

THE COMMUNIST

6^a

Middle East

Revisionism and

Welsh Nationalism

Class Struggle

in the USSR (3)

ALSO:

REPLY TO "WORKERS' PRESS"

Nº 31

Editorial.

Middle East

The most significant fact about the states in the Middle East is not pan-Arabism or Arab nationalism, but the fact that these states represent national bourgeoisies. These bourgeoisies have been successful in establishing the basis for capitalism in the Middle East. Firstly in keeping political leadership in the struggle to remove France and England from political control. (The last such struggle is Algeria in 1963. See CWO Pamphlet No 2, the Palestine Question.) Secondly, in obtaining ever better terms for the national bourgeoisie viz the capital which had been invested by the imperialist countries. (US, France, England, USSR etc.)

In the 19th Century the Middle East's significance was the control of trade routes, as a source of raw cotton and a market for finished cotton goods. The replacement of coal by oil as the main source of energy for transport and the fabrication of chemicals meant that the Middle East as a major source of oil in the world was in a well-placed bargaining position viz advanced capitalism. For it is a fact that the existence of a national bourgeoisie does not mean that a viable capitalism will automatically follow from a pre-capitalist country. That national bourgeoisie need a very great amount of capital to construct an infra-structure to integrate the country so that it becomes a national market for production, distribution and exchange (This infra-structure includes not only roads, railroads, etc but also means of production like the Aswan Dam, needed to put agriculture on a capitalist base.) And second, the national bourgeoisie need a market for what they produce. Both these things--capital and a market--the imperialist bourgeoisie are always willing to supply, after all, that is the essence of imperialism. The point is that the imperialists supply them on terms most favourable to their own immediate interests. These are the extracting from the country of surplus from capital invested--most of the surplus. The national bourgeoisie in the Middle East have replied by nationalising the capital of imperialist countries. (Banks, insurance, some industry, some aspects of oil.) This **does not** mean that they are dispossessing the imperialists. They are merely demanding a greater amount of the surplus for themselves. The imperialists have reacted sensibly. They have agreed.

Not only did the national bourgeoisie threaten to stop oil; but, they also had concluded and were concluding agreements with the USSR and Eastern Europe for the supply of oil, the investment of capital and access to markets. The USSR and E Europe have to a certain extent been taking markets and sources

continued on page

CLASS STRUGGLE

in the USSR (III)

The CPC document, "Reference Material for the Study of 'A Great Historic Document'", gives a number of quotes from Lenin concerning the continuation of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. From these quotes it concludes that: "Lenin saw that after the proletariat seized power, the defeated bourgeoisie remained stronger than the proletariat and was always trying to stage a come-back. At the same time, small production continuously engendered capitalism and the bourgeoisie anew thus posing a threat to the dictatorship of the proletariat. In order to cope with this counter-revolutionary threat and overcome it, it was therefore necessary to strengthen the dictatorship of the proletariat for a long period of time... However, Lenin died in 1924, too early to solve these problems in practice. After Lenin died, Stalin took over this great undertaking from him, led the Soviet C.P. and the Soviet people in safeguarding and consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat, brought about socialist industrialisation and agricultural collectivisation, and achieved tremendous successes in socialist revolution and construction.

"Stalin was a great Marxist-Leninist who actually cleared out a large number of counter-revolutionary representatives of the bourgeoisie who had sneaked into the Party, including Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Bukharin, Rykov and company".

It also acknowledges that Stalin opposed Bukharin's theory of the dying out of the class struggle in the period before industrialisation and collectivisation. But "Following the realisation and the collectivisation of agriculture in the Soviet Union, or the virtual completion of the socialist transformation of the ownership of the means of production, Stalin made a speech entitled "On the Draft Constitution of the USSR"... in Nov. 1936. This report correctly summed up the great achievements of the S.U. in her socialist revolution and socialist construction and at the same time showed Stalin's shortcomings in theory in a concentrated way. In theory, Stalin failed to admit that classes and class struggles exist throughout the historical period under the dictatorship of the proletariat" (It has been shown in previous articles that Stalin by no means "failed to admit" this. In major speeches immediately before and immediately after the speech on the Constitution he emphasised the continuation and intensification of the class struggle.)

Immediately following this a number of quotes are given which, presumably, are intended to show Stalin's "shortcomings in theory". These quotes say that the landlord class was eliminated in the Civil War; that the "capitalist class in the sphere of industry has ceased to exist", as have kulaks, merchants and profiteers; "thus all the exploiting classes have been eliminated". What remains is the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. Under the leadership of the proletariat "the economic contradictions between these social groups are declining are becoming obliterated", so are the political contradictions.

In the quotes from Lenin and Stalin, Stalin's statements about the continuation of the class struggle after industrialisation and collectivisation are omitted, and Lenin's statements about the class structure of Soviet society are omitted. Consider, for example, the following statement: "The internal political situation in Soviet Russia is determined by the fact that here, for the first time in history, there have been, for a number of years, only two classes - the proletariat... and the small peasantry, who constitute the overwhelming majority of the population". That is the kind of statement that the document quotes from Stalin. Nothing of that kind is quoted from Lenin. Yet that statement was made by Lenin in a report to the 3rd Congress of the Comintern in July 1921.

In a report to the 10th Conference of the R.C.P. in May 1921 Lenin said: "For the first time in modern history we have a social system from which the exploiting class has been eliminated but in which there are two different classes - the working class and the peasantry".

But the C.P.C. document quotes similar statements from Stalin made fifteen years later, after considerable progress in building a socialist economy had been made, as evidence of Stalin's "shortcomings in theory", while maintaining that Lenin's position had been theoretically correct. But if Lenin's statements in 1921 were correct, Stalin's 1936 statements to the same effect certainly were correct.

Following what is quoted above, Lenin said: "The principal problem that still confronts us - and will inevitably confront us for many years to come - is that of establishing proper relations between two classes, proper from the standpoint of abolishing classes".

As early as October 1919, Lenin said: "In order to abolish classes it is necessary, first, to overthrow the landowners and capitalists. This part of our work had been accomplished, but it is only a part, and moreover, not the most difficult part. In order to abolish classes it is necessary, secondly, to abolish the differences between factory worker and peasant, to make workers of all of them. This cannot be done all at once. This task is incomparably more difficult and will of necessity take a long time. It is not a problem that can be solved by overthrowing a class. It can be solved only by the organisational reconstruction of the whole social economy, by a transition from individual, disunited, petty commodity production to large-scale social production" (Vol. 30 p.112)

-4-

In his report to the 3rd Comintern Congress referred to above, he said: "...we are now trying to determine the attitude the proletariat in power should adopt towards the last capitalist class - the rock-bottom of capitalism - small private property, the small producer". And "the dictatorship of the proletariat is ...essential as long as classes exist, as long as the bourgeoisie, overthrown in one country, intensifies tenfold its attacks on socialism on an international scale"

Stalin understood Lenin's position very well and agreed with it. His 1936 speech reviewed, on the basis of Lenin's analysis, the changes which had taken place. The last capitalist class, the mass of small peasants, had been collectivised, and the collective farms, which were considered as a transitional property form between private and socialist public property, were integrated into the socialist system of production. But an attempt to gloss over the differences between the collective farm peasants and the working class was opposed by Stalin.

