

**Mike Cooley on
Aspects of
Technological Change**

**Charles Bettelheim on
International Workers
Solidarity**

**Lenin on
Women's Liberation**

**Jorge Sangumba on
Youth in Southern Africa**

**Alex Tudor Hart on
Political Lessons of the
Spanish War**

**NUMBER SIXTEEN
Price 10p (2s)**

THE MARXIST 16

THE MARXIST — January 1971

Contributions to the next issue of *The Marxist* should reach the editorial office (see address below) not later than February 10, 1971.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Mike Cooley

Mike Faulkner

Tom Hill

Frank Huscroft

Jim Kean

Colin Penn

Reg Wagland

CORRESPONDENCE

All correspondence should be addressed to Tom Hill, 11 Barratt Avenue, Wood Green, London N22.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

A remittance for 14 shillings will bring you six issues of *The Marxist*, post free. Single copies 2s 6d post paid. Overseas rates: Europe 25 shillings post paid; rest of the world 30 shillings post paid.

FROM THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

The financial problems of *The Marxist* are the common experience of all publications in any capitalist society which advocate revolutionary change in that society and seek to build the necessary forces to carry out that task. An initial period of limited circulation makes it necessary to appeal for financial support to meet the gap between production/circulation cost and income from sales. If you share our view that this journal has served and can continue to serve the interests of the revolutionary forces in Britain and play a part in the development of a Marxist-Leninist Party, please assist in the following ways:

- (a) Introduce new subscribers to the journal,
- (b) Send a donation to Tom Hill,
11 Barratt Avenue,
Wood Green,
London N.22.

Cheques and Postal Orders should be made payable to The Oasis Publishing Company.

Can you sell?

If you can, will you help sell *The Marxist*?

Up to fifteen copies at a time sent on sale-or-return terms.

Contact Tom Hill.

Comment by Tom Hill

ALTHOUGH THE TORIES claim that they have an electoral mandate to make changes in the law in relation to trade disputes they are also sufficiently realistic to understand that it is one thing to get people to vote at an election but an entirely different thing to put those promises into effect.

In order to weaken any opposition, they place great emphasis on 'parliamentary democracy' and the duty of everyone to accept 'the will of the majority' as expressed in parliament.

The Labour Party and trade union leaders are completely committed to this conception of democracy, and for this reason alone could not lead an all out struggle against the proposed legislation. Vic Feather made this clear when he said *'The Unions will push their opposition to the maximum limits of law and democratic practice.'*

The aims of the Bill will not be thwarted if we allow this kind of drivel to dominate the working class. The capitalist class make the rules and we are expected to abide by them.

It is a dictum of any kind of warfare that one should always try to avoid fighting on ground chosen by and favourable to the enemy, yet this is precisely what we are doing if we allow ourselves to be trapped into trying to defend our class interests within the framework of capitalist democracy.

If we are to be successful we need to take the struggle outside the field of 'party politics' and 'parliamentary democracy' and take it where it really belongs, on the more favourable (to us) ground of class interests and class politics.

A growing number of workers already regard parliament as of little consequence as evidenced by the increasing proportion who do not bother to vote. If this spontaneous awakening is built upon and given conscious direction it will prove to be a great positive force.

Many examples can be given to show that parliament does not represent the interests of our class. No mandate has ever been given to increase the number of unemployed; yet both Tory and Labour governments have carried out policies which they

knew would increase the number of unemployed. No government has had a mandate to change the national distribution of income in favour of the rich, but this has been carried out. No government has told the electorate that it would reduce the number of houses being built, but this is what is happening. No government has asked or received a mandate to join the Common Market, but everyone knows that it is practically a foregone conclusion. No government has received a mandate to freeze wages, yet only the 'unconstitutional' actions of workers at shop floor level have prevented its full operation.

Prices are increased without reference to the consumer, but wage increases can only be obtained in the teeth of opposition from employers, government, and in many cases, trade union leaders. The ruling class have made the rules by which their kind of democracy works, and naturally they have framed them in their own interests.

We cannot win unless we change the rules, and they cannot be changed 'by the democratic process' but only by the working class being strong enough to dictate them.

This is the reality that determines our attitude towards not only the Tory proposals but also towards the Labour Party and trade union leaders who preach docile acceptance of the existing rules of the game.

It is for the same reason that the working class cannot allow the conduct of any struggle to be placed in the hands of these people

How can the Labour Party effectively oppose the Tory proposals when only a few months ago it was advocating something almost identical?

How can they and the trade union leaders lead a struggle against the Bill when they accept the need for a 'wages policy', and join with the employers in condemning 'wildcat' strikes?

All the proposals to date for 'reforming industrial relations' can only be made to work if the working class can be intimidated, cajoled, or simply fooled into accepting the rules as laid down by the employing class.

The task of Marxists is to encourage the rejection of and stimulate opposition to all forms and expressions of capitalist authority.

There is already a spontaneous growth of this kind of sentiment and we need to develop it into a conscious rejection of capitalist democracy by showing how the dice are loaded against the working class in every way, not just trade unionwise.

Rejection and repudiation of all forms of capitalist authority are growing. In factories it expresses itself in workers attitudes towards foremen and the management in general. The attempts of the trade union leaders to dictate to the membership by such things as coming to an agreement over their heads or ordering them to stop a strike, are all forms of capitalist authority and are subconsciously recognised as such and consequently increasingly rejected by the membership. The same is happening to some shop stewards who adopt similar ideas and attitudes.

This is causing anger and concern amongst the ruling class, and dismay within the ranks of our would-be leaders. It should however be a cause for

rejoicing amongst revolutionaries because although it is spontaneous, it means that workers are ready to receive new ideas that give support to these attitudes and which point to new horizons in keeping with their interests.

Nothing is more pathetic than the person who has spent his life in the trade union movement and yet takes the line that "the workers will never learn." What he really means is "they will not learn from me." He is pathetic because he does not realise that it is he who has not learned anything and that the workers have learned their own lessons and are ahead of him.

If we encourage this rejection of capitalist authority at all levels and in all its forms, (even when we ourselves are the target of such criticism) and create a climate of opinion that what is good for the working class is good for the majority of the British people, that is to see things in class terms, then we can help develop the struggle against the passing of a particular law into a struggle against capitalist law, capitalist order and capitalist institutions in their entirety.

'Left' to Right

IT HAS OFTEN been remarked that if you move far enough to the 'left' you will find yourself supporting, and being supported by, those on the extreme right — as Trotskyites have been known to do.

This fact is illustrated in the following quotations from *Hammer & Steel Newsletter*, No 4, 1970, published in the USA.

'The left revisionists continue to claim that contradiction is the main aspect of Sino-US relations. They never attempt to explain why the 7th Fleet and US planes were so quiet during Mao's counter-revolution in 1966-67. Would the US have been so peaceful if anti-imperialist forces were taking power in China?'

How can anyone with a vestige of socialism apply the phrase 'so peaceful' to US policy? To call the Cultural Revolution a counter-revolution must mean that in the opinion of the writer China was socialist before 1966 but is not now. We wonder if those who are now so vociferous in opposition were equally loud in praise before 1965. We doubt it.

Our pseudo-lefts go on:

'The foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is anti-imperialist in form and collusion with US imperialism in content. The three-in-one state power concept of Mao, borrowed from the dogma on the Trinity of the Christian Church, is the Chinese version of Khrushchevism. How long could such a regime exist if it did not depend on US imperialism?'

So now Mao emerges as a student of the Bible! We do not know what is meant by the phrase 'the Chinese version of Khrushchevism' and would be interested to see an attempt to find any similarities whatever between Mao and the now-discarded Russian revisionist.

Only someone who has completely lost touch with reality could claim that the US is really a friend of China, and only someone whose real position is on the extreme right could have such faith in the overwhelming power of US armed might as to believe that People's China exists only by sufferance of the USA.

Aspects of technological change

by Mike Cooley

Part One

The use and fabrication of instruments of labour, although existing in the germ among certain species of animals, is specifically characteristic of the human, labour-process, and Franklin therefore defines man as a tool making animal. Relics of bygone instruments of labour possess the same importance for the investigation of extinct economic forms of society, as do fossils bones for the determination of extinct species of animals. It is not the articles made, but how they are made, and by what instruments that enables us to distinguish different economic epochs . . . Instruments of labour not only supply a standard of the degree of development to which human labour has attained but they are also indicators of the social conditions under which that labour is carried on.

Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 1.

Social relations are closely bound up with productive forces. In acquiring new productive roles men change their mode of production; and in changing their mode of production, in changing their way of earning their living, they change all their social relations. The hand mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam mill, society with the industrial capitalist.

Karl Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy.

THE EARLIEST MEN we know of made and used tools in order to enable them to meet their primitive requirements of shelter, food and an economic environment in which to reproduce their own kind. The techniques by which they did this have been in constant change and are generally referred to as 'technological change'. Technological development is a powerful force which has moulded the course of history from earliest times. Not merely in the sense that it tends to raise the standard of living for all or sections of the community, but also in a much more profound political sense, in that technological change alters the whole character of society.

It was the invention of agriculture, and the subsequent flow of inventions such as metallurgy and the use of wheeled transport which transformed the simple life of primitive communism into civilisation with its complexities and class divisions.

'Democracy' of iron

About 3000 BC a discernible change was taking place in the structure of society. The communities of equal farmers were gradually replaced by states in which the vast majority lived at subsistence level, while all the surplus products of their labours were used for a small class of kings, noblemen and priests. Class division became the basis of social structure. That age obtained its name from the

metal used to provide implements at that stage — Bronze. However, due to its rarity and costliness, bronze never greatly extended man's control over nature. Its rarity also ensured that it was only available to the prosperous class.

When man learned to produce iron as well as bronze, the then society was profoundly affected by this technical advance. At this stage, metal tools became generally available to the farmer, and enormously increased the productivity of agriculture. From 700 BC, iron axes made possible the clearance of great forests and hence a further expansion of agriculture. The increased productivity of agriculture yielded a surplus which could then support a large number of craftsmen. The commodities produced by the craftsmen became more generally available, and were no longer merely produced for the wealthy. The craftsmen provided the farmer directly with tools in order to increase the productivity of his work. There then existed for the first time a balanced relationship between industry and agriculture.

