

# INTERNATIONAL BULLETIN 3



**PART II:  
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE,  
FEBRUARY, 1973**

**International Socialists**

50

## THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Table of Contents

	page
Introduction	1
Lutte Ouvriere document, <u>The Common Market</u>	3
Lutte Ouvriere document, <u>Sino-American Rapprochement</u>	9
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM (Great Britain): building the party & work in the unions	13
Critiques and Answers (Italians, I. S. (U. S.))	15
The Common Market	16
Sino-American Rapprochement	17
MILITANT (Great Britain): building the party, work in the unions	18
Critiques (I. S. (U. S.), I. S. (GB), L. O.)	19
Sino-American Rapprochement	19
LENINIST FRACTION (Denmark): revolutionary activity in the class	20
Comments by L. O.	21
The Common Market	21
Comments by L. O.	22
PROLETARIAN SOCIALISTS (Denmark): the Common Market	22
K. A. G. (Communist Workers Group) (Sweden): revolutionary activity	22
Comment by L. O.	23
P. O. U. M. (Spain): the situation in Spain, building the party	23
The Common Market	24
Sino-American Rapprochement	25
ACCION COMUNISTA (Spain): work in the working class, building the party	25
Sino-American Rapprochement	27
INTERNATIONALIST COMMUNIST PARTY (Italy): the situation in Italy, the revolutionary party, work in the unions	27
Critiques by L. O. and the POUM	30
ZENSHIN (Japan): on the Japanese political situation	31
On the world situation	32
The Common Market	33
Sino-American Rapprochement	33
Stages in the development of the struggle in Japan; their role	33
Critique by L. O. and reply	35
DOCUMENT	37
COMBAT OUVRIER (French West Indies)	36, 42-44
NATIONAL CAUCUS of LABOR COMMITTEES (U. S.)	45
Critique by L. O.	48
The Common Market	48
Sino-American Rapprochement	49
SPARK (U. S.)	50
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS (U. S.)	51
Sino-American Rapprochement	52
The Common Market	52
Critique of the Conference	53

(concluded on inside of back cover)

## Introduction

Early in November 1972, I accompanied our national secretary, Sy Landy, to France to the Third International Conference. The first two conferences had been organized jointly by Lutte Ouvrière, the British I.S. and ourselves. This one was organized exclusively by L.O.

Present were: FRANCE: Lutte Ouvrière; GREAT BRITAIN: International Socialism, the Militant; DENMARK: Leninist Fraction, Proletarian Socialists; SWEDEN: K.A.G. (Communist Workers Group); WEST GERMANY: S.A.G. (Socialist Workers Group); SPAIN: Accion Comunista, P.O.U.M. and its youth group; ITALY: Internationalist Communist Party; JAPAN: National Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League (Zenshin); FRENCH WEST INDIES: Combat Ouvrier; UNITED STATES: National Caucus of Labor Committees, Spark, and the International Socialists. Neither the West German S.A.G. nor the Spanish youth spoke.

The conference began with four presentations by members of L.O., three of them based on documents; the undocumented presentation on "Building the Revolutionary Party", and the document "Revolutionaries and Trade Union Activity" are included in Part I of this bulletin; the other two documents, on the Common Market and Sino-American Rapprochement, follow this introduction.

As a preface to the Sino-American document, it should be noted that L.O. holds that the USSR is a degenerated workers state, but that all other Stalinist states remain capitalist states, since none of them ever experienced a workers' revolution. There being only two basic classes in modern society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, a state must be either one or the other. The question of the internal dynamic of the Stalinist states being the same, L.O. considers irrelevant.

These were the only discussion documents presented to the conference. Almost 3 days of discussion followed, with time off for informal exchanges.

In the absence of documents, the positions here presented are based on notes I took during presentations and discussion. Since I speak French, and since in addition comrades spoke in either English or French and their remarks were translated sentence by sentence into the other language, my notes were relatively complete. Comrades naturally spoke in the first person, "we", and for the most part I have so transcribed my notes.

Organization of this material presents certain problems. My objective is to make it as useful as possible for I.S. (U.S.) comrades. In order to give the fullest possible picture of each group, I am presenting the positions of each group on all topics -- including critiques of those positions and the group's reply -- in one place. By consulting the Table of Contents, readers may choose to follow the 4 topics discussed: Building the Revolutionary Party, Trade Union Activity, the Common Market, and Sino-American Rapprochement (reversing the order at the conference). "See below" references, too, should be checked with the Table of Contents.

Because the I.S. International Bulletin is designed primarily for our own comrades (and only secondarily for comrades abroad), familiar details of our politics and our organizational functioning are not repeated here.

The two groups taken most seriously at the conference -- for good reasons, their relative size and their political weight in their national situations -- were Lutte Ouvrière and the British I.S. They are therefore given first place.

But Lutte Ouvrière is given additional space, in fact the entirety of Part I of this International Bulletin is devoted to the central aspects of L. O.'s politics: Building the Revolutionary Party, and Revolutionaries and Trade Union Activity -- set in the framework of the French situation whose particularities are relatively unknown to most of us in the U. S.

The next group in order of importance was the British I. S. For clarity, in that it is also British, and for clarity alone, comes the Militant, followed by the other European groups. Very much "doing their own thing" are the Italian and Japanese groups, and the Labor Committee. These 3 were particularly delighted at having an international audience for their politics, and, as the reader will see, took full... advantage of the opportunity.

"In the present state of relations among left groups, it is difficult to know their special situations; thus it is difficult and dangerous to make judgments," said L. O. in opening their critique of other groups. For that reason, though tempted, I have refrained from interspersing my own remarks amidst the long presentations by the Internationalist Communist Party and Zenshin; in the case of the Labor Committee, I succumbed to temptation. I should note that we share L. O.'s alarm at the charges levelled at another Japanese group by Zenshin.

Having followed accounts in Lutte Ouvrière of recent workers' struggles in France, I came to the conference with many specific questions on the organization and functioning of French trade unions. My questions were far from exhaustive. Reading Part I of this bulletin has undoubtedly given rise to readers having further questions. I feel sure that L. O. comrades will be as helpful in answering your questions as they were in answering mine. Comrades are free to send any questions directly to L. O., but I would suggest channelling them through me in order to avoid duplication.

I have left the Western hemisphere groups to last, so as to allow Sy the honor of beginning the Critique of the Conference. This section closes with the questions asked and criticisms made of L. O.'s positions and practice, L. O.'s reply, critiques of the conference, and L. O.'s closing statement.

Besides the report on the International Conference, this bulletin includes an item to whose author I owe a profound apology for the 6 month delay in publication: Peter Cam's translation of G. Munis' introduction to his book on the Spanish revolution.

International Bulletin #4 (which hopefully will appear without such a protracted delay) will include more on Bolivia, a report on Brazil by Derek Briscoe, and reports on Ireland. May I again remind readers that contributions and criticism are most welcome.

((Remarks in double brackets)) are my own.

Barbara Zeluck

## INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

THE COMMON MARKET

Some European States have tried repeatedly to unify their markets; their repeated failures in doing so merely illustrate the idleness of the capitalists' wish to overcome the ever increasing contradiction between internationalized division of labor and production, and the solid divisions between States.

Even the limited political and economic attempts which the European capitalist countries undertook right after World War II to achieve some sorts of unions turned out to be still-born (E.O.E.C., W.R.U., D.E.C., S.C.E.C., etc.) These attempts had been undertaken upon the injunctions of American imperialism, which was eager to facilitate the selling of its own goods to a stabilized capitalist Europe as well as to set up a political and military bloc to oppose the Soviet bloc. These attempts eventually led to the signing of the Rome agreement, which dealt with the creation of a Common Market. Supposedly, the Market today runs smoothly between its six original nations member. The Common Market is just about to sign on three more countries. And the panegyrists of capitalist United Europe consider this augmentation to be a monumental step toward the complete economic and political integration of the European countries into a wider unit.

Those same panegyrists try to present the project of a Europe for capitalists in the exciting image of the vanishing of anachronistic national borders, and as such the embodiment of the great hope for a fraternal Europe rid of national rivalries. Actually it is in vain that they paint this fantasy for it is quite obvious that the peoples' welfare is not at all being considered in the cold calculations of these tradesmen who are scanning wider markets and bigger profits.

But the outlook of Europe being thoroughly united under the protection of capital not only lacks exhilarating connotations for the workers, but lacks the feasibility of its realization as well. History provides no precedent for a complete and irreversible political and economic unification of capitalist powers, as achieved by mutual agreement. A declining capitalism is even more impotent on this ground - no capitalist power will ever willingly renounce its state apparatus.

The Common Market is no United Europe, and neither is it the embryo for this delusion.

## THE COMMON MARKET : A LIMITED AND REVERSIBLE CUSTOMS UNION

Without all the finery it should be covered with in the future, and the one presently adorning it, the Common Market really amount to nothing more than a stingy Customs Union contract.

This stinginess can be accounted for by the wish of every capitalist to have access, under the best possible conditions, to its neighbor's markets, while at the same time haggling about the price. The resulting awkward structure is called the Common Market, and though it has suppressed custom-house dues between the Six, it has not for that object unified their markets. While on the one hand they were discarding the "quota" system, abolishing duties, and trying to harmonize their taxing regulations and policies, on the other hand the Six were putting together a complex set of rules aimed at protecting those interests they cared for most (big farming in France, etc.) These numerous and diversified new regulations are in fact perpetuating the old protectionist measures of the member States within the so-called "Common" Market itself.

There is still another reason for asserting that the establishment of the Common Market in no way constitutes a relapse of protectionism on a world-wide scale. The Six have set up a common custom tariff, a common protectionism (quotas, etc.) which has slowed down, and in some instances altogether suppressed the commercial relations enjoyed by some member states with other foreign countries.

But the very opening up of their respective frontiers to the free circulation of goods has nonetheless enabled the Six to considerably develop their commercial exchanges. Between 1958 and 1970, the foreign trade price figures of the Common Market member countries had gone up by 650% while world trade registered a mere 100% increase during the same period. But this boom was mainly due to the overwhelming development of trade between the Six themselves, which at the same time in fact hindered the growth of exchanges with foreign countries outside the Common Market. Nevertheless, the fact that so limited and incomplete a reduction in the divisions between capitalist States has brought about such results stands out in comparison as a proof to the very perniciousness and oppressiveness of national partitioning.

The customs union set up by the Six is not only a openly structure, locked in by a host of regulations restricting its advantages, but even more importantly, the consolidation and the duration of this limited union is completely dependent upon contingencies. The present contract agreement between sovereign States merely expresses and codifies the give and take sacrifices agreed upon by individual capitalist powers for the sake of advantages gained on the markets of rival countries. But those agreements correspond to a given situation, to a given equilibrium. Should the situation evolve to a point where a country would find it preferable not to respect the provisions of the contract, it would not hesitate to breach its agreement, since all the possibilities and means of so doing have been wholly preserved.

The short history of the Common Market is already filled with examples of a country refusing to abide by "the rules of the game"; a partial recession in a single branch of industry has proven to be usually sufficient to drive the affected country back to its former protectionist practices. In the event of a crisis, a generalised reversion to protectionism would be inevitable.

In this field of peaceful "unification" the only agreements that capitalist countries can arrive at are temporary compromises at the top level, that will stand as long as they are advantageous to each and every one of them, but no longer. The nature of commerce demands that there can be no durable half-measures in this domain. Economical unity implies a single currency, a single budget and a single State; and for each member State, complete political integration would mean renouncing one's sovereignty altogether.

Such a total political integration is yet to be born no matter how many treaties are signed in the world - even if they declare the integration process to be irreversible - any sovereign State still could choose not to accept a unity which is no longer compatible with the defense of its respective interests.

More than that, no step toward this political integration had been taken - or even considered since the installation of the Common Market. And it could not be otherwise!

One thing is sure. The belief that the Common Market will ultimately see a lasting economical interpenetration, leading to a total economical integration is widespread among bourgeois pacifists, federalists, and other such dreamers as well as among some supporters of revolutionary socialism. As if the increasing interpenetration of national economies made it possible for some capitalists to do without the economical crutches of State help - whereas this help is especially useful to the most powerful of them! As if a number of capitalists could consider the possibility of forsaking what appear to be their supreme weapon in dealing with a crisis or with aggravated competition -

namely political intervention of their respective States in order to protect at least the national market! Or else, as if the penetration of European capitalist trusts on the national markets of one another had rendered competition obsolete! In fact the national State still is a most needed weapon in dealing with foreign - even European - competition; and these trusts won't willingly renounce it.

The same approach leads other people to the conclusion that the ever increasing economic interpenetration characteristic of imperialism, will ultimately lead to the formation of a super-imperialist power, that this power will peacefully and definitively marshal the markets for the imperialist nations and groups of nations composing it.

Imperialist powers are indeed capable of entering into various economic and political alliances with one another. Such associations however are bound to be more or less loose and transient or more or less hostile to outside powers. But more than that, imperialist countries will never give up their right to withdraw if and when they find it preferable because each and every State is the warrant of such a possibility; and who says "States" implies "frontiers".

#### IS THE US - EUROPE BALANCE OF POWER BEING UPSSET

This "European integration" mythology has given birth to still another myth which in turn nourishes the mother myth; it is a myth based on the belief that the US-Europe balance of power is rapidly evolving toward the replacement of the American hegemony over the world imperialism by some sort of triumvirat including the US, Europe and Japan.

However, those who say that the European imperialists can possibly set up as rivals of US imperialism are overlooking the fact that there is not ONE European imperialism but SEVERAL ones, and that these countries are contesting with one another at least as much as with the US. The European economic patchwork cannot on these grounds be comparable to the single US economic system. Therefore any quantitative comparisons which are liable to be drawn between the US and Europe are of limited value because one cannot fairly add up figures that in reality - because of competition - tend to cancel out each other. Yet one must take note of the conclusions which can be drawn from such comparisons, for they show how senseless are those who pronosticate the end of American hegemony.

The output capacity of American economy leaves that of the Six far behind and even supersedes that of the Nine, although the latter's population is definitely larger than that of the US. The American gross national product is twice that of the Six, which roughly means 50% larger than that of the Nine (of course GNP itself is a sort of hold-all invention that must be viewed with caution, but these figures do suggest a general picture of the situation). The energy consumption figures however serve a more accurate index of actual industrial activity, and in this area the US total equals about three times that of the Six and nearly twice that of the Nine.