Despite the momentous changes which had taken place since Lenin's death, there was no question of abolishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is formally recognised in the Constitution. And in his speech Stalin dealt with the matter at some length, concluding: "I must admit that the Draft of the new Constitution does preserve the regime of the dictatorship of the working class, just as it also preserves unchanged the present leading position of the C.P.S.U. If the esteemed critics regard this as a flaw in the Draft Constitution, that is only to be regretted. We Bolsheviks regard it as a merit of the Draft Constitution".

If Stalin had been of the opinion that there were no longer contradictions in Soviet society, and that the class struggle was ceasing, what possible reason would there be for continuing and strengthening the proletarian dictatorship (except against external forces)-?

Dealing with the criticism that certain things were not said in the Constitution, and with proposals "to introduce ...elements of historical references, or elements of declarations concerning what Soviet power has not yet achieved and what it should achieve in the future", Stalin replied; "To describe in the Constitution the difficulties the Party, the working class, and all the working people have overcome during the long years of struggle for the victory of Socialism; to indicate in the Constitution the ultimate goal of the building of a complete communist society - such are the subjects with which these amendments deal... I think these amendments ... should be set aside as having no direct bearing on the Constitution. The Constitution is the registration and legislative embodiment of the gains that have already been achieved and secured. Unless we want to distort this fundamental character of the Constitution we must refrain from filling it with historical references to the past, or with declarations concerning the future achievements of the working people of the USSR. For this we have other means

and other documents".

To concentrate attention on a speech about a document from which certain matters have been consciously and openly excluded; to cite this speech as being representative of Stalin's position on the matters which have been excluded; and to ignore the "other means and other documents" which deal with these matters: that can hardly be described as a scientific Marxist approach to the subject.

B.Clifford

Reply to

"Workers' Press"

A criticism (so to speak) of the ICO was published by the trotskyist S.L.L. in the Workers Press (July 25th). The subject of the S.L.L. criticism is the ICO criticism of the Hsinhua News Agency's reporting of events in N. Ireland since last August. The S.L.L. supports the Hsinhua version of what happened. The ICO article showed that the Hsinhua version was identical with the trotskyist version. It is quite logical that the trotskyists should now rally to the defence of Hsinhua.

The S.L.L., of course, does not deal in concrete realities any more than the Hsinhua reports did. It merely quotes some conclusions expressed by the ICO in an incredulous tone of voice, and ignores the concrete evidence in support of these conclusions.

The incidents in question have been dealt with at length in this ^{magazine} and in the Irish Communist. They concern the role of the British Army last August, and the nature of the military conflict between the Army and some Protestant nationalist elements in the Shankill Road last October. The S.L.L., like Hsinhua, maintains that the Army intervened to suppress a revolutionary movement and that the conflict in October was between reaction and revolution. The indisputable fact is that the Army intervened to bring a halt to an anti-Catholic pogrom and that there were no revolutionary forces involved in the October conflict. No matter how incredulous a tone of voice you repeat these facts in, they remain facts. If your world outlook cannot accomodate these facts, so much the worse for your world outlook.

The S.L.L. rants a lot about the threat of Paisleyism. But the "revolutionaries" who took on the British Army last October were Protestant nationalists like Paisley, who differed from him only in being more militant. Like many "revolutionary" phrasemongers the S.L.L. was nowhere to be seen during the crisis last August, when there was a real threat to some Catholic areas. The S.L.L., it should be noted, had a substantial group in N. Ireland a couple of years before the ICO was formed. But when the barricades went up last August the S.L.L. was nowhere in sight. They were well away from the danger area, where they could phrasemonger in safety, ignore the realities of the actual situation and develop their fantasies. (In this they were not distinguished from many other "revolutionary Marxist" organisations.)

The article describes the ICO as one "of the various sects claiming to be Maoist". But "now the ICO has fallen out with its erstwhile mentors in Peking". (What a fine and original turn of speech: "erstwhile mentors" !) It says that the ICO is "treading in the footsteps of the M.L.O.B." which, after some years of Maoist phrasemongering, declared that Mao was a fascist and Liu was a revolutionary.

The ICO has never claimed to be Maoist. Since its formation in 1965 it has made known its disagreements with certain positions of the CPC. Because of this it has been described as trotskyist by virtually all of the Maoist groups. It was described as trotskyist by the M.L.O.B. when that body was in its Maoist phase. But when the M.L.O.B. launched its attack on Mao as a fascist, the only published reply to it was made by the ICO. On this matter the position of the ICO has not changed substantially since its inception five years ago.

The Workers Press refers to the ICO as a "grouplet". The ICO certainly began as a very small group in 1965, and has grown steadily since. The S.L.L. had a sizeable group in N. Ireland in the early sixties. But the S.L.L. in Ireland has declined and vegetated ever since. The dominance which trotskyism enjoyed in Irish socialist politics from the late fifties to the mid sixties was broken by the ICO, and the S.L.L. fared no better against the ICO than its trotskyist rivals. Today it has two "grouplets": the League for a Workers Vanguard in Belfast and a Young Socialist group in Dublin. Both are very intense sloganising bodies, and are very short in concrete analysis.

The ICO has described the democratic changes which have occurred in bourgeois politics in Ireland, North and South, and has described the actual causes of these changes. The L.W.V. publication, Vanguard, says: "The next stage in the Irish struggle, contrary to what organisations like the ICO, who prattle on about the establishment of bourgeois democracy, believe, is a strengthening of the move to the right". The ICO has described the changes which have taken place and the political forces which are actually operating. It is also attempting to build a working class political force. At present there is no working class political force

of any significance. The democratic changes which have undoubtedly occurred have resulted from bourgeois politics. It is in the imperialist interest to consolidate these changes, and they have been acting consistently to that end. That is not a matter of prediction but of history. The S.L.L. has contributed nothing to these changes in one way or another. If its "revolutionary" talk had not been sheer phrasemongering it would have been behind the barricades last August trying to develop working class politics. It was not behind the barricades. The only working class force there was the ICO.

