



**NOTTINGHAM
COMMUNIST GROUP**



**RED
STAR**



A MARXIST-LENINIST JOURNAL

50p

EDITORIAL

1

ARTICLE

The Hazzaras of Afghanistan

5

DISCUSSION NOTES

Classes and Strata in Contemporary
British Capitalism

16

Economic Contradictions of
Socialist Society

45

BOOK REVIEW

China: Radicalism to Revisionism

55

BOOK ADVERTISEMENT

61

NUMBER 6

APRIL 1981

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Make sure that you receive your copy by taking out a subscription.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR ONE YEAR (FOUR ISSUES):

UNITED KINGDOM: £2.00

REST OF EUROPE: £3.60

Make out cheques, etc. payable to "Red Star Publications".

Send orders to:

RSP

c/o Flat 2,

10, Villa Road,

Nottingham,

NG3 4GG,

U.K.

EDITORIAL

Since the last issue of "Red Star" the British ruling class has taken two hefty knocks in the space of a few weeks. The victory of Provo Bobby Sands in the Fermanagh/South Tyrone election has nailed the bourgeois lie that the Provos have no popular support and exercise control only by coercion and terror. The exposure of this lie is of some significance because the ruling class have used this lie over and over again in order to con English people into supporting their ruthless oppression of the Irish struggle for national self-determination. Thatcher, Whitelaw and co are wriggling around like worms on a hook trying to figure out some way to bring the troops out with this not having the effect of a major loss of face for British imperialism. So far they haven't come up with anything.

The other blow the ruling class has suffered is the open rebellion of large sections of the community in Brixton. This rebellion, which was not a black versus white race riot, was directed against the police and hence the state. The increase in state racism has resulted in the continuous harassment of black people and this oppression is now beginning to bring organised resistance. As the world recession deepens it is becoming increasingly obvious, even in the imperialist countries, that capitalism has nothing to offer. The dictum "It is right to rebel" is showing its universal validity.

In this country the formation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party is becoming a pressing need as the spontaneous activity of some sections of the populace begins to develop. The same is true all over Europe; in France, Germany and in Switzerland open defiance of bourgeois rule is

2
becoming manifest. As yet these are small beginnings, no one could pretend the bourgeoisies of Europe are about to be toppled, but cracks are beginning to open up in the crumbling edifice of capitalism.

In the United States the ruling class are feeling more than a little shaky over the activities of the Revolutionary Communist Party of the U.S. The chairman of the RCP-US, Bob Avakian is being hounded and hassled by the U.S. rulers as are many of his comrades. Avakian and other comrades are faced with a variety of phony charges in connection with a demonstration against Deng in Washington two years ago. Since then the bourgeoisie have tried their hardest to get Avakian out of the way for good. This situation has now led comrade Avakian to seek political asylum in France. The Nottingham Communist Group hope that comrade Avakian will be successful in this matter as it is no exaggeration to say that his continued presence in the U.S. constitutes a real danger to his life.

The last two issues of "Red Star" have met with a good response in terms of subscriptions and sales but a poor response in so far as there has been little feed back from our readers. We very much welcome comments from our readers even if only in the form of a short letter. We are also still keen to have articles submitted for publication, especially from comrades who have experience of the struggle in other countries. In this issue we publish an article sent to us by an Afghani comrade, "The Hazzaras of Afghanistan; a History of class struggle", which is a clear account of the struggle of the Afghani people against imperialism and particularly the struggle of the Hazzara in this context.

We also continue our analysis of, "Class and Strata in contemporary British capitalism". In the second part of these discussion notes we evalua-

te the revolutionary potential of different sections of the working class and the middle strata. Particular attention is paid to the composition and political character of the labour aristocracy in British capitalism. For far too long British Marxist-Leninists have ignored this important question.

From discussions we have had with other groups and individuals it has become apparent to us that many people are confused about the economics of socialist societies and indeed the central economic issues of the socialist period. This confusion often results in comrades asserting that the objective of socialism is to develop the forces of production and that the material basis for socialism does not exist until there is a high level of development of the productive forces. This line is the one that is always peddled by the revisionists; the need for increased production that will somehow, by itself, make a country 'more socialist'. In "Economic Contradictions of Socialist Society" it is argued that it is the relations of production, rather than the forces of production, which must be transformed during the socialist transition period. This is not just abstract academic discourse; two great revolutions have floundered on this problematic and there is no chance of developing a correct revolutionary programme which does not pay careful attention to this matter.

In relation to this the review of "China: Radicalism to Revisionism" by Bill Brugger is pertinent. Brugger is one of the few sinologists who has not been taken in by the revisionists in China and hence is to be applauded. However, his criticism of Mao for not fully anticipating all of the problems of the socialist transformation in China can only be regarded as unjustified since it is idealist in conception. This does not invalidate the general principle that analysis of the principal contradictions of socialism is

important and should be done for all past revolutions. Nonetheless future revolutions will not take place in a smooth uniform manner and each of them will bring new circumstances and particularities.

The heroic stand of Comrade Chiang Ching has been applauded by revolutionaries throughout the world. Our final contribution is a poem written in her honour by a New Zealand comrade entitled "It is right to rebel".

VICTORY TO THE OPPRESSED PEOPLE
THROUGHOUT THE WORLD!

THE HAZZARAS OF AFGHANISTAN: A History of Class Struggle

Among many groups of peoples the Hazzara's are considered the second most powerful groups in Afghanistan. Human history has rarely experienced such disastrous events as the peoples of Hazzara have during the last two centuries in Afghanistan.

The disasters of the Hazzara started in 1880 when Amir Abdurrahman Khan- became the king of Afghanistan. Amir Abdurrahman Khan, this bloodthirsty agent of the British Empire, turned Afghanistan in to a blood bath; he shifted all the Pushtun (the past and the present ruling groups of peoples in Afghanistan to a permanent settlement in the north side of Afghanistan, then sudenly civil war started in the non Pushtun provinces.

Amir Abdurrahman Khan wrote a decree in which he mentioned that Hazzara's mostly are SHIATS and he considered them as Kafirs. Because he was Sunni all Sunni believers were encouraged to wage a war against Hazzara's. Because of this twe millions of Hazzaras left their native lands for Pakistan and Iran in 1890. The military troups of Amir Abdurrahman attacked in Hazzara provinces, they viciously killed women and children and burnt the houses but the people of Hazzara reseted and continued their heroic struggle against the fascist regime of Amir Abdurrahman.

From that time the British Empire encouraged the Pushtons to fight against their Hazzara

brothers and also many other groups of people. The British aided Amir Abdurrahman in his policy of apartheid between Hazzaras and Pushtuns, this was the first time such a policy had been pursued, although Pushtun domination had been in existence for two centuries. Amir-Abdurrahman was completely under British domination and encouraged by them, he began to sow discord amongst the people; to restrict the Hazzaras to non-fertile mountainous areas and prohibit their settlement in the cities. At that time Hazzara girls and women were openly sold for six pennies in Kubul. This slavery caused some Jewish inhabitants of Kubul to call the Hazzara people "Six Penny Hazzaras" The leaders of the Hazzaras were often arrested by the military troops and brought to a jail in Kubul where they were kept in dark cellars infested with poisonous insects. On one occasion, on the instigation of Amir Abdurrahman, the foundations of the jail were weakened so that the cellars collapsed and killed hundreds of Hazzara prisoners.

Amir Abdurrahman invented another most fascist methods to kill Hazzara people; this was putting Hazzaras men and women inside a bag made of thick cows skin and dropping them from the top of "Shairdarwaza" or "Asmaei", the two famous mountains in Kubul. Rape and robbing of Hazzara women and property was a simple thing, in spite of this, the Hazzaras never surrendered, they defended their native land very bravely.

The war of the Hazzaras against the fascist British backed regime of Amir Abdurrahman created a great historical pride and there are hundreds and thousands of different type of heroic true stories about the fights of the Hazzaras against Amir Abdurrahman.

It was British policy to keep Afghanistan as a buffer state between Tsarist Russia and British India, All those who seized power with the help of the British Empire were following the policy of divide and rule which was dictated by the British who were trying to keep the people in misery and poverty and creating problems among one groups of peoples against the other.

After the death of Amir Abdurrahman, his son Amir Habibullah became the King of Afghanistan. Still the Hazzaras had many problems with their neighbours; Pushtuns nomades were forcing the people to buy their merchandise like Tea, Cloth, Shoes, and many other things.

Because of a shortage of money, Hazzaras began to buy goods from Pushtun nomads and in exchange gave carpets, oil, woolen cloth and other Hazzara handicrafts. This was not enough for the Pushtuns who began to demand a much higher rate of barter, up to ten times as much.

Although it took hundreds of years, the Hazzaras changed the nature of the land, but even so a little Arable land and pasture was not enough for a self sufficient economy. Most of the Hazzara people were not able to pay the price of the commodities they received from the Pushtun nomads so the Pushtuns began to take Hazzara land instead. They took land ten times more valuable than the goods they sold the Hazzaras. When Hazzara people took the Pushtuns to local courts the local judges, themselves Pushtuns, always gave the ruling in the favour of the Pushtuns. This happened thousands of times all over Hazzara provinces.

On March 30th 1885. Russian Tsaris troops moved into Afghanistan and occupied Panjdeh to the Russians because they did not consider it to

be an important city. In 1893 Amir Abdurrahman signed a shameful treaty with the British whereby strategic parts of Afghanistan were signed over to direct British rule.

Amir Amanullah Khan became King of Afghanistan in 1919. He was a progressive King who wanted to modernise Afghanistan but the British were not pleased with his ideas, and with the help of British missionaries, they deposed him. The British replaced Amir Amanullah with Bacha Saqqao, he didn't last long and after nine months he was overthrown by Nadir Khan.

In 1929. Nadir Khan was put into power with enormous military and financial aid from the British. His brother, Mohammad Hashim Khan, launched a campaign of terror against Tajik this period including 2,500 democrats and revolutionaries who were murdered in Betimahrou near Kabul airport.

Nadir Khan was succeeded by his son Zahir Khan in Nov 1933. During his rule nothing changed for the Hazzara people and even teachers were forbidden to enter the Hazzara lands. Nadir Khan encouraged the development of Pushtuns with many welfare and development projects in Pushtun areas.

In 1946 a group of Western educated young Afghans tried to bring about free elections and this resulted in the "Liberal Parliament" of 1949. This parliament passed laws permitting the freedom of the press. Dr-Mahmoodi, a revolutionary democrat and a representative of the Kabul citizens in parliament, organised a party under the name of Nedai Khalq-Voice of the people. At the same time a weekly newspaper "Voice of the People" was also launched.