In the mid-sixties, the US output amounted to 45% of the industrial production of the whole capitalist world, while the Six were lagging more than half-way behind. Now if we consider the evolution of these figures over a number of years, we would arrive at a similar picture. Inasmuch as those who pretend that the economic growth rate in Europe is faster than in the US can do so only because they limit themselves to post-war rates of growth, in fact the "faster" postwar growth rates of European countries merely clarify the fact that Europe was then painfully recovering from its huge war-imposed slow-down; besides, this recovery would not have been possible without American aid. Now if we compare pre-war figures as well, we receive an entirely different picture. The US share in the total industrial output of the capitalist world was of 41.25% in 1937 and had reached 44.8% in 1963; while the industrial output of the Nine has notably decreased during the same period, the main reason for this being the collapse of British power.

The economic superiority of the US is not limited to the field of industrial output; the productive capacity of the American farmer for instance is four or five times that of his European counterpart and this ratio is exhibited as two or three to one in industry.

Of course the growth in productivity of the worker is faster in some European countries than in the US. But this again is merely indicative of relative economic under-development. In fact, this faster growth rate is due largely to a transfer of farmers (occupation of low productive capacity). As such this superior rate is bound to dwindle in relation to the number of farmers driven out of the country side.

Finally the economic growth of Europe is more or less to be accomplished to the prejudice of its bourgeoisie. Not only is bourgeois Europe incapable of catching up economically with the US, but it is also far from strengthening its condition against the superiority of the American bourgeoisie. In 1969 the KNOWN American direct investments in the Common Market already represented three times the amount of the direct investments of European capitalists in the US, while this ratio was not even 2 to 1 in 1960. The balance of power between the US and European imperialism is indeed being upset, but to the advantage of the former and with increasing speed. In 1969, 10% of all registered investments in Europe came from America. US is currently taking over entire sections of European economy, concentrating on the most important, dynamic and profitable branches (95% of the market of integrated circuits, 80% of the market of electronic equipment, 30% of the automobile and petroleum markets, etc.) These figures indeed bring out the absurdity of de Gaulle's quixotic opposition to American investments in Europe.

#### THE US AND THE COMMON MARKET

Because the Common Market is merely a customs union and not a economic entity, it is far from being a rival to the United States (at present, or even in the future), and moreover these European countries are playing into the hands of American imperialism. A freer circulation of goods and capital among European countries cannot but profit the dominating economic power, namely the US, which alone can fully take advantage of the possibilities of a widened market.

The Common Market was born under the thoughtful supervision (not to say upon the injunctions) of American imperialism. The latter never had to regret its contribution to the "European cause".

Some economists (and among them would-be revolutionary marxists) had predicted that the setting up of a unified European market would bring about the formation and rapid growth of large European corporations which would ultimately threaten the superiority of the American corporations. They are now being proven utterly wrong. However they were partly right in saying that increased competition would encourage the fusion of large companies; the creation of common subsidiaries, although in fact these groupings are mostly financial groupings (holding companies controlling a host of various companies with low productive capacity). As such they count more on a planned slow-down of production by trust managements than on their own ability to modernise production or raise the output capacity of the plants they control.

In any case such associations are usually restricted to trusts of a single country or else, involve US controlled companies. These are the so-called "multi-national" corporations. For each common subsidiary sponsored by European corporations, foreign companies, (mostly US) sponsor two. From 1963 to 1965 for instance, American investment in the European Community amounted to three times the sum of "trans-European" investments.



The Common Market's existence, along with other circumstances, has actually reinforced the weight of American capital in Europe. The obstacles meant to protect European capitalists from increasing American investments were proven insufficient in counterbalancing this trend. Why? Because the American companies already established in Europe for instance, are no longer dependent upon US capital; when their profits allow them to do so, they simply reinvest them, and if need be, they can get the help of the European money market with even greater ease than the European companies themselves. European extollers of the Common Market are then left with the assumption that the Common Market has developed international trade to the point that, in this field at least, the Six have left the US behind. This is true to a certain extent. In recent years, owing to the over-evaluation of the dollar, the trend in commercial exchanges was favorable to Europe. But if we are to speak strictly, we must also admit that Europe is a loser. Between 1958 and 1970, the value of E.E.C.'s exports to the US had risen from 1,6 to 6,6 billion dollars; while the value of the goods it imported from the same US had risen from 2,8 to 9 billion dollars! The global commercial balance of the Common Market with the US is then definitely showing a deficit, despite the over-evaluation of the dollar and despite the fact that bigger American corporations have no reason to be exporting to Europe since they own plants there!

#### THE SOCIALIST UNITED - STATES OF EUROPE

Propounders of the myth that the formation of a supra-national Europe is inevitable are to be found in the very ranks of revolutionary marxists. Their originality being, so to speak, in that they dressed old pieces of nonsense in marxian clothes complete with up-to-date figures.

This myth is certainly not a new one, as the idea of a united capitalist Europe was the subject of many summit conferences and of many diplomatic advances. Even then it was already dated material.

Generally speaking, the idea of a supra-national grouping, of a fusion of the capitalists states and nations in a larger community is as old as world capitalism itself. From its very inception, capitalism was being undermined by its built-in contradictions between the international character of production and the national character of bourgeois domination, a contradiction which capitalism was of course never able to solve.

The only supra-nationality that capitalism has ever known was the type imposed through war upon a weak bourgeois nation by a stronger one. The only example of a small bourgeois state being absorbed by a larger national state occurred when the latter destroyed the former. The North American states imposed the US supra-nationality on South American states during the Civil War which ended with a toll of one million dead. Hitler imposed some sort of supra-nationality on Poland, Czechoslovakia and Belgium with his powerful war machine; and despite the efficiency of his war machine, Hitler still preferred to come to an agreement with the state of the French bourgeoisie.

In the eyes of the bourgeoisie, the state, its state, is a weapon not only against the working class but also against foreign competitive bourgeoisies. A supra-national state acts in the former capacity, but not in the latter, at least not when the competitive bourgeoisie happens to be a part of the same supra-national state. The abandonment of the national state as a weapon for a national bourgeoisie means the latter's surrender to the merciless domineering bourgeoisie of the "supra-national" state. The only sincere "supra-nationalist" capitalist nations are the domineering ones, which can secure their hold over the supra-national state.

Belief in capitalist Europe's ability to overcome its divisions and create an economic entity capable of modifying relations between imperialist states, and of developing the European productive forces on a large scale represents only a utopian scheme. It also grants European capitalism progressive properties which it had actually lost a long time ago. Half a century ago, Trotsky wrote the following: "On this road, (unification of Europe) they can't go much beyond partial concessions and half-way measures. In this regard, an economic unification of Europe capable of providing huge advantages for producers and consumers, and in general for the whole cultural development, thus becomes the revolutionary task of the European working class in its struggle against imperialist protectionism and its tool militarism."

This and its conclusion is still valid today. In front of the vain and pitiful attempts of Capital to overcome the anachronistic division of Europe into rival states, the old slogan of working class revolutionaries still provides the only solution: the Socialist United States of Europe.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

SINO - AMERICAN RECONCILIATION

Nixon's trip to Peking in early 1972 brightly marked the renewal of the US relationships with Mao's regime, after twenty years of total isolation of people's China - an isolation due to the blockade carefully worked out by the US themselves.

Since 1949, Mao's regime lived on the legend it was an obstinate anti-imperialist country. Most of the legend was based on the breaking off from the US, though the rupture was not a Chinese decision. The fact that Nixon himself went to Peking to re-establish relationships - opposed to a Chinese leader coming to Washington, might be everywhere considered as a victory of People's China over imperialism.

Still the US always took the initiative from start to end, whether it was for rupture or for reconciliation.

WHY DID THE US TOOK A TURN IN THEIR POLICY TOWARD MAO'S CHINA ?

When the US broke off with People's China in 1949, in the Cold War period, they were clearly natifying that they would not tolerate any shift in favor of the soviet camp within the world relation of forces. When Mao was looking forward to settle an alliance with the USSR - and in this regard, he did not limit himself to USSR only - he placed himself in the enemy's camp, and was treated as such. That was a warning to all countries and governments that might have thought of an alliance with Moscow, or more simply that wanted to play on the US-USSR antagonism, in their own interests. The US summoned them to make a choice - and there was no possible escape.

Also, when the US sent their warships to Taiwan for protection, they were only putting into practice their "containment" policy which was going in the next period to be used against the Soviet camp. In so doing, they were opposing the nationalist desires of People's China, and prevented a complete unification of China, since they were supporting the Chiang Kai Shek clique against Mao's regime.

The situation looked quite different in the seventies. First, the Cold War and the "containment" policy were abandoned in favor of smoother policy of the US in relation to the USSR and its allies, and to the Third World nationalist movements. For the example set up by China for the Third World had then become blunt. Twenty years after, the limits of the Chinese experience had become evident and consequently such example was less praised in under-developed countries. So imperialism's fears were quietened about a possible extent of the Chinese formula. All the more so as Mao largely proved in his international policy that he did not bother about helping or initiating similar revolutions in other countries.

Last but not least, this is the rupture between USSR and China in the sixties which totally modified the international political game. The rupture came from China's fear to be abandoned by its Soviet ally in the the course of the US-USSR reconciliation. Then China became completely out off from the Soviet camp - a situation which wiped off the US's main grievance toward Mao's China and at the same time opened up for the US possibility to play on the China-USSR antagonism.

All these reasons account for the shift in the US' policy toward China. This policy had been forged in a quite different context, which no longer exists. The situation had become anachronistic. Moreover, to maintain such policy was becoming contradictory to the very interests of the United States.

But the immediate reason for Nixon's decision to be the initiator of the policy of outstretched hand to Mao, is based on the necessity for the US to find a settlement to the Vietnam issue (and this regardless of the fact that Nixon built up his political career as an outstanding anti-communist during the Cold War). In face of the Vietnamese people's heroic struggle, the US were forced into admitting that they were not able to win in Vietnam. To do so they would have been obliged to engage such important forces in the war that it would have resulted in a considerable overturn of American policy and economy. It was even hardly conceivable for the US to ever support the present war, since even a limited engagement brought forth political and financial difficulties. It was not worth doing it for the mere pleasure of keeping the NLF from seizing power in Saigon. This is why the US had to find out a solution - which would of course inevitably result in letting the NLF come to power in South Vietnam, whatever the forms and terms of it.

The US being forced are now ready to accept this. But here again they are in the same situation as in 1949, before China. With a different background, an other adversary faces them. What will inevitably appear as a victory of the nationalist forces, should not spread in the eyes of the US, especially in a region which has already proved to be unstable, as in Laos or Cambodia. Thus the settlement in South Vietnam must be a settlement for Southeast Asia, or possibly for all Asia. The US need China's help to impose the settlement, i.e., to impose status quo to all the nationalist movements in this area. This is this help that Nixon came for to Peking.

#### CHINA'S POLICY

The reestablishment of relationships with the United States could only be favored by People's China. For it implies it again has its part to play in the concert of nations, and more or less rapidly there will be put an end to the economic and political blockade China has been suffering from for twenty years.

First, as we previously stated, rupture from the United States was not China's deed, and it probably did not wish that.

Then, the end of ostracism can allow China to make itself heard in the concert of nations and to defend the interests of the Chinese state more easily - at least they believe so. The Chinese rush into all international organizations which simply half-opened their doors clearly bear proof of that, especially since the very same Chinese leaders were so patently looking down on the UNO in the days when they were not admitted in it.

Eventually, the more People's China develops (even though it is a very slow evolution), the more badly they need to reestablish exchanges on the world market. Indeed the nearly total rupture from the international market protected China from direct imperialist exploitation. As long as imperialist's direct investments in China are forbidden (the former investments have been nationalised), as long as exchanges are much reduced, if not totally suppressed, imperialists can hardly draw any surplus value out of China. On the other hand, China being cut from the world market, it could not obtain the necessary goods, machinery, licenses, modern techniques to proceed even to a small industrialisation, all things which can only be provided by imperialist countries with their high ranked technology and productivity. Of course, to get machinery, licenses and advanced techniques, China will have to exchange them for raw materials and produces of land. This implies that such trade would rapidly reach its limits, that of the Chinese economy, even though we suppose that the US obstacles are dismissed. Even a fierce dictatorship over the Chinese peasants and workers to force them into more production would be useless in front of that. Moreover this means that the more such trade develops, on the basis of unfair exchanges, the more China is likely to fall again under imperialist domination.

In this regard, when the Chinese leaders strive toward industrialization, they merely succeed in putting their country partly under the hold of imperialism again, though they initially tried to escape such domination. There lies the contradiction yielded by their nationalist policies.

#### CHINA IS READY TO SUPPORT IMPERIALIST STATUS QUO

Nobody knows exactly what's been said between Nixon, Kissinger and Co. and Mao or Chou en Lai. Still it is obvious that the American imperialists' main demand - which pushed them toward nearer relations with China - could only be met favorably by the Chinese leaders. And this for a very simple reason: because such demands cope with the basic policy of Peking.

For Peking is exclusively concerned with the defense of the Chinese state's interests. A status quo in Asia, warranted by the US, corresponds to these interests. For the immediate future at least, People's China main concern is to put aside the menace that imperialism had maintained over its head for the past twenty years.

Two recent clashes in Asia bear proof of China's willingness to be the warrant of status quo. In Bengla Desh and in Ceylon, People's China effectively stood for the governments then in power, and against the insurgent Bengali and Ceylonese people.

In Bengla Desh, a people was fighting for its own independence, and was denied it by a reactionary military government which was responsible for the genocide of Bengali people. In Ceylon, there <sup>was</sup> an upsurge of the masses against the left government of Mrs Bandaranaike - and what is worse, they more or less claimed to be Maoists.

In both cases, China aided with the governments in power, in defense of the status quo. In both cases it also sided with the US in practice.

Obviously, China can't help a lot in the settlement of war in Vietnam. The possible pressures it might exert on the Vietnamese people would not have any effect before the will of a people who's been fighting restlessly for 25 years against French imperialism first, then against the American imperialism and the puppet government in its pay. The settlement of war in Vietnam only depends on the relation of forces existing in Vietnam itself.

But we can expect China to weigh down on all other countries in Southeast Asia, either to stop the current struggles led by nationalist forces (Laos, Cambodia, Thailand) or to discourage those that might be induced to start such a fight. After what happened for Bengla Desh and Ceylon, every partisan of armed struggle against the governments in power is quite aware that he will have to face China's hostility.

#### THE TAIWAN ISSUE

In comparison with the main reasons which push the US and People's China toward restoring relationships, the Taiwan issue - which was viewed as the cornerstone in Sino-American relations - is then obviously put on a secondary level.

Mao had more difficulty to forget that American warships were still protecting the remairings of Chiang Kai Shek's regime when he received Nixon, than the latter had to abandon his old ally when the UNO asked Taiwan's delegates to give way to Mao's ones.