The L.W.V. has formulated a programme. It is a very strange programme for a tendency which holds that there is no progressive function for bourgeois politics in Ireland. The political demand is for "A workers' and farmers' government breaking from Westminster, posing unity of action immediately with the workers of the South and of Britain". Under this government there would be "guaranteed ... democratic rights ... to the Protestant minority". In short, a programme for the bourgeois unification of Ireland. A "workers' and farmers' government" could only be a bourgeois government. The farmers are a very substantial bourgeois force in Ireland.

In "Permanent Revolution" Trotsky attacked as counter-revolutionaries the Leninist ("Stalinist") programme of a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry as the first stage of the revolution in the colonial countries where there were strong feudal remnants, and a large peasantry struggling against them. In Ireland there is no peasantry in that sense. The overwhelming majority of the farmers are bourgeois and petty bourgeois. The democratic agrarian has long been accomplished. A workers' and farmers' government means a workers' and bourgeois government. The trotskyists in the S.L.L. should scrutinise this very closely. It looks as if Gerry Healy is committing them to an Irish bourgeois nationalist programme. (This is a common occurrence with Irish trotskyists.)

The Dublin grouplet of the S.L.L., the Irish Y.S., is a splinter of the League for a Workers' Republic. The L.W.R. is a fragment of the trotskyist I.W.G., which petered out in 1968. It is led by Pat Healy who had waged a struggle against the I.W.G. leader, G. Lawless. He accused Lawless of having abandoned trotskyism and succumbed to Irish nationalism. Earlier this year Pat Healy was singing the praises of Gerry ~~Lawless~~ ^{HEALY} and the S.L.L. But suddenly he was denounced by the S.L.L. for having abandoned trotskyism and succumbed to Irish nationalism. A group within the L.W.R. which was even more enthusiastic about the L.W.R. than Pat Healy left it and set up the I.Y.S. grouplet. 522

The I.Y.S., like the L.W.V., maintains that there is now a bonapartist regime in the 6 Cos. "balancing itself between the Army and the trade union leaders".

Of the L.W.R. it says "we condemn the revisionist L.W.R., who are liquidating into the Labour Party while still posing the secession

CPCGB & Welsh Nationalism

Over recent years the Communist Party of Great Britain has had to come to terms with the phenomenon of a Welsh Nationalist revival. The rise of the Welsh Nationalist Party has gone hand in hand with the drastic and continuing slump in electoral support for the Communist Party in Wales. The CPCGB has fallen to the position of fifth party in Wales at the same time as Plaid Cymru has risen rapidly to a position of third party, and is stronger now than the Liberal Party, which traditionally monopolised Welsh politics. A similar situation holds in Scotland.

Faced with this situation it is the task of the communist movement to make a thorough analysis of the class nature of Welsh and Scottish Nationalism, of the economic reasons for their rise, and of the attitude it should take towards them. It should also analyse the reasons behind the decline in its own influence in the working class movement.

Unfortunately the CPCGB has failed to do this on all counts. Its attitude to the rise of Welsh Nationalism has been an opportunist, vote-catching one of a gradual shift towards the Nationalist position, culminating in the resolution passed, calling for Welsh and Scottish Parliaments, at the last National Congress. The statement at the Congress contained no class analysis of the National movement, and merely reacted subjectively to it. This policy has not paid off in terms of increased votes, as the recent elections showed clearly.

The only clear statement by a leading member of the CPCGB on Wales and the Welsh economy is the article by Tom Drinkwater in CYFFRO No. 2, "Wales Needs a New Economy". Cyffro is not a theoretical journal of the Welsh Communist Party, but a Marxist Forum; but it is reasonable to assume that Mr Drinkwater's attitude is that of the CPCGB, as he is a prominent member of the Economic Committee of the Party.

This article is a reply to Tom Drinkwater's statement, and is a small contribution towards a class understanding of Welsh Nationalism, and of the CPCGB in Wales.

REVISIONISM AND WALES

1/ OPPORTUNISM

Since the very earliest stages in the rise of the working class movement, whenever a particular section of the bourgeoisie has found itself in contradiction with the ruling bourgeois stratum, or whenever the ruling class has seen the need for a change in its policies, the radical bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie have always sought to channel the energy of the working class movement behind their own bourgeois demands, using the bourgeois intellectuals in the working class organisations to formulate the theoretical basis for a revisionist programme; i.e. a programme of bourgeois demands disguised as communist demands. The 'national' petty bourgeoisie in countries dominated by British Imperialism, including the nations of Britain, are a vacillating class: at some periods their class interest is anti-imperialist and they may align with the working class movement; at other times their class interest may align them with imperialism. It is the job of Communists to make a thorough class analysis of the situation in which they work in order to discover who are their friends and who are their enemies, especially where

← THIS ARTICLE CONTD P 21 →

bourgeois national movements are concerned. And under no circumstances should they confuse the class aims of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the working class, as this can only lead to the confusion of the working class movement, its degeneration into revisionism and its falling behind one bourgeois movement or another.

2/ MARKET SOCIALISM

Modern revisionism is one of the most widespread and dangerous forms of opportunism prevalent in the working class movement today. Its economic basis lies in bourgeois demands, especially the demand for a rapid and unlimited expansion of the market in 'socialist' countries. Unlike Communists like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, who held that communism would arise out of socialism as a result of the abolition of the market, the revisionists hold that communism will arise as a result of the utmost unrestricted expansion of the market. This policy, which has served as a basis for the restoration of capitalism in the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, has also been incorporated into the policies for a 'peaceful transition to socialism' in the imperialist countries, and is an integral part of the policy of the CPGB for a 'socialist' Britain.

3/ WELSH REGIONALISM

Ever since the Second World War the British government, and all the Parties, have shown an increasing interest in regional development. The economic depression of the inter-war period was one in which the spontaneous development of capitalism had the effect of exaggerating the contradiction between the underdeveloped North and West of Britain (and especially Scotland and Wales) and the higher developed South and East. In the post-war period efforts have been made by all governments, Labour and Conservative, to reduce this contradiction. Pressure in this direction has been applied by working class, petty bourgeois and big bourgeois organisations and parties alike, for different reasons corresponding to their own class interests. In Wales this Welsh regionalism has been expressed in the regional policies of the Tory, Labour, Liberal and Communist parties, and in the rise of the Welsh Nationalist Party, Plaid Cymru. Since there is an unbroken front of Parties in favour of special treatment for Wales (and other regions) it is necessary for a Communist to understand the reasons why the various classes of our society should find their interests served by Welsh regionalist policies.