Dr Mahmoodi opposed the Zahir monarchy which

was brought into power by British Imperialism and accused Zahir of torturing and killing Hazzara people. He defended all the oppressed people in Afghanistan and organised the citizens of Kabul to protest in rallies against the monarchy. The monarchy reacted by closing down the newspaper "Voice of the People" after its 23rd issue. Some Hazzara intellectuals joined the Nedai Khalq party and started to fight against the monarchy. In 1949 another progressive party was started this was Wattan-"Homeland"- founded by Mir Ghulam Mohammad-Ghubar. Prior to this, in 1947, a right wing party, representing Pushtun interests, was established by Daud Khan, a cousin of King Zahir, this was the Klubb Milli. Babrak Karmal was a prominent member of this group. In 1952 many members of the Wattan-Nedai Khalq parties were arrested including their leaders Dr-Mahmoodi and Mir Ghulam Mohammad Ghubar. Babrak Karmal was also arrested at this time but Dr Mahmoodi told everyone to beware of him because he was a spy of the monarchy and not a genuine political prisoner.

After a certain amount of coercion some of the people arrested including Ghubar and Karmal, agreed to cease their political activities.

Dr Mahmoodi was released from jail in 1959 and died three months after his release. Over 80,000 people turned out on the day of his funeral and on that day all revolutionary democrats swore an oath of revenge on his death. Mir Ismail Bulkhi was another revolutionary democrat sentenced to a long jail term. He was a well known poet and great champion of Hazzara freedom. He died in 1970.

In 1953 Daud, the first cousin of King Zahir, was appointed Prime Minister. The West tried to encourage Daud to join one of the Western military pacts Daud moved instead towards

the Soviet Union. In January 1954 the Soviet-Union loaned Afghanistan 3.5 M. dollars to build two silos, one in Kabul and the other in Pulikhumri. In 1955 the Soviet Union provided 100 M dollar loan for long term developments to be jointly organised by Soviet and Afghan teams. One of these projects was a new road between Kabul and Jalalabad. This new road was built with the cheap labour of Hazzara people as also was the tunnel in Tanji, during the construction of this tunnel at least 20,000 Hazzara workers were killed. During this period new class forces began to develop and a new strata of pro Dauod-Pushtuns began to appear as a comrador bourgeoisie. The national bourgeoisie was supported by Western multi-national companies, began to develop more strength and influence. Most of the projects funded from overseas fell into the hands of this comrador bourgeoisie and pro-Dauod Pushtuns were elected to posts of influence in both industry and government. The Pushtun language became official in the civil service and those who would not speak it were penalised and passed over.

During Zahirs time thousands and thousands of Hazzara families left Hazzarajat their homeland and came to Kabul and other major cities. Mainly they were working as agricultural labourers and industrial labourers in, for example, the textile, plastic and chemical industries as well as vehicle mechanics and selling second hand U.S. dresses. More than 500,000 Hazzara emigrated to Iran where they now form the cheap est labour force there.

Dauod Khan kept non-Pushtun elements out of the military academies. All the important military positions were occupied by Pushtuns and there were few Hazzaras in any civil service posts. He pursued a conscious policy of preventing any outsiders, such as WHO or

UNICEF delegatias, from visiting Hazzara provinces or even talking to Hazzaras in the big cities. He deliberately suppressed the figures relating to the number of Hazzaras in existence. At that time there were over 8.5 million Hazzaras in Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan.

Pro-Dauod reactionaries, involving those of the historical society of Afghanistan, forged and fabricated the history of Afghanistan, so as to make it appear that the Hazzara had never played any significant role in the previous "Histories".

Louis Dupree, a former CIA adviser in Afghanistan who served the U.S. imperialists in Afghanistan for over twenty years, denied the presence of Hazzaras there and never mentioned them, Louis Dupree was in the pocket of the Zahir family and they gave him many priceless and unique treasures from the Kabul museum of Ancient Relics.

By resorting to every lie and subterfuge, downright falsehood and every method of deceit Zahir made the history of Afghanistan to appear as if the Hazzara had never existed whereas in reality the opposite is true; without the presence of the Hazzara the history of Afghanistan is meaningless.

The increase in progressive activity, including an increase of Marx, Engels Lenin- and Stalin revolutionary literature, forces King Zahir to end the Dauod dictatorship in 1963. Dr Yusuf was appointed in his stead.

1965 is a remarkable year in the history of Afghanistan. A new constitution was passed by the National Assembly (Loyal Serga) and parliamentary elections began throughout the country. The elections began themselves were

a farce as only those people approved of by the King and feudal elements were allowed to stand.

Early in the year Marxist Leninist Afghan revolutionary Youth Organisation was founded by Alcrum Yuric. Their political analysis of the situation in Afghanistan led to the formulation that only protracted peoples war against feudalism and imperialism could advance the lot of the masses. ARYO organised a mass demonstration at the time of the elections on 25th October 1965. By 3 o'clock that afternoon over 3,000 students protested outside the home of Dr Yusuf, the puppet prime minister. The military were sent in and armed with automatic rifles and tear gas, they shot seventy five unarmed students. The bodies of the students were spirited away by the military and it was announced only three had been killed.

The 25th October 1965 was a turning point in the history of the Afghan revolution. From then Afghan Marxist Leninists began to analyse the class forces in the country. In this analysis the role of the ruling class was made clear and the fact that the national struggle is an aspect of class struggle also became clear. The monarchy was not only oppressing the Hazzaras but the Pushtuns also were being kept in misery. The influence of ARYO grew and in April 1968 they started a theoretical journal 'Eternal Flame' (Shola-Jaweed) in this journal and in other propaganda ARYO pointed out that only Marxist Leninism Mao Tse Tung taught could avoid falling into the trap of national chauvinism. The Marxist Leninist party has the historical mission of uniting all oppressed people - workers, peasants intellectuals and petit bourgeois against reactionary imperialist dominated regimes; All those people, who had

been oppressed throughout the centuries, are the friends of the revolution and its driving force. Throughout its eleven issues 'Eternal-Flame' awakened and gave consciousness to the people of Afghanistan. They began to understand that they were exploited by landlords in the country side and bosses in the factories. 'Eternal Flame' also made a valuable contribution in exposing the Fallacious "non-growth road of capitalism," pointing out that this was a parody of Marxist Leninism that was fabricated by the Khrushchevite revisionists and all it does is foster the growth of a bureaucratic bourgeoisie. It pretends to be socialist but that is in name only; in practice it fosters imperialism and social chauvinism. Meanwhile Soviet Revisionism became more and more apparent in Afghanistan, between 1960-1978 the Russians signed treaties with the monarchy worth more than 2.5 million dollars. As is common with other countries they exploit, the Russians stripped Afghanistan of many valuable resources, including natural gas, cotton, wool and gemstones. As is the case in Eastern Europe they tried to turn Afghanistan into a Soviet state. Because of this brutal exploitation the people of Afghanistan rose up in protest against the USSR.

Strikes and demonstrations began all over the country. Peasants, workers and students united in their opposition to the Soviets. In this mass movement Shola Jaweed played a leading role. Today the great majority of the people are against the Soviets.

In 1970 the founder and chairman of the Afghan Revolutionary Youth Organisation, comrade-Akrum Yuri, was poisoned by an agent provocator of the Soviets. In the same year the KGB agent Yudeen came to Kubul as an adviser in the Kubul Russian Polytechnic. Yudeen began to expand KGB activities in Afghanistan and

tried to divide and split the Shola Jaweed group. Shola Jaweed exposed these activities and urged all Marxists Leninists to ignore these splittest activities and remain united. In 1972 Sayedall Sukhandan, one of the comrades of Shola Jaweed, was murdered in Kabul university by Gulbudding Hikmatyar, a follower of the reactionary Moslim Brothers group. Today Hik Matyar is the leader of the Islamic party of Afghanistan in Pakistan.

After the death of Sayedall Sukhandan, Dr-Fuic joined the Afghan Revolutionary Youth Organisation and began to attack the Shola Jaweed comrades. Faiz was the son of a senator and came from a big land owning family in Kandahar. Although Faiz attacked the Shola Jaweed group he never directed any criticism against the royal family even though Daoud came to power again in July 1973.

Finally Shola Jaweed became divided and split into several smaller groups. The comrades lost their revolutionary enthusiasm and ceased the struggle against revolutionary enthusiasm and Daoud pascism. Opportunism and economism became rampant in Shola Jaweed and only a small group of comrades continues the struggle for Marxism-Leninism Mao Tse Tung thought.

At the end of 1977 the so-called revolutionary group around Faiz showed their true colours when they supported the revisionist HOXA in his attack upon Mao Tse Tung.

On black April 27th 1978 pro Russian groups of Purchan and Khalq staged a coup d'etat and overthrew the Daoud Khan regime. It was the sunset of British colonial rule after two and a half centuries. The Russians made many promises to the Afghan people, land reform etc, but what they did was to turn Afghanistan into a Soviet puppet state. They slaughtered all the Marxist Leninist

forces and many Hazzara people as well. The Hazzaras began to fight back in the defence of their motherland, now under Soviet rule. In late 1978 Amin, a Soviet-agent, ordered the slaughter of ten thousand Hazzara families. He invited the Kharooti tribe in Paghman to "Kill Hazzaras, plunder their houses and bring their heads to us". In this slaughter many Hazzaras were killed but three hundred remained alive without noses or ears which had been cut off in the slaughter.

Amin sent tanks and helicopters to Hazzara province to kill the peasants. Many prominent Hazzaras, including Mohammed Ismail Mobaligh and Haji Suleh Korahani were executed in 1979. Comrade Akram Yuri and twelve thousand Marxist-Leninists were also executed in the same year.

The war against the Soviets has united the Afghani people in a way never seen before in the history of the country. Now Hazzari and Pushtuns are uniting as well as many other smaller ethnic minorities. The battle of Jaghoori is now famous in Afghani history; Jaghoori revolutionary guerrillas blew up more than 600 Russian tanks and killed more than 6,000 Soviet troops.

The Hazzara people have the historic mission to liberate Afghanistan and to fight against any national chauvinism which oppresses the people. The Hazzara do not want the country for themselves but for all the people in it. As Mao Tse Tung pointed out "Imperialism" has prepared the conditions for its own doom. These conditions are the awakening of the great masses of the people in the colonies and the semi-colonies and in the imperialist countries themselves. Imperialism has pushed the great masses of the people throughout the world into the historical epoch of the great struggle to abolish imperialism".