Actually the Chinese leaders are still hoping to unite Taiwan with China, and in this regard they dream of some political settlement with Chiang Kai Shek or his followers. This is expressed through many statements of the Chinese leaders displaying conciliatory feelings as regards the old Kuomintang dictator. This is also expressed by Chou En Lai in his last declarations to American journalists, stating that Taiwan capitalists could be granted the same advantages as the "nationalist capitalists" had enjoyed in China.

Such statements prove above all that the Chinese leaders themselves consider that there is no fundamental social contradiction between their own regime and that of Chiang Kai Shek. In their eyes it is possible to come to an agreement between the two regimes, with the support of the Taiwan bourgeoisie.

#### ALLIANCES REVERSED

Eventually the Sino-American reconciliation raises the problem of a possible reversal of alliances between the great powers, namely the US the USSR and China. Today the US are working on a settlement of their relationships with China, and in the meantime they are negotiating with the USSR.

China is lowering its attacks against the USSR, and in the meantime it defends its national interests on all fronts. It looks forward to negotiating not only with the US but also with minor imperialist powers such as Japan and Germany, for the latter ones rushed to Peking as soon as the US allowed them to.

But the fundamental shift actually occurred ten years ago when the USSR-China alliance was broken off. Here was the shift that opened up possibilities for the future.

The first possibility was that of an alliance of the China and the US against USSR.

Since in the present situation none of the great powers (nor even the minor ones) is forced into definitive choice, each of them can play its own game. Still in the eyes of imperialism, the enemy to be smashed is the USSR. In case of a world crisis, regroupments of forces will be done in relation to the conflict itself and to the US on one side, and the USSR on the other. Twenty years ago, China was unwillingly thrown into the Soviet camp. Today opportunities exist for it to come back into the US camp again.

Of course, this does not imply such a shift will be achieved in the months, or even in the years to come. We know still less about the roads and the means toward this goal. Maybe China and the US have enough good reasons to settle an alliance. Nonetheless there still exist various antagonisms, i.e., that of an imperialist country facing an underdeveloped country which tries to escape its domination. So we can expect the China-US relations to be tumultuous and intricate, according to circumstances and world policy, up to the moment when crucial necessities force each of them to make the fundamental choice.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM (Great Britain)

The present situation in Britain requires that Marxist leadership be linked with leadership within the working class, and, therefore, that the I. S. not limit itself, but be open to any worker ready to stand up within the factory and defend revolutionary ideas on basic points of principle -- to oppose racist ideas, to denounce British imperialism in Ireland, to differentiate him/herself clearly from the "left" trade union leaders who are ready to compromise over wages and union rights.

Although such workers are not fully formed, the job of the I. S. is to train them at the same time as we struggle to build an organization within the working class. The I. S. (GB) is trying to build an organization capable of rapid growth. Two years ago we had a membership of 1000; now we have about 2500, and that is only a beginning.

Starting with the problems daily confronting the workers, principally unemployment, the laws against the unions, rapid inflation especially of rents in government housing, the I. S. (GB) does its main work in the unions and among government housing project tenants. We seek to build I. S. fractions in factories and industries, to get out rank and file papers in particular industries. In tenants' work, we began with propaganda, a pamphlet showing the sharp increase in rents the government was preparing. I. S. (GB) works in existing tenants' associations, or, where they didn't exist, forms them. We also work in those Labor Party branches which expressed verbal opposition, but which were not prepared to organize action against the rent increases. We encourage the withholding of rent, and point out that the tenants' movement, to be successful, must develop links with the unions and organize industrial strikes against rent increases.

In addition, I. S. (GB) poses a political alternative to the Tory government in campaigning against the government around prices, rents, unemployment, and anti-union legislation, in effect calling for the overthrow of the present government. Such a call at this time is the equivalent of calling for a Labor government. If an election were provoked by working class action against the government, the only alternative would be a Labor government, and the I. S. would call on the workers to vote for the Labor Party.

To call for a Labor government with socialist policies, as the SLL is doing, would be to spread illusions. Furthermore, such a call is not sufficiently precise to expose the Labor Party, since abolition of the anti-trade union legislation and higher rent laws is precisely what a Labor government will not be able to do. The I. S. (GB) calls for the construction of a socialist alternative over the next few years.

The task of building the revolutionary party cannot be separated from our perspectives for the coming period. For example, if the crisis is already here, it is too late to start building the revolutionary party; it leaves time only to raise our flag and the barricades. But if we consider that the crisis is postponed to the far future, our only job is to preserve our cadre and continue our routine.

The I. S. (GB) makes this economic analysis: the boom of the permanent arms economy is now slowly ending, giving the perspective of the continuing development of big social struggles over several years.

There are two great dangers for small revolutionary organizations cut off from the working class: (a) becoming a sect by seeing its own organization as the already appointed vanguard of the working class, and seeing the greatest danger coming from

the groups closest to it, thus devoting its publications to attacks on its rivals; or (b) becoming opportunist, in the manner of Pabloism, being so struck by its own impotence that it looks everywhere for other forces to fulfill the revolutionary tasks. Any theory giving any progressive character to the "workers states" leads to the danger of developing such a reliance.

During the '50s and '60s there was apathy by the working class since progress was possible without a political perspective. Now the working class is becoming political, due not to the activities of revolutionaries, but to the attacks by the bourgeoisie, which results in a significant section of the working class being open to revolutionary ideas.

The bourgeois state exerts continual pressure aimed at swallowing the unions. The main pressure is exerted on the union bureaucrats (a) by putting legislative limits on unions to force the bureaucracy to help the state prevent the development of the union movement, (b) by productivity agreements and voluntary income agreements, so as to assimilate the bureaucracy as labor lieutenants of capital.

So far this has been prevented by a series of mass strikes, particularly those of the miners and dockers. Other strikes have shown the limits of the ability of the workers to counter bourgeois pressure on the bureaucrats, e. g. the refusal of the engineers' union ((mechanics in the U. S.)), a union under "left" leadership, where the CP is strong, to fight seriously. There the leadership broke the struggle up into local agreements.

In this context -- including that of the rising class struggle, I. S. perspectives are: There are limits to the fight for democracy within the unions in light of bourgeois pressure. But, in Great Britain, where (a) a large percentage of the working class is in the unions, it is necessary to exercise pressure and fight for democracy within the unions, and (b) where there is no political exclusion, as compared with the political nature of the unions for example in France, it is possible to conduct a political fight.

The relationship between union and political work inside the plants is one of the main tasks today. We organize more workers than our own militants because in Britain's situation, revolutionaries can organize open political discussion in the plants. Building discussion groups around our cells, as well as selling Socialist Worker inside the plants, is our open political intervention.

The I. S. (GB) has fractions of its own militants within the unions, with a large base in a number of them: construction, auto, print, draftsmen, mines, post office, power, teachers, electricians, steel, docks. We attempt to build rank and file organizations (caucuses) able to fight within the unions, while maintaining our own fractions. The rank and file caucuses fight around immediate needs and struggles, and relate to the general problems facing the union movement.

The caucuses are led by comrades, and ((in the unions underlined above)) put out their own papers every one or two months. The papers have a large circulation.

In a number of other industries, we work with members of the CP, sometimes dissidents, but the I. S. caucuses put out their own paper as well as a joint one.

We try to link up different strike committees to develop a real opposition to the bureaucrats within the unions. For example, one of the most important demands of the miners' caucus is that the miners must support the industrial action of the power workers.



It is necessary for our comrades to intervene politically and openly in such formations.

Critique by other groups

(1) Italian Internationalist Communist Party (Bordiguist): The I. S. (GB)'s minimum program clearly makes it Menshevik.

(2) I. S. (U. S.): We have reservations on I. S. (GB)'s methods of recruiting, and question whether such methods can produce an internally democratic organization. But they have a political strategy for the working class beyond joining the party, which is necessary and good. Their attitudes toward the Labor Party are not clear.

(3) Accion Comunista (Spain): Accion Comunista is democratic centralist, which leads to our wondering whether I. S. (GB) can maintain democratic centralism without real factory cells? We see a danger of social democratic degeneration. It is difficult to maintain democracy without cells. The problem arises of domination by the fully experienced, this leading to the others being made into second class citizens.

(4) Lutte Ouvrière: The I. S. (GB), presented with the problem of winning militant worker cadres, turning to revolutionary ideas, to the I. S., opens the doors to their organization wide on the basis of 3 points (as compared to 4 points last year). This means lowering the political level of the organization.

During an upsurge when workers are moving toward a revolutionary party due to events and the intervention of the party -- which must daily confront a rich and changing political life, politicization occurs very rapidly. That is not being done in Britain where the turn to revolutionary ideas is still minimum. So the role of a revolutionary organization is to win workers to a higher political level, to train them to be revolutionary cadres, to prepare for the coming tasks. Between initial contact and recruitment, it is necessary to have an intermediate organization of workers where they can act together and train themselves before joining. We have structure to allow organization of activist workers not yet ready to join around our ideas.

In our intervention we take account of the views of these workers, but to take them into the party means to water down our ideas and the surrender of the revolutionary organization. This is not a barrier to the entry of revolutionary workers; they now make up half our organization.

On elections: in imperialist countries the working class is under the domination of the Social Democracy or the CP. We must take account of this daily as well as in the elections. The problem is not to reinforce the illusions which we have the impression would be done in Britain by calling for the Labor Party to power, and by making further demands on them when they are in power -- always saying you can't cut yourselves off from the workers, saying a Labor government is the only solution the workers can see in the present situation. Even if it were true, it wouldn't be correct, because we must struggle against such illusions. We must explain that the Labor Party in power will solve nothing. We should develop an alternative point of attraction, even though it may be small. When we don't have the strength, we may only be able to criticize. If we have the strength, we should run our own candidates in order to give the workers a choice.

Response to the critiques by I. S. (GB):

It's not a question of 3 points. The basis of recruitment is the political statement

in Socialist Worker, the 3 points being only important examples. We wish to win workers committed to fighting around this program. The charge of lowering the political level to that of recent recruits is unfounded; we continue the political fight through education and political discussion with the organization, education and discussion aimed to raise the newest recruits to the level of the most experienced. It is true that only a minority of the working class, 1% in England now, is open to revolutionary ideas. The big problem is that we don't even reach and organize the 1%, not only to recruit them, but to create a whole range of intermediate organizations, rank and file caucuses for example.

We recruit workers who fight around the points we raise. We are not a social democratic organization with a passive membership. Workers are willing to make sacrifices to join us. Such workers have a role to play. We are building a combat organization. We have an internal life. We don't simply transmit an existing program to virgins.

Students who have studied and militants with 10 years in the plants have something to learn from each other, but the students have more to learn.

If an organization is built in struggle, the nature of the political debate will reflect the experiences of the militants in struggles. Only meaningful debate, not formal rights, provides democracy.

Regarding entry into the Labor Party: entry is a tactic, is empirical. Once we, and especially our youth, were in the Labor Party because that was the only way to establish contact with politicized workers. That is not true now. The Labor Party is no longer a live organization of militants in most places, but we are inside in the few cities where there is a live Labor Party group. If the Militant ((see below)) were correct, if there were big struggles by many workers within the Labor Party, we would not be absent.

Regarding electoral relations to the Labor Party: We oppose the slogan "Labor Party to power on a socialist program", because it is so vague as to be ineffective. The workers believe that the Labor Party is, not socialist, but represents some aspirations of the working class. It is organically linked to the unions. Millions pay dues, and every union local elects delegates on the local level to Labor Party congresses. So since we are fighting for our politics in the unions, we must have a position on the Labor Party.

Though certain small reforms are possible, a reforming Labor government like in 1945 is no longer possible. We must raise concrete issues to show the limits of a Labor government.

L.O. accuses us of going in a circle by supporting the Labor Party both in opposition and in power and in opposition, but support for the Labor Party is only a small part of our activity. Mainly we say it is necessary to build a combat organization to defend the workers against the Labor Party or the Tory government. That was not possible for us in 1964; it is now.

#### On the Common Market

Britain's entry into the Common Market is part of the general Tory policy for the workers. It will mean a sharp rise in prices, increased mergers leading to factory

closings and unemployment, and tax changes. All of this will hit the less developed regions the hardest.

The I.S. (GB) opposes and denounced labor people and Labor Party members voting for the Common Market.

Britain was twice refused entry into the Common Market. If that had been repeated, there would also have been a severe attack on the working class.

It is necessary to combat chauvinism in the British labor movement, as well as the chauvinist ideas of the CP and of the left of the Labor Party.

The issue of the Common Market allows us to raise internationalism in the labor movement, not abstractly, but the concrete problems related to it, the international problems of capitalism.

The L.O. document omits (we are not criticizing what's included) the fact that capitalism is increasingly functioning in an international way, that workers must face the problems of the international corporations, that workers must have a strategy against the growing threat to workers' organizations that limit themselves to the national framework. For international companies can break strikes by switching production from one country to another. They can close one factory and move production to a country where workers are less organized and less well paid. For example, when a British factory was being moved to Spain, I. S. (GB) got information from Accion Comunista on wages and working conditions, and thus was able to pass this information on to the workers at the British factory affected. This was an example of international cooperation on a small scale.

There is the serious problem of regional underdevelopment which can't be solved by the Common Market, because decisions about where to place factories are made by companies not under the control of a national or supranational state or body. So the problems of Scotland, Ireland, or Southern Italy can't be solved by a capitalist Europe, but only by a United Socialist States of Europe. This enables us to raise the question of the United Socialist States of Europe as the real answer to the workers' problems.

International cooperation by the workers is more important to the problems raised by the international companies than is the Common Market. For example, Ford plants exist in Britain, Germany, and Belgium, the last two being in the Common Market, while Britain is not. Or last summer the strike at the Dunlop-Pirelli rubber plants was an important step toward international cooperation by the workers, some in and some out of the Common Market.

Setting up international committees of workers' delegates from international companies is an important task for the coming period. Revolutionary organizations, even though small, must play a role here because the larger organizations that could play a role, don't.

#### On Sino-American Rapprochement

That China had no workers' revolution and is not a revolutionary force, and that

China is a backward country explain its present political position. The Sino-U.S. rapprochement is due to common interests in stabilizing Asia.

If we reconsider the Russian question, that is state capitalism in Russia, led by a Stalinist party, we can understand the antagonisms between China and Russia. The initial problems of Chinese economic development were closely related to her economic dependence and to her imperialist domination by a state capitalist country. The present situation can be traced to the economic break between Russia and China, which was due to the unequal relationship between the two. The break ended Russian aid and led the Chinese to attempt to develop state capitalism in isolation. Their failure, and the continuing conflict, explain the shifting pattern of alignments between Russia, China, and the United States.