4/ IMPERIALIST INTEREST IN REGIONALISM

Why is the (imperialist) ruling class interested in developing Wales? Tom Drinkwater points to some of the answers himself in his CYFFRO article:

"Does the state now give more attention to Wales, as an economic area? Yes, it does. Firstly it has to, because of mass popular pressure from Wales. Secondly, The government has now adopted "regional" policies for all parts of Britain, in order to minimise severe labour shortages in certain areas and consequent upward pressure on wages in those areas. Thus it discourages employers from opening up more enterprises in congested areas (South-East England and West Midlands) while encouraging them to open up in most of Wales, Scotland, etc. where there are large pools of unemployed. Thirdly, the state finds it expensive to provide new "social capital" - (houses, schools, roads etc.) in the congested areas to meet the elementary needs of those moving into these areas,

- 10 -

whilst working people are leaving the economically depressed areas and the existing social capital in these latter areas is thereby under-utilised," (p.17, my emphasis)

Thus imperialist industry finds it in its interests to develop Wales in preference to 'developed' England because:

- 1) Wages are lower, and therefore profits greater, for the same work.
- 2) Essential services which the ruling class has to provide for its workers are cheaper.

In both cases it comes to the same thing: for the same amount of work done, i.e. for the same value given by the working class to the capitalist class, the capitalist class has to give less back to the workers. In other words relative surplus value, and hence profits are increased.

5/ PETTY BOURGEOIS INTEREST IN REGIONALISM

What is the petty bourgeois interest in Welsh regionalism? The core of the Welsh petty bourgeois class is the mass of small shopkeepers, small farmers etc. catering to a Welsh market. The small manufacturing element in Wales, catering to a Welsh market, is a marginal remnant. This is not to imply that Wales comprises a unified market; in fact Wales has had two quite distinct market areas, North and South, with very little interrelation, since even before the Act of Union in the 16th century. (The market centres in each case were in England: Bristol and Hereford on the one hand, and Shrewsbury and Chester on the other.) The Welsh petty bourgeoisie today deals not with a unified Welsh market, but with smaller, local markets, falling within the boundaries of the Welsh Nation. All these factors are important in shaping the present day petty bourgeois national movement in Wales.

The basis of Welsh petty bourgeois nationalism today is not, as it was in Ireland, the conflict between small manufacturers and big English imperialist manufacturers, who with larger capital could produce the same commodities at lower cost, and thus dominated the home market. Welsh small manufacturing in competition with English imperialist industry was either eliminated long ago (such as the Mid-Wales wool industry), or else it grew into big imperialist industry in its own right, depending on the export market (like coal, metal industries etc.). Thus there is no economic basis for a Welsh separatist movement at this stage, with the policy of protection of home manufacturers against imperialist competition.

The conflict between the Welsh petty bourgeoisie and imperialism, which has led to the rise of an independent petty bourgeois Welsh National movement, is not over who should control the Welsh market. Primarily it has been over the destruction or continued existence of the Welsh market. The depopulation of rural Wales in the nineteenth century led to the elimination of the Welsh peasantry, and was accompanied by the massive growth of the industrial towns of South Wales. Its total effect was the decline of a class which produced much of its own means of subsistence, and its replacement with a large class which produced none. Thus the industrialisation of Wales had the effect of enormously increasing the size of the home market. On the other hand, the free development of world capitalism in the twentieth century has led to massive urban depopulation, which has decimated the Welsh market, and brought the Welsh petty bourgeoisie into an increasingly precarious position. The Welsh petty bourgeoisie is incapable of reconstituting the Welsh market out of its own development; what it requires is the cooperation of imperialism in reintroducing industry into Wales, so as to enlarge the Welsh Proletariat, which is the main market of the petty bourgeoisie.

This is reflected in the policies of the Welsh petty bourgeois national party, Plaid Cymru. In the pre-war period, when imperialism was ruining the Welsh market,

the Blaid made a lot of 'anti-imperialist' noises, but never advocated economic separatism. Practically it advocated the setting up of new industries on a cooperative or 'workers' control' basis, since imperialism was unwilling to step in with capital in order to save the Welsh market. Since the War, with the imperialist ruling class itself making some attempt to develop Wales, its main complaint is that the government is not moving fast enough or thoroughly enough. It stands for free movement of labour and capital between England and Wales; and has as its main policy the aim of Political Home Rule, which would allow Wales to contract out of paying its share of the British defence budget, and to sell its resources (like water) which are now taken by England free of charge. The considerable extra money available to the Independent Welsh Administration would be used to provide incentives to (mainly English) capitalists to set up industry in Wales and thus preserve and expand the Welsh market. Self-government would also allow Wales to contract out of S.E.T., which hits the Welsh petty bourgeoisie particularly heavily as they are mostly in the 'non-productive' trades which are penalised by the tax.

Thus the petty bourgeois Welsh National movement expressed in the Blaid is primarily a movement for the utmost extension of the market in Wales. Due to the specific character of the Welsh petty bourgeoisie it has not produced a consistent separatist movement; and at present, due to the current interests of imperialism, it constitutes a radical, but in noway anti-imperialist movement,

6/ THE WORKING CLASS INTEREST

The bourgeois class interest is to maximise profit on capital. This is equally true both of the imperialists and the petty bourgeoisie; only the nature of the specific capitals involved is different. This has nothing whatever to do with the working class interest. The interests of all sections of the bourgeoisie are the laws of the market - the laws of capitalism. The interest of the working class is to abolish capitalism and the laws of the market, and to build socialism, with its economic laws.

Stalin investigated and defined the basic economic laws of modern capitalism and socialism in his anti-revisionist work, 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR', suppressed by the revisionists. Stalin correctly identified the basic economic law of modern capitalism as the securing of maximum profit at the expense of the working class, whereas the basic economic law of socialism is

"the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole population through the continuous expansion and perfection of socialist production on the basis of higher techniques.

"Consequently: instead of maximum profits - maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of society...."

(FLPH Moscow 1952, p.45)

In short, capitalism involves production for maximum profit, in pursuit of which the bourgeoisie must constantly expand the market. Socialism abolishes the market and replaces it with production for use. It is in the interest of the Welsh workers that they should seize power in order to "wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e. of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible." (Communist Manifesto p.57)

How does this square with Welsh regional development? The building of a socialist Wales will involve the rapid, continuous, balanced and unimpeded development of the productive forces in Wales, in the interests of satisfying not market demand, but the material and cultural needs of the Welsh people. This is what production for use implies in a workers' state. It therefore puts an end for all

time to the National oppression of the Welsh people by imperialism, which has taken the form of the economic, territorial and cultural destruction of the Welsh Nation through forced emigration as a result of high unemployment and low wages: these themselves being a consequence of the destruction of productive forces in the basic industries of Wales in response to the general crises of the world capitalist market, the distorted development of the Welsh economy by imperialism, and the run-down of the coal market in the face of cheap oil from Britain's neo-colonies.