This changed relationship ended a stage in which agriculture provided the food for the craftsmen, but the craftsman's product went to the select few. The craftsmen, by using iron, were able to provide themselves with ever improved tools, thereby increasing the productivity of their crafts which

in turn tended to enhance their economic status. Thus the advance in technology from the production of bronze to that of iron tended to break down barriers between classes which had brought about a stagnation in the Bronze Age.

Power Driven Machinery

It can therefore be demonstrated that even from earliest times technological change has had a profound effect upon the structure of society. The more 'democratic' Iron Age societies created circumstances in which technical advance could be made. This progress was however limited by the fact that although slavery created the conditions for the accumulation of wealth into fewer hands and therefore laid the basis for a further development of the productive forces; yet, in its decline it was responsible for holding back the full development of techniques such as animal power and the water wheel. Thus technological advance necessitated a social change in which the slave states had to be replaced by mediaeval feudalism. This structure of society provided a higher status for the master craftsman, and thereby stimulated a wealth of technical innovations including the first development of power driven machinery.

By the end of the middle ages, the scale and nature of machinery had become too large for the social organisation which had created it. Thus the master craftsmen and their powerful Guilds which had introduced the machinery then became an impediment to future progress. The further development of the productive forces could only be brought about by the newly arising capitalist class.

Capitalism then provided the social organisation which made possible the primitive accumulation of capital, the social organisation for using heavy machinery and the development of an economic framework within which it would be effectively deployed.

Capitalism — A Retarding Force

We shall attempt to demonstrate that capitalism today, just as the societies which preceded it, has reached an historical stage when it is a retarding force not only politically but in the field of technological change and in the implementation of those techniques which technological change now makes possible. To generalise one might say that technology and social organisation interact to elevate the nature of man's existence to a higher level. Each form of society, during its early stages, tends to encourage the advance of technology. However, when technological levels rise, the society which had given birth to it tends to fail to keep pace with it. There is then arrived at, a historical breaking point at which the old society must be transformed

into a new one otherwise it is incapable of utilising the potential of technology to the full. In capitalist society, science and technology, which could provide the material basis for a fuller and more dignified form of existence, is being retarded. Further, because of the enormous contradictions within capitalist society, technology is heightening those contradictions to levels where a change in society becomes even more imperative. *Capitalist society is now incapable of providing the rational framework in which to organise the productive forces in social production.*

Rate of Change

Before dealing with some aspects of technological change in a contemporary context, it is essential to quantify if only roughly, the actual rate of this change. The scale of development in the last twenty years is probably equal to that accomplished in the whole of man's existence. The scale of scientific effort (which is now closely allied to technical change) in the present century has increased out of all recognition. It has been asserted by Professor J D Bernal that in 1896 there were perhaps in the world some 50,000 people who between them carried on the whole tradition of science; not more than 15,000 of whom were responsible for the advancement of knowledge through research. Today, the total number of scientific workers in industry, government and academic circles must be in the order of 2½ million. The expenditure on science has increased at an even greater rate as is demonstrated by the following table:—

Expenditure on Research and Development

(£ millions)

INDUSTRY			
	1937	1955	1962
USA	61	920	1,800
Britain	3	65	213
GOVERNMENT			
Civil			
	1937	1955	1962
	20	140	960
	3	36	139
Military			
	1937	1955	1962
	5	710	2,800
	1.5	214	246

During the past few years, the growth rate has sometimes been up to 25 per cent which is a far greater rate of growth than in any other element of society. It is in fact even greater than that of military expenditure. These enormous sums indicate

not only a change in size, but also a change in the relationship of science to society as a whole.

Rate of Obsolescence

In capitalist society, production dominates the producer. In socialist society, the producer dominates production. We shall attempt to demonstrate that technological change within the framework of capitalism intensifies the domination of the producer by production, and man becomes more subordinate to the machine. Further, that technological change and automation extends the range of proletarianisation thereby creating new allies among sections of the intelligentsia.

Two major features are discernible in the type of equipment used for advance production in this era. Firstly there is an enormous increase in the rate of obsolescence of this equipment. Complicated machinery now has to be replaced every five years compared with ten years during the fifties, and thirty or forty years at the turn of the century. (Marx pointed out the increasingly short life of fixed capital). This means that companies such as ICI have to modify their policies accordingly. Paul Chambers (Chairman of ICI) spelt this out when he said:- that the Company was 'beginning to think in terms of fifteen years for new projects. In early 1960 this came down to twelve to fifteen years; and more recently the average for new plant has come down to about ten years. For certain kinds of investment, where the risks of technological obsolescence are thought to be high, the amortisation period is down to five to seven years'.

The second feature is that the total amount of capital necessary to provide the means of production for a commodity on a mass production scale is ever increasing. Thus confronted with equipment which has a high rate of obsolescence and enormous capital expenditure, the employer will seek to exploit it for 24 hours a day.

Shift Working

Wider sections of the working class will be compelled to disrupt their normal social existence to accommodate the requirements of production. In a profit orientated society, automation will only be introduced into narrow sectors of the economy, there to be exploited to the maximum at twenty-four hours per day. The motive forces of capitalist society will prevent the widespread introduction of this kind of equipment, and through its general use the shorter working week, longer holidays and more leisure time. Since the tendency will be to increase productivity and not production (see Marxist Number 14) the effect will be to have some sections of

the community working 24 hrs/day whilst creating a permanent pool of unemployed persons. This pattern is already quite discernible in the United States. The effects of shift work on those who are compelled to undertake it is considerable in a physical, psychological and social sense.

A number of studies demonstrate this. P E Mott et al. 'Shift Work, the Social, Psychological and Physical Consequences,' Ann Arbor, 1965,

'found that day workers get an average of seven and one-half hours sleep per night, which is an hour more than the overall average of rotating shift workers. But when they are working the night segment of their shift, rotating workers average only five and one-half hours of sleep. The biggest problem for rotating shift workers occurs when they move from their turn on the day shift to the night shift.' One study 'report that only 37 per cent of the workers adjust to the new sleeping times immediately, while 28 per cent of the workers said that they took four days or more to adjust to the night shift. . . . Another study of operators in two different power plants in the United States found that only 31 per cent of the men working under an extended seven-day week rotation reported that they adjusted to their hardest shift change within a day or less. Even fewer, just 5 per cent of the men working a monthly rotation schedule, stated they could adjust to their hardest shift change in one day. Under the latter schedule, 70 per cent reported that their adjustment to the new schedule took four days or more.' (page 235)

'A higher proportion of night and rotating shift workers reported that they were fatigued much of the time, that their appetites were dulled, and that they were constipated much of the time.' (page 301)

'The ulcer rate (among German workers) was eight times as high for the rotating shift workers as for the fixed shift group.'

'The most frequently mentioned difficulties in husband-wife relationships concern the absence of the worker from the home in the evening, sexual relations, and difficulties encountered by the wife in carrying out her household duties' . . . 'Another area of family life that seems to be adversely affected by certain kinds of shift work is the father-child relationship.' (page 18)

We see therefore, that the introduction of this kind of equipment in a profit orientated society lessens 'the quality of life'. The problems posed are

wildly different from the theorising of bourgeois social scientists, who, at the dawn of automation wrote many books about the problems of using leisure time.

Fragmentation of Skills

A central feature of the change has been the fragmentation of skills. The millwright of a hundred years ago was capable of repairing any machine in the plant at which he worked. He would predict the failure rate of bearings, select the material for the new ones, and in most cases manufacture them himself.

With the increasing complexity of production, materials are now selected by white collar workers — i.e. metallurgists. Failure rates of equipment are worked out by maintenance, planning and reliability engineers (sometimes using advanced mathematical techniques such as the theory of probability). In consequence, the division between manual and intellectual work becomes even greater. Due to this fragmentation, the nature of production becomes more and more specialised into narrow areas. Machine tools are now specified for a precise function. Lathes are no longer ordered to a general specification of length and speed of rotation. They are specified as being screw cutting, surfacing, end-coder controlled, or numerical controlled etc.

Since in capitalist society man is seen as an appendage to the machine, that appendage is also specified more precisely. Adverts for those in the engineering industry now specify precisely the sort of man required, indicating the type of equipment with which he must be familiar. Adverts for engineering graduates specify the precise qualifications required. No longer a degree in engineering, but one in heavy electrical engineering, light electrical engineering, electronic or electrical control or one of a host of other disciplines. This technological change will mean that human beings are 'pigeon holed' at a very early stage, and the possibility of changing from one kind of job to another will be increasingly difficult. Job satisfaction will be eliminated for more and more sections of those who work.

The "Man Component"

Not only will men be suited to their productive role in terms of their technical ability, they are looked at as components within a total man/machine system. For example, the life expectancy of the 'man component' is assessed in the same way as the life expectancy of the machine component. The response rate of that man must be as high as the response rate of the system otherwise the system is not used to its capacity. Hence we find more and more in

productivity deals, the assessment of people's physical capabilities through medical examination. This has already been introduced in the steel industry's 'Green Book'. When — in steel — a worker's health is impaired due to the intense rate of work, the medical check is used as a means of downgrading him. In steel, some workers have lost up to £15 per week in consequence of such medical examinations. This downgrading finds its analogy in the machine component, when such a machine, having been involved in high precision work for a number of years, deteriorates, and is then relegated to second rate work in the jobbing shop. This systematising of people, which subjugates them further to the machine, creates enormous pressures for older men.

We are, as Samuel Beckett said 'all born of the gravedigger's forceps'. Growing old is the most natural process inherent in man. It is a biological process, but in the depraved nature of capitalist society it is treated almost as a crime.

Some agreements in high productivity plants, seek to eliminate workers purely on the basis of age. In Standard Triumph's in Coventry, it is reckoned that a man is 'burned up' in ten years on the main production line. Clearly, the employer wishes those ten years to be as early as possible and the company recently attempted to get some manual unions to agree that only workers of up to thirty years of age would be recruited for this high tempo work area of the factory.

Technology Extends the Range of Proletarianisation

Technological change and automation greatly extends the whole range of proletarianisation into other fields of social and economic activity. Whilst the change in the organic composition of capital replaces people by machines in industry, activities such as agriculture, office administration and even education become industrialised — i.e. more mechanised and streamlined.