I. S. (GB) cannot agree with L. O.'s conclusions on the alignments between the three, since Russia, too, is enjoying a rapprochement with imperialism, and from a stronger economic situation. All 3 countries played a counterrevolutionary role in Ceylon.

The Chinese leaders are desperately attempting to develop in an imperialist world where this is impossible without world revolution. This aim of economic development leads them to search in many directions for economic aid. They failed in isolation in a world where capitalism continues its accumulation. The Chinese Stalinists know they can't develop under the domination of a single imperialism, so they try to balance between Russian state capitalism and Western imperialism. They will resist whichever of the two is most threatening, playing one against the other or themselves against both. This is not due to fear of an abstract rapprochement between the U.S. and Russia. Saying so is not necessary to explain that China is not a revolutionary force.

#### MILITANT (Great Britain)

It is necessary to build a revolutionary party to take power and build socialism, but history shows that the working class doesn't move directly to revolutionary solutions. We have disagreements with nearly all the other groups at the conference who imply that the class will move directly from being followers of the Social Democrats or the CP to the revolutionary party. That is true only of a tiny minority.

As the economic crisis develops, the mass will initially turn toward the existing traditional mass organizations, no matter how treacherous they have proven themselves. This will lead some leaders of these organizations to turn to the right and collaborate with the government; others will move left to be able to reflect the pressure of the rank and file, as has happened in some unions. So all the main movements will be in the mass organizations which will go through a process of development of left reformist or centrist character. The possibility of building a mass revolutionary party from these organizations will thus open up. We can't bypass this process by declaring ourselves the Revolutionary Party to which the workers will come.

((Editor's note: Militant members are deeply buried in the British Labor Party.))

This the I. S. (GB) understands, as is shown by their saying that tens of thousands of workers won't immediately accept a revolutionary program. But they conclude they must create a left reformist or centrist organization in which they will then intervene with their ideas. Such an idea is either utopian or a Frankenstein monster: without a clear revolutionary Marxist program, in a situation where the I. S. (GB) had to take

power, they would be incapable of giving revolutionary leadership. They are sectarian organizationally, opportunist politically.

We must be inside in order to intervene in the inevitable struggles in the mass organizations -- the Labor Party in Britain, the CP in France, the SPD in Germany -- in order to counterpose Marxist revolutionary ideas to the new "left" leadership.

Calling for the Labor Party to power on a socialist program shows you know the Labor Party leaders are incapable. It is necessary to raise the demand to expose the illusions of many workers. Revolutionaries must go through the experience with the workers. The program must be spelled out in detail in regard to the workers' needs.

But calling for the Labor Party to power on a reformist program creates illusions in the leadership because this is not the final stage of the crisis where no reforms are possible. Repeal of the Industrial Relations Act will be carried out by a Labor government. There is a great danger that if a revolutionary party wins a small number of workers, it could split them from the mass of the workers who have illusions in the CP and Labor Party.

The unions are enmeshed with the state for historical reasons. So they can't be torn loose in a period when workers are not militant, when there is no crisis. A crisis is now developing. It is causing attacks by the capitalists. These attacks have led to working class militancy which is preventing the bureaucrats from maintaining integration of the unions with the state. Either the leaders will be replaced, or they will verbally turn toward the left, as has happened already in several big union elections. The "lefts" are as incapable of resolving the workers' problems as are the "rights", but left words feed rank and file militancy and produce illusions among the rank and file -- a process that has not yet occurred but will come in other western European countries.

The role of revolutionaries in the unions is not big, since the "lefts" words will take the workers in, and make it more difficult for revolutionaries. We must put forth an uncompromising revolutionary position in the unions to differentiate our ideas from those of the "left", not just call for revolution. We put forth the demands of the Transitional Program in specific situations.

We are against groups based on minimum demands against the bureaucracy. Organizing around minimum demands will lead to attracting increasing numbers of workers to such a group. This will result in the group's developing illusions on the impact of its "revolutionary" ideas. The mass is not ready in this period. We can't artificially separate the unions from political struggles. Workers won't spontaneously form national rank and file committees. They will first turn to the traditional organizations despite the historical role of the latter. We must intervene in the struggles to win the workers to revolutionary ideas.

#### Critique by other groups

(1) I. S. (U. S.): We reject the views of the Militant since the British working class does not have illusions that the Labor Party is socialist.

(2) I. S. (GB): Regarding the "left" turn of the bureaucracy, the Militant never mentioned the necessity of an open independent political presence, the necessity of denouncing the traditional organizations of the working class as well as the leadership.

This is absolutely essential for serious intervention in the union movement. It is not in contradiction with the attempt to build a broad base within the unions around union democracy, against racism, against the union bureaucracy, and for the immediate demands of the workers. It is possible to create such a base without insisting that all workers involved completely understand the Transitional Program, because there is a difference between mass organizations fighting within the unions on union questions and a political organization which must be at the heart of such a formation. Many thousands of workers really want to fight against the bosses, and against the government, but are not yet fully convinced of all the details of the revolutionary program.

(3) *Lutte Ouvrière*: Regarding a pre-revolutionary period and a "left" turn by some bureaucrats: this never extends to restoring workers democracy in the unions because the bureaucrats are opportunists. We must break the union machines and fight for the workers to take control of all their organizations.

### On Sino-American Rapprochement

The Vietnam war has led to a crisis in the U.S. China has developed economically, is not dependent on the world market, and has the most stable bureaucracy in the world. As a bureaucracy, it wants to maintain the status quo. (No workers democracy exists, so China is a degenerated workers state.) The bureaucracy will draw great advantages from capitalist technique, but involvement in the world market will not make China more dependent. It has not made the Soviet Union more dependent. Trade will strengthen China more than it will the capitalist economies.

The main problem for the bureaucrats is not economic, but the danger of political revolution by the working class. The bureaucracy is becoming more and more of a fetter on the productive forces, as for example in Poland in 1970. There are no intermediate layers between the workers and the bureaucracy. This is the main difference between a degenerated workers state and capitalism. Once the workers go into action, the bureaucracy will collapse like a house of cards.

That's what forces the bureaucracy to seek rapprochement with capitalism.

The main enemy of the bureaucrats and of the capitalists is the working class in its own country.

### LENINIST FRACTION (Denmark)

What is a party? We think it should be in the working class. The problem of the relationship between the party and the class is not an organizational question. The cell connects the economic struggle in the factories and the political class struggle against the capitalists and the state. The cell will be able to build strike and factory committees when the level of struggle rises.

We have the same policy of building rank and file groups of socialist sympathizers around us as does the I.S. (GB).

The great majority of Danish, Swedish and German strikes are spontaneous and absolutely out of the control of the unions. Although the strikes may have very radical demands, because of the weakness of the revolutionary organizations, they are usually taken over by Stalinist shop stewards, turned aside from the demands, and stopped.

When this has not happened, victories have been won.

Our position on revolutionary intervention in the unions is close to that of L. O. But a contradiction exists in that most fights occur outside of the unions and against them. A large part of the working class is more revolutionary than its leaders, but the leadership still manages to keep its confidence.

The contradiction is very clear in Denmark, where nearly all the workers are in one union federation, with the highest percentage of organization in the world. Though the level of struggle is lower than that in France, Britain, or Italy, Denmark in the recent past has been having the highest number of strikes in the last 50 years.

#### Comments by L. O.

That most struggles work through the unions is not in contradiction with recent events wherein most militants were opposed to the union leadership.

L. O. has led many struggles as leading union militants in the factory, in political opposition to the union bureaucracy, e. g. at Renault during the 1971 strike, where the best known militants were in the CFDT; but the policy was not that of the CFDT, but of L. O. Or at Polymechanique where we worked in FO against the CGT in the plant, but the FO confederation wouldn't have approved what we did.

#### On the Common Market

We have just been involved in the first mass struggle to have reached layers of the working class never before reached, the struggle against Denmark's joining the Common Market.

The situation of the 3 Scandinavian countries is as follows: a falling rate of profit, stagnation in Europe, monetary crisis (having, however, nothing to do with the Labor Committee's vision of catastrophe). The falling rate of profit has reinforced the capitalists' realization that they must destroy small non-profitable enterprises and attack world working class standards. It is this attack which has produced most European strikes.

We agree with L. O. against the various so-called Fourth International groups who claim that capitalist integration is possible, who claim that the Common Market offers protection against U. S. economic domination.

European capital has not been progressive since 1916. A united capitalist Europe would not be progressive. It is a reactionary utopia to fight monopoly except through socialist revolution.

But that L. O. doesn't think a united capitalist Europe is possible is a different form of economic determinism and is absurd. We are not convinced by arguments that capitalist competition is inevitable, that existing national states' giving up their sovereignty is impossible without military force since it has never happened before, since no step in that direction has been taken since the beginning of the Common Market.

The Common Market rests on production, on the relationship of forces between the bourgeoisie and the working class. L. O. ignores the independence of the political level as well as the relations of strength between the classes.

A Common Market state apparatus would represent the interests of a fraction of European capitalism against other capitalists and, above all, against the European

working class, the Danish workers included.

The fight against the Common Market should be a fight for the interests of the international working class. The eventual building of a Common Market state would be a threat to socialist revolution. The fight against the Common Market must be a part of the fight for socialism, a fight for the United Socialist States of Europe and of the world.

Questions we must face are: What does building a state apparatus for socialist revolution mean? Can the European working class intervene against the construction of a supranational capitalist state in order to defend its ability to struggle?

#### Comments by L. O.

The Common Market is a partial and temporary attempt by the European economies to confront certain problems. This raises the level of consciousness of some sections of the working class, but not real consciousness of the difficulties faced. It is necessary to struggle against the underlying conditions. The Common Market doesn't prevent struggles within the Common Market nations. It doesn't mean that the bourgeoisie is better armed against the working class. We must organize ourselves to fight optimistically and to show the workers that if the capitalists force us to struggle on a continental scale, that will be better for the workers than for the capitalists.

#### PROLETARIAN SOCIALISTS (Denmark)

We are in basic agreement with the L. O. document on Sino-U.S. rapprochement. We have differences on what L. O. leaves out. We believe the source of the Chinese-U.S. agreement lies, not in the Sino-Soviet split, but further back: the Bandung conference with the nationalists, the 1954 Geneva conference, Indonesia as an example of Chinese foreign policy. All resulted from the non-proletarian character of the Chinese state as well as of the Chinese revolution, i. e. from China's nationalist program under the leadership of the bloc of four classes.

We disagree with L. O.'s saying that Southeast Asian nationalists will no longer have illusions about China. In Bangla. Desh the Maoists are still excusing the Chinese role.

We disagree with L. O. on a future regroupment of revolutionary forces as a result of the Sino-U.S. rapprochement. The proletariat cannot take sides in a conflict between China and Russia.

We have another difference. What constitutes a proletarian revolution? Some here ((the Labor Committee and the Militant)) have illusions about workers states and the NLF. Such differences make discussion of the China-U.S. document impossible.

#### COMMUNIST WORKERS GROUP (K. A. G.) (Sweden)

We agree with L. O. in general, but we must approach the problem from the Swedish point of view, which is similar to the Danish.



The 1969-70 Swedish strike movement broke the 40 year hegemony of reformism, dating back to the time when the unions became tied to the state by anti-strike laws and through Social Democratic control. The Social Democrats have been in the government since 1932, in the leadership for most of that period. During this whole time, corporate agreements have replaced the class struggle.

The striking workers had to organize themselves against both the bosses and the unions. Large meetings elected strike committees. The unions tried to send the workers back prior to negotiating.

After the strike wave, the strike committees continued. The iron mines were most important; there they collected very large sums which the workers contributed to help other unofficial strikes, that is to say all the strikes.

In 1971 there was a conference of strike committees to exchange experiences, and they decided that such meetings should continue.

In 1972 the conference was bigger, due to the participation of Left groups. This led to the organization of "Workers Solidarity", whose aim is to set up a network of contacts to support strikes in process. The most conscious, militant, and experienced workers are involved.

But most workers are still reformist. Laws and contracts made it necessary for the strike movement to be built outside the unions, though preparations are being made inside the unions.

Our task in the unions is to fight for democracy and against anti-strike laws.

We expect the situation to stay the same for some time. The movement is just beginning. We welcome the experience and advice of others, for example on what to do when plant closures are threatened.

#### Comments by L. O.

L. O. is for the formation of strike committees for the same reason as we are for union democracy -- because workers must control their own affairs, decide their own program and how to win their demands. A strike committee can reach out to the workers of other factories and organize financial support or generalize the strike.

#### POUM (Spain)

((The POUM made its first intervention at the conference with what struck me as a distinctly reformist analysis of the period, on which I did not take notes. On the other hand, the POUM gave the most complete explanation of the situation in Spain at the present time; for that reason, their views here precede those of Accion Comunista. For additional information on workers' struggles in Spain, see International Bulletin #2.))

In Spain, under fascism, where there can be no legal class organization, struggles have been mounting for 12 years, struggles centered in individual factories, then corporation by corporation, then by industrial sectors, at first on a local level, today on the citywide level by all workers in a single industry.

The Asturian miners have been conducting a struggle for years, 6 years, at Vigo and El Ferrol until just a few weeks ago. This struggle was originally limited to one sector. The workers were directly confronted with the power of the state and with a struggle against the regime, i. e. a struggle against capitalism. There has been increased government resistance. The regime has been aware of the workers' struggles since the confrontations of November-December 1970, the most brutal in 10 years. 14 workers were murdered by the cops and the army.

The CP, in an empiricist way, speaks of the liberalization of the regime, of its becoming neo-fascist, a soft dictatorship!

Behind all these events there is a particular background -- the Spanish Civil War, when the capitalists nearly lost their factories, when the workers became aware of the need to take them over. That struggle remains in the consciousness of all classes. The regime may adopt a tactic of changing its facade, remaining always really the same, just older, with its central aim being to prevent the development of independent working class organizations, to stop the political development of Spain -- which is utopian. Different layers of the population are coming into contradiction with the regime. The working class is struggling for its most basic needs.

Perspectives of the struggle are: to reconquer the elementary rights to meet, to organize, to have a press. This is basic, a fact not understood by most left groups. The POUM differentiates itself from the opportunist CP, which refuses to put forth these basic demands.

What forces are on the workers' side?

The CP has the deepest roots, and profits from the deepest hopes of the workers to try to make compromises with the bourgeoisie.

The SP (social democrats) and their union, the UGT, which do not have deep roots in the class.

The Anarchists and their union, the CNT.

