when he (K) writes "Political agendas were not interchangeable across geographical frontiers...."

KROON'S 'STRENGTH' KAMMED HIT

When a Labour Government came to office we suffered the spectacle of Anthony Greenwood, star of the social democratic left, gassing school-children in Bahrain on behalf of an autocracy (rightful even by the standards of that area. Within weeks of the slaughter of a million workers and peasants of Indonesia, Michael Stewart was first ashore shaking the bloody hands of the butchers and promising them every assistance. Hardly a voice was raised in the Labour Movement - so deepgoing is the demobilisation of consciousness on this question. It is no accident that the Government's domestic policy is equally class-collaborationist.

With the Stalinist parties the situation is no better. The pernicious theory of socialism in one country has been translated into a diffuse polycentrism - every party its own way to socialism and to hell with the rest of the world. Episodes in the long history of Kremlin treason to the revolution were the sabotage of the Chinese economy by the withdrawal without notice of technicians and plans, the arming of India against China, and the granting of aid to the repressive regime in Columbia against which guerillas are fighting arms in hand. The last shows the complete lack of any living link between the Kremlin and the Columbian workers and peasants, and it was rightly condemned at O.L.A.S.

The Chinese Communist Party in spite of its revolutionary phraseology, is equally sunk in chauvinism and opportunism stemming from its lack of any idea of internationalism. The way it rushed in to recognise the counter-revolutionary coup d'etat in Algeria in hopes of gaining factional advantages over the Russians if the proposed conference was staged there shocked even neo-colonialists African regimes. They arm the Pakistan military dictatorship. They have not come out in support of Guevara and the OLAS conference - presumably because of their obscure and trivial quarrel with Cuba.

Worst of all is the failure of the Russians and Chinese to organise a united front for the defence of Vietnam.

However it would be a mistake to think of these episodes as mere aberrations which may be easily corrected. These anti-internationalist attitudes have deep social roots in authoritarian structures concerned with conserving the power and privileges of a parochial bureaucracy.

It was when Trotsky saw that the Third International and the Communist Parties had degenerated into administrative machines with no internal life, that he decided it was time to start again, to build a new International dedicated to breaking the grip of social democracy and the Stalinist bureaucracies on the workers' movement. It remains true that the idea of building a new International represents perhaps the most enduring and relevant legacy of Leon Trotsky.

THE GERMAN STUDENTS' STRUGGLE

by GODULA CASTLES

The SDS (German Socialist Student Federation) became known in this country, during the Easter demonstrations in Berlin and elsewhere, as the core of the "Extra-Parliamentary Opposition" in Germany. This anti-authoritarian movement started as a manifestation of protest against the general trend of restorative politics in post-war Germany and against developments in the university in particular: the Vietnam war has exposed the contradiction/science and humanism as they are taught at the university. The technological and economic need for a higher output of intelligensia has led to a shortening of the length of studies and to expulsion from the university of those who do not complete their degree in this time. This measure directs itself against those students who have to earn a living while studying. (Only 20 per cent of students get grants in West Germany, and mainly for this reason, only 5 per cent come from working class homes.)

The demand for the democratisation of the university institutions has met with considerable resistance from the authorities, both within and without the university, and they have used their administrative and bureaucratic positions for fighting liberalisation. More and more students have realised that the SDS was fighting for their common interests. As they joined the protest movement, they found themselves confronted with a rigid authoritarian structure. They came to understand that the conditions in the university was a reflection of the socio-economic state of capitalist society, and the world-wide conflict between revolution and counter-revolution became clear. The step from fighting the university authorities to fighting all irrational authority and thus becoming a general "anti-authoritarian movement" was an inevitable one.

The movement understands itself as being in a period of transition. It is obvious that the revolution cannot be achieved without the support of the masses of the working people. However, as the students' demands became more radical and their challenge more general, ever larger sections of society got involved in the fight against them. And since the machine of power, press and mass propaganda are in the hands of the authorities, the students became more and more isolated from precisely the part of society whose support is vital to them - the working class. Yet, the students have been successful in breaking the weakest link in the authoritarian system - the institution of the university. Other weak parts, like technical colleges, stagnant industries, etc., are the next steps on "the long march through the institutions".

Already, the movement has ceased to be confined to the universities. Groups such as young workers and trade unionists, pupils and teachers are being drawn in increasing numbers. It is significant
+between

that many of the recent demonstrations took place in towns where there is no university. The Grand Coalition has done away with all possible opposition within Parliament and society has taken a decisive step towards the right. The Extra-Parliamentary Opposition is the only opposition in West Germany and is growing in importance.