This is true even in complicated fields of intellectual work such as engineering design. In the past, design engineers worked in an atmosphere of monastic quiet. Many were graduates and technically qualified workers who did not see that they were part of the working class and that their class allegiance should be with the organised labour force.

During the past five years, high capital equipment has now become available to them. The introduction of computer aided design is having an enormous 'Proletarianising effect' upon them. With computer installations available which have cost perhaps £½ million and have a life expectancy of only three or four years, more and more companies

are seeking to insist that their designers, mathematicians and aero-dynamicists work on three shifts. In addition, since their work function has to be synchronised with a highly organised work plan, the timing of other jobs becomes, from an employer's point of view, a necessity. More and more intellectual workers at this level are being subjected therefore to timing and stopwatch techniques which formally were reserved for the workshop floor. In the recent major confrontation between DATA and Rolls Royce, some of the conditions the Company sought to impose included the following:-

The acceptance of Shift Work in order to exploit high capital equipment. The acceptance of work measurement techniques. The division of their work into basic elements and the setting of times for these elements, such times then to be compared with actual performance. The confrontation cost the union over £¼ million, and whilst the increases gained were not considerable, the union did resist the introduction of the clauses outlined above.

Increase in Decision Making Rate

The actual rate at which intellectual workers operate will also be intensified. In the design field by utilising computer graphics, most of the routine reference work which a designer undertook in the past will be eliminated. The Department of Labour in the US assesses that a designer may spend up to 95 per cent of his time on reference work and only 5 per cent on actual design decision making effort. The introduction of computer graphics therefore can increase the decision making rate by up to 19 times and place upon such personnel an enormous strain. Utilising this equipment, and working interactively with the computer, one US aircraft corporation can optimise the wing configuration of a supersonic aircraft in 5.8 minutes. Formally, this would have taken four to five months. When used purely as a mathematical tool the computer enormously increases the rate of exploitation of the technical worker — e.g. all the stress work calculations in the Gyretron — the space frame centre piece of Expo 67 required the use of a computer for two hours. A graduate mathematician would have taken 30,000 years to perform the same calculations.

De-skilling of Jobs

The use of this kind of equipment also changes the relationship of the productive forces in a large engineering organisation. A number of companies now use automatic draughting equipment (ADE). In this system, the draughtsman uses, not a drawing board, but a digitiser on which he produces a tape. This tape can be used to create a drawing on a micro plotter, but more important, it can be

used directly on a numerically controlled jig borer, lathe or milling machine. This has meant at Ferranti's in Edingburgh, that the skilled jig borers have now been replaced by unskilled operators, and their machine setting function has been transferred to white collar workers in the drawing office.

In the process one of the most highly skilled jobs on the shop floor is eliminated and the skilled elements transferred further from the point of production to the drawing office. This technique will be widespread within five years and the consequences for the most highly skilled machinists (the old 'shop floor aristocracy') will be enormous. The same tape can also be used in digital inspection machines thereby de-skilling the inspectors' jobs. In both cases the 'decision making stage' becomes more remote from the actual point of production and increasingly takes place further down the pre-production sequence.

Political Solution needed

In those cases where there is still a high labour content in the productive process the tape can also be used. The effect in this situation is that the operator completely loses control over the tempo at which he works. The tape sets the tempo and the operator must either respond to it or stop the machine.

In some systems such as the CAV Airveyor one, every stoppage of the machine is recorded by a central computer. The operator is thereby ensnared in a system which increasingly subordinates him to the machine. The contradictions which arise cannot be resolved within the framework of capitalism since they are but the manifestations of the irreconcilable contradictions between the interests of the exploiters and the exploited. Trade Unions however militant can at best only protect their members from the worst excesses of technological change. Only a political solution — a change in the ownership of the means of production can harness these new forces in the interests of the majority of the population. In the meantime the very technological advances which could liberate man from drudgery and provide the material basis for a full and prosperous life, will under capitalism bring about the material and spiritual impoverishment of the people.

The intensification of the class struggle that this will engender will in turn contribute to the greater instability of the system.

This contradiction can only be resolved by the working class seizing political power and taking the ownership of the means of production into its own hands.

Lenin and women's liberation

by Clara Zetkin

The following is an account by Clara Zetkin of a meeting and discussion with Lenin at the Kremlin in 1920. Clara Zetkin was a contemporary of Rosa Luxemburg, a founder member of the German Communist Party and a staunch champion of women's rights.

COMRADE LENIN frequently spoke to me about the women's question. Social equality for women was, of course, a principle needing no discussion for communists. It was in Lenin's large study in the Kremlin in the autumn of 1920 that we had our first long conversation on the subject.

'We must create a powerful international women's movement, on a clear theoretical basis', Lenin began. 'There is no good practice without Marxist theory, that is clear. The greatest clarity of principle is necessary for us communists in this question. There must be a sharp distinction between ourselves and all other Parties. Unfortunately, our Second World Congress did not deal with this question. It was brought forward, but no decision arrived at. The matter is still in commission, which should draw up a resolution, theses, directions. Up to the present, however, they haven't got very far. You will have to help.'

I was already acquainted with what Lenin said and expressed my astonishment at the state of affairs. I was filled with enthusiasm about the work done by Russian women in the revolution and still being done by them in its defence and further development. And as for the position and activities of women comrades in the Bolshevik Party, that seemed to me a model Party. It alone formed an international communist women's movement of useful, trained and experienced forces and a historical example.

Movement of Working Women

'That is right, that is all very true and fine', said Lenin, with a quiet smile. 'In Petrograd, here in Moscow, in other towns and industrial centres the women workers acted splendidly during the revolution. Without them we should not have been victorious. Or scarcely so. That is my opinion. How brave they were, how brave they still are! Think of all the suffering and deprivations they bore. And they are carrying on because they want freedom, want communism. Yes, our proletarian women are excellent class fighters. They deserve admiration and love. Besides, you must remember that even the ladies of the "constitutional democracy" in Petrograd proved more courageous against us than did the Junkers. That is true. We have in the party

reliable, capable and untiringly active women comrades. We can assign them to many important posts in the Soviet and Executive Committees, in the People's Commissariats and public service of every kind. Many of them work day and night in the Party or among the masses of the proletariat, the peasants, the Red Army. That is of very great value to us. It is also important for women all over the world. It shows the capacity of women, the great value their work has in society. The first proletarian dictatorship is a real pioneer in establishing social equality for women. It is clearing away more prejudices than could volumes of feminist literature. But even with all that we still have no international communist women's movement, and that we must have. We must start at once to create it. Without that the work of our International and of its Parties is not complete work, can never be complete. But our work for the revolution must be complete. Tell me how communist work is going on abroad.'

Lenin listened attentively, his body inclined forward slightly, following, without a trace of boredom, impatience or weariness, even incidental matters.

'Not bad, not at all bad', said Lenin. 'The energy, willingness and enthusiasm of women comrades, their courage and wisdom in times of illegality or semi-legality indicate good prospects for the development of our work. They are valuable factors in extending the Party and increasing its strength, in winning the masses and carrying on our activities. But what about the training and clarity of principle of these men and women comrades? It is of fundamental importance for work among the masses. It is of great influence on what closely concerns the masses, how they can be won, how made enthusiastic. I forget for the moment who said: "One must be enthusiastic to accomplish great things." We and the toilers of the whole world have really great things to accomplish. So what makes your comrades, the proletarian women of Germany, enthusiastic? What about their proletarian class-consciousness; are their interests, their activities concentrated on immediate political demands? What is the mainspring of their ideas?'

'I have heard some peculiar things on this matter from Russian and German comrades. I must tell you. I was told that a talented woman communist in

Hamburg is publishing a paper for prostitutes and that she wants to organise them for the revolutionary fight. Rosa acted and felt as a communist when in an article she championed the cause of the prostitutes who were imprisoned for any transgression of police regulations in carrying on their dreary trade. They are, unfortunately, doubly sacrificed by bourgeois society. First, by its accursed property system, and, secondly, by its accursed moral hypocrisy. That is obvious. Only he who is brutal or short-sighted can forget it. But still, that is not at all the same thing as considering prostitutes—how shall I put it?—to be a special revolutionary militant section, as organising them and publishing a factory paper for them. Aren't there really any other working women in Germany to organise, for whom a paper can be issued, who must be drawn into your struggles? The other is only a diseased excrescence. It reminds me of the literary fashion of painting every prostitute as a sweet Madonna. The origin of that was healthy, too: social sympathy, rebellion against the virtuous hypocrisy of the respectable bourgeois. But the healthy part became corrupted and degenerate.

'Besides, the question of prostitutes will give rise to many serious problems here. Take them back to productive work, bring them into the social economy. That is what we must do. But it is difficult and a complicated task to carry out in the present conditions of our economic life and in all the prevailing circumstances. There you have one aspect of the women's problem which, after the seizure of power by the proletariat, looms large before us and demands a practical solution. It will give us a great deal of work here in Soviet Russia. But to go back to your position in Germany. The Party must not in any circumstances calmly stand by and watch such mischievous conduct on the part of its members. It creates confusion and divides the forces. And you yourself, what have you done against it?'

Sex and Marriage

Before I could answer, Lenin continued: 'Your list of sins, Clara, is still longer. I was told that questions of sex and marriage are the main subjects dealt with in the reading and discussion evenings of women comrades. They are the chief subject of interest, of political instruction and education. I could scarcely believe my ears when I heard it. The first country of proletarian dictatorship surrounded by the counter-revolutionaries of the whole world, the situation in Germany itself requires the greatest possible concentration of all proletarian, revolutionary forces to defeat the ever-growing and ever-increasing counter-revolution. But working women comrades discuss sexual problems and the question of forms of marriage in the past, present and future.

They think it their most important duty to enlighten proletarian women on these subjects. The most widely read brochure is, I believe, the pamphlet of a young Viennese woman comrade on the sexual problem. What a waste! What truth there is in it the workers have already read in Bebel, long ago. Only not so boringly, not so heavily written as in the pamphlet, but written strongly, bitterly, aggressively, against bourgeois society.