Different left groups, some only students and of fleeting existence, some of Catholic and other origin, but inside the class, operating clandestinely.

The POUM is at the base of the Asturian broad united social action group, which is developing consciousness in action; in the Catalan Social Movement, which is in the Workers Commissions and does political work in the mass working class organization; and in the mass cultural organizations. We are in contact with groups with positions close to ours throughout Spain; including Accion Comunista; we exchange internal documents and put out common publications, etc.

The revolutionary party of the Spanish working class will be built on the basis of struggle by the coming together of the different groups which have arisen under the clandestine conditions of the Spanish struggle, to create the basis of a mass party in the Spanish working class.

### On the Common Market

Marx always investigated the actual tendencies of capitalist development. Lenin never said that imperialism is permanent; until destroyed by the proletarian revolution,

capitalism will continue to restructure itself.

German customs unity led to political unity. Of course we fight for the United Socialist States of Europe, but we must also prepare ourselves to fight against capitalist unification.

### On Sino-American Rapprochement

The enthusiasm of the Chinese revolution led world imperialism, with the U.S. at its head, to impose a total blockade. That limited Chinese development. Except in Korea and Indo-China, the blockade crushed the revolutionary wave. The Vietnam war led U.S. imperialism to the edge of a financial crisis; the U.S. could have won by an atomic war, but that was impossible in the world situation.

China's need for technique -- which can be provided only by the capitalist countries -- will lead to her being exploited by the unequal exchange, just as other countries that broke with imperialist domination have been exploited. But every revolutionary country has the right to use these means for economic development.

Imperialism cannot crush revolutions that have taken place. It has been led to the edge of financial crisis by the Vietnam war. This is what led the U.S. to make an agreement with the Chinese.

China will sacrifice countries and movements struggling against imperialism, and for this she must be condemned.

The relations between China and the Soviet Union reflect political and economic contradictions, which are increased by the hegemonic policy of the Soviet Union and the nationalist policy of China. A conflict between Russia and China would be a catastrophe for the world workers movement, but is not likely. Since they cannot now normalize relations or make war, relations will stay as they are until new conditions arise.

The agreements between China and the U.S. correspond with and are subordinated to worldwide relationships. For that reason they are not likely to last.

If the world socialist revolution is the main enemy of imperialism, Russia is the main enemy of world imperialism. In case of military conflict between Russia and China, a U.S. -China alliance can be ruled out, because the U.S. would lose, such a conflict setting off a world revolution. It is more likely that World War III would lead to world revolution, which, by its socialist character would put questions in quite a different light.

### ACCION COMUNISTA (Spain)

The objective situation in Spain forces revolutionary groups to develop in complete isolation from each other, then to realize that they have a number of common views. They conduct political discussions among themselves, and work together, for example setting up pickets, issuing leaflets.

We often do common propaganda work where there are several groups with similar positions. We are not afraid of our militants reading the publications of others. We even share internal documents.

There are some groups in regions where Accion Comunista has no organization. There our comrades work with other groups; where we have groups, comrades from other groups work with us. This is not "entry", as we openly defend our different political opinions.

Groups with big differences work together. We work, for example, with POUM, to issue pamphlets together, because it is useless to do the historical research separately. The only group with which all the other groups have problems is the Communist League (United Secretariat of the Fourth International) which considers itself already the party. Experience with the Maoists created widespread suspicion and anxiety about being absorbed.

The question of collaboration with other groups is related to building a party. It is just a question of time for the groups to fuse. We are in transition on political issues. If we agree, it is inconvenient for the groups to have different names.

In Spain our work is among industrial workers. We aim first at individual recruitment, which is very difficult and very slow. Secondly, we work in mass organizations. Unlike previously, we now work among students, teachers, doctors, etc.

Workers' Commissions were the spontaneous response of the class to the problems arising 4 or 5 years ago, e. g. the new contracts, and because management wanted to discuss directly with the workers and not through the fascist unions which the workers don't recognize.

In the first period there was an important development of the commissions. The CP tried to build against the commissions, as did a few left Catholic groups among the workers, e. g. the USO. But when the CP realized the Commissions were the workers' response to concrete problems, they threw themselves in, in order to try to control them. Sometimes the CP formed new commissions, succeeded in attracting more people, and made the apparatus put forth CP politics in the name of the Workers Commissions. This led to the decay of the commissions, since the CP's opportunism did not represent the workers.

It is important to fight the CP. Left sectarians called for revolutionary and anti-imperialist workers commissions and pretended to be them. That is now changing.

There are now two important plain Workers Commissions where revolutionaries have some influence and sometimes some control, where revolutionaries represent the workers in the factories and have led strikes during the last years. These strikes have met a response even outside Spain. They also provided different revolutionary groups with the chance to discuss politics in front of the workers who could then choose.

In Greater Barcelona the CP-controlled apparatus controls very few factories. There is real coordination, especially in engineering, where revolutionary groups have power. There are 3 or 4 revolutionary groups. Their influence in the plants depends on the size of their following. There is coordination within the regions of Barcelona and in the region as a whole. The revolutionaries were able to introduce the slogan of boycott in the fascist union elections which the CP supported. Support amounted to the same thing as participation. In the big auto plant, SEAT, the CP is stronger than we are. That was the only plant where the boycott was not effective. That the CP strategy was wrong was proved during the strike at SEAT when the delegates were fired.

### On Sino-American Rapprochement

China is not the agent of world revolution, nor will it be on the side of the U.S. in a world conflict. China is not state capitalist. China, as an underdeveloped country, must reach out for technique.

A socialist system must be world wide. - Neither China nor Russia is interested in building socialism on a world scale. There cannot be "socialism in one country", so contradictions are increasing in those countries, leading them to reach outside in order to develop their economies.

The concrete situation at the time of a crisis will determine which side Russia and/or China will be on.

### INTERNATIONALIST COMMUNIST PARTY (Italy)

((Aside from my imperfect notes on their intervention at the conference, these comrades requested that I include in the International Bulletin several paragraphs of an editorial they had recently published. To try to make their position comprehensible, admittedly difficult, I have edited and incorporated their translation of the article into the presentation. Paragraphs from the article are marked \* .))

The Italian situation calls for a certain type of struggle and party. 1969 saw the bombings in Milan and the Reggio Calabria murders.

Since 1968 Italian imperialism has been in economic crisis. This has resulted in two basic divisions among the bourgeoisie: fascist and reformist. Neither provides any solution, but they fight against each other. In the '70s we must prepare against fascism, the only bourgeois solution.

\* The new Andreotti government has already inaugurated an open anti-working class policy. It pushed toward police control of the workers' movement within the framework of the open class collaboration of the union organizations. Its character is that of support to monopoly capital with state funds and with the mechanism of stealing from the masses. So it is destined to deepen social tensions and to accentuate more and more the contradictions existing between the reformist and fascist wings of the bourgeoisie.

Since 1968 the ministers and trade union bureaucrats have had a real problem controlling the working class movement. Stalinist reformism can't control the class or provide a solution.

\* If the movement has lost in breadth, it has increased in depth. The struggles of the last years did not weaken it. On the contrary rather, it has been developing toward autonomy; the struggles strengthened the more active elements. Since 1971, that is since the struggles for employment and against the worsening of the conditions of life have intensified, becoming of first importance, certain political developments have occurred. This development has been reflected on the level of class consciousness with a slow but continuous movement of working class elements to revolutionary positions; and not only on the level of consciousness, but also on the forms of struggle, raising the number of solidarity strikes, the tendency to transform the struggle for defense of jobs into a struggle for guaranteed wages, etc.

\* The strength of the workers' combativity hardens the social contradictions and thus the necessity for the bourgeoisie to contain the working class. To this necessity is counterposed the will for better conditions and development of the working class. On this basis the struggle tends to become violent.

\* Certainly, to understand this well, we mustn't confuse political development with the unity of the working class. Political development is taking place, and it can continue because the average worker, the worst paid worker, the unemployed understand that there is a difference between their interests and those of the labor aristocracy. So they understand that it is necessary to substitute -- for the methods and aims of the workers' aristocracy, of the unions -- the methods and aims of the majority of the working class.

Divisions in the working class are healthy -- since the interest of the workers' aristocracy is more and more the same as those of monopoly capital, and is opposed to those of the working class as a whole, employed and unemployed. The division of interests between the workers' aristocracy and the class as a whole reflects the divisions between the class in the north and those in the south, between those employed in large factories and those in small. The struggle is so bitter that it is leading to a situation of civil war.

The difference between layers of the class is so big that you cannot defend the worker aristocrats, but must fight them. That 40,000 northern workers went south to demonstrate against southern workers whom they called fascists means that the northern workers are racists. But we defend the same northern workers against the capitalists.

\* The unity of the working class, which the workers' aristocracy proposes, is a corporate unity, which prevents any political development at all. So, if today we see the sharpening of certain internal divisions in the working class, we must not see in this a symptom of disunity and regression; on the contrary, we must see in this a sign of real working class unity on a revolutionary basis, built up in opposition to the old reformist unity. A political development of the working class is inconceivable in the present historical period without an open conflict with the workers' aristocracy.

\* The period 1968-69, with its tremendous mass strikes, left an example of the typical form of working class unity: spontaneous unity. This form of unity is not repeatable in today's conditions, and moreover, it would be a step backward to want to repeat it today. The unity that is necessary today, after 4 years of non-stop working class struggles, is proletarian unity based on political consciousness, on revolutionary consciousness. It is on the basis of this need that we must consider the movement and the actual tendency of the working class.

The party is the organ of battle of the proletariat to bat down the bourgeoisie and to build a communist society. It therefore has no interests different from those of the proletariat. For that reason the revolutionary party is necessary and irreplaceable. The party is the most conscious fraction of the working class.

The relationship between the party and the unions is that the unions are not simply an organ of the economic struggle, but an organ of the class struggle that support the party in the fight for socialism. The party fights against the unions' indifference to politics. The unions have degenerated; it is this that has resulted in differences between the party and the unions. The degeneration of the unions results from pressures on

them from the workers aristocracy, from the monopolies, and from the state.

To fight opportunism, real intervention in the class is necessary. The unions today are instruments of class collaboration, agents of capitalist programming in the working class, and therefore social-imperialist. This can't be overcome as long as the revolutionary party's influence in the class is so low. Since the class base of the unions remains, the unions remain mass organizations of the working class, and must deal with working class needs.

We work in the CGIL ((the CP-dominated national confederation)), but not due to a preconceived attitude toward the others ((the Catholic CISL and the right-wing social democratic UIL. Unity discussions have been in process between the 3 for the past year or so.)) We are not opposed to unification of the unions, as unification would make possible our having wider influence.

We can't limit ourselves to propaganda work. We must become an organ of battle, a party, the organization of the conscious vanguard, to show the working class how to fight physically against fascism which is developing among the petty and big bourgeoisie in the big cities, which aims to attack the struggling workers, their picket lines, and to kill revolutionaries. Against fascism there can be no hesitation on the means of defense, there can be no illusions on bourgeois democracy. Self-defense groups must be organized in factories and working class neighborhoods and among students against the fascist tendencies.

We are also fighting reformism, its sabotage of working class struggles. We are fighting for a guaranteed minimum wage of 150,000 lire ((about \$250)) a month for employed and unemployed. There are 3 million unemployed and 3 million Italian workers abroad who, during a serious depression, will eventually return. We are opposed to the fight to reduce the working week to 36 hours.

We also oppose organizing struggles against factory closings. We explain to the workers that the closing is due to the decay of the imperialist system, and raise the demand that the government pay wages to the unemployed. To demand that the factory stay open or that it open again would mean that when it inevitably closes again a month or so later, the workers would be demoralized.

The reformists hate us; they limit themselves to the defense of the employed and of the worker aristocracy. This really means surrender to the Italian monopolists, without fighting against what is called increased productivity. The worker aristocrats, the employed are ready to work overtime for a little more money, to accept the unemployment of thousands and thousands of other workers.

The CP signed a contract in the chemical industry, which means a 3 year truce, and their parliamentary deputies accepted a law allowing management to fire a million workers in both large and small factories. They invited the government to send the army against the unemployed of Reggio Calabria in 1971.

Workers discuss problems in the factories and follow the union leadership, but this hasn't raised the level of consciousness of the working class. It only gave new leaders to the union machine to fight for the interests of the worker aristocracy. The revolutionary and most militant workers and the unemployed had to fight against this form of workers democracy.

The question in Italian factories is not to fight for working class democracy, but to fight to give roots to a revolutionary leadership. We don't need to denounce the

union machine, the workers already know they must fight it and have been fighting it for 4 years.

What is needed is a political leadership, a revolutionary party. The political struggle in the working class is not between the reformists and the left groups, but between the left groups for effective leadership. We fight against other left groups who have wrong policies, e. g. Avanguardia Operaia and Lotta Continua. We consider them reformists.

We want to develop internationalist nuclei in the factories, representatives of the party in the factories, to undertake activity on the economic, political and ideological levels -- activity not related to workers democracy. The centrists have no perspectives of fighting for the workers' needs. They want to fight against the bureaucrats on the basis of workers democracy alone. In the fight against the telephone workers' contract, so as to lead the struggle even though together we were only a minority, with Avanguardia Operaia we organized a demonstration by 5000 workers in Milan and thus prevented President Leoni from coming to Milan.

Also the contract in the chemical industry, the left minority organized demonstrations against the will of the bureaucrats and worker aristocrats. This was possible due to working not only in the unions, but also with the most militant workers outside the unions who fight daily against the bureaucracy.

Revolutionary worker cadres won't be educated only by work in the factory, but rather only in the party. They must then link themselves with the working class, and not only in regard to the unions. So we develop factory cells which also work in unions and which represent our attempt to resolve the relationship between the party and the class.

Union mass work, on the basis of the material and political interests of the working class, is the most important work of the revolutionary party. Its purpose is not to denounce reformism and fight for the unity of the class, but to develop class consciousness in the most exploited part of the working class, to link the most exploited with the unemployed (whose numbers are rising due to the crisis) to fight against the interests of the labor aristocracy and its union bureaucracy, which, in turn, is linked with the monopolies and state capitalism.

Working class democracy is a mechanical formula of Trotskyism. It does not separate the interests of the most exploited from those of the worker aristocracy. Their interests at the moment are completely different.

#### Critiques, (1) by L. O., (2) by the POUM:

(1) It is hard to know other countries; we can understand some things about Italy, but not the real situation. But a pre-civil war situation is not clear from your description. A pre-civil war situation would mean an international civil war. Really, repression against revolutionaries is not the same thing as against the working class.