The anti-authoritarian movement is essentially democratic. All organisational work is done in public and is subjected to criticism by all participants. Conspiratorial methods are considered useless, since the authorities and the police are bound to have agents amongst them. Such methods would also be in contradiction to the aims of the movement - an "anti-authoritarian movement" could hardly expect its members to accept decisions imposed on it by a leadership group, without the possibility of democratic discussion. Rudi Dutschke can be quoted as saying: "there are no chief ideologues, there is no unified line, there is no party." He, himself, became victim of the deliberate policy of the Springer press monopoly, who have tried to personalise the movement. By representing Dutschke as leader of the movement and trying to show him as a half-crazy extremist, under the influence of East Berlin, they have avoided discussing the real causes of the students' widespread discontent. The spontaneous Easter demonstrations against the Springer press, all over Germany, have proved Dutschke right and Springer wrong.

There is certainly no unified political line within the SDS. People who would, in Britain, spend most of their time fighting each other in "CP", "Trotskyist" or "Maoist" fractions, are able to cooperate on questions of action within the SDS, without any suppression of theoretical discussion. This was shown, for instance, by the discussion over participation in the Federal Elections next year. The argument for participation can be summarized as follows:

- (1) The election would give the left a chance to raise issues in such a way that the other parties would have to answer. the left would thus gain a wide audience and could use the campaign for building political consciousness.
- (2) Discontent in West Germany is wide-spread since the SPD ceased to form an opposition. The German voter should be freed from the dilemma of again having to vote for a party which he does not support only because it is the lesser evil. A united election campaign could even make the new left party strong enough to become represented in Parliament.

Here, however, the supporter of the election participation meets opposition. A party, even a new left party, can only be a reproduction of the difficulties of every bourgeois membership organisation. It would necessarily develop bureaucratic and authoritarian traits and therefore lose the ground that has been won by the anti-authoritarian movement. It would mean recognising the parliamentary system as being basically democratic, the implication being that one has only

to change the parties to restore democracy. However, the institutions themselves become oligarchic and powerful, and only their abolition by the revolutionary movement can lead to democracy. The national conference of the SDS, two months ago, decided to adopt this second line, although it remains up to every individual to decide whether he will take part in the campaign for the new party. The SDS line is not binding for any of its members.

It is essential for the understanding of the movement to realise that it is opposed to authoritarian systems in both East and West Germany. Co-operation with East German organisations is possible to the extent to which these support and assist the students' struggle against the West German authorities. However, the SDS realised that the GDR is far from being democratic or socialist, although progress has been made towards fairer distribution of goods and better educational and social systems.

The anti-authoritarian movement has no fixed model of what ^{the} society of the future should look like. It refuses to identify with the so-called "socialist bloc". The revolution has to produce something new: socialism which means democracy of the people. The fact that this has not yet been completely achieved anywhere does not mean that it cannot be the future. The concept of the permanent revolution means criticising every aspect of society again and again until it has been changed for the better.

THE RISE OF WEST GERMAN STUDENT RADICALISM

by GISELA MANDEL

One year after the infamous Godesberg party congress of the Social Democratic Part of Germany (SPD) in 1959, where Marx was finally and definitely cast aside and Lassalle enthroned in his place, this party started to expell its whole student union, the SDS, with the final words: "We'll show these kids who is boss in Germany". Some 800 students and with them a handful of intellectuals, were put on their own and decided to remain faithful to Marxism. They accepted the expulsion and started their independent political work in 1960.

They began modestly, partly with educational work inside the trade unions, partly with research for university reform. Several efforts for the founding of a new revolutionary opposition party failed; several attempts to agitate for the Cuban and Vietnamese revolutions in the mass May Day demonstrations also failed.

Socialist students were beaten by the workers who, in 1961, never heard anything about Vietnam in the West German papers, and only knew that "some gangsters had taken power" in Cuba. They had survived fascism, years of starvation after the war. Now they lived with relatively high

wages and with the assurance of the West German capitalist government that their jobs would remain stable forever. What did they care about revolutions in other parts of the world? Their only experience of something like "revolution" was the Stalinist system in East Germany, which just then had to build a wall to prevent her population from leaving the country to participate in the West German "economic miracle".

The dissatisfied intellectuals could either join the establishment or leave the country and go "to your friends in East Germany", as the SPD put it. Some got integrated; the majority accepted isolation, were called "destructive elements" by the bourgeois press, and began various research projects. In study circles they analyzed revolutions in the third world, the situation in the workers' states of Eastern Europe, and the politics and economics of West Germany. They developed in this way, over a period of years, a highly trained scientific and political cadre.

Today the situation has dramatically changed.

A recent opinion poll taken by the well-known left-liberal weekly Der Spiegel (The Mirror) showed that 25 per cent of all youth between the ages of 19 and 25 in West Germany are generally in favour of the SDS and its leader Rudi Dutschke.