The Welsh economy is geared to the imperialist market. Consequently the impoverishment and oppression of the Welsh people fluctuates with the state of the world imperialist market. At present the world market is not in a period of severe crisis, but is expanding as a result of the opening up of the revisionist countries to the capitalist market. Hence British imperialism can profitably expand the export orientated Welsh industries. This is the external condition for imperialist Welsh regionalism, as higher profits and low wages are the internal condition. It is evident that the world imperialist market cannot indefinitely expand: it is in its nature to have alternate periods of boom and crisis; so that the interests of the Welsh working class, and the development of productive forces in Wales can only be served consistently by contracting out of the world market altogether. This is in absolute contradiction to the interests of Welsh capitalism which depends for its very existence on the world market.

In the meantime, while capitalism lasts, it is the task of the working class movement in Wales to organise to overthrow capital. Primarily this means to develop Communist politics, and on the basis of this to acquire the theoretical ability and organisational strength to successfully challenge capital in its periods of crisis. In order to do this the first condition is that the Welsh working class should preserve its existence as an organised class. There is no doubt that the regionalism of the bourgeois ruling class at present is helpful in this respect. The working class movement can make use of ruling class regionalism in so far as it relieves the destruction of the Welsh working class by forced emigration; it consolidates or expands the class numerically; by reducing unemployment it puts organised workers in a stronger position for fighting economic struggles, and so on. The second condition is that all forms of opportunism (i.e. bourgeois policies masquerading as communist policies) in the working class movement are consistently and thoroughly exposed. It is necessary to make it clear that bourgeois regional policies are only adopted by the ruling class because they allow it to exploit the workers more effectively. One of the main reasons for imperialist Welsh regionalism is that the Welsh workers accept lower wages and produce bigger profits than the English workers. It must be made clear that capitalist development of Welsh productive forces can only continue while the world capitalist market continues to expand. It must be understood that the Welsh petty bourgeoisie is not interested in promoting the working class interest; it is not interested in socialism and the abolition of the market economy; it is interested in promoting the fullest extension of the Welsh market, and in encouraging the greatest possible influx of imperialist capital into Wales. And finally it is necessary to thoroughly expose the opportunism of self-proclaimed Marxists in the revisionist CPGB and elsewhere who promote the imperialist or petty bourgeois policy of Welsh regionalism under the name of working class politics, and to show that this deception can only serve to obstruct the development of genuine working class politics. The third condition is that the Welsh working class movement should understand who are its friends and who are its enemies; that the petty bourgeoisie are always unreliable allies even though they may be in contradiction with imperialism, and in particular the Welsh petty bourgeoisie are bound hand and foot to imperialism and cannot be expected to play any consistent anti-imperialist role as they are at present constituted; and that the only reliable allies of the Welsh workers in the struggle for socialism are

the working class of the other nations of Britain, with whom they must unite in a single Communist Party if they are to effectively challenge the British capitalist state.

7/ SOCIALISM, CAPITALISM AND REVISIONISM

-13-

One of the common factors that runs through all the 'creative developments of Marxism' of the various revisionist economists, from Libermann and Sik down to Tom Drinkwater, is the theory that Socialism will be characterised by the fullest possible development of commodity production, i.e. of market relations. In this they follow the lead of other well known 'Marxists' like Kautsky, Trotsky and Bukharin, and are in fundamental disagreement with Marx, who showed that the highest development of commodity production was Capitalism. The class basis of this revisionist theory was shown by Stalin, in 'Economic Problems' to be bourgeois, and its function was to enable the restoration of capitalism in a socialist economy to be described as 'progress towards communism'. In order to reconcile this theory of 'market socialism' with some of the better known Marxist tenets, such as that Capitalism and Socialism are fundamentally different, the revisionists have to resort to mystification and obscurantism, and invent new definitions of such fundamental concepts as capitalism, socialism and democracy. And this is very apparent in Tom Drinkwater's CYFFRO article on the Welsh economy. At the basis of this article is the idea that socialism in Wales will be brought about by the continuous expansion of the Welsh home market, and the orientation of Welsh production towards this market. As a consequence of this he is forced to redefine the difference between Socialist and Capitalist Nationalisation. Orthodox Marxism holds that if an industry is taken over by a capitalist state (i.e. the bourgeoisie organised as ruling class) and produces for the market, then the system is one of State Monopoly Capitalism, irrespective of the profitability of the industry nationalised. Socialism involves a working class state (i.e. the proletariat organised as ruling class) taking over industries in order to remove them from the sphere of commodity production - production for the market, and introduce Socialist production - production for use. Tom Drinkwater, as a revisionist, has no intention of removing nationalised industry from the sphere of commodity production in his plans for a 'socialist Britain'; for him the difference between Socialism and Capitalism is one of the rate of profit.

"It is one thing to create a "state capitalist" sector of the economy by nationalising industries that are ailing, and then running this state capitalist sector in the interests of big private business as a whole without particular reference to the needs of Wales and imposing quite mechanically on these industries the need to make profits in line with those made currently by private capitalist firms..

"The Communist Party, however, is proposing something quite different!"

One would hope so. But what the Communist Party turns out to be proposing is no more than nationalisation of

"the expanding industries, those which are the most profitable."

So that Nationalisation is capitalist if it is unprofitable, and socialist if it is profitable!

Since he has no intention of advocating a socialist economy, Mr Drinkwater is continually in trouble trying to find differences between capitalism and what he wants. In order to solve this dilemma he defines capitalism as incapable of evening out any of its previous uneven development, and generally identifies it with unimpeded free private enterprise, ignoring the fact that one of the functions of

-14- the state in a modern state capitalist economy is to reduce the excessive effects of uneven capitalist development by providing necessary infrastructures, giving financial incentives, levying selective taxes etc. What is entirely lacking in Tom Drinkwater's article is any sort of class analysis of capitalism or socialism in general, or specifically in Wales. Capitalism is not to be condemned from a working class point of view, because it exploits the labour of the working class in the interests of another class and leads inevitably to the increasing impoverishment of the working people; but because

"it is extremely crude, and among its defects is numbered the fact that it exploits economic resources in a fashion which is arbitrary, fitful, anarchic and ultimately stupid from a social point of view."

Clearly implying that if we can produce a 'sensible', 'planned' and 'sophisticated' economic system we shall have socialism!

Stalin dealt with this point of view in his refutation of the revisionist economist Yaroshenko, who denied the importance of relations of production under socialism, and held that socialism and communism were nothing more than the 'rational organisation of productive forces'.

" Marx said:

"In production men not only act on nature but also on one another. They produce only by cooperating in a certain way and mutually exchanging their activities. In order to produce, they enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their activity on nature, does production, take place."(KM & FE, Vol 5, p.429)

" Consequently, social production consists of two sides, which, although they are inseparably connected, reflect two different categories of relations: the relations of men to nature (productive forces), and the relations of men to one another in the process of production (production relations). Only when both sides of production are present do we have social production, whether it be under the socialist system or any other social formation.