(2) Your refusal to fight for workers democracy shows a mistrust of the working class, and a negation of socialism which is workers democracy. At a low level of workers consciousness, the majority organizations can distrust workers democracy, but revolutionaries cannot.

#### On Sino-American Rapprochement

Historically China has two great enemies: Russia and Japan.



Russia has imposed territorial demands. Chinese animosity increased after World War II because of the Russian state capitalists' stealing Manchuria. A big part of the Russian army is now on China's borders, threatening Sinkiang and Outer Mongolia. Russia is trying to control China through an alliance with Japan and through its 1971 alliance with India.

Japan is China's competitor for the domination of Asia.

China doesn't see the U.S. as an historical enemy. This can be seen from Mao's 1930s policy. He was then willing to ally himself economically and militarily with the U.S. against Japan and Russia.

China knows she can't play a world role, but can only serve as a lieutenant of the U.S. in Asia. This was evident in her actions toward Ceylon and Bangla Desh.

This is a period of collapse of the post World War II imperialist situation, which was based on the hegemony of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. That hegemony has been shaken in Europe by the commercial war led by European imperialism in the '60s and at present. In Asia it has been shaken by the rapid development of Japan.

We are seeing a resurgence of the imperialists beaten in World War II, Italy, Germany, and Japan. This brings into question the Yalta agreements, and leads to a new division of the world. Aggravation of the reactions of the competitors will lead to friction and to wars.

China is participating from a subordinate position. She represents 1% of world commerce and 25% of the world population. Thus she is potentially a tempting market. The temptations of her market are resulting in reconciliation with Japan. This is a new stage of Chinese policy and of Asian imperialism. China is trying to weaken the two superpowers who are now most threatening to her. She must rely on conflicts between the rival imperialisms.

China's main enemy is Russia. Without war or an alliance nothing is stable, but this is a transitional period allowing China to break out of Russian-Indian-Japanese encirclement.

L.O. doesn't recognize the capitalist nature of Russian exploitation of China, nor the role of Japan in Asia, a role historically more important than that of the U.S. L.O. gives a superficial examination of the relations between China, Russia, and the U.S.

#### ZENSHIN (National Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League) (Japan)

The National Committee of the Japan Revolutionary Communist League is known as Zenshin (Forward), that is by the name of their weekly newspaper, which has a circulation of 80,000. Zenshin has 2 mass youth organizations: the Marxist Young Workers League (which is one of the tendencies in the Anti-War Youth Committee, Hansenseineniinkai, or Hansén for short) and a youth organization, Chukaku ("Core", a Leninist conception) with important influence in the student youth movement, Zengakuren. ((Zengakuren dates from 1948.))

((According to the Chukaku member with whom I spoke in August 1969 in Tokyo: In 1958 the left split from the Japan CP, initially forming an organization called the

Communist League or Bund. The Bund has continued, but another split-off occurred in 1960-61, resulting in the establishment of the Revolutionary Communist League (Kakamaru) and the Marxist Student League (MSL) which participated in the Zengakuren. In 1963 the Revolutionary Communist League split into the Kakamaru and Chukaku factions. All groups are active in the Zengakuren. The Chukaku member in 1969 estimated that the anti-activist CP group, Minsei, had 15,000 members, Kakamaru between 1000 and 2000, Chukaku 3000, and two separate organizations originating in the Bund 2000 and 1500.))

The Zenshin speaker at the conference stated that his organization came into existence in 1959, just before the 1960 struggle against the renewal of the U. S. - Japan security treaty. At that time 3 groups split from the Japan CP (which at the time and until 1966 was strongly influenced by the Chinese CP). The first to split set up a Fourth International (F.I.) (United Secretariat) group, the second the Communist League. Those involved had tried to fight Japanese imperialism inside the CP. This was impossible because, while the CP fought against U.S. chauvinism, it completely abandoned the struggle against Japanese imperialism. (The JCP had lost influence in the workers movement after, at the behest of the Chinese CP, it organized an armed uprising in 1952.) In addition the JCP put undue emphasis on parliamentarism and handled internal disputes in a very bureaucratic way.

A majority of the student movement leaders who fought within the JCP left with the Communist League, as did small groups of workers from the railroad and teachers unions. They were strongly influenced by the 1956 Hungarian events, but the decision to split was based essentially on the Japanese class struggle.

The F. I. group was founded just after the Hungarian revolution. There had been no Trotskyist position in Japan before that. The F. I. group is typified by its degenerated workers state position including toward the Chinese CP, its tactic of "entry", its tactical opportunism and economism. Zenshin has relations with, but is not close to, the F. I. group.

Zenshin-Chukaku strategy is anti-imperialist and anti-Stalinist. In regard to "entry", they believe that it is necessary to create a revolutionary workers party opposed to the SP and CP, and that independent activity is necessary both within and outside the unions. The F. I. hesitated to put its own position before the masses.

In 1960 a third split took place, this time from the Communist League, which then had a majority in the Zengakuren. This split occurred because: (a) the Communist League had an uncertain strategy. Its critique of Stalinism was very limited; it sometimes spoke for Maoism, and it was influenced by the Third World movement. It did not have a combined strategy for backward and industrial countries. (b) Its practice was on a tactical level, seeking issue after issue, action after action. This led to totally abandoning the building of a revolutionary workers party within the factories.

The split resulted in the main leaders of the Communist League entering Zenshin after the 1960 defeat. Fundamental relationships between these organizations have changed in recent years.

The post-war system is very unstable and artificial, it doesn't solve any of the

fundamental contradictions of imperialism, fundamental contradictions which broke out through World Wars I and II and in 1929.

The beginning of the decline of the post-World War II system is made evident by the dollar crisis and the intensification of the Vietnam war. The decline is a result of contradictions within the system of U. S. domination over the world economy and over the underdeveloped countries -- domination guaranteed by two methods: the International Monetary Fund and the Yalta agreements -- and realized through the integration of the Stalinists within the policy of the imperialists.

Though it can't continue either its domestic or foreign policy, the U. S. wants to continue it. The Stalinists try not to intensify this crisis but to defend themselves as they did when Russia was integrated into World War II but did not intervene. That resulted in the division of the world being determined by the conditions which existed before the war.

#### On the Common Market

The Common Market is one main support of the post-war system, which was organized to rebuild capitalism under the domination of the U. S. Since 1965 things have been changing rapidly, but the Common Market and Japan are not replacing the U. S. The whole system has exhausted its power and there is no way for the U. S., which must maintain world domination through any means.

The contradictions of the post-war system are now concentrated against Japan, whose post-war development is at a standstill. The problem now is the crisis of the Japan-U. S. alliance. The main cause of the U. S. balance of payments deficit is the heavy export of Japanese chemical products. Nixon wants to stop this in order to protect the U. S. market. That would lead to a crisis in Japan and to increasing conflict with the U. S., but Japanese imperialism can't cut its economic, political, and military relations with the U. S., as was shown in the matter of Okinawa.

#### On Sino-American Rapprochement

U. S. policy is to seek breathing time, to postpone the coming crisis, and -- with no guarantee of success -- to try to perfect its domination over the countries of Asia through the rapprochement with China.

There is an uneasy situation in Indochina and the Philippines. The U. S. is trying to increase its domination, but finds it can no longer control the situation.

Japan's main aim, similar to that of the U. S., is a more stable situation in Asia. Continuation of its alliance with the U. S. is the fundamental policy of Japanese imperialism.

For the Chinese Stalinists, after the Vietnam war there will still be Japanese imperialism. They therefore need an agreement with Japanese imperialism for economic, political, and ideological reasons. Facing the danger of Russian troops on their border, the Chinese need peace with Japan, in return for which they will allow Japanese aggression against all Asian countries except China.

Japan has temporarily agreed to no territorial aggression in China. Japan plans heavy exports to China.

#### Stages in the development of the struggle in Japan

1959-1965: Through activity in the factories, Zenshin tried to build important

influence in the workers and students movements. They were not successful in generating a workers party. After 1960 they drew the following organizational conclusions: the need to organize the defense of the militant workers' movement, to form a left opposition within the unions, and -- by forming study groups to build the base of the organization -- to move toward building an independent organization, toward constructing a workers party. The period, marked by the approaching crisis of Japanese imperialism, left room for unions to develop a movement on wages, working conditions, and political struggle.

1966-69: 1965 was marked by 3 important things: the intensification of the Vietnam war, the Japan-Korea peace treaty, and the beginning of Japanese aggression in Asian countries. This period saw the degeneration of the workers movement, the total surrender to chauvinism, to loyalty to each enterprise.

Young workers began to organize into Hansen, with a slogan of construction of a workers movement.

Zenshin's main activities were (a) organizing workers into Hansen, (b) continuing left activity in the unions, (c) the organization, on October 8, 1967, of armed struggle by the student movement.

1969-now: This period is marked by the intensification of the crisis of Japanese imperialism, whose economic and political base is very fragile, as well as of the crisis of world capitalism with the accumulation of political, economic, and social contradictions. No way of solving this crisis exists for the capitalist government of Japan but going into the countries of Asia after the fundamental failure of Japanese imperialism in regard to Okinawa. The bourgeoisie is trying to establish a system to mobilize the Japanese people for aggression.

The class struggle is entering the stage almost of a civil war character. In 1969 and 1971 Chukaku organized demonstrations involving 3000 armed workers and 2000 armed students. The importance of these demonstrations was that they occurred at the decisive point when Japanese imperialism was trying to solve the Okinawa problem, when the prime minister went to the U.S. in order to come to an agreement, and when parliament was about to recognize the return of Okinawa to Japan. Chukaku organized its 3000 worker comrades and 2000 student comrades, both times, for a primitive armed struggle. 1500 workers were arrested in 1971, 300 in 1969. Important leaders were arrested in both demonstrations and sentenced to 1-2 years. And a law against subversive activities was passed. "All other tendencies, running from the capitalists to Kakamaru, said we would disappear, but we have maintained until now our factory cells. We confronted counterrevolutionary terrorist attacks by Kakamaru which was protected by the state."

There are 4,000,000 workers in the Japanese unions. Zenshin engages in every kind of activity in the unions and the workers' movement -- from the point of view of building a workers revolutionary party. They are now engaged in organizing oppositions in unions, organizing Hansen inside and outside of factories, defending and leading a minority union. They don't believe they should be limited to fraction activity. They develop the factory cell not only by economic activity in the unions and political programs in the factory, but by posing the problem of the revolutionary organization of workers.

Zenshin has factory cells as well as cells within the army, since all the problems

of the society can be resolved only by a proletarian revolution under the leadership of a revolutionary party. Factory activity is developed according to the political line of the organization, which is not yet a party. As Trotsky described it, there is a big difference between the objective and subjective conditions of revolution. Only opportunists or sectarians ignore this. Objective conditions don't always wait for the development of the subjective conditions, especially in the period of the coming crisis.

The task of revolutionaries today is to change the relationship between the subjective and objective conditions, to struggle against the divisions within the class. It is necessary to establish a workers' movement to confront Japanese aggression in Asia. Zenshin's main slogan is to defend the militant workers' movement against the chauvinist mobilization which is supported by the social democratic union bureaucrats and the CP. They join with peasants and with the Korean (about 600,000) and Chinese people in Japan, and help develop the movement of the segregated 3,000,000 Buraku people (a survival from the middle ages). They fight for Okinawa.

### Critique by L. O.

It is hard to know other countries; we can understand some things about, but not the real situation, in Japan. A pre-civil war situation is not clear from your description of fights between the left and the police. A pre-civil war situation would mean an international civil war. Really, repression against revolutionaries is not the same thing as against the working class.

Your saying that Kakamaru is a counterrevolutionary organization controlled by the state and the police, though we don't know, brings to mind our bad memories of the CPs' making the same charges against the Trotskyists. We do know this problem in France, where the CP makes the same charge against the Maoists despite their being the main victims of the police. In Japan we don't know, but the accuser has furnished no proof. Political debate is absolutely necessary between organizations, but we want to banish calumnies and violence from the movement.

### Reply to Critique

We are grateful to L. O. for the opportunity provided by the conference, and welcome the advice regarding Kakamaru.

The situation became objective in November 1971, though before that Kakamaru refused to join all the common actions in which 8 groups, including Maoists, Spontaneists, Togliattists, and reformists participated from 1967-69 until now. The size of the groups changes: there are fewer Maoists, other groups have divided, but there is serious cooperation.

Kakamaru has now been excluded due to its violent sectarian intervention, including the use of batons, which it did not use to fight the police. In November 1971, after the struggle against the subversive activity law had led to an almost underground situation, when public meetings were forbidden or surrounded by the police to prevent sympathizers from coming, Kakamaru began to attack us. They launched attacks on our headquarters and on the homes of our leaders, as well as on universities and factories where we are. Kakamaru is under the protection, not the control, of the police. Their political position is one of opposition to the violent development since 1967 of the Japanese class struggle. They don't fight against Japanese aggression in Asia, saying only that Japanese economic expansion results in prosperity, which will continue, and that the rapprochement between the U. S. and the USSR will continue. They are in the union

bureaucracy. In wildcat strikes, e. g. in the nationalized railroads, we fight against management and the bureaucrats. In Tokyo, where the Kakamaru are strong, they attacked our workers with two to three hundred of their members armed with batons and iron bars. The police didn't stop them, but arrested some of our members. We had to protect ourselves, self-protection being part of our indispensable program.

((See ZENSHIN document, made available at the conference, on the next page.))

Western Hemisphere:

COMBAT OUVRIER (French West Indies)

Combat Ouvrier (Workers' Fight) is a newspaper and an organization of revolutionary communists fighting to build a revolutionary workers' party and for a socialist revolution in the French West Indies (Guadeloupe and Martinique).

The French West Indies are "legally" an integral part of France, an "overseas department". A special situation -- national independence is still a question -- and special tasks, the fight for independence, against colonial and national oppression as well as against all varieties of nationalism, face the comrades of Combat Ouvrier (C. O.)

The C. O. organization was created two years ago at a time when many militants were dropping out of the CP. These ex-CPers were publishing a newspaper, but were unable to create an organization. Some of them had the same politics as the CP, but were opposed to the bureaucracy. Others were attracted by the nationalists. The youngest turned to C. O.

There was also a split in the CP-controlled trade union federation, the CGT. It divided into several parts, each led by a former CP leader. Among the dockers there are 2 CGTs, one led by the CP, one by a reformist ex-CPer. In construction one union is led by an ex-CP nationalist, and similar situations exist in power, electricity, the PTT (post office, telephone and telegraph), and among the workers in trade.

The CP has absolute control only over government office workers and a large part of the sugar mill workers.

The splits have resulted in no improvement for the workers. The nationalist ex-CP leaderships use the unions as political tools, so Combat Ouvrier has to challenge them as well as the CPers mainly on a political level.