'The extension of Freudian hypotheses seems "educated", even scientific, but it is ignorant, bungling. Freudian theory is the modern fashion. I mistrust the sexual theories of the articles, dissertations, pamphlets, etc., in short, of that particular kind of literature which flourishes luxuriantly in the dirty soil of bourgeois society. I mistrust those who are always contemplating the several questions, like the Indian saint his navel. It seems to me that these flourishing sexual theories which are mainly hypothetical, and often quite arbitrary hypotheses, arise from the personal need to justify personal abnormality or hypertrophy in sexual life before bourgeois morality, and to entreat its patience. This masked respect for bourgeois morality seems to me just as repulsive as poking about in sexual matters. However wild and revolutionary the behaviour may be, it is still really quite bourgeois. It is, mainly, a hobby of the intellectuals and of the sections nearest them. There is no place for it in the Party, in the class-conscious, fighting proletariat.'

I interrupted here, saying that the questions of sex and marriage, in a bourgeois society of private property, involve many problems, conflicts and much suffering for women of all social classes and ranks. The war and its consequences had greatly accentuated the conflicts and sufferings of women in sexual matters, had brought to light problems which were formerly hidden from them. To that were added the effects of the revolution. The old world of feeling and thought had begun to totter. Old social ties are entangling and breaking, there are the tendencies towards new ideological relationships between man and woman. The interest shown in these questions is an expression of the need for enlightenment and reorientation. It also indicates a reaction against the falseness and hypocrisy of bourgeois society. Forms of marriage and of the family, in their historical development and dependence upon economic life, are calculated to destroy the superstition existing in the minds of working women concerning the eternal character of bourgeois society. A critical, historical attitude to those problems must lead to a ruthless examination of bourgeois society, to a disclosure of its real nature and effects, including condemnation of its sexual morality and falseness. All roads lead to Rome. And every

real Marxist analysis of any important section of the ideological superstructure of society, of a predominating social phenomenon, must lead to an analysis of bourgeois society and of its property basis, must end in the realisation, 'this must be destroyed'.

Lenin nodded laughingly. 'There we have it! You are defending counsel for your women comrades and your Party. Of course, what you say is right. But it only excuses the mistakes made in Germany; it does not justify them. They are, and remain, mistakes. Can you really seriously assure me that the questions of sex and marriage were discussed from the standpoint of a mature, living, historical materialism? Deep and many-sided knowledge is necessary for that, the clearest Marxist mastery of a great amount of material. Where can you get the forces for that now? If they existed, then pamphlets like the one I mentioned would not be used as material for study in the reading and discussion circles. They are distributed and recommended, instead of being criticised. And what is the result of this futile, un-Marxist dealing with the question? That questions of sex and marriage are understood not as part of the large social question? No, worse! The great social question appears as an adjunct, a part, of sexual problems. The main thing becomes a subsidiary matter. That not only endangers clarity on that question itself, it muddles the thoughts, the class-consciousness of proletarian women generally.

'Last and not least. Even the wise Solomon said that everything has its time. I ask you: Is now the time to amuse proletarian women with discussions on how one loves and is loved, how one marries and is married? Of course, in the past, present and future, and among different nations—what is proudly called historical materialism! Now all the thoughts of women comrades, of the women of the working people, must be directed towards the proletarian revolution. It creates the basis for a real renovation in marriage and sexual relations. At the moment other problems are more urgent than the marriage forms of Maoris or incest in olden times. The question of Soviets is still on the agenda for the German proletariat. The Versailles Treaty and its effect on the life of the working woman—unemployment, falling wages, taxes, and a great deal more. In short, I maintain that this kind of political, social education for proletarian women is false, quite, quite false. How could you be silent about it? You must use your authority against it.'

Sexual Morality

I have not failed to criticise and remonstrate with leading women comrades in the separate districts, I told him. By my criticism I had laid myself open to the charge of "strong survivals of social democratic ideology and old-fashioned philistinism".

'I know, I know', he said. 'I have also been accused by many people of philistinism in this matter, although that is repulsive to me. There is so much hypocrisy and narrow-mindedness in it. Well, I'm bearing it calmly! The little yellow-beaked birds who have just broken from the egg of bourgeois ideas are always frightfully clever. We shall have to let that go. The youth movement, too, is attacked with the disease of modernity in its attitude towards sexual questions and in being exaggeratedly concerned with them.' Lenin gave an ironic emphasis to the word modernity and grimaced as he did so. 'I have been told that sexual questions are the favourite study of your youth organisations, too. There is supposed to be a lack of sufficient speakers on the subject. Such misconceptions are particularly harmful, particularly dangerous in the youth movement. They can very easily contribute towards over-excitement and exaggeration in the sexual life of some of them, to a waste of youthful health and strength. You must fight against that, too. There are not a few points of contact between the women's and youth movements. Our women comrades must work together systematically with the youth. That is a continuation, an extension and exaltation of motherliness from the individual to the social sphere. And all the awakening social life and activity of women must be encouraged, so that they can discard the limitations of their philistine individualist home and family psychology. But we'll come to that later.

'With us, too, a large part of the youth is keen on "revising bourgeois conceptions and morality" concerning sexual questions. And, I must add, a large part of our best, our most promising young people. What you said before is true. In the conditions created by the war and the revolution the old ideological values disappeared or lost their binding force. The new values are crystallising slowly, in struggle. In relations between man and man, between man and woman, feelings and thoughts are becoming revolutionised. New boundaries are being set up between the rights of the individual and the rights of the whole, in the duties of individuals. The matter is still in a complete chaotic ferment. The direction, the forces of development in the various contradictory tendencies are not yet clearly defined. It is a slow and often a very painful process of decay and growth. And particularly in the sphere of sexual relationships, of marriage and the family. The decay, the corruption, the filth of bourgeois marriage, with its difficult divorce, its freedom for the man, its enslavement for the woman, the repulsive hypocrisy of sexual morality and relations fill the most active minded and best people with deep disgust.

'The constraint of bourgeois marriage and the family laws of bourgeois states accentuate these

evils and conflicts. It is the force of "holy property". It sanctifies venality, degradation, filth. And the conventional hypocrisy of honest bourgeois society does the rest. People are beginning to protest against the prevailing rottenness and falseness and the feelings of an individual change rapidly. The desire and urge to enjoyment easily attain unbridled force at a time when powerful empires are tottering, old forms of rule breaking down, when a whole social world is beginning to disappear. Sex and marriage forms, in their bourgeois sense, are unsatisfactory. A revolution in sex and marriage is approaching, corresponding to the proletarian revolution. It is easily comprehensible that the very involved complex of problems brought into existence should occupy the mind of the youth, as well as of women. They suffer particularly under present-day sexual grievances. They are rebelling with all the impetuosity of their years. We can understand that. Nothing could be more false than to preach monkish asceticism and the sanctity of dirty bourgeois morality to the youth. It is particularly serious if sex becomes the main mental concern during those years when it is physically most obvious. What fatal effects that has!

The changed attitude of the young people to questions of sexual life is of course based on a "principle" and a theory. Many of them call their attitude "revolutionary" and "communist". And they honestly believe that it is so. That does not impress us old people. Although I am nothing but a gloomy ascetic, the so-called "new sexual life" of the youth—and sometimes of the old—often seems to me to be purely bourgeois, an extension of bourgeois brothels. That has nothing whatever in common with freedom of love as we communists understand it. You must be aware of the famous theory that in communist society the satisfaction of sexual desires, of love, will be as simple and unimportant as drinking a glass of water. This glass of water theory has made our young people mad, quite mad. It has proved fatal to many young boys and girls. Its adherents maintain that it is Marxist. But thanks for such Marxism which directly and immediately attributes all phenomena and changes in the ideological superstructure of society to its economic basis! Matters aren't quite as simple as that. A certain Frederick Engels pointed that out a long time ago with regard to historical materialism.

I think this glass of water theory is completely un-Marxist, and, moreover, anti-social. In sexual life there is not only simple nature to be considered, but also cultural characteristics, whether they are of a high or low order. In his *Origin of the Family* Engels showed how significant is the development and refinement of the general sex urge into individual sex love. The relations of the sexes to each other

are not simply an expression of the play of forces between the economics of society and a physical need, isolated in thought, by study, from the physiological aspect. It is rationalism, and not Marxism, to want to trace changes in these relations directly, and dissociated from their connections with ideology as a whole, to the economic foundations of society. Of course, thirst must be satisfied. But will the normal person in normal circumstances lie down in the gutter and drink out of a puddle, or out of a glass with a rim greasy from many lips? But the social aspect is most important of all. Drinking water is, of course, an individual affair. But in love two lives are concerned, and a third, a new life, arises. It is that which gives it its social interest, which gives rise to a duty towards the community.

As a communist I have not the least sympathy for the glass of water theory, although it bears the fine title "satisfaction of love". In any case, this liberation of love is neither new, nor communist. You will remember that about the middle of the last century it was preached as the "emancipation of the heart" in romantic literature. In bourgeois practice it became the emancipation of the flesh. At that time the preaching was more talented than it is today, and as for the practice, I cannot judge. I don't mean to preach asceticism by my criticism. Not in the least. Communism will not bring asceticism, but joy of life, power of life, and a satisfied love life will help to do that. But in my opinion the present widespread hypertrophy in sexual matters does not give joy and force to life, but takes it away. In the age of revolution that is bad, very bad.

Young people, particularly, need the joy and force of life. Healthy sport, swimming, racing, walking, bodily exercises of every kind, and many-sided intellectual interests. Learning, studying, inquiry, as far as possible in common. That will give young people more than eternal theories and discussions about sexual problems and the so-called "living to the full". Healthy bodies, healthy minds! Neither monks nor Don Juan, nor the intermediate attitude of the German philistines. You know, young comrade ———? A splendid boy, and highly talented. And yet I fear that nothing good will come out of him. He reels and staggers from one love affair to the next. That won't do for the political struggle, for the revolution. And I wouldn't bet on the reliability, the endurance in struggle of those women who confuse their personal romances with politics. Nor on the men who run after every petticoat and get entrapped by every young woman. No, no! that does not square with the revolution.