CLASSES AND STRATA IN CONTEMPORARY BRITISH CAPITALISM (PART 2)

In part I of these discussion notes, (see Red Star No. 4), the following classes and strata were delineated as being present in Great Britain in 1971:

	Numbers (millions)	% of occupied populn
RULING CLASS		
Monopoly capitalists	0.05	0.2%
I. INTERMEDIATE STRATA		
Competitive capitalists	0.71	3.0%
Managers & administrators	1.63	6.3%
Professionals & technicians	2.54	10.7%
Police & armed forces	0.37	1.5%
WORKING CLASS		
Semi-proletariat	8.31	34.8%
Industrial proletariat	10.23	42.9%
TOTALS	23.84	100%

The rest of the population, the 30.14 millions not occupied in 1971 were retired members of these classes and strata or the dependents of occupied persons. Thus, it can reasonably be supposed that their membership of classes was roughly in the same proportions as that of the occupied population.

WHO ARE OUR ENEMIES? WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS?

The strategy for revolution in Britain can only be developed if a clear and precise assessment is made of the configuration of class forces actually existing and this entails analysis of the modes of economic and political organisation of each class and stratum, their ideological outlooks and their mutual interrelationships. We stress that the following discussion is of an even more tentative character than the actual delineation of the class structure itself and we urge readers to critically scrutinise the points we make in the spirit of seeking the truth to serve the people.

THE ENEMY: THE MONOPOLY CAPITALIST CLASS

The principal class contradiction in Britain today is obviously that between the monopoly capitalist class and the working class. With the growing economic crisis of capitalism during the last fifteen years or so, this inherently antagonistic contradiction has been intensifying although the monopoly capitalist class has continued to be the principal aspect.

As Lenin pointed out, there has been a growing fusion between the two fractions of large-scale capital, industrial capital and bank capital, since the late nineteenth century. (1) This has resulted in the formation of finance capital whereby the oligarchy who control the great financial institutions, (banks, insurance companies etc.) came to dominate the whole of large-scale industry and commerce. Both an aspect of the dominance of bank capital over industrial capital and an indication of it in general is the considerable membership of the boards of large industrial companies by the directors of financial institutions. For example, one study carried out in 1971 of the 40 largest firms in Britain found the holding of multiple directorships of

these firms by persons who were also directors of major financial institutions interconnected 31 out of the 40 firms.(2) Furthermore the trend towards monopoly in British capitalism has accelerated in the post-war period. One indication of this is the fact that in 1963 the 100 largest companies with quoted shares accounted for 51% of the aggregate market value of all quoted share capital, a figure which had risen to 60% by 1969.(3) There can be no doubt about it. Although only numbering around 50,000 persons, the monopoly capitalist class has a very concrete existence and the immense concentration of wealth and power in its hands is becoming more concentrated and centralised. In its ties with the British state, which is essentially the political instrument of its rule, are very close and have both a formal character, e.g. membership of government advisory committees, and an informal character, e.g. kinship relations with politicians, top civil servants, etc. (4)

Even so, the complete fusion of industrial and bank capital has not yet come about in British capitalism. Indeed, a peculiarity of British capitalism has been the slower rate at which the growing dominance of finance capital has proceeded in comparison with other imperialist countries such as France and Germany. This can be explained in terms of the fact that because Britain was the first industrial capitalist country to emerge, the strength of industrial capital was such that it was able to be much more autonomous with respect to bank capital than was the case in the countries where industrial capitalism arose later. These latter countries, developing capitalist industry, trying to compete in the face of the dominant international position of British industrial capital, were unable to be fully self-financing and thus fell under the domination of bank capital at an early stage. Thus, in Britain today the two distinct fractions of monopoly capital still exist even though

they are interrelated and even though it is true that bank capital is the principal aspect of this contradiction. Given the different relationships to the means of production of these two fractions, it necessarily follows that their bourgeois ideological outlooks differ as well.

The industrial fraction of the monopoly capitalist class have their interests located in particular sections of industry much more so than do their brothers in the financial institutions. Indeed, members of the industrial fraction are much more likely than are members of the other fraction, to have been upwardly socially mobile from the ranks of the manageriat and, to a lesser extent, the intelligentsia. Their knowledge and experience of capitalist enterprise is fairly specific to particular types of production and distribution and thus they are committed, not to the accumulation of capital in general, but the accumulation of capital invested in particular types of industrial production. This feature of industrial capital determines a certain degree of antagonism in its relations with bank capital. When the rate of profit in a particular industry is tending to fall below that of the generally prevailing rate, then bank capitalists will be reluctant to provide fresh investment funds and may attempt to withdraw their existing investments. This antagonism between the two fractions of capital, represented on the one side by the Confederation of British Industry and on the other side by the financial institutions of the City of London, can be clearly seen at the present time. The finance capitalists are far less committed to particular firms and industries than are the industrial capitalists and the former shift their capital to where, either within or without the country, it can bring the greatest return. At the present time during a period of the major restructuring of capital on an international scale, this means that British industry is starved of the funds

it so badly needs if it is to re-equip in order to compete effectively on the international market. Another particularity of industrial capital is that its controllers have a much more direct relationship with the working class than do the finance capitalists. It is the industrial capitalists who have to organise and control the working class in general, and the industrial proletariat in particular, on a day-to-day basis. The success of the industrial capitalists in dominating and exploiting the working class directly determines the rate of profit of British industry and thus indirectly of capital invested in Britain as a whole.

It is the above two factors which determine the character of the ideological outlook of the industrial fraction of British monopoly capital. The fact that their investments are located in particular enterprises, both at home and abroad, determines that their general aim is not so much to accumulate capital in the abstract but capital of particular types. An important consequence of this is that they are much more willing to see the state play a directly interventionist role in the economy than are the finance capitalists. Indeed the growing intensification of the contradictions of monopoly capitalism necessitates that the bourgeois state plays an increasingly active role in support of industrial capital. From around World War I onwards there have been an expanding range of measures of state economic support for industrial capital, ranging from import controls and tax relief through research and development grants to nationalisation of ailing industries and direct state investment and participation in industrial firms by means of the National Enterprise Board. Also, the fact that industrial capitalists are the ones in direct contact with the working class means that their approach to industrial relations in particular, and bourgeois-proletarian relations in general, tends to be more conciliatory than that of finance capitalists.

If at all possible, industrial capital has learnt to avoid damaging confrontations with labour, and it was precisely in those industries where an inflexible position was taken up by capital, especially the railways and the mines, that this merely served to exacerbate the difficulties brought about by a declining rate of profit. In the main, industrial capital has been happy to routinise and institutionalise relations with organised labour in the form of trade unions and the state has played an active role in promoting this development. The success of this strategy of institutionalising trade unions and partially incorporating them in the state apparatus is widely recognised by bourgeois students of industrial relations, two of whom, for example, describe this development as "an essential part of the mechanism of social control".(5) Another part of the comparatively conciliatory approach of industrial capital to labour has been its fairly ready acceptance, and at times promotion, of the whole range of social provisions now collectively known as the 'welfare state'. True, the working class has had to fight every inch of the way to achieve even these mild reforms but from the early years of the century the industrial capitalists have come to realise that they have nothing to fear and in fact everything to gain from social welfare schemes run for and paid for by the working class.

The ideological expression of the material interests of the industrial fraction of capital is clearly represented by a strand of Conservative political thought, arguably that of "true Conservatism". This posits an organic model of society in which the different classes and strata are seen as essentially having relations of functional complementarity of a harmonious kind rather than antagonistic relations based on a real opposition of material interests. The state is seen as having a positive role to play

in maintaining harmonious relations between classes and, indeed, if the state does not function effectively in this role then accidental and external factors will eventually bring about conditions of conflict. The elaboration and development of this strand of bourgeois ideology can be traced back throughout the history of the modern Conservative Party and its prominent theorists and practitioners include Robert Peel, Benjamin Disraeli, Joseph Chamberlain, John Maynard Keynes (although nominally not a 'Conservative'), Harold Macmillan and Edward Heath. This type of bourgeois ideology has by no means been confined to the Conservative Party and it is apparent in the contemporary Liberal Party where it appears in the form of the doctrine of "co-ownership", as well as in the Labour Party, especially its recent leading dissidents who parade it under the billboard of 'social democracy'. In fact, the ideology of the industrial fraction of the monopoly class appears in many guises ranging from the Stroesserite fascism of sections of the National Front through to the "socialism" of Labour Party ideologues such as Stuart Holland. In recent years the distinct character of this bourgeois ideology has increasingly been recognised and designated as "corporatism" (sometimes "corparativism"). (6) The essence of corporatism is the institutional incorporation of large scale industry and organised labour into the state apparatus with the object of achieving social stability and harmony. The rhetorical terms used to express the doctrine and the emphasis placed on different parts of it differ as between its different exponents but nonetheless, objectively, it is a clear ideological expression of the material interests of the industrial fraction of monopoly capital.

It is during periods of economic expansion that industrial capital is most powerful and exerts its greatest influence over state policy. In

Britain corporatist policies were more or less consistently implemented by successive Labour and Conservative governments during the period 1945 - 74. During capitalist booms the industrial fraction of monopoly capital can, because of the rapid accumulation of capital, achieve a relative degree of autonomy from the dictates of bank capital. Industry becomes largely self-financing and, indeed, a policy of concessions to, and conciliation with the working class is reasonably acceptable to bank capital because, to put it crudely, the profits are rolling in. However, even during the "affluent" nineteen fifties some of the more far-sighted political representatives of finance capital had serious reservations about the long-term viability of Keynesian corporatism. In 1958 a number of Conservative ministers, including Peter Thorneycroft, resigned from their posts in the Macmillan government as a protest against its economic policy. They correctly foresaw that the post-war boom would not last indefinitely, recognised the limitations of Keynesian economic management and were concerned about the expectations which organised labour had come to develop as to the ability and willingness of the state to maintain economic profitability and growth. It was at least implicit in the position these Tory dissidents took up, that come the next depression a working class which had become used to "economic feather bedding" by the state would become very discontent when the state was no longer able to maintain full employment and economic growth. During the nineteen seventies, with the onset of another major world depression and the failure of corporatist state policies, the finance fraction of monopoly capital has become predominant once again.

Finance capital is far less tied up in particular industries, or for that matter particular countries, than is industrial capital. This gives finance capital a much greater degree of

operational flexibility than that of industrial capital and the former is merely concerned to maintain the ability to move its investment funds wherever they can earn the greatest returns.