How did this development take place? Within six years there has been a new radical upsurge in West Germany, and its main centre is in West Berlin, the most anti-communist reactionary and Americanised city of Western Europe. On June 2, 1967, several hundred students demonstrated in West Berlin against the Shah of Iran. Police attacked the demonstration and shot one student to death. Numerous protest demonstrations were held afterward throughout West Germany, none of them fewer than several thousand strong.

For the past several months there has been a growing participation in the student demonstrations on the part of workers - especially young workers. This despite the fact that West Germany is the most economically and industrially developed country in Western Europe, with the highest wages for workers in this part of the world. On Feb. 18th a massive demonstration of 20,000 took place in West Berlin against the way Vietnam, for the victory of the Vietnamese revolution and against imperialism as a whole. At least 2,000 workers took part. For the first time in 35 years, red flags - 1,200 of them - were seen openly in the streets. How was all this possible?

A definitive answer could obviously be given only in a thorough study of the international radicalisation of youth, of which the German youth are a part. Some of the general factors include the changed social composition of the overcrowded universities, that is, the growing masses of students from working-class and lower middle class origin; the absolute lack of contact between the mass of students and their professors in most of the Western European universities; the reaction against the authoritarian structure of the universities; the insecurity

of students in getting decent jobs when they finish school etc., etc. An analysis on an international basis would show similar signs in many countries, from Japan to India, from the United States to Western Europe.

But three special factors are involved in the rapidly deepening radicalisation in West Germany:

1) The older generation which supported Hitler and the fascist regime of Germany during the Third Reich remains quiet, tries to simplify the matter. The new generation in West Germany today asks questions without getting answers. The gap between the generations thus widens from year to year. It started inside the families and grew to a deep split inside the whole society.

The students ask where the supporters of the fascist regime are today; and the only answer they get is that nobody knew anything of what was going on under fascism. They know that this is not true, and so they start to doubt also what the older generation, which supported fascism, has to say today. They doubt their government, their university professors, their newspapers. They doubt the leaders of the big parties, the trade union bosses, radio and television.

They know that the generation which supported Hitler now governs or supports the present system. And now they revolt against it. The innumerable political tendencies amongst the students and young workers in West Germany have one thing in common: an utterly anti-authoritarian attitude.

2) The formation of the "great coalition" between the CDU (Christian Social Union) - the main capitalist party) and the SPD opened a place for a new opposition party. Since such a party does not exist the SDS today fulfills more or less this role.

3) The "great coalition" coincided with the beginning of the first big recession since the end of World War Two. Prices rose, 800,000 workers lost their jobs and were even told that this recession was due to the fact that they had earned too much and worked too little throughout the last 15 years.

The SDS - which has now reached a membership of 4,000, and has received innumerable applications for membership from whole groups - is not ready organisationally to fulfill the role of a revolutionary opposition party. The SDS leaders are doing some serious thinking these days: the results of an opinion poll of the magazine Der Spiegel were astonishing even to members of SDS. The main, rather, triumphant slogan of the Feb, 18th demonstration, "We are a small radical minority", is no longer true.

Out of three million West German youth between 15 and 25 years, 65 per cent of those who are workers, 71 per cent of the high school students, and 74 per cent of the university students said they were in favour of protest in general. Out of 100 young people who are in

favour of protest 57 would demonstrate against rising prices; 60 would demonstrate against the war in Vietnam and for the Vietnamese revolution; 61 per cent for workers' control; and 26 per cent for the expropriation of the main capitalist press monopoly of Axel Springer. (ed. note. This article was first published in the April 22nd edition of The Militant U.S.A.)

=====

THE CANADIAN MAOISTS "ANALYSE" THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

by PHIL COURNEYEUR

The Progressive Workers' Movement (PWM, Canada's Maoist group) have come out with the startling revelation that Cuba all this time has only been "masquerading" as a socialist revolution but is really only "a bourgeois democratic revolution". Worse, "Castro aims at no more than a patching up of the capitalist system" and "Fidel and his colleagues... are not socialists and are ^{only} intrinsically (sic) anti-imperialist. In short, Cuba is capitalist!

These choice slanders of the Cuban revolution stick out like bandaged thumbs in what purports to be a review of Debray's Revolution in the Revolution, published in the February issue of the Progressive Worker. According to the editors of this official publication, this represents "A systematic presentation of the Progressive Workers Movement's position" based on a "critical examination" of Debray's book.