" Comrade Yaroshenko, evidently, is not quite in agreement with Marx. He considers that this postulate of Marx is not applicable to the socialist system. Precisely for this reason he reduces the problem of the Political Economy of Socialism to the rational organisation of the productive forces, discarding the production, the economic, relations and severing the productive forces from them..

" Hence, starting from the right idea that the productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary forces of production, Comrade Yaroshenko reduces the idea to an absurdity, to the point of denying the role of the production, the economic, relations under socialism; and instead of a full blooded social production, what he gets is a lopsided and scraggy technology of production - something in the nature of Bukharin's "technique of social organisation!..

" Comrade Yaroshenko thinks that we have only to ensure a rational organisation of the productive forces, and we shall be able to obtain an abundance of products and to pass to communism, to pass from the formula, "to each according to his work," to the formula, "to each according to his needs". That is a profound error, and reveals a complete lack of understanding of

the laws of economic development of socialism. Comrade Yaroshenko's conception of the conditions for the transition from socialism is far too rudimentary and puerile. He does not understand that neither an abundance of products, capable of covering all the requirements of society, nor the transition to the formula, "to each according to his needs", can be brought about if such economic factors as... commodity circulation, etc. remain in force." (Economic Problems p.70)

Another quite clear concept which Tom Drinkwater has to revise to eliminate its class content is democracy. Marxism has always held that there are two kinds of democracy: Bourgeois democracy, which is a particular form of bourgeois dictatorship; and Socialist democracy, which is a particular form of Proletarian dictatorship. Tom Drinkwater, however, emerges as an advocate of "true democracy", explaining that when he talks about socialism he means "Socialism, or democracy carried to its logical conclusion if one prefers more words to say the same thing." Marxists like Lenin and Stalin consistently exposed and ridiculed the revisionist concept of "true democracy".

" The dictatorship of the Proletariat cannot be "complete" democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as for the poor; the dictatorship of the proletariat must be a state that is democratic in a new way (for the proletarians and the non-propertied in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie)' (Lenin: State and Revolution). The talk of Kautsky and Co. about universal equality, about "pure" democracy, about "perfect" democracy and the like, is a bourgeois disguise of the indubitable fact that equality between exploited and exploiters is impossible. The theory of "pure" democracy is the theory of the upper stratum of the working class, which has been broken in and is being fed by the imperialist robbers. It was brought into being for the purpose of concealing the ulcers of capitalism, of embellishing imperialism and lending it moral strength in the struggle against the exploited masses..

" Democracy under capitalism is capitalist democracy, the democracy of the exploiting minority, based on the restriction of the rights of the exploited majority and directed against this majority. Only under proletarian dictatorship are real liberties for the exploited and real participation of the proletarians and peasants in governing the country possible. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, democracy is proletarian democracy, the democracy of the exploited majority, based on the restriction of the rights of the exploiting minority and directed against this minority."

(Stalin: Foundations of Leninism. p.46)

If Tom Drinkwater doesn't want to face the reality of proletarian dictatorship he should remember Lenin's advice that he is not a Marxist who accepts merely the class struggle; only he is a Marxist who accepts the class struggle's logical conclusion in the Proletarian Dictatorship. Then perhaps he will cease to cause confusion in the working class movement by disguising his bourgeois economic as Marxism.

8/"POPULAR PRESSURE"

Life is not always easy for opportunists. Where bourgeois radicalism is in open contradiction with a reactionary bourgeois government it is often quite easy for opportunists to gain support for the radical programme by posing as 'anti-imperialist' or 'socialist'. When the ruling class itself adopts a rather radical

programme, as is the case with the present series of British Governments in relation to the Welsh economy, then it is much harder for the radicals to appear revolutionary. A reactionary ruling class can be condemned for not carrying out the radical programme; a liberal ruling class can only be condemned for carrying it out half-heartedly or slowly. Inevitably, to retain the 'socialist' illusion, the radical opportunists claim that the government 'can not' or 'will not' carry out their demands. Then when it does, they are left with only one conclusion - it was 'popular pressure' which forced the government to act. This is a gross over-estimation of the influence of the working class movement. It is a doubly dangerous illusion as it appears to provide evidence for the revisionist theory that the British state is no longer a bourgeois dictatorship but some kind of neutral or malleable state, responsive to popular feeling, and that there is therefore no longer any need for a socialist revolution or a proletarian dictatorship because socialism can be attained by the normal workings of democracy. This theory was thoroughly exposed by Lenin in his 'State and Revolution'. Tom Drinkwater's article is full of this sort of shallow revisionism. To explain why the government is paying more attention to Wales than previously, he says

"Firstly, it had to, because of mass popular pressure from Wales"

Then, calling for a mass movement to demand a Welsh parliament, he claims that

"When forced to concede such a Parliament, the state will no doubt try to sabotage it....The outcome will depend on the political struggle".

Tom Drinkwater may rest assured that if the British Imperialist Bourgeoisie decides to give a parliament to Wales it will be because it serves its interests, and they will therefore do everything necessary to ensure that it works effectively and without obstruction.

The truth is that the Communist movement in Britain is so weak, so ineffective, and so riddled with opportunists that it poses no sort of threat to anyone, least of all to the British imperialist ruling class and state, who have therefore no need whatsoever to take its 'popular pressure' into account. Only if bourgeois opportunists like Tom Drinkwater are thoroughly weeded out and exposed will there be the possibility of genuine communist politics emerging in the working class movement. Only when it adopts communist politics will the working class movement start to pose a political threat to imperialism.

9/ TOM DRINKWATER'S "COMMUNIST" PROPOSALS FOR WALES

At the end of his CYFFRO article Tom Drinkwater makes a clear statement of his economic demands for Wales in the form of a number of proposals. These come down to ten; namely:

- 1) Repopulation of Mid-Wales by the introduction of industry
- 2) Extension of transport links between North and South Wales to give all-Welsh integration.
- 3) Diversification of industry (& hence job opportunities)
- 4) Extension of education to cope with this.
- 5) All-Wales industrial integration.
- 6) Expansion of population, to expand the home market.
- 7) Orientation of Welsh production towards the Welsh market.
- 8) An all-Wales financial network.

17-
9) New employments in the rural areas.

10) Promotion of tourism by state provision of infrastructure and state aid to small entrepreneurs.

Let us take the first one: To repopulate Mid-Wales by the introduction of industry.

This, of course, is exactly what the government itself has been trying to do, with the Mid-Wales Industrial Development Association and the Mid-Wales New Town Development Corporation. The population of Mid-Wales is not yet expanding, but the depopulation has already very nearly ceased, and this trend looks like continuing. To quote from the WESTERN MAIL's 'Mid-Wales Review' of July 3rd:

' In 13 years the area has enjoyed a dramatic rejuvenation.. The Welsh Midlands have seen 56 new factories established in ten years, and today there are nearly 100 different manufacturing industries in Mid Wales employing more than 5000 men and women....