The revolution demands concentration, increase of forces. From the masses, from individuals. It cannot tolerate orgiastic conditions, such as are
(continued on back of cover)

Economic inequalities between nations and international workers solidarity

by Charles Bettelheim

The following article first appeared in a somewhat shorter form in the French paper 'Le Monde' on November 11, 1969. Its author, Professor Charles Bettelheim, has made available to us the text of the original article. Professor Bettelheim is the Director of the Centre d'Etudes de Planification Socialiste at the Sorbonne and the author of several books on Marxist economics.

AGAINST THE PROPOSITION of international workers' solidarity there is sometimes counterposed the idea of a deep divergence between the interests of workers of different countries. For those who hold this view, the divergence has its roots in the exploitation of certain countries (called 'poor') by others (called 'rich'). The exploitation alluded to here is not — at least not mainly — imperialist exploitation,¹ but is held to result directly from exchange as it takes place on the capitalist market. It would arise from 'unequal exchange', which itself would be explained, in essence, by *wage inequalities* between countries. This 'unequal exchange' would imply that the workers of the 'rich' countries exploit the workers of the 'poor' countries. If this were true one would have to give up the proposition of international workers' solidarity. Workers in high-wage countries would not just be 'beneficiaries' of an economic situation that was not due to them, but would be 'active agents' of the situation. Moreover, every time these workers won wage increases, they would increase the exploitation of the poor countries.

This theory assumes that wages play the special role of an 'independent variable', able to determine the level and structure of prices. Such an idea is completely arbitrary. Nevertheless, there is a danger that it might be readily accepted because it has a kind of 'commonsense' in its favour, that is to say certain 'obvious facts' (exactly those that scientific thought must always question). In this case the 'facts' are also those put forward by those who hold reactionary economic ideas when they accuse workers of being responsible for price rises, inflation, etc., because of the 'excessive' wages they demand. Not one of these statements or suppositions is sound: wages are one price among many (the price of labour-power), and have no 'overriding' influence on the general price level. Apart from currency depreciation, wage increases lead not to price increases but to reduction of profit. Depreciation is not 'determined' by wage increases. In general, all argu-

ment based on the 'overriding' influence of wages on prices, provides itself in advance, by making an assumption, with the 'proof' of something which has not been shown to be true.

Whence come international wage differences?

To understand the implications of international wage differences one must explain them. Theory and actual analysis show that international wage differences spring from the unequal development of capitalist production in different countries and from the effects of this unequal development on work intensity and productivity. In general, these increase with the development of the capitalist mode of production. Consequently, in each country taking part in one kind of production, the same period of work produces different quantities of the same commodity. But on the international market these commodities have the same price — their 'world price' — so that the workers of the most advanced capitalist countries produce, in the same time, a greater value, expressed in monetary terms, than do the workers of less advanced capitalist countries.

These productivity differences, expressed as money, bring about a series of consequences affecting national price and wage levels and the conditions of international capitalist specialisation.

The following point is essential: nominal wages, and still more real wages, by no means vary proportionately with international differences in productivity,² whence follows the seemingly paradoxical but in reality essential fact (that is to say, a fact resulting from the laws of operation of the capitalist mode of production), that the *rate of exploitation*³ is much higher in the advanced capitalist countries than in the less developed ones.

To say that the rate of exploitation is higher in the advanced capitalist countries than in the less developed ones does not mean that the *level of consumption* of the workers is lower there (as is

known, the exact contrary is true), it means only that wages there are *relatively* lower, in comparison with productivity expressed in money terms. It is precisely because in the less advanced countries the value of the worker's production is low that the rate of exploitation there is, on average, relatively lower, in spite of the *miserable wages* paid.

Since differences in productivity, expressed in terms of money, explain differences in the level of prices and wages in different countries, the higher wages of the workers in the more advanced capitalist countries are in no way won at the expense of the workers in the less advanced countries: *these wages form part of a price system which they do not control.*

One practical result of the above proposition: when, in a capitalist country with advanced production, the workers do not get higher wages, this does not result in an improvement in the living standards of the workers of poor countries, but in greater profits for the capitalists of the rich countries and therefore in *an increase in unequal development.* On the other hand, wage increases obtained by workers in highly industrialised countries can make the industries of less advanced countries more 'competitive' and thus create conditions correspondingly more favourable for the economic class struggle of the workers of those countries.

The basic fact: unequal development of the capitalist productive forces and 'freezing' of the development of the dominated and dependent countries.

Ultimately, it is the unequal development of productive forces under conditions of domination of the world by capitalist production relations that is fundamental. This is what explains international economic wage inequalities; this is what manifests itself in the form of 'unequal exchange'; this is the basis of imperialist exploitation (exploitation which still further increases inequalities of development); this is what, finally and above all, manifests itself in the form of a 'freezing' of the productive forces of the less advanced capitalist countries.

This 'freezing' is nothing but the expanded reproduction of economic inequalities. It is one of the main results of the domination of the world by capitalist production relations. It shows that the enrichment of the most advanced capitalist countries is due not so much to the exploitation of less advanced countries (an exploitation which would imply their development) as to *keeping undeveloped* the immense wealth (in people and land) of the so-called 'poor' countries.⁴

Where is the basic social contradiction?

Since one cannot speak of the exploitation of the workers of the 'poor' countries by those of the 'rich' countries, one must recognise that there is no fundamental contradiction between their interests. On the contrary, there exist objective bonds of solidarity between them because they are all subjected, directly or indirectly, to capitalist exploitation, or are threatened by it.

Referring more specifically to the productive wage-earners subject to capitalist domination and exploitation, all are in the same position, whatever their wages,⁵ their labour is still the source of wealth of the capitalist class. The capitalists only own the means of production and decide on their use. Faced with this domination these workers too are bound up with the peoples of the countries subject to imperialist exploitation.

In the final analysis, the basic social contradiction is that between the workers of all countries and the dominating and exploiting classes that deprive them of the control of their means of production and of the products of their labour. In view of this contradiction the 'special' or 'national' interests which may oppose some workers to others are only secondary.

Of course, these secondary contradictions are used by the ruling classes in order to maintain their rule. That is precisely why one must constantly bear in mind where the basic social contradiction lies.

A reminder of the objective unity of the workers is especially necessary today, because now more than ever the peoples of all lands are at the mercy of national and international crises, including wars, the natural result of the capitalist mode of production.

Wars, by which capitalism tries to maintain its domination of the world, are multiplying, whether openly (as in Vietnam or the Middle East), or in the form of civil or guerilla wars (as in various countries of Asia and Latin America). Their cost, in human lives, suffering and military expenditure, is becoming greater and greater. They make all peoples realise more and more how necessary it is to develop their active solidarity in order to put an end to imperialist domination. This domination condemns the great majority of mankind to misery, for the benefit of a tiny minority, while depriving the whole world of the immense contribution to the growth of production which would be made possible by the socialist development of the productive forces.

(continued on page 14)

CORRESPONDENCE

THE GLASGOW COMMUNIST MOVEMENT (Communist Federation of Britain) disassociates itself from the article 'Nationalism and the Proletarian Revolution' published in the Marxist, No. 15.

The author of the article, C K Maisels, was a member of the GCM until recently. The article was written in order to explain the group's statement on nationalism published earlier in the Marxist (No 12). When this was drawn, C K Maisels was temporarily away from the group. Some time after his return to the GCM he submitted his article to the group for discussion during which the group corrected several major errors contained in the article. Though these were all accepted by the author, the article as published in the Marxist is not the corrected version but it is the original draft.

While arguing against the nationalist diversions in Britain to-day, Ireland has been put in the same bracket as England, Scotland and Wales (p18 & 19). This reflects neither a correct understanding of

Scottish and Welsh nationalism nor of the Irish Question. The GCM unequivocally upholds the right of the Irish people to self-determination, no matter which class comes to power through this. The working class in Britain, the oppressor country, cannot take any other stand less than this.

We maintain that nationalism is still a progressive force in Ireland and this will remain so as long as the democratic revolution remains incomplete. This revolution can now be led only by the working class, uniting all progressive forces opposed to imperialism. The revolution cannot of course end at the democratic stage but will pass on to the socialist stage in due course.

Secondly, in page 18 (para 6), we learn: 'the Trotskyites and Revisionists are now being forced by events to abandon the LP if they wish to retain any revolutionary image'. While the statement is partially true for the Trotskyites, it however contradicts the most elementary and glaring manifestation of British Revisionism. The revisionists are not abandoning the Labour Party, they are embracing it more closely every passing day.

Economic Inequalities between Nations

(continued from page 13)

NOTES

- 1 The expression 'imperialist exploitation' refers to the result of the economic relations between the great industrial and financial powers and the countries they dominate politically and economically, especially as these relations, by reason of foreign capital investment in the dominated countries, permit the exploitation of the workers of those countries.
- 2 Available statistics show that in extreme cases, the relation between the product of one hour's work (measured in monetary terms) by workers in the advanced capitalist countries, and the product of one hour's work by workers in the less advanced capitalist countries, is of the order of 40 to 1. They show too that the national average wage rates in the most advanced capitalist countries are 30 to 40 times higher than in those countries where capitalist production is least developed.
- 3 The amount by which the value produced exceeds wages is surplus value. It is divided up as industrial and commercial profit, interest, rent and taxes paid by firms. The ratio of the total surplus value to the total of wages is the **rate of exploitation**.
- 4 The consequences of this cannot be studied here. Some of them are: the parts of the world where accumulation and investment are concentrated are not the low-wage countries but those where wages

are 'high'; most of the profits from imperialist investment in the 'poor' countries are not reinvested there but 'sent home' and invested in the 'richest' countries (still further increasing unequal development). I would add that the term 'freezing' used above is purely descriptive. As I tried to show in the 'Remarks on Theory' which appeared with A. Emmanuel's book, **Unequal Exchange**, this term refers to a reality which is much more complex: a 'growth of dependence' which tends above all to make dominated countries into suppliers of cheap raw materials.

- 5 The so-called 'high' wages of workers in advanced capitalist countries are, in fact, hard-earned. They are accompanied by increasing speed and intensity of work, ever-growing physical and nervous exhaustion, strict labour discipline, the constant threat of dismissal for the slightest lapse, the dismissal of ageing workers, a life made difficult and unhealthy by problems of transport and housing and all the 'unpleasantnesses' which accompany capitalist industrial development.

THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE welcome comment, criticism and suggestions for future articles. We also welcome letters and communications for publication. Please write to Tom Hill, 11 Barratt Avenue, Wood Green, N22.

The role of youth in Southern Africa

Speech made by Jorge Sangumba, the representative of UNITA (National Union for Total Independence of Angola) at the Fourth PAC Congress.

ON THE OCCASION of your 4th Congress there is nothing else I can offer but to share with you some views about the Southern African revolution and the role of African Youth in that Revolution. I might not say anything new to you, but our experience in Angola might offer you some food for thought that you might consider in your revolutionary deliberations about the Zimbabwe Revolution.

We have seen a tremendous rise in militancy in the world student movement during the last decade. In America, Japan, France, Italy, and even in some African countries, the youth have come up in a mighty force and are shaking the foundations of the society of the respective countries. So in Africa today, and particularly in Southern Africa the youth, mainly the revolutionary youth must respond to this challenge of the African revolution. The task of a revolutionary youth whether in Europe or in the battle field is to serve as a resolute instrument of the anti-imperialist propaganda that is now guiding the African revolution. To do this effectively we must educate ourselves not only by participating in the daily struggles against all sorts of oppression, but also by learning the correct revolutionary ideology that will be applied one day in Africa in our own concrete situation. This ideology must be based on the experience of all those revolutionaries who successfully and correctly fought revolutionary wars all over the world.

And at this momentous period of history, when the forces of oppression, racialism, colonialism and imperialism are being united in their determination to muster their guns against our people, so, we, the youth, must combine our strength, co-ordinate our revolutionary strategy wherever we are. Today in our continent the main contradiction that must be resolved immediately through a long and bitter struggle is between the leaders who have fallen under the influence and control of imperialism, and the African masses, who are the most oppressed of those who toil as new slaves, those peasants and true proletariat of the extended monopoly capitalism in Africa.

But also we have to realise clearly that imperialism cannot be defeated just by reading a few left-wing magazines, newspapers, and a few marxist volumes. Imperialism also will not be defeated through action without analysis, but through a consistent and protracted struggle based on concrete analysis of the concrete conditions. The Youth of Africa must analyse the existing material conditions in themselves and historically develop correct guidelines for action. The first step that has to be taken is here in our respective schools and universities. We are studying in Western universities. The politics of the university is the reflection of the politics of the society, but with its own peculiarities because of the function it serves in the imperialist-dominated society. The imperialist university is the main propagator of the corrupted values.

For instance, in the universities we are led to believe that Africans do not have their own history. We are told that even their own history is a series of mechanical events, caused arbitrarily by actions and whims of an elite of kings, queens, warlords, big politicians, nobles and prime ministers. We are told that pursuit of knowledge is an aim in itself, independent of productive activity, and independent of serving people's needs. So students are forced to become men of a career, lackeys and even agents, who have no other aim in life than to serve their own selfishness and egoism, and to consciously negate the needs of others. We also learn that by changing ourselves externally, we become more free. A female, for example, who must produce herself as an object for man's visual pleasure, does so by adopting mini-skirts, bikinis, see-through-dresses, and all the paraphernalia of the sexy life. These are propagandised heavily from the underground train posters to the wall of the ministers' cabinets as symbols of woman's emancipation and liberation. In the same way, drugs and drunkenness are converted into the symbols of rebellion of 'inner liberation' so that people can deceive themselves that they are revolutionaries without making any revolution. This kind of degenerate system and life style is driving the youth in larger and larger numbers to the search for a genuine alternative.

In Africa and even among the liberation movements all manner of red herrings are being used to distract and deflect us from our goal. Some African leaders shout about African socialism, Arab and Muslim socialism, democratic socialism, pragmatic socialism, Africanisation. Such leaders go from village to village, from campus to campus, to fool politically ignorant people that they have found the real answers to the African problems. Brothers, there is only *one kind* of socialism whose laws are universally binding and applicable in all concrete situations.

This is the scientific socialism that is based mainly on three principles:

- 1 man's struggle against nature
- 2 class struggle
- 3 and scientific experimentation,

and this socialism will be achieved only through an armed struggle fought correctly in our own respective countries in Southern Africa. This scientific socialism is the main ideology of the oppressed peoples which has been proved correct in all countries which have successfully waged wars of liberation and have reconstructed their countries.

Outside Africa, and this in some socialist countries which in theory and practice have abandoned the road of armed struggle to achieve socialism, tremendous efforts and preparations are being made to confuse the oppressed Africans to abandon the road of armed struggle and to take the road of 'peaceful co-existence', 'peaceful transition', 'peaceful competition'. How can we co-exist, or compete with Ian Smith, Gaetano, and Vorster if they regard Africans as non-existent people? Can we co-exist without existing? No, brothers these are treacherous theories that must be fought against. And because of these treacherous ideas on revolution, we have Communist Parties, such as the Communist Party of South Africa. We have liberation movements which are able to compromise the principles of the struggle to this romanticism. Because of this, some liberation movements which are well known to you are able skilfully to wear different masks in different countries. In Tanzania, they appear outspokenly nationalistic. In Algeria and Cairo, they are revolutionaries and advocate armed struggle even against Vorster. In Moscow they follow the policy of 'Comrade Krushchov', of peaceful co-existence, and in London, sometimes they are liberals and at other times social democrats.

But criticism without providing positive and better alternatives is tantamount to opportunism and a game of liberalism. In Angola, where today

we are confronting three liberation movements claiming to control the populations and liberate almost the entire country, we have learned a big lesson; never maximise your victories or minimise your defeats. UNITA is putting this lesson into practice.

One of the weaknesses that exists in all liberation movements in Africa appears to be ideological deficiency — not to say occasionally the total lack of ideology. Brothers and Sisters, we must clearly grasp both theory and practice in such a way that the more advanced cadres equip themselves with a clear knowledge of the real objective of the struggle, and to enable them to determine both the area of deviation and the need for correction, and finally to devise more effective strategy and tactics for the future.

Some nationalist leaders who think that nationalism is an end in itself are not only breeding the germs of neo-colonialism but also have been attacking any revolutionary ideology as a 'foreign ideology'. Are Africans who have already embraced capitalism and christianism victims of foreign ideology? There is no such thing as white man's biology, chemistry, anatomy and white man's science. Medicine, for instance, as a science is always medicine whether in Africa or in Europe, but medicine to be applied and used in tropical countries must be tropical medicine. So is the revolutionary ideology — whether in Vietnam, in the USA, England, Zimbabwe, China etc, its laws are universal and always applicable to any condition. Revolutionary ideology is therefore a science of the laws of social development that enables us — white and black — not only to chart a correct course through the labyrinth of social contradictions but also to predict the path events will take, the direction of historical progress and the new stages of social development. The secret is always to apply creatively the principles of the revolutionary ideology after rigorous analysis of concrete conditions in our respective countries.

Another important lesson that we have learned in Angola is the conception of leadership in a liberation movement. This has given a new meaning and has created a new dimension in the theory and practice of leadership. To be a leader is to lead. The people want to be led and to see the leader. To lead the struggle from Dar es Salaam, Lusaka, Cairo, Algiers, Moscow, Peking, London etc, will not enable leaders to assess objectively and to appreciate the hardships of the people at home. The dialectical unity between people and leader cannot be achieved from exile; leaders must be at home otherwise there can be no possibility of politics being in command. Furthermore there can

be no possibility of developing superior tactics or planning correctly. For those leaders who produce all types of personal excuse for not returning home and facing the difficulties with the people, are just lifting a rock, only to be dropped on their own feet.

If we speak in terms of efficiency and honesty, considering our limited material resources, is it efficient and honest to lead the struggle from outside? We cannot have a telephone without money; a headquarters without money; a car without petrol; petrol without money. Therefore if a leader is outside much of his energy will be diverted to the campaigning for funds and to keeping the outside organisation going. Our leaders should learn from other leaders who have waged successfully any struggle for national liberation. What would have been the result of the Cuban Revolution if Castro and Che had led the struggle from an hotel in Mexico? Why are the African leaders obsessed with leadership by telepathy? Is it practical? I don't think so. Let the representatives be abroad and campaign for funds, but let the leaders be at home.

Today we have to face the reality if we want to succeed. The reality is that liberation is not a

welfare commodity to be dispersed through charitable agencies. Let us not have illusions, brothers and sisters, because imperialism is firmly entrenched in Southern Africa which is the source of sixty-five per cent of African mineral wealth. We have to understand that they will never relinquish their position in Southern Africa, only through a people's war.

Therefore the Youth of Southern Africa must be revolutionary in words and deeds, and join the broad masses in the jungles, the mountains, rivers and the villages of Africa where the true liberation will come from. To quote a well known revolutionary leader who said: 'How should we judge whether a youth is revolutionary? How can we tell? If he is willing to integrate himself with the broad masses of workers and peasants and does so in practice. If he is willing to do so, he is a revolutionary, otherwise he is a non-revolutionary, he is a counter-revolutionary.'

Brothers and Sisters, let us face the challenge. The struggle in Southern Africa will be long and bitter. A revolutionary must fight all his life to bring well-being to his people, and to change the material conditions of his country.

Political lessons of the Spanish War

by Alex Tudor Hart

The following article raises some important questions about the character of united front work. There is room for argument with the author's conclusion and the editorial committee hope that readers will send in their criticisms

THE DEFEAT of the democratic side in the Spanish Civil War of 1936-39 has been generally ascribed to external causes, to the objective conditions in which the struggle took place. It is time to investigate the internal causes, the defects in the policy of the democratic side that may have led to defeat.

Background to the war

Within Spain, the war was a continuation of the democratic bourgeois revolution that had been so delayed in Spain, but had finally made a decisive start with the overthrow of the king in 1929, followed by a series of bourgeois governments whose main aim was to stop the revolution going any further. In 1934 there had been a very brutal military suppression of a miners' strike in the Asturias in Northern Spain. In January 1936 a popular front government was voted in and the army

generals at once started to prepare to take over power by force. To do this, they sought and obtained the support of both the main established fascist regimes, in Germany and Italy, led by Hitler and Mussolini.