Also, since finance capital's relations with the working class are more indirect their approach to the conduct of the class struggle is far less conciliatory. Finance capitalists see the proper role of the state in a much more limited terms than do their industrial brethren. For finance capital the main tasks of the state are to maintain "law and order", (i.e. keep any working class dissent down by means of the police and the military), to ensure "national defence" (i.e. build up strong military forces to oppose rival imperialist powers) and to maintain a stable monetary system. Formal expression of the ideological outlook of the finance fraction of monopoly capital are less apparent than is the case with the ideology of industrial capital, although in its directly economic aspect it has found a guru to counterpose to Keynes: Milton Friedman. In Britain the political progeny of finance capital can be traced back to the section of the old Liberal Party that passed over into the Conservative Party around World War I.

Its ideologies did, in the main, dominate the policy of the Conservative and National governments of the inter-war period precisely because of the major world depression then prevailing and the consequent weakness of industrial capital. In ideological terms finance capital holds an atomistic, rather than an organic, model of society. It is the direct successor of nineteenth century laissez-faire Liberalism and Social Darwinism. Its obsession with "sound currency" obviously derives from its basis in purely financial operations and its atomistic conception of society has the same source. Social relations are seen as essentially reducible to ones solely mediated by the cash nexus. Unlike the

corporatists, the ideologists of finance capital see bourgeois man as identical with "economic man".

The policy of the British state began to fall under the sway of the outlook of finance capital during the last Labour government with its "bastard monetarist" policy of cuts in public spending to attempt to reduce the money supply. However, it is only with the Thatcher Conservative government that "monetarism" has got into its full stride. It is interesting to note that Margaret Thatcher has repeatedly attacked the "corporatism" of previous governments, both Conservative and Labour. Finance capital is faced, at home, with two related tasks in dealing with the present depression. On the one hand it has had to effect a massive restructuring of industrial capital, necessitated by the emergence of new forces of production such as microprocessors, and on the other hand it has had to find ways of getting the working class to put up with a reduction in the value of their wages and an indefinite period of mass unemployment. On the international scene its task is to ensure that Britain plays its part in defending the interests of the U.S. imperialists in the face of the challenge of Soviet social imperialism. Finance capital does not wear the liberal mask of industrial capital. It sets about its task with no outward show of humanity and even tries to present its ruthless measures as a show of virtue - "you've got to be cruel to be kind" is the message of Thatcher and her cohort. Just one example of this vituous cruelty is the appointment of a banker Ian McGregor to implement a programme of ruthless restructuring of British Steel. The "steelmen", the top managers who have made their careers in that industry, have been swept aside so that no lingering sentiments of attachment to blast furnaces and "responsibility" for steel workers are allowed to interfere with what has to be done

in the interests of capital.

Unless overthrown by proletarian revolution, the hegemony of finance capital will last until the next capitalist economic boom, except that this is unlikely to occur. During the inter-war period the outbreak of inter-imperialist war, World War 2, stimulated the recovery of industry and the twenty year boom following the war. The outbreak of another inter-imperialist war during the coming period, between the U.S. and Soviet blocs, is very likely, but given that it is likely to involve the use of nuclear weapons and will probably be centered on Europe, industrial plants are likely to suffer catastrophic devastation rather than a return to full capacity output.

In the last year or so a certain public hostility between the representatives of industrial capital and finance capital has become apparent. Most noticeably, at the last CBI Annual Conference people such as Michael Edwards had some harsh things to say about the present governments' policies. Of course, there is nothing unusual about this faction fighting within the monopoly capitalist class. In early nineteenth century Britain there was considerable antagonism between landed capital and industrial capital. Today in Britain there has even been vague talk of some sort of joint initiative by the CBI and the TUC in opposition to the policies of finance capital. It is difficult to see what effective form this could take and anyway in the last analysis, there can be no question of industrial capital seriously opposing finance capital. The common interest of maintaining bourgeois hegemony is much stronger than disagreements as to how to do this. Any class collaborationist moves of this kind by the TUC must be rigorously exposed.

There can be no doubt about it. The monopoly

capitalist class is the main enemy of the working class in Britain today. And, let it be added for the sake of those who have been taken in by the Three Worlds Theory, they are first and foremost our enemy in every sense. When it comes to the crunch, both fractions of this class will use every and any means to maintain their power, as has been brutally demonstrated in Northern Ireland. Monopoly capitalists never throw the towel in the ring. They would rather destroy the world than concede defeat.

OUR FRIENDS: THE WORKING CLASS

In part 1 of these discussion notes we claimed that the working class comprised 77% of the population of Gt. Britain in 1971 and consisted of an industrial proletariat from whom surplus value is directly expropriated and a semi-proletariat engaged in administration, distribution, sales and public services who, although oppressed, are not directly economically exploited. We have already said that the principal class contradiction in Britain today is between the monopoly capitalist class and the working class. More specifically, this contradiction is at its most intense in the case of the industrial proletariat because it is the success with which the monopoly capitalists succeed in controlling and exploiting them which determines the overall rate of profit received by capital.

A problem which has perplexed generations of revolutionaries in Britain is the very low level of revolutionary political consciousness among the working class here. Although it is true that right from the beginning of the capitalist era there has always been a current of revolutionary thought among the proletariat, it has always been in every sense weak; ideologically, politically and organisationally. Of course, the material conditions of everyday working life generate an oppositional proletarian outlook in

contradiction with the dominant bourgeois ethos but this has only occasionally developed into a fully conscious revolutionary outlook on any significant scale. If by our active intervention we Marxist-Leninists are to begin to change this deplorable state of affairs then we must first grasp the real material causes of the conservative passivity of the working class in Britain. If we are to cure the sickness to save the patient then we must discover the causes of the disease.

The classical Marxist-Leninist explanation of this problem, first put forward by Marx and Engels and then developed by Lenin, is the theory of the labour aristocracy. The essence of the theory can be stated as follows:

1. The world predominance of British capitalism during the mid-nineteenth century brought about a vast influx of wealth into Britain.
2. An upper stratum of skilled workers in the proletariat directly benefitted in material terms from this inflow of wealth.
3. This resulted in this stratum becoming accommodated to life under capitalism, dropping some of their more radical demands and becoming bourgeoisified and chauvinist in their outlook.
4. Through the means of their dominance of working class trade union and political organisations this labour aristocracy was able to lead the great majority in the lower strata of the working class into adherence to opportunist, reformist politics.
5. As other countries became imperialist and reaped a harvest of super-profits they too developed a labour aristocracy with the same

resulting effect.

6. However, as inter-imperialist competition and rivalry intensifies, the growing economic crises within each imperialist country will progressively erode the material basis for the existence of a labour aristocracy and the working class will necessarily have to turn to and take up an authentic revolutionary outlook. (7).

The theory of the labour aristocracy has always been a source of embarrassment for those of Marxist inclinations in the imperialist countries, especially Britain. For those of right opportunist leanings the theory is unacceptable because it designates the very people these opportunists see as being the "vanguard" of the working class as the carriers of bourgeois ideology within the working class. These people are the most highly paid skilled workers who tend to be the most committed trade unionists and Labour Party supporters. The entirely spurious way in which right opportunists, such as Trotskyists, attempt to overcome the problem is to claim that the labour aristocracy no longer exists or else, as in the case of the Birchite CPB(M-L), that it never did exist! (8). It is of course, futile to try to wish away some part of reality just because one finds it unpalatable. Whatever its material causes it is a matter of everyday empirical fact that there is in existence today in Britain a stratum of the working class with these ideological and political characteristics. The opposite left opportunist error is to claim that not only does the labour aristocracy exist but that the whole of the working classes in the imperialist countries now have this character and their accustomed standard of living derives directly from the exploitation of the peoples of the oppressed nations. (9). The only logical outcome of this position is to take up a "third

world first" position arguing that any significant proletarian revolutionary movements cannot arise in the imperialist countries until such time as imperialist domination and exploitation of the oppressed nations is destroyed by the people of those countries, thus undermining the material basis for the hold of bourgeois ideology over the working class. For adherents of this left opportunist view, any attempts of mass revolutionary action in imperialist countries appear futile and some of them, in a mood of despair, resort to counter-productive terrorist acts designed to provoke the bourgeois state into acts of open oppression, hoping that this will goad a stupified working class into action.

There is insufficient space here to launch into a discussion of whether or not, just how and to what extent the working class or sections of it benefit from imperialist exploitation today. (10). This is, of course, a very important question and one of the Marxist-Leninists programmatic tasks is to thoroughly investigate it. What we do definitely assert is that there does exist in Britain today a stratum of the industrial proletariat which in its outlook and behavior does have the qualities described by Lenin as being those of the labour aristocracy. Even a slight acquaintance with trade union leaders, especially those of skilled workers, both at the national and local levels provides ample confirmation. Also, let us emphasise that we are referring to a whole stratum and not just a few individuals. It is not just the labour lieutenants of capital, to use Lenin's phrase, but the labour lance corporals of capitalism as well who actively strive to maintain capitalism. On the part played by imperialism in creating and maintaining this stratum we can make one point with certainty. The comparative economic stability of monopoly capitalism as a direct result of imperialist domination and exploitation certainly has created the conditions whereby reformist politics have in practise

worked to some extent for the working class. Adherence to trade unionism on the economic front and social democracy on the political front really has delivered the goods. All this is so regardless of whether or not the working class or a section of it has directly shared in the super profits of imperialism. The factors which are now undermining this comparative stability are the much more intense economic internal contradictions of a capitalism much more monopolised than in Lenin's time, the great post world war 2 upsurge in national liberation struggles and the reduction of the main lines of inter-imperialist conflict into that between two unprecedentedly powerful imperialist blocs: U.S. imperialism and Soviet social imperialism. Britain in the 1970's has witnessed the breakdown of the efficiency of reformism as a palliative for working class problems.

At present we are only able to make a preliminary attempt to identify the labour aristocracy in terms of its size and characteristics. We can begin to do this by considering differences of earnings between different types of employees. The following tables have been extracted from the New Earnings Survey 1971. It should be noted that these figures only cover certain occupations

FULL-TIME MEN AGED 21 & OVER, 1971.		Manual	Non-manual
Average gross weekly earnings		£28.8	£38.9
Dist'n of " " " :			
10%	earned less than	£19.2	£21.2
25%	" " "	£23.0	£26.3
50%	" " "	£28.1	£34.4
25%	" more "	£34.3	£45.1
10%	" " "	£41.2	£60.0

FULL-TIME WOMEN AGED 21& OVER, 1971.