C. O. has prevented the nationalists from drowning the working class in patriotic unity around a bourgeois political program which would deprive the people of the West Indies of working class power after independence.

Combat Ouvrier emphasizes the political independence of the working class as absolutely essential in the struggle for independence, as well as the special leading role of the working class in the struggle. While the issue of national independence increases consciousness, C. O. must permanently defend the communist program against the nationalists.

The working class must have its own political leaders, representatives, defense, and political organization, a revolutionary workers' Bolshevik Party. At this time,

(continued on page

BEGINNING OF THE HISTORIC CATASTROPHE OF THE POSTWAR WORLD SYSTEM  
AND CRISIS OF JAPANESE IMPERIALISM

-37-

From 1972 onward through the '70's, Japanese class struggle is inevitably going in a civil-war-like and revolutionary way. The objective conditions for that will be analysed here. (the subjective conditions will be discussed in other parts).

( 2 )

The first condition that makes the revolutionary development of the class struggle inevitable is the fact that the post war world imperialist system has stepped in an endless catastrophe.

The postwar world system is, as we have already analysed and made clear in many occasions (since the Third National Congress of JCRL in 1966), characterized as follows : 1) the imperialist stage of capitalism, namely the highest and the last stage of capitalism, or the "dying" capitalism after Lenin's notion ; 2) the world-historical transitional period from imperialism to socialism, beginning with the victory of the Russian Revolution ; 3) its transformation into the "Yalta-Geneva system", system of peaceful co-existence, through distortion of the international communist movement into Stalinism on the one hand, and through the concentration of the political, military and economic power to the USA on the other hand ; in other words, on these presuppositions the world imperialism has survived with the aid of Stalinists, making the USA the main prop, politically, militarily and economically. The imperialist side of this system centers around the USA in two ways : 1) the imperialist military blocs=collective security system (NATO, CENTO, SEATO, "ANPO"=Japan-US security Treaty) ; 2) the so-called "IMF system", or the international monetary system which has dollars and sterlings as "key currency". These two presuppositions have constituted necessary basis of the imperialist world system in a peculiar form of the postwar period. Fictitious world domination of the USA, guaranteed by the huge material power, and its relatively stable growth have so far enabled postwar development of the world imperialism in spite of many difficulties.

The postwar imperialist world system is, however, not perfectly stable. On the contrary, it has many defects as follows : 1) the imperialists had to suppress explosion of the postwar revolutions with the aid of Stalinists (the Yalta Treaty in 1945 and the Geneva Treaty in 1954), by military forces as well, and from that time on, had to maintain a vast military network on a world scale ; this military network and collective security system, and the very existence of the "military-base-divided states", such as South Korea, Formosa, South Vietnam, Israel, etc, have turned the sharpest focusses of contradictions of the postwar world system ; 2) the IMF system have certainly restored the external "unity" of the world economy on the basis of the overwhelming power of the USA, but it has not been able to bring solution to the fundamental contradictions of the world imperialism since the Great Crisis of 1929 and the disintegration of the world economy in the 30's that followed ; this contradiction has become apparent with the revival of Western Europe and Japan and relative decline of the USA, and this uneven development of capitalism has led to intensification of the rivalry of the imperialist countries ; 3) since the 30's and especially after the Second World War, agricultural products and raw materials of the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries are incessantly declining in the sphere of the world economy (with exception of petroleum and several raw materials) owing to the agriculture-protection policy in the in-

perialist countries and the so-called scientific-technological- revolution, coupled with the heavy-chemical industrialization ; this, together with the military and economic aid of the USA which have devastated the economy into the chronic crisis, has put the economy of the underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries in a extremely disadvantageous position ; consequently, class struggle in these countries have been intensified and revolutionary rebellions have successively taking place there ; 4) the imperialist countries have so far developed by means of the Keynesian state monopoly capitalist policies ((namely the continuous mild inflation, and postponing the explosion of crisis), extending postwar growth and development in a forcible way ; but this policy has reached its limits, and the accumulated contradictions of the surplus capital are beginning to explode, especially in a serious inflation and in a crisis of currency ; catastrophic phase has been des- peded ; 5) through the Second World War and its postwar settlement neither the cause of war nor the war itself was basically removed ; therefore many wars have been taking place since of the end of the Second World War and these wars are beginning to be turned from imperialist wars into international civil war-revolutionary war ; 6) the USA has maintained the world economic system centering on the US, which ensured it large amount of wealth, but this very system has concentrated burdens and contradictions on the US imperialism.

The fundamental contradiction of the postwar world imperialist system have begun to explode especially in its main prop, the US imperialism. The military defeat in Vietnam and the dollar crisis are the keenest manifestation of the underlying crisis of the US imperialism, namely bankruptcy of its traditional foreign policy, and also mounting crisis at home politically, militarily, economically and socially, leading to an urgency of the postwar revolution in a specific form. The US imperialism as dominator of the postwar world is confronted with the insoluble dilemma : it has become impossible to continue its course it has been taking in the world domination and domestic rule, but still it is imperative to continue its course; the US imperialists have to, on the one hand, lay its burdens to the other imperialist countries, destroying the "unity" of the postwar world economy, in order to bring upturn on the US economy, and on the other hand, it has to count on the cooperation of the other imperialist countries. The two main policies declared last year, the decision of Nixon's visit to China and the so-called New Economic Policy, are nothing but means of gaining time to breathe and to postpone catastrophe. These two policies will only result in deepening the contradictions of the postwar period.

The second condition that makes the revolutionary development of classe struggle inevitable is the fact that the historical bankruptcy of Stalinism is all the more deepening, in the midst of the catastrophic progress of the postwar imperialist world system and intensified attack of the imperialists in order to save the whole system from ruin.

Stalinism consists essentially in the following points : to abandon, in the world-historical transitional period from imperialism to socialism initiated by the victorious Russian Revolution, fundamental principles of marxism, namely to recognize absolute necessity of world revolution for the human liberation through communist revolution; to replace it with the theory of "socialism in one country" and the policy of "peaceful coexistence", causing reactionary deformation on the revolutionary advance of the world historical transitional period. In other words, while the social-democratic degeneration of the Second International was based upon the transformation of the workers' movement into the prop of the imperialist domestic rule, the Stalinist degeneration of the Third International was based upon surrender to and integration into the world imperialist system, of the international revolutionary movement.

The international Stalinist system, established after the Second World War, centering around the USSR, aimed at forming a local "communist world", on the presupposition of the rivaling co-existence with the imperialist countries, which is symbolized in the Yalta treaty as well as the Geneva treaty. But two historical events, Hungarian Revolution (1956) and Czechoslovakian rebellion (1968) have clearly disclosed the truth of the so-



called "international socialist system"; the USSR, through subjugating other "socialist" countries to it, gained profit from this system on the sacrifice of the people of these countries, and put burden on these countries, which was produced as the result of "socialism in one country" of USSR itself.

On the other hand, Chinese Communist Party under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung, have stood against the USSR Stalinists, represented by Khrutchev, especially in respect to the too close cooperation with the USA, and also the method of the USSR military and economic aid to China, that demanded unconditional obeisance to the USSR and meant in fact expropriation by the USSR, far from the spirit of socialist-brotherly cooperation for the common cause. In the so-called "proletarian cultural revolution" they tried, under the flag of "anti-imperialism, anti-revisionism", to resolve the contradictions caused by the "people's commune" = "great leap forward" policy (1958) and also by "adjusting" policy (1961-65). Those policies adopted by Mao and Chinese CP have given expectation for the revolutionary revival of the international communist movement to the large number of fighting people all over the world, who were bitterly discontented with surrendering policy to the imperialists, parliamentarism, trade-unionism, that led integration of the workers' movement into the existing system of imperialism, and who were not able to clarify the real cause of these degeneration taking place in the communist parties under the leadership of USSR CP. But, as we have consistently asserted since the time of "people's commune" and also the time of the "proletarian cultural revolution", the alleged left wing position of the Chinese CP signifies only that it stands against imperialism in this or that political points. The Chinese CP lacks strategy of world revolution, that is, completion of overthrowing world imperialism; it also lacks theory of socialist society as well as policy of transitional period, in order to face and overcome difficulties and deformations arising in China in front of the task of constructing transitional society. In these respects, Mao and Chinese CP do not surpass the theory and strategy of Stalin and Khrutchev.

Nixon's policy of visiting China, as the countermeasure to the thoroughgoing upheaval of the postwar world imperialist system and the domestic crisis of the US imperialism itself, put to a severe test the Chinese Stalinists, who were bureaucratically controlling and curbing the "proletarian cultural revolution". The US imperialism, as the main prop and the most criminal of all the imperialist countries, in its desire of taking breath in the catastrophic crisis, charged attack on China, as a challenge to the fighting people all over the world. At this critical moment, Chinese Stalinists accepted the US proposal. This is giving a humiliation to the Asian people who are fighting resolutely against US aggression, and averting eyes of the world proletariat from the grand perspective for the great American revolution. The Chinese Stalinists are playing most reactionary role in doing this.

This historical betrayal recalls to our mind the Germany-Soviet Non-Aggression Treaty (1939). But at the same time, we must realize the fact that, however reactionary the policy of Nixon's visit to China is, and however treacherously Chinese Stalinists behave, it is impossible to evade the crisis of the postwar world imperialist system and the imperialist ruling system in the under-developed and semi-colonial countries.

The Third Condition is the fact that the contradictions arising from the crisis of the postwar world system are now going to be focused upon Japanese imperialism; such as intensification of the US aggression, and surrender and cooperation of the Chinese Stalinists to it, as we have seen above.

The postwar recovery and development of Japanese imperialism is, as we have repeatedly pointed out since the Third National Congress of JCRL, thoroughly dependent upon the policy of Japan-US Alliance; Japanese imperialism has been closely connected with the US imperialism, politically, militarily and economically, and through this connection also linked with the whole postwar world imperialist system. The policy of Japan-US Alliance, the core of which is the "ANPO", Japan-US Security Treaty, is therefore the life-line, as it were, for Japanese imperialism. But Japan faces a new phase of development of this relation. The US now is beginning to transfer its burdens that arise from the crisis of its own system, to Japan, economically as well as politically. In this situation, however, Japan is obliged to maintain Japan-US Alliance on the sphere of economy as well as of politico-military problems, even if it will charge lot of sacrifice on the Japanese side.

In other words, Japanese imperialism is confronted with the insoluble dilemma : it has to continue the policy of Japan-US Alliance notwithstanding the fact that this alliance is beginning to see catastrophe. Economically saying, Japanese imperialism has to enlarge its export of products of heavy-chemical industry to the USA in order to get out of stagnation, but this increased export, in its turn, leads to destruction of Japan-US economic relations and, still further, of the world economic system itself.

In regard to the diplomatic relation between Japan and China, Japanese imperialism is being put into difficulties by the crisis of the postwar world system, but it is also creating danger to this system through its action. The US imperialists have begun to adjust the US-China relations in order to get out of the serious crisis, regardless of the Japan-US Alliance. This US policy has imposed harsh trial upon Japanese imperialism, which is pursuing its course of aggression on Asian countries by means of maintaining Japan-US Alliance. For Asian people, it is absolutely unpardonable that Japanese imperialism which invaded into the Asian countries during the Second World War, giving unbearable pain and affliction to them, should make aggression once again on the Asian countries only after a lapse of a decade. As the Japan-China relations have come to question, it has become more and more evident that nothing was solved in regard to the Japanese role and its results during the Second World War. The present US policy is to make Japan engaged in a difficult task of reestablishing ruling system over underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries in Asia, while the US is taking breath through entente with China, and to give recognition to the newly developed situation under its hegemony.

Consequently Japanese imperialism and its political committee have no other policies than as follows : 1) in spite of the beginning of catastrophe of Japan-US relations, to maintain the policy of Japan-US Alliance, and to go on with depending on the US market in the sphere of the heavy-chemical industry; 2) seeking for the readjustment of Japan-China relations on the one hand, to go on basically, on the other hand, with the invasion upon the Asian countries; 3) to lay on the working class and minor enterprises the burdens originated from standstill of the postwar development and also from dumping export in order to solve it; 4) in order to relieve monopoly capitals from stagnation, to take positive fiscal-financial policies regardless to inflation, and to enlarge munitions industries; 5) in order to suppress the resistance of the Asian people and Japanese working class, to strengthen the Self-Defence Force as an imperialist army; to establish a powerful Bonapartic ruling system, and to apply forcible civil-war-type suppression to the revolutionary forces; 6) to establish a national mobilization system for the aggression on the Asian countries, through appeasing class struggle with the help of SP, CP and Kakumaru, instilling into proletariat the ideas of "national interest" defense of enterprise, and advocating irrational, chauvinistic ideologies, culminating in the Tenno (Emperor) system and its ideology. But these policies of Japanese imperialism will not be realized in an easy way, owing to the following factors : 1) already launched catastrophe of the postwar world system; bankruptcy of cooperation system among imperialist powers;

growing antagonism among them; 2) crisis of the ruling system in Asian underdeveloped and semi-colonial countries, and rise of anti-Japanese imperialism struggle there; 3) civil-war-like and revolutionary development in Japan, with mounting popular support. Intensified state power suppression, coupled with the counter-revolutionary armed assault by state-civil forces, in revenge to the great 71 autumn struggle manifests desperate fear of imperialists and counter-revolutionary groups for the future of Japanese imperialism.

besides its newspaper, C.O. issues bulletins in the factories and housing projects, trains its activists morally and theoretically, and engages in theoretical, political, and economic struggle alongside the workers. Only because they have already created a revolutionary organization are they able to do so effectively.

Believing that the working class cannot be organized without revolutionary intervention in the unions, Combat Ouvrier is involved in all the unions, and every member must be involved in union activity.

Activists must be known to the workers if they want to play a role. Both revolutionaries and their program become better known if they engage in daily activity within the working class. C.O. comrades aim to be better and more effective fighters than the nationalists in order to prevent the initiative in the anti-colonial struggle falling to the nationalists.

Within the last 2 years they have been engaged in many struggles, starting with the purely economic. Due to the colonial situation -- France cannot tolerate the least sign of independent working class activity -- the economic struggles were rapidly transformed into a political movement. During strikes by farm workers in Guadeloupe, by factory workers in Martinique, the riot police were sent in to reinforce the ordinary cops in occupying the factories and sugar cane plantations and arresting the pickets. The strikes thus became an object lesson in the use of "armed bands" by the capitalist state.