The international background is equally relevant. In the autumn of 1929 had started the capitalist world depression. In Europe, the country where the political effect of the depression was biggest was Germany. In 1932 the Communist Party in Germany got six million votes. Communists and sympathisers everywhere expected to see the working class in power by 1933. Instead, it was Hitler who was made chancellor by President Hindenburg, with no action taken by the Communists. Then followed the Reichstag fire, and the biggest setback to socialist morale since 1914. The political causes of this severe defeat in Germany have not been adequately analysed to this day.

In February 1934 a fascist coup in Austria led by Chancellor Dollfuss was resisted by the armed social democrats, who fought for three days to defend the Karl Marx municipal estate in Vienna. They were defeated, as of course a defensive action in such circumstances is bound to be defeated — to counter-attack is the only possibly winning tactic — yet this armed resistance by social democrats after the unresisting defeat of the six million Communists in Germany the year before, had a tremendous positive effect in restoring revolutionary morale. The splendid moral counter-attack by Dimitrov in the Reichstag fire trial in Leipzig also was an important restorative. In 1935 took place the last World Congress of the Comintern (dissolved by Stalin in 1942) where Dimitrov led the acceptance of the policy of a popular front against fascism, which had already been initiated by the Communist Party in Spain.

This soon brought results. In February 1936 the Popular Front in Spain won the general election, and then the triumph was repeated in France in the following May. While the Spanish generals, in alliance with Hitler and Mussolini, were preparing counter-revolution, the new French Popular Front Government, under Leon Blum, supported by the French Communist Party, was faced at once by a revolutionary situation — a successful general strike with occupation of places of work. This strike was intermediate both in time and in strategy between the British General Strike of 1926 and that in France in 1968. In Britain there had been no occupation of places of work, and the initiative was left throughout in the hands of the Tory Government. In 1936 the workers took the great step forward of occupying all places of work, wherever they were on strike, and in addition the whole atmosphere was a revolutionary one with a newly elected government, comparable to our own situation after the general election of 1945. But instead of going forward, as Lenin had insisted on doing at once in 1917 with his April Theses, the French Communist Party was satisfied with the achievement of the Popular Front parliamentary majority, and was most careful not to go on to claim any further socialist advance. It was then that Thorez, the leader of the French CP, put forward the slogan which critics of the Communist Party have been quoting ever since — 'il faut savoir terminer une greve' — one must know how to end a strike. And the CP ended the strike in order not to "embarrass" the Blum Government. The revolutionary situation in France initiated by the General Election victory in May was brought to an end. Within a few weeks the counter-revolution had started in Spain and the French CP then wanted to support Spanish democracy against the fascist attack. It was too late. The revolutionary

initiative had been lost. The bourgeois government was firmly installed and determined to maintain bourgeois rule against any danger of revolution. So the Blum Government invented "non-intervention", a slogan immediately taken up by the British Government, which was on the side of Franco from the beginning.

In Spain itself we need not go into much detail about the events immediately preceding the Army coup, but it is important to stress that the Spanish CP was a very small one, not one-tenth the size of the great German CP of the early 1930s. Nonetheless this very small CP, with practical experience of fighting in the Asturias, and thus no illusions about parliamentary roads to socialism, had been able to initiate the Popular Front movement from 1934-35 and was the main ideological force behind the Popular Front election victory of 1936. They were of course not in the Government, which was in fact a very half-hearted democratic bourgeois government. The situation in Spain in the first half of 1936 was not at all comparable to that in France where in May 1936 there was a potentially revolutionary situation. In Spain there was no such possibility in 1936. The prospect was only to maintain and develop a democratic form of capitalism, to make it possible to develop a socialist movement of the working class. But both in France and Spain Communist Parties much smaller than the German CP had halted fascism by taking the initiative against it. It is the failure to maintain this initiative that we have criticised in France in 1936 and that we shall go on to criticise in Spain in 1937.

The attack by the Army was started in Morocco on 17th July 1936, next day in Spain itself, where a number of towns were captured and hundreds of Republicans were arrested and immediately shot by the rebels, while the Republican liberal government dithered and hoped to get a compromise, i.e. to make an alliance with the fascists. But the fascist rebels shot everyone who did not fully support them, including all the generals who showed any dither, and also several emissaries sent by the government to negotiate.

Early on the 19th of July, with a new Prime Minister in Madrid, arms were at last distributed to the trade unions, and orders were telephoned for similar arms distribution in all towns. But these orders mostly came too late, the army rebels having already moved into action. In Galicia, the extreme north-west of Spain, the English Whig historian of the war writes 'the grave and poverty-stricken peasants came in from the country in carts and on foot as if to a fiesta, resolved to fight to the death.' But the fascists won because the peasants had no arms.

In Barcelona however the workers, mostly anarchists, did not wait but seized several arms depots by force, and after two days of severe fighting, the people won. And in Madrid the workers were armed, and the army could not even get out of its barracks, which were fairly easily captured.

The Spanish people in the two capital cities of Madrid and Barcelona, in the great majority of smaller towns, and throughout the Asturias, Viscaya, Catalonia, and over almost all Andalusia, thus defeated the military seizure in twenty-four to forty-eight hours, so that within a few days the people were in general triumphant, and it could not have taken long to reduce these parts of the country, such as Northern Castile and Navarre, where the military had been successful because of local political backwardness, and the patches of military resistance in the south.

But under the 'liberal' hypocrisy of non-intervention, the Spanish Republic was immediately blockaded by the French Popular Front Government, which was itself being pressurised by the British Government. Even so, a military overthrow of the fascist strongholds in Burgos, etc could have been quickly organised if the war had been in fact a Spanish one only, since the Spanish troops available to the reactionary generals were very few and would either have put up little resistance or deserted to the popular government side.

But as soon as it was seen that the seizure of power in Spain had been defeated, an invasion of Spain was organised from Morocco, while at the same time Mussolini prepared an invasion by the Italian army. It was the invasion of Spain from the south by mercenary troops of the Spanish Foreign Legion, with the active help of Germany and Italy and under the protection of France and Britain, that in 1936 from August on began the defeat of the Spanish people and the victory of reaction. Yet at no stage of the struggle did the Spanish Government proclaim freedom for its colony in North Africa or appeal to the Moorish mercenaries to join in a common fight for national freedom.

The Government had no trained troops to oppose this invasion by an experienced battle-trained mercenary army of professional soldiers. Revolutionaries must understand that untrained forces cannot stop the advance of a trained military force. Even trained guerrillas must remember the four slogans of the Chinese:

Enemy advances we retreat,
Enemy halts we harass,
Enemy tires we attack,
Enemy retreats we pursue.

But the Franco advance on Madrid from the south was not stopping, there were no troops available to stop it and no time to train any.

But the morale of the revolutionary movement in Europe generally was still so good that already in July and August a number of individuals who happened to be in Spain or in France went to offer their help. A number of English comrades enlisted in the Republican forces in Catalonia, and one, a young artist named Felicia Browne, was killed on the Aragon front in August. Among those who went to Catalonia that summer was a twenty-year-old Communist from Cambridge, John Cornford who after some weeks with the POUM returned to London determined to organise some effective military help. Meantime, the Comintern also decided to do this. The Soviet Union allowed volunteers from its air force and its armoured forces to go to Spain and supplied fighter planes and tanks. The decisive force in the autumn and winter of 1936-37 was the International Brigades organised from every country in Europe from September 1936 onwards, but in the earliest days chiefly from Germany, France (hundreds of immigrant workers) and on a much smaller scale from Britain. Without this help at a crucial moment when the experienced and well-armed troops of Franco had opposing them only ill-armed and untrained volunteers, Madrid must have fallen and the war been over before Christmas 1936. The first defeat of the invaders in the suburbs of Madrid was inflicted by the first organised International Brigade (the Eleventh) who were about 90 per cent German, with a single platoon of British volunteers (known as 'die englander' or 'les anglais' or 'los ingleses'. The Irishmen, Scotsmen and Welshmen who made up a large proportion of these fighters were internationally classified as simply English).

The Spanish Republican Army started as a political development and the original regiments were recruited by political parties, chiefly the anarchists and the communists. The anarchists played a most important, possibly *the* most important role in July, when the workers, especially in Barcelona, showed fantastic heroism with complete disregard for their own lives in defeating the generals. But later the anarchist regiments failed to make an effective fighting army, whereas the communists — they took the name of 'Fifth Regiment' — were from the beginning the most disciplined, the best cared for, the best organised, the best fighters and in consequence also the most popular. These new fighting troops, tremendously encouraged by the sensational arrest of the enemy in the suburbs of Madrid, rapidly played a bigger and bigger role.

Franco's troops were again arrested in a two weeks battle north-west of Madrid (at Las Rosas)

in January, and again in February south-west of Madrid when the fascist army tried to cut the Madrid-Valencia road at the battle of the Jarama. Finally at the battle of Guadalajara in March 1937, the most decisive Republican victory of the whole war was won with the almost total annihilation of the considerable forces that had been sent to Spain by Mussolini. The enemy was caught in column formation, was almost surrounded, and only a small portion escaped.

This completed the fight that had started on the southern outskirts of Madrid the previous autumn. The result was neither complete victory nor defeat, but a temporary stalemate with neither side able to mount a decisive offensive against the other. The Republicans were left with the initiative and therefore had to decide what to do next. They decided to continue their policy of converting the newly-formed popular army of the Republic into a disciplined army on the bourgeois model similar to the developments taking place at the same time in the Red Army of the Soviet Union. This was in complete contrast with the continued emphasis on social equality in the Chinese 8th Route Army as it then was.

This contrast needs to be emphasised because the excuse given at the time in Spain and elsewhere was that the Republican Army must go bourgeois in order not to frighten the bourgeoisie. But in fact the Red Army was going through the same process and by 1942 was more epauletted than the British Army of the same period. Indeed it is a more epauletted army today than the British. In the Soviet Union not only the army, but the whole civil service is graded into generals, colonels, etc. In the Chinese PLA all rank gradings have been abolished, and the only title said to be in use is Commander, *i.e.* man in charge, corresponding to the Commandante title that was originally the only one used in Spain in 1936 and still is, I think, used in Cuba, where Fidel Castro in reports in English is always given the rank of major.