	Manual	Non-manual
Average gross weekly earnings	£14.7	£19.7
Dist'btn of " " " :		
10% earned less than	£10.2	£11.7
25% " " "	£12.2	£14.2
50% " " "	£14.6	£18.0
25% " more "	£17.6	£23.1
10% " " "	£20.9	£30.6

and exclude agriculture, some clerical, public service and professional personnel. Also, the "non-manual" category includes persons in the managerial, intelligentsia and semi-proletariat while the "manual" category covers some of those in the semi-proletariat as well as members of the industrial proletariat. For our purposes this data is far from being ideal but it does enable us to proceed with the analysis to a certain extent. A striking fact revealed by the tables is the disparity in earnings between men and women with the former earning on average about twice that of the latter. Despite subsequent legislation aimed at changing this disparity the situation is still much the same. It is obvious that whoever the labour aristocracy are they are men and not women! If we focus on full time manual men then it can be seen that there are very considerable differences in the range of earnings with the most highly paid 10% earning over twice that of the 10% with the lowest earnings. The next table takes into account the factor of "skill". It can be seen that the average earnings of workers classified for statistical purposes as having different degrees of skill

AVERAGE GROSS WEEKLY EARNINGS OF FULL-TIME MANUAL MEN, 1971

Skilled	£29.8
Semi-skilled	£27.7
Unskilled	£24.3

do not differ all that much. Even in the crudest sense, it is not the case that all "skilled manual" workers are comparatively privileged as compared with other workers. Only some skilled workers enjoy these relative advantages. If some of these workers are to become "bourgeoisified" in their outlook and behavior then it is not unreasonable to suppose that their level of income needs to be on a par with some sections of the middle strata who certainly do have a predominantly bourgeois outlook. The first table shows that the average gross weekly earnings of full-time manual men was £38.9 in 1971. As already pointed out, this average figure includes the earnings of semi-proletarians such as clerks but their average earnings tend to be considerably less than this overall average figure. Examples of "non-manual" middle strata occupations with average earnings around the overall average for all non-manual men in 1971 were 'office supervisors' £35.1, 'school teachers' £37.1, 'office managers' £40.9 and 'engineers, scientists and technologists' £41.4. Somewhat arbitrarily then, we have decided to consider all male skilled manual workers who earned £40 a week or more in 1971 as the comparatively privileged section of the working class, the labour aristocracy. The New Earnings Survey shows that 20% of these workers were in this category and the 1971 Census reveals that there were 5,286,000 skilled male manual workers. Thus on this basis it can be tentatively concluded that around 1,057,000 workers were labour aristocrats, that is approximately 10% of the industrial proletariat and 6% of the working class as a whole.

Further analysis based on the New Earnings Survey reveals that these workers were most likely to be found in the 'paper, printing and publishing', 'shipbuilding and marine engineering' and 'vehicles' industries where over 25% of skilled workers earned £40 per week or more. Industries where at least 10% of skilled male manual worke-

rs had the same level of earnings included 'transport and communications', 'metal manufacture' 'mechanical engineering', 'chemicals', 'food, drink etc.', 'bricks etc.', 'construction' and 'electrical engineering'. These are precisely those parts of industry where there is a long and strongly established tradition of craft trade unionism and where union membership rates tend to be the highest. Let us also note that these are the working class people who are most likely to be Labour Party supporters. Their relative advantage over other workers is not just a matter of greater earnings but also consists of greater job security, better fringe benefits, better working conditions, more intrinsically satisfying work and higher social status.

At this point it is important to emphasise that the labour aristocracy has had to fight to achieve and maintain its position. In no sense have its relative advantages ever been handed out to it on a plate by the bourgeoisie. Each fresh wave of innovations in the forces of production e.g. microprocessors, poses a threat to the position of the labour aristocracy. Certainly, during the last two decades many jobs, including highly paid skilled ones, have been eliminated in shipbuilding, transport and engineering. More recently the position of the skilled worker in printing and vehicles has come under attack. One result of this trend has been for the craft unions to increasingly abandon their independent existence and become amalgamated into industrial and general workers' unions although skilled workers tend to retain a sectional identity and exert a disproportionate influence over union affairs. Could it be the case that Lenin's prediction that the relative advantages of the labour aristocracy would decline as imperialist competition intensified is coming about? The evidence available does in fact suggest that the differential reward for manual skill has been declining. In 1913/14 the average earnings of male skilled

manual workers were 1.56 times greater than that of male unskilled manual workers while by 1971 this ratio had declined to 1.23.(11). This long term decline in the differential reward for skilled manual labour does seem to be general to the Western imperialist countries.(12) However, we should not jump to the conclusion that the labour aristocracy is nearing extinction. Its threatened position simply serves to incite its members to defend their relative advantages, as has been apparent in recent years with craftsmen in vehicle building taking industrial action to maintain their "differentials", and this may even act so as to heighten their sectional consciousness and loyalties. The labour aristocracy is alive and well in Britain today.

The classical Marxist-Leninist view has been that the ideological outlook generated by the particular material conditions of the labour aristocracy is "social democracy". While it is certainly true that the labour aristocracy have been the most enthusiastic working class supporters of social democratic politics it does not necessarily follow that they are the originators of this doctrine. A point in support of this contention is the fact that in the U.S.A. where there certainly exists a labour aristocracy there is not and never has really been a social democratic political party with mass support. It was Marx who summed up the outlook of this section of the working class in ".....the conservative motto, "A fair day's wages for a fair day's work!"....."(13) which is the ideological perspective later described by Lenin as an economistic, trade union consciousness. As Marx pointed out, implicit in the motto is acceptance of the wages system and the assumption that it is possible for labour to obtain its just rewards under the rule of capitalism. What we have here is not so much social democratic ideology but rather what has been called "labourism", the view that the working class is just as much an essential part

of the natural order of things as is the capitalist class and that it too has a part to play in bourgeois politics with the state being responsive to the demands of labour and acting so as to promote fair dealing and harmony between capital and labour. Concretely, the sort of political demands made from this perspective include those of the state providing the legal framework for the legitimate existence of trade unionism, enacting legislation on working conditions, acting positively to protect the national economy from foreign competition and providing a range of social and welfare services. In so far as "labourism" favours more active state intervention into economic affairs it is of a kind designed to maintain the status quo, for example the subsidising and nationalising of ailing industries, rather than bring about any fundamental changes. In this respect, it is significant that when the post-war Labour government was engaged in a programme of large-scale nationalisation it offered the relevant unions some form of direct participation in management, an offer which was universally rejected. The Labour aristocracy know their place, on the shop floor and not in the boardroom. They have always shown a decided lack of enthusiasm for schemes of "workers' control" drawn up by social democratic intellectuals such as Ken Coates. In short, "labourism" is very much a bourgeois ideology and it bears many resemblances to the ideological outlook of the industrial fraction of capital, which is hardly surprising because this essentially is what it is: the corporate strain of conservatism adapted to the particular interests of the labour aristocracy.

It was only with great reluctance that the labour aristocracy ever took an independent initiative in bourgeois politics. At first, during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, they looked to the more "radical" elements in the Tory and Liberal parties to represent their int-

erests. Only when this approach was no longer delivering the goods did some trade unions form the Labour Party in 1906, explicitly a party of organised labour rather than a social democratic party as in Germany, France and Italy. It was not until 1918 that the Labour Party adapted an explicitly social democratic constitution and this was the work of the radical elements of the manageriat and the intelligentsia, the Fabians in particular, and the differing ideological outlooks of and resultant tensions between the 'practical' trade union leaders and the 'idealist' social democrats, (e.g. Tony Benn), have been a constant feature of the Labour Party. Given the pre-eminence of the labour aristocracy in the organised labour movement, both in point of time and organisational effectiveness, it is hardly surprising that it has been able to exert a considerable degree of hegemony over the working class as a whole, especially the rest of the industrial proletariat. Taken as a whole stratum the labour aristocracy are not and never can be a revolutionary vanguard. On the contrary, they are the rearguard of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the working class.

In fact the most fertile breeding ground for the growth of revolutionary consciousness are the other 90% of the industrial proletariat, the people that the great revolutionary leaders always insisted were the bedrock of the revolution. As Lenin put it, the revolutionaries must "go down lower and deeper to the real masses". The great mass of industrial workers do not enjoy the advantages of the labour aristocrats. Their earnings are much lower, their jobs less secure, their working conditions inferior and their work of a kind which generates a considerable degree of conscious alienation. Outside of work these are among the people least likely to own their own homes, own cars or go on holiday. Their attachment to bourgeois ideology is less secure than that of the labour aristocracy and they are less

likely to be trade unionists and Labour supporters. Let us not forget that today only about one third of the working class, taken as a whole, vote Labour, the rest either supporting other parties or not voting at all. (See Red Star No2). It is among these lower strata of the industrial proletariat that the growing economic crisis is having its greatest effect. To some extent and in certain respects bourgeois illusions begin to fade as a result of these very real material changes and the hitherto subordinate proletarian side of working class consciousness begins to assert itself. So far, this has been evident not so much in the form of militancy at the workplace but rather in confrontations with state agencies in the context of "community" life. The most obvious instance of this is the disaffected, unemployed youth who come into direct confrontation with the police at football matches and on other occasions. We are not suggesting that this behavior is in itself revolutionary in a conscious, developed sense. However, it is indicative of a deep alienation from the institutions of bourgeois society. To a considerable extent, large sections of the lower strata of the working class conform to Marx's original description of the proletariat as "a class in civil society which is not a class of civil society" and, unlike the labour aristocracy, "which does not claim a particular redress because the wrong which it is done to it is not a particular wrong but wrong in general." In post-war British society the social democratic ideal of 'equality of opportunity' has been loudly proclaimed particularly in terms of the formal changes made in the state education system. In fact, the children of the lower strata of the working class have experienced only a marginal increase in their life chances as a result of these reforms. However, the widespread illusion that a large degree of 'equality of opportunity' has actually been achieved merely serves to generate a sense of inadequacy and rejection by society among

these young people who have been labelled as failures by the educational system. The 'wrong in general' done to these young proletarians is the very obvious way in which bourgeois society makes it clear that it has no need of them by even curtailing the opportunity to sell ones labour power and be exploited. It is among the black youth, who tend to be concentrated in the lowest strata of the working class, that this alienation from bourgeois society is, both objectively and subjectively, at its most intense and it is they who so far have shown the greatest degree of willingness to fight back against oppression. Let there be no mistake about this development. The hold of bourgeois ideology over the lower strata of the working class is crumbling with the consequence that a sort of ideological vacuum is arising, especially among the younger generation. Nature abhors a vacuum and it will be filled, one way or another. The fascists have already achieved some success in recruiting disaffected young proletarians and it is precisely those forms of fascist ideology which appears to be the most opposed to the dominant bourgeois ethos and thus most "revolutionary" which appeal to the disaffected, demoralised youth. We refer to the crudest form of Hitlerism as peddled by the British Movement. The same conditions which give rise to a flowering of revolutionary consciousness can also be taken advantage of by the most extreme kinds of bourgeois reaction. Not only do the changing material conditions of life of the lower strata of the working class, (in fact the majority of proletarians), provide an opportunity to build a conscious, revolutionary movement, firmly based within the working class, but also, the Marxist-Leninists do not seize this opportunity the agents of reaction surely will.