' Between 1951 and 1961 the population of the area fell by 7184. Between 1957 and 1961 the annual rate of decline was 0.39%, but between 1962 and 1968 this rate had fallen to 0.14%....

' The measure of its (MWIDA's) success is 2500 new jobs in the area since late 1957. The Association has been the means of attracting 53 new industrial projects into Mid-Wales.

And as labour forces are built up and factories expanded there are a further 1500 jobs in prospect....

Now every town in Mid-Wales has one or more manufacturing industry....

' In some parts the new industries already introduced have helped to create conditions of full employment. And there is now a danger that in some areas the introduction of more industry without more people might create sharp competition for labour and disadvantages for existing firms and newcomers.

The Association's reply is that this must not be regarded as a difficult position but rather one of achievement. To have created a demand for people in Mid-Wales means that the association has helped to create the conditions in which the solution to depopulation and progress towards the area's modest growth is feasible. By bringing with it a demand for houses, services and amenities, the demand for labour and the creation of more and better paid jobs is providing the stimulus for the expansion of the number of the area's small towns.

' All this creates an encouraging situation in which those anxious to ensure the future of the area are no longer actively concerned in preventing a decline but are actively engaged in rebuilding....'

It would be possible to go into all the 'proposals' at this length, but it is not worth it. The ten points are a straightforward catalogue of petty bourgeois demands which can be summed up in two:

- 1) The vigorous expansion of the Welsh market
- 2) The orientation of Welsh production to this market

The imperialist ruling class accepts the first of these demands and those that follow from it : repopulation of mid-Wales; diversification of industry; extension of education; expansion of population; new employments in rural areas; promotion of tourism etc.; but they reject the second and its corollaries: all-Welsh financial network; all-Wales industrial integration; all-Wales integrated

transport system etc.

It is clear that Tom Drinkwater's article is nothing but a radical petty bourgeois programme; an attempt to gain support for radical petty bourgeois demands for a more thoroughgoing expansion of the Welsh market than imperialism is prepared to undertake at present. All this under the cover of marxist phraseology from a prominent member of the Economic Committee of the "Communist Party of Great Britain". Clearly the whole object is to channel the energy of the working class movement behind these bourgeois demands. This sort of shallow opportunism must be exposed if a genuine working class line on Wales is to emerge.

Lawrence Fry

* * *

A series of articles on the history of the 20th century Welsh Nationalist movement, and of Communist attitudes towards it, is in preparation, and will appear in future issues of THE COMMUNIST.

Editorial continued

of oil from the US and Europe. There exists an inter-imperialist rivalry here which the Middle East national bourgeoisies are assiduously trying to exploit for their own interests. The national bourgeoisies have learned to act in concert when confronting imperialism for more surplus. And at no time have they allowed anti-imperialist politics to obscure their economic interests. They cannot afford to. Why? The playing off of one imperialist 'sector' against another is limited: Russia and E Europe cannot take all the oil the Middle East wants to sell. US and European companies are exploring for alternate sources of oil and attempting to get them on stream as fast as possible.

The national question of Israel must be set against this background. At the level of the national question: the dispossession of Palestinian Arabs -- in a manner similar to the US dispossession of the Indians (see the Palestine Question) -- was unquestionably a violation of the right to self-determination. At the level of political economy, Israel had no serious problems in constructing a capitalist infrastructure: she had the necessary capital and access to markets and none of the social problems which come with transformation of pre-capitalist, largely feudal society to a capitalist market economy. The Israelis were already a capitalist nationality; the Israeli bourgeoisie had met Communist politics with Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie had no trouble attracting imperialist capital for there was a high rate of profit compared to the Arab countries.

The Israelis were already a capitalist nation and consequently the Arab bourgeoisie were correct to fear Israel's imperialist designs. Prior to the June '67 War, the Arab strategy was determined mainly by nationalism -- the Israelis have no right to exist here; they must be dispossessed -- rather than a objective assessment of Israel's military ability and imperialist support.

It is a fact that the territory gained by Israel from the '67 War has consolidated her position as a capitalist nation: in terms

of access to the sea, agricultural self-sufficiency and given her borders which have natural advantages for national defense. Israel is explicit in wooing and expecting increasing numbers of emigrants from imperialist countries to settle. The '67 War jarred the Arab national bourgeoisie into adopting an objective political attitude to Israel--recognising that she could not be booted into the Red Sea and also realising that she must be made to treat the Arab nations as the bourgeois states which they were, and not as if they were still weak feudal states to be plundered etc.

Since the '67 War, the national bourgeoisies in the Middle East mounted a concerted operation of self-defense for their bourgeois states. In doing so, they gained tactical advantage by supporting the Palestinian nation's demand to exist in Israeli territory.

Since the '67 War, Israel's strategy has been to force the Middle East states to agree to the territorial gains which Israel made in the war. This would mean the states admitting that they could not defend their national integrity and opening the way not only for further Israeli aspirations but also to imperialism taking back some of the economic gains made by these bourgeoisies. The Arab's strategy since the '67 War has been to construct an adequate self-defense and to win back that territory lost to Israel. And just prior to the American peace initiative which began in June 1970, the Middle East states were beginning to look as if they were on the way to effecting this.

What has been the strategy of the imperialists? Firstly, the British and French have consistently since the '67 War supported the Arab's right to some redress from the Israeli encroachment. They have done this because they have recognised that unless Israel was prevented from plundering other bourgeois nations, a conflict between bourgeois nations would develop endangering international bourgeois law and order and preventing normal capitalism from functioning in that part of the world. Ruling class papers have consistently implied that Jordan could be taken from Hussein and given to the Palestinian bourgeois to solve their need for territory. (Hussein's claim to Jordan dates to British fiat after the imperialists had carved up the Middle East in 1920 at the San Remo Conference.)

The US has recognised that its interests are being supplanted by the USSR and has recognised that the way to defend its interests is by defending the Arab bourgeoisie's rights. Thus it has denied Israel the arms and the capital she needed to finance a war of aggrandisement. (Israel is today facing a serious balance of payments crisis which a consensus of Israeli academics are predicting will end in devaluation and unemployment.) The US Peace Initiative is apparently the result of agreement by the US and the USSR that Israel is essentially in the wrong and that the US is the only country which can convince Israel of this peacefully. The pro-Jewish lobby in the US is very strong because the Jews have been as a nationality exceptionally successful as capitalists and as petty-bourgeois intellectuals in the US.