The review has no merit aside from the light it casts upon the present attitude of Maoism towards the Cuban revolution. Summing up the whole experience of the insurrectional struggle against Batista by the July 26th Movement, the editors declare:

"Batista's regime was on an extremely shaky foundation from the every moment he seized power and it grew rapidly weaker with each passing day....Finally the U.S. imperialists refused any longer to subsidise Batista with loans and his regime staggered to its doom, to be replaced by the Castro led rebels in mountains who enjoyed a wide measure of popular support for no other reason than that they opposed Batista with arms." (emphasis added.)

The next paragraph goes on to accuse Castro of declaring "the establishment of 'Socialism' by decree" -- implying that this was enacted only to get aid from the "revisionists" in the Soviet Union. On top of this, the editors assert that "the Cuban revolution held few lessons for Marxist-Leninists but many illusions for the unwary". This assertion is probably intended to help cover up the silence maintained by the Maoist leadership in China on the death of Che Guevara and the revolutionary positions stated by him in his last message published in

Tricontinental magazine. The Maoist leadership has maintained a similar silence on the historic decisions taken by the conference of the Organisation of Latin-American Solidarity insisting on the road of armed struggle for the socialist revolution across Latin America.

Following suit, Canada's Maoist grouping, the PWM, have dummied up. They failed even to carry commemorative mention of Che in their press. The growing hostility of the Maoists towards the Cuban revolution can be traced to a dispute around the 1965 rice deal and Castro's charges of economic pressure from China. The roots of the disagreements, however, go much deeper than trade problems. The most fundamental questions of revolutionary strategy in our epoch have come up between the Cuban and Chinese leaders, just as they have between the Cubans and the Russians. The most immediate and pressing question is the defense of Vietnam from the imperialist aggression.

The Maoists were stung by Che's moving appeal for real solidarity with Vietnam and by his call for a genuine united front at the state level between China and the Soviet Union. His daring to criticise the Chinese sectarian attitude on this question placed him beyond the Maoist pale and outside the ranks of the faithful. Also galling to the Maoists were Che's conclusions on the socialist character of the Latin-American revolution with his now famous statement: "either a socialist revolution or a make-believe revolution". The OLAS conference marked a parting of the ways with the old theory of alliances with the so-called progressive bourgeoisie.

Canadian Maoists -- like most of their strain throughout the world -- are arch nationalists and uphold the "bloc of four classes" programme. This policy enacted so tragically in Indonesia by Aidit's pre-Peking Communist Party, is becoming more and more discredited among revolutionary currents in the colonial world. Nevertheless, the whole programme of the PWM for Canada has been to graft this nationalist programme onto working class politics in this country. They advocate an all-inclusive multiclass "United Front" to drive out U.S. imperialist investment, repatriate the economy and free Canada from U.S. domination. Even "independent Canadian capitalists" will have a place in what PWM calls the "great movement of national resurgence". But we are assured that the resurgence would leave no place for "capitalism of the old style".

What the new style "national resurgence" has in store for the workers is left to the imagination except for statements such as the following: "We reject the contention that Canadians will not be prepared to make any initial sacrifices that may be necessary in the way of foregoing any unessential comforts and luxuries, so as to establish our national independence on a firm footing". (Quoted from March 1966 Progressive Worker)

It seems ludicrous to even point to the abyss between the arrant nationalism of the PWM and the socialist internationalism of the Cuban revolution and the vanguard revolutionaries in Latin America.

Cont. from page 26.

By their fight for the victory of socialist democracy based on councils, the Polish students have strengthened the anti-imperialist front of Vietnam, Cuba, and all the insurgent masses of the world. For cutting out the bureaucratic gangrene from the countries which have abolished capitalism will deprive imperialism of one of its last political arguments.

Free Modzelewski, Kuron, and all the imprisoned high-school and university students!

Long live the united struggle of the Polish students and workers for socialist democracy based on councils!

Long live the united struggles of students and workers of all countries against imperialism and for the defence of the Vietnamese revolution!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

Cont. from page 38.

But the price for failing to adhere to Mao's thought is very severe. Overnight you can be changed from a socialist to a fascist, from a revolutionary to a reactionary. Overnight a workers state can become capitalist. The Cuban revolution can, by PWM decree, cease to be socialist and become, as they put it, a "bourgeois democratic state masquerading as socialist". The criterion for determining the class character of a given party, programme or state, is no longer rooted in the real world, but in the omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent thoughts of Chairman Mao, as interpreted by faithful clerics like the editors of Progressive Worker.

Strangely enough, the imperialist strategists on Wall Street and their hirelings in the Pentagon haven't noticed the revelation about Cuba being capitalist. Neither have the Cuban people, nor the revolutionary vanguard in Latin America.

(editors note. This article was first published in World Outlook Vol.6 .
No.16)

Tail-piece. Some British Maoist's are no less super-patriotic. Point two, no less, of The Marxist's programme is "Fight for the national independence of the British People."