Three fairly distinct strata in the semi-proletariat can be distinguished. There are the one million or so self-employed persons. As was po-

inted out in Part 1 of these discussion notes, many of these are only really self-employed in a formal, legal sense, e.g. some building workers, and many are in fact dependent on obtaining work from large-scale monopoly enterprises. Even so, many of these people aspire to become small-scale capitalists and are heavily infected with bourgeois ideology, especially the Thatcherite anti-statist kind. The modern bourgeois state is for these people a hindrance, rather than a help, with its high rates of taxation and ever proliferating red tape. This section of the semi-proletariat also exercise a certain bourgeois influence over the working class, as Lenin also recognised. They tend to suffer particularly severely from the impact of the depression and, given their anti-monopolist orientation, are also open to the influence of fascism, although it is the more "respectable" varieties which have most appeal for them. On the other hand, there is at the same time a certain contrary tendency among this self-employed section of the semi-proletariat. Many have been wage earners and have become self-employed in order to be more 'independent', to escape the oppressive subordination of waged employment. The desire for a higher income is also often an important motive although frequently this does not transpire. While not of a very conscious kind, this rejection of monopoly capitalist relations of production does have a progressive side to it in so far as it opposes the rule of capital. However, it must be admitted that these people are not the most fertile ground for recruitment to the revolutionary ranks. Perhaps the best to be hoped for is that the revolutionary forces can at least persuade them that it is not just monopoly capital and its state which are their enemies but capitalism as such. In this way they can be "neutralised" in the class war and thus prevented from going over, on a large scale, to the forces of extreme reaction.

Another distinct stratum of the semi-proletariat are the large number of 'non-manual' and sales workers, the majority of which are women. During this century the size of this group has increased as a result of the trend towards large-scale monopoly organisation and the growth of the state apparatus. Parallel with this growth has been a relative decline in earnings and status. In 1971 the average weekly earnings of male clerks (intermediate grade) were only £25.0, routine and junior clerks £21.4 and shop salesmen and assistants £20.4. The proletarianisation of "white collar" workers is well known and during the 1970's there was a considerable growth of trade union consciousness among these workers as is indicated by the rapid growth in trade union membership and increasing recourse to trade union action. However, it must be remembered that, like trade unionism, in general, this development constitutes an attempt to defend sectional interests. A strong impulse behind it is the desire to try to prevent proletarianisation running its full course. This strategy is not likely to succeed because the ranks of these workers are no longer growing and are now being decimated by increasing mechanisation and automation in offices and shops - the "microprocessor revolution". Even so, the social position in the division of labour of these unproductive workers does to a significant extent set them apart from the industrial proletariat, the latter tending to see the former as on the side of "management". This is particularly so in the case of clerical workers whose role is essentially one of assisting managers and administrators to organise and control the industrial proletariat. Furthermore it is this objective position which tends to generate a certain amount of bourgeois consciousness among clerical employees. This has some effect on the industrial proletariat especially since many male industrial workers are married to women in clerical and sales employment. Nonetheless, progressive proletarianisation means

that the objective conditions favouring a growth of revolutionary consciousness are becoming more favourable and we should make strenuous efforts to win over these people to the revolutionary cause.

The third stratum of the semi-proletariat are manual workers in various types of 'service' employment. These include cleaners, catering workers etc. They tend to be the lowest paid, lowest status workers of all and are disproportionately female, old and from minority ethnic groups. Their comparatively geographically dispersed and economically marginal character makes it difficult for them to take collective action. Even so, in recent years their trade union involvement has increased. In just about every way this is the most oppressed stratum of the whole working class. Capitalism has given them nothing and holds out the promise of nothing. While it is true that the main strength of the revolutionary forces will be located in the mass of the industrial proletariat, this part of the semi-proletariat also has considerable possibilities and must not be neglected.

* * *

The third, concluding part of these notes will consider the position and role of the middle strata with respect to the class struggle and then proceed to an overall assessment of the configuration of the class forces.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) LENIN, V.I., Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Peking, 1975, especially chs 2&3.
- (2) WHITLEY, R., The City and Industry: The directors of Large Companies, their Characteristics and Connections, in Elites and Power in British Society, eds P. Stanworth & A. Giddens, Cambridge, 1974.

- (3) MOYLE, J., The Pattern of Ordinary Share Ownership, Cambridge, 1971.
- (4) Full analysis of the state apparatus in contemporary British capitalism is vital for the development of a strategy to overthrow it and such analysis is an essential part of the programmatic tasks facing the Marxist-Leninists.
- (5) FOX, A., & FLANDERS A., The Reform of Collective Bargaining: From Donovan to Durkheim, British Journal of Industrial Relations, 7 No.2, 1969, 151-80.
- (6) For a recent useful discussion see PANITCH, L Trade Unions and the Capitalist State, New Left Review, No.125, Jan-Feb 1981, 21-43. Although the work of a neo-Trotskyist, a worthwhile analysis of the Conservative strand of corporatism is HARRIS, N., Competition and the Corporate State: British Conservatives State and Industry 1945-1964, London, 1972.
- (7) This summary is derived from V.I. Lenin, op.cit and his Imperialism and the Split in Socialism, Moscow, 1972. It must be pointed out that there is a certain generality in these expositions by Lenin with differing emphases upon and interpretations of points as between the two accounts. A useful compilation of Lenin's writings on Britain, much of it dealing with just this question, is Lenin on Britain, London, 1934.
- (8) For a particularly crude attempt to dismiss the theory see The British Working Class and Its Party, Communist Party of Great Britain (Marxist-Leninist), London, 1971.

- (9) A sustained attempt to verify this thesis is EDWARDS, H.W., Labour Aristocracy, Mass Base of Social Democracy, Stockholm, 1978.
- (10) A discussion and critique of the more recent sophisticated theories claiming that the working classes of the imperialist countries do directly benefit from imperialism is to be found in NABUDERE, D., The Political Economy of Imperialism, London & Dar es Salaam, 1977, especially ch.20.
- (11) Information extracted from Table 8 in WESTERGAARD, J., & RESLER, H., Class in a Capitalist Society: A Study of Contemporary Britain Harmondsworth, 1976, p.76.
- (12) For a presentation and analysis of data arriving at this conclusion see PHELPS BROWN, H., The Inequality of Pay, Oxford, 1977, ch.3.
- (12) MARX, K., Value price and profit, London, 1899 p.93.

ECONOMIC CONTRADICTIONS OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The following brief discussion of the main features of an economy under socialist transformation has been contributed in order to stimulate debate and contributions to Red Star on this important but neglected topic. Without a developed theory, based on the experience of socialist economic transformation as it has occurred in Russia and China, it will be impossible to draw up a communist programme capable of guiding the social movement through class struggle, to the abolition of classes and private property. In particular, such a programme must place special emphasis on the recognition that, in the socialist period, the direction taken by the communist party holding state power can either lead towards communism, or to renewed forms of capitalism, depending on the political line of the party.

It is a basic tenet of Marxism that under socialism, commodity production will be replaced by the production of use values for the satisfaction of the needs of the people as expressed in the formation of a state plan. Yet in every society which has experienced the dictatorship of the proletariat up to this time, commodity production - that is production for sale which involves a transfer of ownership and which is mediated by money - has remained predominant over the production of direct use values.

The existence of commodity production in countries where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established has been explained by Stalin in his 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR' as deriving from the fact that not all the

means of production can be appropriated by the socialist state at one time. In Russia and China, a collective ownership system, comprising mainly agriculture and the smaller industrial units, has existed side by side with the state owned system. The fact that products are therefore owned respectively by the socialist state and various enterprises under the collective ownership system, determines that exchange between the two systems must take the form of commodity exchange. As Lenin pointed out, "commodity exchange is a yardstick to measure the normality of the relations between industry and agriculture. A second explanation for the existence of commodity production in the period immediately after the proletarian revolution concerns the need of the proletarian state to pay immediate attention to the task of restoring, developing and expanding the economy, since it is inevitable that the armed struggle to overthrow the old regime involves considerable destruction and disruption of the productive forces of the economy. This was the historical reason for Lenin's introduction of the New Economic Policy, which involved some compromise with the 'forms and techniques' of capitalism, as Lenin expressed it.

In general, these two explanations for the retention of commodity production are correct as far as they go, but they are inadequate. Stalin's explanation in terms of the different ownership systems in socialist society enables us to understand why there is commodity production outside the state sector, and why there is commodity circulation at the interface between the state sector and the collective and private sectors, but it does not explain why commodity categories are retained within the state sector. Similarly, the need for measures such as those introduced by Lenin in the NEP were the result of exceptional circumstances and were regarded by Lenin as being historically specific.

In a collection of writings on the transition period of socialist society, Charles Bettelheim has drawn attention to the inadequate explanations which have been put forward for the retention of commodity production in the state sector. (1). In what follows, I shall attempt to outline the substance of Bettelheim's explanation, which takes the form of a critique of Stalin's ideas as expressed in his 'Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR'.

Stalin, in 'Economic Problems...', justified the use of commodity categories in the state sector by referring to the need to calculate "whether enterprises are paying or running at a loss, for checking and controlling the enterprises". (2). In his critique of Stalin, Bettelheim considers that this explanation is also unsatisfactory, since "the real question is...why calculations have to be made by means of commodity categories and why they are not made directly in terms of labour time?". (3). The fact that calculations have to be made in terms of commodity categories must be because they possess a certain reality; for Bettelheim, it is not sufficient to remark, as does Stalin, that the content of commodity categories is different under socialism.

Stalin considered that the essential prerequisite for the disappearance of commodity categories is the disappearance of the division between the two ownership sectors and the progressive raising of collective farm property to the level of public property. (4). However, Bettelheim points out that while Stalin considered this to be a necessary condition for the disappearance of commodity production, he did not consider it to be in itself sufficient. In addition, he considered that "a social-economic centre" must appear which could control the whole product of social production so effectively that a system of "products exchange" would replace "commodity exchange" (5).