The military strategy in Spain also followed the same bourgeois lines. They decided on an attempt at a break-through north of Madrid (at Brunete) by blitzkrieg tactics, though without the necessary armour to accomplish this. The result was a failure to dislodge Franco's troops to any significant extent. This was followed in the late summer by the Aragon offensive (at Belchite) planned in a similar manner. This captured some small provincial towns, but failed to affect the course of the war.

The strategy of those offensives may be compared to the strategy insisted upon by the military command of the Wang Ming/Po Ku leadership of

the Chinese Communist Party in Kiangsi (Central China) in 1934 against the advice of Mao Tse-tung. The failure of those positional warfare tactics ('dig in and resist at all costs') which are said to have been decided under the influence of a Comintern military adviser, led to the forced evacuation of the Kiangsi base. Indirectly, this had the effect of forcing acceptance of the leadership of Mao Tse-tung after the dismal failure of the Wang Ming/Po Ku leadership.

In Spain in 1937 was there an alternative?

Yes, there was. The alternative was a *People's War* on the lines so successfully worked out in China, and since then in Vietnam, and now being developed in other countries.

For this it would have been necessary deliberately to spread the war throughout Spain by a process of infiltration of small groups, preferably led by men returning to their own neighbourhoods, where they would know both the people and the country. Strategically, this would have meant the abandonment of all attempts at mounting a positional offensive, but there would have been little risk of Franco being able to do this, as he would have rapidly become occupied in dealing with multiple insurrections, ambushes and guerrilla warfare of all types throughout those provinces of Spain that he had succeeded in over-running. It can safely be assumed that at that time (spring/summer 1937) 90 per cent of the Spanish people, with the possible exception of Old Castile and Navarre, were filled with violent hatred of Franco, his generals and his imported mercenaries.

Politically, it would have meant the abandonment of an attempt to win the support, or at least the neutrality, of a middle class, but instead an all-out policy to win the active support of the *peasantry* who constituted then, even more than they do today, an overwhelming majority of the Spanish people.

It would also have meant abandonment of Government and Communist Party opposition to letting the villages decide for themselves whether to collectivise or not. Unlike the Social-Revolutionaries in Russia in 1917, who were opposed to collectivisation, the main organisations of the Spanish peasantry, the FAI, CNT and UGT, were in favour of collectivisation and undoubtedly represented the main force in the post-revolutionary situation among the peasants. Thomas, in his history of the war, states that CNT and UGT, *i.e.* anarchists and social democrats, in the villages were on good terms with each other and keen to collectivise; while of course

Government and Communist Party were not only opposed, but even trying to decollectivise the already collectivised. All this of course in order not to provoke or offend the bourgeoisie.

A people's war would have meant chiefly a peasant's war. A weakness of the Soviet Revolution was that it never succeeded in fully winning the peasants, and even today continues in consequence to have difficulties with its agricultural production. On the other hand, the Chinese Revolution has been made by peasants. One cannot but feel that advisers from China rather than the Soviet Union in 1937 might have been more useful to the Republican cause in Spain.

It seems relevant here to note that Norman Bethune, the Canadian Communist surgeon who had been organising the first blood transfusion service ever used in war, for the Madrid and other fronts, decided at this time, spring 1937, to leave Spain to go to work in China. It seems to me that Bethune showed in this action an extraordinarily exact understanding of the relative political values of the two wars, that in Europe, and that in China.

Would such a policy of people's war have been practicable from the viewpoint of the international situation in 1937? This question must be put because we must assume that decisions on political and therefore on military strategy in Spain were taken with the international situation and in particular the military threat to the Soviet Union (at that time the only socialist country) necessarily very much in mind.

The answer to this question must be related to the overall policy of the Comintern. It must be assumed, for instance, that the policy of not developing the revolutionary situation in France in May 1936 immediately following the overwhelming victory of the Popular Front in the general election, was not taken without consultation with Comintern headquarters. This apparently reflected a fear on the part of the Comintern leadership that a too revolutionary leadership in the West could be dangerous by frightening the liberal bourgeoisie, then still ambivalent in their attitude to Hitler.

Looking back at it now, it is easy to see that this whole attitude was dangerously opportunist and thoroughly mistaken. Some communists may feel that it is therefore 'unfair' to make such a criticism of the international leadership of the period. But revolution is not a game, nor is the study of history for Marxists a question of apportioning merit as if we were drawing up lists of comrades who should, or should not, receive the Order of Lenin. We are

concerned exclusively with the practical question of analysing the truth in order to help us in our battle at the present time.

From this viewpoint, the formal responsibility for the incorrect political and military strategy adopted in Spain from the spring of 1937 onwards remains with the Spanish Communist Party leadership. This responsibility must be recognised as having been in fact merely formal. We do not know whether Jose Diaz, the leader of the Spanish Communist Party at that time, did or did not agree with this policy. In the following winter he left for the Soviet Union, where he died not long after.

The possibility of turning the Spanish war into a guerrilla war must have occurred at the time to many, even if it would naturally not occur to philistine republican generals of the type that Lister shows himself to be in his book of egotistical memoirs 'Nuestra Guerra'. The present writer outlined this criticism of the conduct of the war to a comrade who had become a high officer in the International Brigades — now an enthusiastic revisionist but simultaneously an enthusiastic defender of Stalin's leadership. This comrade told me that he had made this very proposal to his commanding officer, the Polish general from the Red Army previously mentioned, without, of course, any effect. This merely confirms that the decision to continue a bourgeois type of war was simply the reflection of the political decision to woo the liberal bourgeoisie instead of aiming to secure its support by mobilising the proletariat and peasantry to develop maximum strength — something that could be done by a political programme to appeal not to the liberal bourgeoisie, but to the peasantry of the villages.

Finally, it would be dishonest and misleading not to mention the obverse of this incorrect right-wing policy in both the political and military fields. This other aspect is equally inevitable if the main policy does not sufficiently *rely on and trust the people*. It was also to be seen in China in 1934, in relation to which every revolutionary should study most carefully the very full analysis of this period given in the published works of Mao Tse-tung. It was also to be seen in the Soviet Union, where 1937 saw the inauguration of the policy of large-scale arrests and executions.

In Spain the first outstanding ill effect of the mistaken policy was the anarchist Trotskyist (POUM) revolt in Barcelona in May 1937. This revolt was inexcusable. It did nothing but harm. But like the Kronstadt Revolt in 1921, it was a signal of acute popular dissatisfaction which would have been noted by a revolutionary leadership.

In 1921 Lenin reacted to the Kronstadt Revolt by introducing, the very next month, the New Economic Policy that was an absolute necessity to win back the support of both peasants and workers.

In 1937 the representatives of the Comintern in Spain reacted to the POUM revolt only by widespread arrests and executions and made no change in the policy that had led to the revolt. On the contrary, they re-emphasised both the bourgeois respectability of the government and its separation from any socialist aspirations of the people.

The war in Spain, like the non-war in Germany in 1932-33, was lost, according to the Comintern analysis, because the Social Democrats betrayed the revolution—the SPD in Germany, the Blum Government in France. This is very true. But since when has any Marxist-Leninist expected social democrats not to betray revolution? Isn't that just why communist parties were started after 1917?

These defeats have to be related to the policies not of the opposing class, whether openly capitalist or pseudo-socialist, but to the policies of the revolutionary parties. It is the responsibility of revolutionaries, not of non-revolutionaries, to see that revolutions are successful.

It is the duty of European revolutionaries today to study critically the history of revolutionary failures in Europe from 1918 to 1968. It is surely likely that these failures are related to the now openly bourgeois development of the Soviet Union. But there have been enough failures. It is time to go over to successes. What objective reason can there be why the small country of Albania should today be the only country in Europe which is developing socialism?

What is missing in revolutionary movements in Europe is not the objective conditions for revolution—consider Greece, consider France in 1968, Italy in 1969—what is missing is the subjective condition for revolution, an effective revolutionary leadership with a correct analysis of the class situation and with a revolutionary policy that will unite all those who can be united against the main enemy.

A leader of a brother-organisation which is genuinely revolutionary recently said 'We must unite all who will accept the points in our programme'. This is of course quite correct, and the programme itself is correct. That is how to build the personnel of the revolutionary party. But it is not what Lenin and Mao mean by the slogan of 'Unite all who can be united against the main enemy'. In 1937 did Chiang Kai-shek accept the programme of the Chinese Communist Party? Not at all, yet the Party correctly called him—in fact, forced him—into alliance against the Japanese. It

is in that sense that revolutionary leadership must understand this basic slogan if we are to turn defeats into victories.

Mao Tse-tung has advised us to dare to think, dare to speak, dare to act.

The first thing to dare is thought, which has to include a fully critical attitude to the history of our own revolutionary movement.

Women's liberation

(continued from page 11)

normal for the decadent heroes and heroines of D'Annunzio. Dissoluteness in sexual life is bourgeois, is a phenomenon of decay. The proletariat is a rising class. It doesn't need intoxication as a narcotic or a stimulus. Intoxication as little by sexual exaggeration as by alcohol. It must not and shall not forget, forget the shame, the filth, the savagery of capitalism. It receives the strongest urge to fight from a class situation, from the communist ideal. It needs clarity, clarity and again clarity. And so I repeat, no weakening, no waste, no destruction of forces. Self-control, self-discipline is not slavery, not even in love. But forgive me, Clara, I have wandered far from the starting point of our conversation. Why didn't you call me to order? My tongue has run away with me. I am deeply concerned about the future of our youth. It is a part of the revolution. And if harmful tendencies are appearing, creeping over from bourgeois society into the world of revolution—as the roots of many weeds spread—it is better to combat them early. Such questions are part of the women question.'

THOSE WHO LIVE IN GLASS HOUSES . . .

WE TAKE the following from a generally pessimistic article, *UN in Decline*, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, in the *New Statesman* of October 23, 1970.

'Even in the field of disarmament and arms control the most important negotiations no longer take place in New York or in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva; they are conducted secretly by the United States and the Soviet Union in Helsinki and Vienna.'

And the Soviet Union is the country that regularly accuses China of making under-cover approaches to the US and so undermining 'socialist unity'!