-20- Thus when Egypt used the cease-fire to consolidate her defences, the US had been forced to grant Israel more arms---thus postponing the political settlement. (The petty-bourgeois hysteria caused by the high-jacking has moved the US further---to granting capital to Israel.)

The strategy of the USSR has been firstly to consolidate her position economically and politically in the Middle East. Secondly, she has recognised that her position will not be helped by national bourgeois conflict, thus the USSR's support of the US peace initiative.

The Arab nations and the USSR supported the peace initiative because it contained the means for a political solution which would recognise their rights to territorial integrity as bourgeois nations. On the other hand, they moved the missiles into more favourable conditions because it is a fact that Israel's victory in the '67 War would make it practically impossible to roll the balance of power back to its pre'67 position. The surest way to counterbalance that victory and get into a better bargaining position is to possess an increased military strength.

What is the position of the Palestinian liberation movement? Firstly, there is no indication that any of the groups have more than petty-bourgeois nationalist politics. The PFLP (responsible for the high-jacking and avowedly 'Maoist') are petty-bourgeois radicals who see the value of terrorism. (The other Palestinian organisations are now teaching the PFLP that terrorism has a limited, value.)

Secondly, as a bourgeois nationalist movement, the Palestinian Liberation organisations have not been successful in leading the Palestinian refugees: the Financial Times records that most of the refugees are willing to accept a political solution at this point, while the Palestinian Liberation organisations are 'dedicated' to regaining a place for the Palestinians in Israel. (The Fatah are for co-self-determination while the 'Maoist' PFLP are for the radical solution of no Jews.) The Palestinian organisations have been more concerned with their recognition as the legitimate leaders of Palestinians by the Arab nations and the rest of the bourgeois nations than they have been with waging a serious war of national liberation. The Palestinian refugees have more to gain from their enfranchisement within Jordan and Lebanon than from winning back Israel given the present objective situation. The Palestinian organisations realise this and are using their military and armed strength to ensure that this enfranchisement means their own accession to a share of the bourgeois state.

The British left's position in all this? The Left has ignored Lenin's and Stalin's work on the national question and imperialism. In a stance which mirrors the 2nd International, they have opted for support of the Palestinian liberation movement calling it a revolutionary nationalist movement and chosen to ignore all other aspects of the situation and ignore that movement's politics. In fact the British left has proved once again that it is the radical arm of bourgeois politics.

of Catholic areas based on the false and dangerous theory of two nationalities in the North". The "false and dangerous theory" is of course that of the ICO. The L.W.R. periodically announces that it has made a breakthrough in the Marxist analysis of the Irish situation, and then proceeds to repeat (usually in a garbled, half-understood form) a theory developed by the ICO. It has recently done this with the "two nationalities" theory. (And it demanded the secession of Catholic areas in the 6Cos. to the 26 Cos., a demand which it did not borrow from the ICO. That is its own original contribution. It has not explained how the Falls Road could be transferred to the Dublin government.)

There is now a well established cycle in Irish trotskyist development. The attempt to get to grips with concrete realities leads it to take up certain ICO positions (usually in distorted forms). But this departure from pure trotskyist phrasemongering generates a pure trotskyist faction in opposition to it. This faction has the excitement of a pure trotskyist struggle against the leadership. When the leadership is overthrown the triumphant pure trotskyists must try to grapple with objective realities in an attempt to be pure enough trotskyists and the cycle repeats itself.

REPRINTED BY THE ICO

Engels: "History of Ireland to 1014" Price: 5s. Od.

First English publication!

This historic work has been translated from the original German for the ICO by Angela Clifford.

ALSO:

J.V. Stalin: Dialectical and Historical Materialism

Price: 1s. 6d.

All ICO / CWO publications are available by post from:

G. Golden, and
28, Mercers Road,
LONDON N.19

9, St. Nicholas Church Place,
(off Cove Street,)
CORK

ICO / CWO literature can also be obtained from sellers on Saturdays between 11.00 a.m. and 12.00 a.m. at the following venues:

Camden Town Market, and
(off Camden High Street)

The junction of Quex Road
and Kilburn High Road.

IRISH COMMUNIST ORGANISATION
LITERATURE LIST

IRISH HISTORY

The Working Class and the Irish National Revolution (1919-23) 2s.
Liam Mellows: Jail Notes. (ICO Introduction). 1/6.
The Irish Republican Congress (a history of the 26 Cos, 1931-6) 2s.
The Economics of Partition. 2/6
The Birth of Ulster Unionism. 1/6
John Leslie: The Present Position of the Irish Question 1s.
Wolfe Tone: An Address to the People of Ireland. 1/6.
Wolfe Tone: An Argument on Behalf of the Catholics in Ireland. 1/6.
CD Greaves: De Valera (ICO introduction). 1/6

JAMES CONNOLLY

Press Poisoners in Ireland and other Articles. 1/6.
Yellow Unions in Ireland and other Articles. 1/6.
The Connolly-Walker Controversy. 2/6
Socialism and the Orange Worker. 6d.
The New Evangel (ICO introduction) 2s.
ICO: Connolly. 6d.
ICO Policy Statement No 1: Connolly and Partition. 1/6.
Workshop Talks. 2s.

STALIN

Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR (1952). 2/6
On an Article by Engels. 1s.
Concerning Marxism in Linguistics. (ICO introduction) 3s.
On the Personality Cult. 1s.
On Trotsky. 2s.
In Defence of Stalin (by a British worker). 2/6.

POLITICAL ECONOMY

Capital and Revisionism. 1/6
The Economics of Revisionism. 1s.
In Defence of Leninism. 2/6.
On Stalin's Economic Problems. Part I. 2s.
On Stalin's Economic Problems Part II (Marxism and Market
Socialism) 5s.

ICO LITERATURE LIST (continued)

Communist Workers Organisation

The Russian Revolution. 1s 6d.

The Palestine Question. 1s 6d.

Black Power. 2s 6d.

On the National Question in Britain. 2s.

Trades Unions and Productivity, a Communist Analysis by Les Cannan
(CWO introduction) published 1955, reprinted 1970. 1s 6d.

Miscellaneous

Neil Goold: The Twentieth Congress and After. 1s 6d.

The Connolly Association (a historical account of its
degeneration). 2s.

Ulster and Home Rule by an Irish Presbyterian. 1s 6d.

Magazines and newspapers

The Irish Communist--monthly theoretical journal of the ICO. 1s.

Communist Comment--fortnightly newspaper of the ICO. 6d.

The Communist--theoretical publication of the CWO. 6d.

(Subscriptions to the Irish Communist, 9s. for six months post
free. The Communist-- rates on request.)

All literature available by post from:

G. Golden,
28 Mercers Road,
London N.19.

~~D. Callender,
28 Surrey Street,
Belfast Q.~~

(note: include 6d per item for postage.)