For Bettelheim, the root of the retention of commodity production and commodity categories is the absence of such a social-economic centre which is effectively capable of disposing of all the products, and strictly regulating production in relation to the needs of society. According to this view, commodity production will not disappear until society has become capable of consciously regulating its production by reference to its needs, rather than the disappearance of commodity categories enabling society to regulate production on the basis of needs.

Bettelheim appears to consider that it is largely technical reasons which have prevented the planning of production in accordance with needs. Among the reasons he gives are "the uneven development of the productive forces in the different centres of production, the heterogeneity of the conditions of production existing in each of these centres, the still only slight degree of integration of these centres, the imperfect conditions for the transmission of information from the periphery to the central offices, the complex problems of information storage and so on" (6). In addition, he considers that there are still considerable limitations on the possibility of estimating social needs in advance, especially needs which arise in the production sphere itself, as well as the problems involved in estimating in advance the socially necessary labour time needed to produce different products. This problem of estimating needs and socially necessary labour time in advance is central to the problem of replacing commodity production with products exchange. "For if the plan could foresee the exact quantities of products that each working group would provide, and of those that would be required by each group, and if it were in a position to ensure at the desired moment the full satisfaction of the needs of each group, it would also be able to decide where the products should come from to meet each

group's needs and the direction in which the goods provided should be sent. Under these conditions, the products could be dealt with by means of socially efficient allotment orders, and there would be no further need either for purchases or for sales; nor, therefore, for money." (7)

The fact that such forecasting and such balance, a priori, between supplies and needs is not yet possible, means that it is necessary to allow a sufficient amount of autonomy to the enterprises, which in turn results in the rules of business accounting, the money economy within the state sector, commodity categories etc. This freedom of manoeuvre of economic enterprises is therefore only the other side of an inadequate degree of social forecasting; it expresses the de facto inability of society, or of its organs to regulate the whole of social production consciously. This is why, in a planned economy plans are expressed both in quantities and in prices. Only with the disappearance of commodity categories within the state sector of the socialist economy will it be possible for the financial plan to disappear also, giving place to material planning alone, which will include the planning and accounting of labour in terms of socially necessary labour time.

THE CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE FORCES OF PRODUCTION AND THE RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION

While the socialist revolution has fundamentally altered the nature of the contradictions between the productive forces and the relations of production, as well as those between the superstructure and the economic base, there will still remain aspects of these contradictions in societies which have established the dictatorship of the proletariat. The basis for understanding these contradictions lies in recognising that although ownership of the means of production is the most important aspect of the relations of production,

it is not the only aspect. There is also the question of the relations among people in the process of production as well as the question of how the goods produced are to be distributed. Engels recognised this when he declared that state ownership of the means of production is but a formal means of resolving the contradiction between the social character of the productive forces and the private character of appropriation. State ownership of the means of production - even when the state constitutes the dictatorship of the proletariat - designates a legal relationship and not an overall transformation of production relations. This is what Engels meant when he spoke of the state taking possession of the means of production "in the name of society".

For real social appropriation to occur, there must be a radical transformation of the social production process such that the immediate producers appropriate the products of production directly and collectively. This in turn requires that the direct producers must struggle against the division of labour inherited from capitalist society, which places managers, technicians and planners in positions of authority, direction and control over them. Clearly it is impossible for this transformation of the relations of production to take place overnight, nor does it occur spontaneously as a result of the development of the productive forces. This is because the forms that the development of the productive forces assume, reflect class relationships and are determined by the interests of the contending classes. This is as true for social formations transitional between capitalism and communism as it is under capitalism. Hence the struggle by the workers to transform the social division of labour, eliminate hierarchical relations in the factories, take management into their own hands and master technology can only take place as a result of conscious and collective struggles by the working class themselves. In order to create the conditions for the unified mass acti-

on of the working class, the proletarian party must be the instrument for imparting proletarian ideology, enabling the masses to struggle against capitalist forms of management. The manner in which the class struggle develops under the dictatorship of the proletariat therefore depends primarily on the political line of the ruling party. Mao's line of 'Grasp revolution, Promote Production' represented a correct summation of the relationship between transforming the relations of production and utilising the revolutionary energy of the masses to increase output and develop the forces of production. By beginning to break down the divisions between manual labour and intellectual labour, between town and countryside and between administrative tasks and performance tasks, the Cultural Revolution showed the way forward in which a society of associated producers can be brought into being. (8) Of course, this is not to imply that such a society can be created by one or even several 'Cultural Revolutions'. Mao himself repeatedly insisted that many more mass upsurges, like those of the Cultural Revolution in its first few years, would be necessary throughout the long transition period of socialism.

The analysis put forward suggests that the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production constitutes the fundamental contradiction in the economy of socialist society. The persistence of commodity production in such an economy is one manifestation of this contradiction, since in the final analysis, its persistence is to be explained by the fact that the working class are not complete masters of the means of production. Commodity production will progressively decline as the means of production become run by the working class themselves, and as they become imbued with a communist consciousness. Under such conditions planning becomes less a process of the social direction of the productive forces in the name

of society, and more a process whereby the working class themselves dominate the productive forces.

The existence of these contradictions throughout the long transition period of socialist society, means that, to paraphrase Mao, it becomes a relatively easy matter to rig up a system of state monopoly capitalism if profit, rather than the needs of the people is taken as the object of production. Since profit can only be created in the sphere of production, a line which puts 'profit in command' must necessarily involve an increase in the rate at which surplus value is extracted from the working class. This can be accomplished by, on the one hand, increasing the autonomy of the enterprise management to include, for example, determining productivity rates, numbers of personnel and the wage levels of employees. If at the same time the enterprises are allowed to retain a larger share of profits earned, these can be used as a material incentive to the enterprise as a whole and to its management in particular. 'Putting profit in command' does not however mean that central control of the economy by the state planning authorities is relinquished. One of the most important provisions of the economic 'reforms' introduced by Kosygin, for example, was to make increased use of the capital provided by the state to the enterprise, such that the rate of interest was increased significantly and the size of profit accruing to the state in the form of interest charges became the determining factor in decisions concerning where and in which spheres of production, state funds were to be invested. These measures effectively established the state as a monopoly finance capitalist vis-a-vis the enterprises.

The capitalist elements within the ruling party are able to gain support for 'profit first' measures such as these, to the extent that the rel-

ations of production have not been transformed. Indeed the partial reproduction of a de facto bourgeoisie at the level of the enterprise produces a social stratum which has direct interests in the pursuit of a 'profit first' line. It is not a matter of accident that many of the leading revisionists in the Soviet and Chinese communist parties of today began their careers among the nascent bourgeoisies of the new socialist states. As Mao declared: "The rise to power of revisionism means the rise to power of the bourgeoisie!".

FOOTNOTES

- (1) C. BETTELHEIM., The Transition to Socialist Economy, Harvester Press 1978.
- (2) STALIN, JV., Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR, Peking, 1972, p.53-4.
- (3) BETTELHEIM., Ibid. p.38.
- (4) STALIN., Ibid. p.15-16.
- (5) STALIN., Ibid. p.68-9.
- (6) BETTELHEIM., Ibid. p.71.
- (7) BETTELHEIM., Ibid. p.110. It is worth considering the extent to which recent developments in micro-electronics have overcome some of the difficulties which Bettelheim considers have prevented the planning of production in accordance with needs in the past, Microelectronics represent a considerable advance in the development of the productive forces, as well as permitting much greater accessibility and storage of information.
- (8) For a detailed account of the changes in management and the division of labour which occurred during the Cultural Revolution, see

Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organisation in China by Charles Bettelheim, Monthly Review Press, 1974.

BOOK REVIEW

China: Radicalism to Revisionism

CHINA: RADICALISM TO REVISIONISM 1962-1979.

Bill Brugger. Groom Helm, 1981. £5.95.

In the decade from the mid nineteen sixties, a never ending flood of books on China poured out from Western publishing houses. While a few of these works are of lasting value, for example Cultural Revolution and Industrial Organisation by Charles Bettelheim, most of them were unoriginal and often inaccurate pieces of journalism thrown together from secondary sources and laced with a bit of local colour gleaned from the obligatory three week trip to China. However, since 1976 the professional sinologists seem to have been suffering from a sudden mass outbreak of writers cramp. The flood of sinobiblia has slowed to a trickle. No doubt the reason for this is that these people have been reluctant to commit to print their interpretations of developments since 1976 just in case they get it all wrong and thus lose face in the world of professional China watchers. There have been a few books on the period from the mid nineteen seventies onwards but these are mostly low grade journalistic hack work, for example The Future of China after Mao, by Ross Terrill.

Like Terrill, Bill Brugger is an Australian academic, but there the resemblance ends. The work being reviewed is a revised edition of the authors sequel to his earlier work China: Liberation and Transformation 1942-1962 and the subtitle of the present book clearly indicates Bruggers overall interpretation of recent events in China. In the space of only 275 pages

Brugger presents a very carefully documented account of the period 1962-79. For each crucial conjunction of events he informs the reader of the differing interpretations put forward and makes it clear which ones he finds cogent. Brugger's narrative sets out to "...trace the split which did occur in the leadership (of the Communist Party of China) after 1962" (p.13) and finally concludes that "...at the end of 1979 there seems little doubt that China is heading in a capitalist direction". Since these words were written further measures taken by the new revisionist leadership only serve to justify this conclusion.

Among the strengths of this book is the light it throws on the centrist role played by Zhou Enlai, appearing to sympathise with the left but in fact covering up for and protecting the right. Zhou's role is clear, for example, in the struggles leading up to the onset of the Cultural Revolution. When reporting to the Third National Peoples Congress in 1964 he formally emphasised the political, rather than administrative, character of the Socialist Education Movement while at the same time emphasising stability as a prerequisite for "modernising" the country. Clearly, the latter injunction negates the former one. How can there be political class struggle and "stability"? Then, during the Cultural Revolution, Zhou protected Chen Yi, the Foreign Minister, who was one of the more outspoken opponents of this proletarian upsurge, and an open supporter of Liu Shaoqi. Even at the height of the Cultural Revolution, foreign affairs remained under the general control of Zhou Enlai and the evidence put forward by Brugger definitely implies that Zhou was the original architect of the notorious reactionary Three Worlds Theory.

It also becomes clear in this book that Zhou Enlai was very much the patron of Deng Xiaoping.

Certainly this little creep is now repaying his debts to his late master by arranging extravagant public praise for Zhou. Brugger documents Deng's role in leading the new bourgeois counter-revolution. Significantly, Brugger seems to reject the usual explanation put forward by most sinologists for the limp character of the campaign to criticise Deng Xiaoping in 1976. The lack of mass enthusiasm, claims Brugger, was not because the people were fed up with the Four, but because the reconstructed Party machine was already dominated by rightist elements. The author draws attention to the irony of the accusation directed at the Four, after their arrest, of carrying out the unauthorised arrest of senior cadres. He points out how ridiculous are many of the slanders heaped on the Four, particularly the crude sexist abuse of Comrade Jiang Qing. In discussing the rural policy initiated during 1977-8 Brugger comments that; "If one's focus was on increasing output, the above picture was very encouraging. If, however, one was worried about capitalist tendencies there was cause for alarm". (P.212). Events during the last year or so, since these words were written, bear out the latter part of the judgment. The communes are being broken up and a class of kulaks are being created as an act of deliberate state policy. As for 'increasing output' the present agricultural situation in China is catastrophic. In 1977 pamphlet, How China became self-sufficient in Grain, it is stated that; "Gone forever are the times when ten' of millions of her people were starved or malnourished". "Forever" has turned out to be a period of three years, for at this moment over one hundred million Chinese are "starved or malnourished", the immediate causes being drought in one province and flooding in another. What, we indignantly ask, has happened to the considerable grain reserves accumulated during the "ten years of chaos" leading up to 1976? Have Deng and his chums

sold them off abroad to finance their wild "modernisation" schemes? No doubt Chinese agriculture is more profitable than it used to be but millions of peasants are starving and Deng and co. are passing the begging bowl around their bourgeois friends. Brugger comments that; "In 1979, therefore, there seemed to be no major theoretical difference between the Chinese Communist Party and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." (p.229) Also, we would add, the state bourgeoisie in China have managed to achieve the same result in practice- the inability of the people to feed themselves.

A more questionable theme of Brugger's book is his assertion of Comrade Mao Zedong's alleged theoretical shortcomings. True, Brugger does emphasise the dialectical development of Mao's political outlook. For example, Brugger states; "...by the early 1960, Mao began to feel that, in socialist society, certain structural conditions might produce new bourgeois elements. This generative view of class had very important implications for domestic politics. It implied that the revolution was constantly in danger of sliding backwards. Thus, socialism came to be seen not as a model to be achieved and consolidated but as the whole process of transition from the old society to communism. It was, moreover, a reversible process." (PP.16-17)

However, Brugger also repeatedly claims that a serious short coming of Mao was never to have produced a theory of socialist transition capable of providing clear guidance for the conduct of the class struggle. Brugger suggests that perhaps Mao held back from making explicit the implications of some of his views because they bring into question the Leninist principle of the vanguard role of the Party. (p.66). The point here is that if, as Mao claimed, a new

bourgeoisie inevitably arises within the revolutionary party itself and if it is only mass actions which can defeat it, then who decides whether or not the line of the party leadership is a proletarian or a bourgeois line? The masses or a section of the leadership? This is a genuine problem with which all Marxist-Leninists must grapple. However, the fact that Mao never fully explicated a definite position on this key problem is not in itself a serious deficiency on his part.

Theory and practice are always in dialectical unity with, in general, practice being primary. Any attempt to elaborate a full-blown theory of socialist transition which foresees every problem that will be encountered and offers solutions is wildly undialectical. A sound theory of socialist transition can only be worked out in the course of the struggle to effect this transition. This, of course, is why Marx and Engels had so little to say about the precise nature of socialist transformation. They had no experience of an attempt to build socialism. Similarly, Lenin's contributions on this matter are somewhat limited as well. In fact, Mao and other Chinese comrades who upheld the proletarian line, did attempt to theorise on, as Mao put it, "continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat", and the two articles, 'On Exercising All-Round Dictatorship Over the Bourgeoisie' and 'On the Social Basis of the Lin Biao Anti-Party Clique', by Zhang Chunqiao and Yao Wenyuan respectively, are worthwhile attempts to provide some theoretical guidance. Of course, the conception of 'cultural revolution' itself is an enormously important contribution to the theory of socialist transition. Even so, a vital task for the Marxist-Leninists is to study the Chinese experience so as to deepen our understanding of the struggle for socialism so that in future we are better able to combat the inevitable emergence of new bourgeois elements.

Mao and his comrades have provided us with the raw materials for our theoretical armoury. Our task is to forge them into razor sharp blades capable of cutting the ground from under the feet of the new bourgeoisie.

One final point to emerge from Brugger's book is the close political relationship between Mao and the Four. As Brugger states, in the context of discussing the Campaign to Study the Theory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, "...it is inconceivable that Mao did not give Zhang and Yao his blessing". Now, some people, especially those of the SACU "Friends of China" ilk, have been trying to sustain the view that Mao's policies were correct but that the Four were working against these policies. Brugger convincingly argues that this interpretation simply does not fit the facts. Whatever tactical errors the Four may have made, they were nonetheless upholding the proletarian line in opposition to the bourgeois line of Zhou, Deng & co.. The fact that Wang Hangwen and Yao Wenyuan capitulated to the bourgeoisie at the recent show trial in no way negates the revolutionary stand they took up previously. Surely, in the light of the events of the last five years, it must be clear to all except for blind Hampstead sinophiles, who was leading the bourgeois camp?

BOOK ADVERTISEMENT

The Communist Movement

TO THE MARXIST-LENINISTS, THE WORKERS, AND THE OPPRESSED OF ALL COUNTRIES

The Joint Communique of the international conference of Marxist-Leninists held to oppose the capitulationist international line of the Chinese revisionists and their followers.

1980, 15p

£0.25

BASIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE UNITY OF MARXIST-LENINISTS AND FOR THE LINE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT: A Draft Position Paper for Discussion Prepared by the Revolutionary Communist Party of Chile and the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

The main document discussed at the international Marxist-Leninist conference in Autumn 1980. It includes the text of the Joint Communique.

RCP Publications, 1981, 50p

£0.50

THE WAY FORWARD: A Marxist-Leninist Analysis of the British State, the CPGB and the Tasks for Revolutionaries, by Michael McCreery

Articles by the leader of the original Marxist-Leninist split from the CPGB in 1963.

Workers Newsletter Group, 40p

£0.30

IMPORTANT STRUGGLES IN BUILDING THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY, USA, by Bill Klingel and Joanne Psihountas

The main strategic task of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain is party-building and there is much to learn from comrades in other countries who have already reached the stage of party formation.

RCP Publications, 1978, 55p

£0.75

Marxism and Revolution

THE SCIENCE OF REVOLUTION, by the RCP, USA

A clear and concise introduction to the world outlook of Marxism-Leninism with sections on materialist dialectics, political economy, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the line of the RCP, USA. The text is in both English and Spanish.

RCP Publications, 1980, 84p £1.20

REVOLUTION REPRINTS: Articles from Revolution, the organ of the Central Committee of the RCP, USA

Classes and Class Struggle, 7p
Proletarian Dictatorship Vs. Bourgeois "Democracy", 12p

How Socialism Wipes Out Exploitation, 11p

RCP Publications, 1978 The set £0.60

FROM MARX TO MAO TSE-TUNG: A Study in Revolutionary Dialectics, by George Thomson

A clear exposition of the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary outlook as expressed in the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao.

China Policy Study Group, 1975, 182p £0.90

CAPITALISM AND AFTER: The Rise and Fall of Commodity Production, by George Thomson

An introduction to Marxist political economy as applied to the transition from capitalism to communism.

China Policy Study Group, 1976, 148p £0.80

THE HUMAN ESSENCE: The Sources of Science and Art, by George Thomson

A Marxist analysis of the origins and development of science and art.

China Policy Study Group, 1974, 116p £0.75

POLITICAL ECONOMY, Marxist Study Courses (1931-32)

Originally published by the pre-revisionist CPGB as a series of study booklets, this book provides a detailed introduction to Marxian political economy.

Banner Press, 1976, 548p £3.60

HOW CAPITALISM HAS BEEN RESTORED IN THE SOVIET UNION AND WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE WORLD STRUGGLE, by the RCP, USA

The most thorough-going, comprehensive analysis of this subject presently available, including an in-depth theoretical examination and detailed factual data.

RCP Publications, 1974, 156p £1.80

A CRITIQUE OF SOVIET ECONOMICS, by Mao Tse-tung

His discussion on the Soviet line on socialist construction in which he exposes and attacks the revisionist theory of the productive forces.

Monthly Review Press, 1977, 157p £2.35

CUBA: The Evaporation of a Myth, by the RCP, USA

How Cuba has been transformed into a neo-colony and pawn of Soviet social imperialism.

RCP Publications, 1976, 40p £0.35

CHILE: An Attempt at "Historic Compromise", by Jorge Palacios

The true story of the events leading up to the overthrow of the Allende government, including a thoroughly documented expose of the pro-Soviet Chilean CP, and the bloody triumph of the Pinochet military dictatorship. -

Norman Bethune Institute, 1979, 512p £2.95

Contemporary China

ON EXERCISING ALL-ROUND DICTATORSHIP OVER THE BOURGEOISIE, by Chang Chun-chiao and ON THE SOCIAL BASIS OF THE LIN PIAO ANTI-PARTY CLIQUE, by Yao Wen-yuan

These key articles were written in 1975 by two members of the so-called "gang of four" during a critical phase of the struggle against revisionist resurgence during the latter part of the Cultural Revolution.

Liberation Books, 1978, 26p £0.35

AND MAO MAKES FIVE: Mao Tsetung's Last Great Battle, edited with an introduction by Raymond Lotta

A collection of articles and documents from Chinese sources covering the critical period between the 10th. Congress of the CPC in 1973 and the arrest of the Four in 1976.

Banner Press, 1978, 522p £4.35

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION: The Revisionist Coup in China and the Struggle in the Revolutionary Communist Party, USA

A very detailed polemical exchange between American Marxist-Leninists on the character of the post-Mao regime in China.

RCP Publications, 1978, 501p £3.60

THE LOSS IN CHINA AND THE REVOLUTIONARY LEGACY OF MAO TSE-TUNG, by Bob Avakian

The Chairman of the RCP, USA presents a concise survey of the class struggles in China from the period since 1949 leading up to the coup d'etat in October 1976.

RCP Publications, 1978, 151p £1.45

MAO TSEIUNG'S IMMORTAL CONTRIBUTIONS, by Bob Avakian

A penetrating presentation from a Marxist-Leninist point of view of Mao's revolutionary theory and practice.

RCP Publications, 1979, 342p £3.60

Prices are inclusive of postal charges.

10% discount to libraries and 33 1/3 % discount to bookshops.

Send payment with individual orders and make out cheques, etc. to "RED STAR PUBLICATIONS".

Send orders to: RSP
c/o Flat 2,
10, Villa Road,
Nottingham,
NG3 4GG.