The factory and housing project bulletins explain events to the workers, help those already raising political questions to find their way into Combat Ouvrier, and bring together the more advanced workers. Denunciations in the bulletins receive considerable sympathy from the workers, leading to closer relations. Workers come with information for the bulletins, and for help in getting out their own leaflets.

The newspaper, too, has won the confidence of the workers. In spite of attempts by the colonial authorities to prevent its distribution, it has a circulation of 2000 (four fifths of which are read by workers) in a population of 325,000. In the places where it is sold, factories and government housing projects, C.O. also holds meetings which attract between 150 and 200 people. Directed against both colonialism and capitalist exploitation, C.O. speeches meet a sympathetic response.

Because the Stalinists are not as strong in the West Indies as in France, and because spontaneity and violence prevent the bureaucrats intervening as they would like, it is in one sense easier for revolutionaries to intervene in the unions. But the work is harder since there are fewer union members. Setting up a union often leads to the worker-organizers being fired. Due to the colonial situation, organizers most often must stay underground until the union becomes stronger. The workers' lack of self-confidence must be overcome by combining the economic struggle with the fight for democratic rights, that is all economic struggles must become political.

As in most cases, the last two strikes, in construction and by the agricultural workers, were completely out of the control of the bureaucrats. The unions were very new or had just broken from the CGT. The leadership sprang up spontaneously. Neither C.O. nor the nationalists could claim to have led the strikes.

C.O. feels unable yet to draw a balance sheet of its union activity. Politically, while their progress has not been spectacular, they have as much popular support as do the nationalists.

Since Combat Ouvrier made the decision to participate in the French parliamentary elections, the nationalists have followed suit, despite the latter's habitual policy of boycott and abstention.

The present calm in the French West Indies is superficial, it could explode at any moment. Combat Ouvrier is preparing itself to be ready to cope with such a situation.

Founding Statement of Combat Ouvrier, May 24, 1971

(translated by Eric Langdon)

"Combat Ouvrier is put out today for the first time. It is not the journal of a party. The editorial policy of our paper will be to defend the point of view of the working class on all questions -- national and international. We want our analyses to serve as an instrument of the proletariat in its final liberation from the yoke of capitalism.

"In the world at this time -- in the French West Indies as well as everywhere -- the working class is more and more preparing itself to confront the bourgeoisie; in this period of capitalist crisis, appearing in every manifestation of the life of the planet (plant closures, huge taxes, colonial wars, the revolt of the youth, financial crises, etc.); it is urgent that the working class forge a new political outlook toward the world situation and the situation in each country.

"It is to this task that we wish to consecrate our efforts, on that which concerns Guadeloupe and Martinique.

"In the face of the social and political crisis that exists in the French West Indies, by taking positions, by our analysis, we wish to aid the proletariat to regain the road of revolutionary working class tradition.

"We wish to aid the class in grasping the proper consciousness in the course of the struggle for national emancipation.

"In this struggle, we know that the workers will confront the old parties that continue to claim to represent socialism and communism. We will be forced to show that the Stalinist parties (Communist Party of Guadeloupe & Communist Party of Martinique), or the social democrats of the moribund SFIO, have nothing in common with revolutionary socialist ideas. It is true that in the case of the SFIO, it is much easier to dispel workers' illusions on this subject. But the CPG and the CPM continue to have the confidence of numbers of workers. It is in the course of their actions and inactions that we shall expose the bankruptcy of their politics.

"We equally oppose the use of proletarian forces as a mere appendage of a nationalist struggle.

"If the struggle to throw off the yoke of French imperialism and to liberate Guadeloupe and Martinique from colonial domination is primary, it is no less primary that this mean the conscious leadership of the proletariat in its real interests and its real historic tasks, tasks that are not limited to national liberation, but to the emancipation of the masses of workers and poor peasants from every form of exploitation and oppression.

"In the face of colonial repression, in full solidarity with all groups fighting for independence or autonomy, we oppose the politics of all who seek to dissolve the conscious proletariat in "blocs" or "fronts" substituting the national struggle for the class struggle, and who identify in any form the interests of the French West Indian exploited

with the interests of the French West Indian exploiters. We seek, on the contrary, to develop sentiments of class independence among the masses of workers.

"And the sole guarantee that national liberation will benefit the forces of the poorest of the population and that the masses of workers and poor peasants are not pawns in the hands of bourgeois national forces, resides in the seizure of power by the proletariat. This task, the proletariat cannot accomplish unless it constructs a real revolutionary party and conserves its political independence vis-a-vis all other social forces, despite whatever alliances it wishes to enter.

"This journal cannot live unless the workers, the youth, the intellectuals extend their warm sympathy.

"If they make themselves known to us, if they circulate this paper, if they organize gatherings for reading and discussion, if they send financial support to the editor, Combat Ouvrier will live long enough for socialist ideas to find roots in the working class."

Excerpt from Combat Ouvrier, #18, October 18, 1972

"The CGT and FO are calling the workers of Martinique out on a (one day) general strike, October 17, 1972..."

"In spite of the reticence of the unions to lead this strike they're calling to victory, in spite of the timid, confused character of the demands advanced, it is important that all the workers support the strike.

"It is possible and within their power to make this strike something other than symbolic. They can make it into real days of struggle..."

"If it is indispensable to participate in this strike, even on the basis on which it is called, it is still more necessary to show to what point the unions' demands, demands advanced on the occasion of a general strike, do not correspond with the social and political situation here..."

"Such a movement must not limit itself to reaping some promises, nor content itself with a few crumbs thrown out by the capitalists. The root of the evil from which the workers suffer is the economic and political power of the privileged class. Nothing, neither the question of the land, nor that of wages, nor that of unemployment will be decided if the workers don't rid themselves of those who protect the capitalists, their riot police and other cops. The working class must put itself at the head of the struggle for the independence of the French West Indies, prepare itself for the conquest of power for the benefit of the unhappy people, impoverished and humiliated by the capitalists of the colonizing country and of their West Indian confederates.

"In these conditions, an action by all the workers, seriously attacking the evils affecting them, can only be based on a program of demands which include the following: \* the control by the workers over hiring and firing; \* a sliding scale of working hours (division of the work between all hands); \* a sliding scale of wages to prevent inflation from taking away any advantage we may win; \* a general wage increase (1500 franc minimum); \* immediate expropriation of all large landed proprietors -- division of the land among the poor peasants and agricultural workers..."

"Neither the Communist Party of Martinique, nor the Martinique People's Party, nor the leadership of the unions are ready to use such language, because they are too afraid of being heard."

NATIONAL CAUCUS OF LABOR COMMITTEES (U.S.)

((The Labor Committee's pompous pretense of being the "International Caucus of Labor Committees", their presumption at telling all the other groups present that they are "incompetent", revealed the Labor Committee to all as the windbags they are, and provoked general hilarity. As the spokesman for the Leninist Fraction of Denmark put it; "The Labor Committee is absolutely irrelevant."

((I am nonetheless including their "contributions", because in my opinion all serious revolutionaries should know what they're saying and be prepared to combat it.))

The Labor Committee (NCLC) opened with a critique of all the groups present as well as of the International Committee and United Secretariat (both claiming to be the Fourth International). They went on to say that everyone should unite and create a new Communist International. Crisis... Vicious attacks on the working class are scheduled after the German and U.S. elections. In addition, the Soviet Union will help in staving off an immediate capitalist depression. Therefore, the only possible question for this group is how those to the left of the CP can intervene to stop this process. In that connection they advised everyone to read the article on the "United Socialist States of Europe" in the fall '72 issue of their magazine, The Campaigner.

Everything else is secondary to this perspective -- union work as a thing in itself, party building as a thing in itself, the Common Market and China as separate questions.

In the U.S. the struggle for hegemony is being fought out between the NCLC and the CP. The fight against the CP is being waged by the NCLC's organization of Strike Support Coalitions as the programmatic alternative to CP violence, and to turn around the rout of the labor movement. Strike Support Coalitions are based on Marx's Critique of Political Economy, the method of political economy.

The NCLC is optimistic about the U.S., but a socialist transformation must be accompanied by one in Europe. The NCLC has therefore intervened through issuing theoretical journals in France, Italy, Greece, and Germany, through establishing small groups in Germany and Italy, soon to be followed by others elsewhere.

"The situation of the European socialist movement is extremely grave." There are large numbers of dedicated socialist cadre in Europe, but they are proving incompetent in the time objectively remaining. They have no understanding of how to put the European economy on a socialist footing. So this is no time to boast of organizational achievements. The problems are primarily intellectual, e. g. in Italy the largest CP in the west is the one most threatened by a fascist takeover.

The revolutionary groups in Europe are nationalist, as is shown by L. O.'s presentation on the Common Market. Socialist ideas of the unification of Europe are less developed than those of the capitalists. The integration of European industry is an accomplished phenomenon -- as can be seen by looking at every branch of basic industry as well as at the migrant workers. So there is no longer any basis for national organizations in Europe.

Ignored are (a) that a quarter century of primitive accumulation by U.S. imperialism has exhausted the reproductive powers of the European working class; (b) the stagnation in basic industry; (c) that these have had an effect on the levels of education, health, employment, etc.; (d) the need for an increase in social reproduction.

None of the other organizations at this conference recognize this because of their ties with worker militants. It is summed up by the problem of surplus value, all the other groups here holding the Lassallean theory that each worker should receive the complete value of his product.

((Editor's translation: The "competent" intellectuals of the Labor Committee will replace the capitalists in making production decisions!))

Only the basic progressive alliance between the employed and the unemployed to use surplus value to create new employment is adequate. Europeans should use the NCLC's Emergency Reconstruction Program ((for those who have forgotten, a program to organize bank clerks to tear up all the stock certificates in society)) as the basis for daily intervention in the workers' movement.

To organize the working class is not just to intervene in the unions, but, on the contrary, since such practice is contrary to the categories of Marxist thought, only the class-for-itself is able to take control of the reproductive forces of humanity. As Rosa Luxemburg ((? ? ? ! !)) pointed out, organizations of employed workers must be ruthlessly subordinated to the needs of the unemployed, unorganized, and foreign workers.

An increasing tendency to Bonapartism is evident in the attacks on the rights of the labor movement and the right to strike. These can be opposed only by the organization of the working class and its allies, since no strike, however militant, can survive without constantly bringing in outside forces for support.

Marx, far from stressing the parochial struggles of the employed workers, situated the possibility of class consciousness in uniting the employed with the unemployed, and thus forcing the working class to confront its actual tasks of social reconstruction through the subjective ingredient of program. Those who believe that the unemployed shouldn't be in union caucuses are not socialists, but Proudhonists.

There is no possibility of building a national alternative to any CP, whether in Italy, France, Britain or West Germany. To defeat the CPs is urgent, and can only be accomplished through international forms of organization -- not through loose federal forms like that of the United Secretariat, but through a single revolutionary organization with the same program in the various sectors of Europe.

The role of the revolutionary intelligentsia is of central importance. We are on the verge of a world depression, the break-up of the Democratic Party in the U. S. and of the European regimes, of fascism as evidenced by the Zero Population Growth movement. There now exists no socialist organization with a serious program for socialist power in the coming years on the Europe-wide level, at a time when the CP's Popular Front policies are aimed at establishing social control over the working class.

The only answer is a programmatic alliance as proposed by Rosa Luxemburg and Paul Levi. Here the revolutionary intelligentsia have an important initiating role. As Rosa created a mass KPD, we must organize to intervene into the CPs to pull out cadre for the socialist revolution.

It is not necessary to build unions for revolutionaries to get an idea of what the real working class is. Unions represent part of the working class-in-itself, that is, alienated ((the NCLC's definition, or rather re-definition of the word "alienated" is "divided into small groups, i. e. craft unions that side with the boss against other



workers", speech by L. Marcus, Sept. 30, 1972.)), alienated under capitalist rule, and as such unions prevent the development of the class-for-itself. It is necessary to build the broadest possible organs of class struggle. That is the role of revolutionaries.

Economic stagnation has led to high unemployment which produces a permanent group of black unemployed and welfare victims. The precondition for a workers government is to fuse all these groups; otherwise fascism will result. Anyone who opposes this strategy is a vicious racist.

The European economy is completely integrated, but problems are different where the level of working class organization lags. The only way to take power today is to base ourselves on a unified movement in the whole continent, forging the broadest possible programmatic alliances with the immigrant workers. There is no hope of expanding production in France, Italy, or Britain without the German productive forces.

It is mistaken "internationalism" to organize the workers of the multinational corporations toward a United Socialist States of Europe. The consensus here is for a United Socialist States of Europe based on a continent-wide lockout of the unemployed, peasants and immigrant workers.

A revolutionary policy in Europe today means subordination of "national" interests of the working class to the interests of the European working class as a whole.

Far from working in unions which refuse to challenge national chauvinism, but rather challenge "outsiders", revolutionaries can't find out anything about the working class from work in the unions. The class can be understood only by understanding Marxist theory at its highest possible intellectual level through study of Kant, Hegel, Feuerbach, Marx and Luxemburg. Anything else is an adaptation to the backwardness of the working class.

Capitalist rule is based on the method of divide and conquer. A method which presupposes an economic margin for capitalist concessions is useless when that margin disappears in times of depression like today, when union struggles can't win. The bourgeoisie must crush the workers movement, so there is no future for the unions as they presently exist; they will either be destroyed or included within broader class-for-itself organizations. This creates a situation for intervention by revolutionary intellectuals on the basis of the program for socialist reconstruction of Europe. ((While state power is held by the capitalists, is it possible for "revolutionary" intellectuals to engage in socialist reconstruction?))

The task is to create revolutionary nuclei from all sections of the class to serve as the embryo of future soviets. These will be based on socialist expanded reproduction which will use the surplus created by the employed workers to create employment for the unemployed, whose employment will create the surplus necessary for socialist reconstruction. ((I. e., the continued exploitation of the class by the revolutionary intelligentsia who alone understand that the class must continue to be exploited. To quote the Sept. 30 Marcus speech again, "An agency is needed to provide the program for expanded reproduction... We will give up power when the working class is ready."))

The I. S. (GB) is serious about taking power, and must know that Britain's productive apparatus is the most backward and therefore can't satisfy the just demands of the workers in struggle. To increase the standard of living in the developed as well as the underdeveloped countries can be done only through nuclear fusion power. There is no perspective for socialist reconstruction in Britain without an alliance with the German

industrial potential which includes not only German workers, but migrants from Italy where the crisis has led to fascist ferment among bankrupt peasants and the unemployed. Italians have been fired from Volkswagen, and the MSI (Italian fascist movement) has made great progress in Italy's south because the CP shares the same methods as the groups here and is becoming more and more the party of the employed workers, saying nothing about the unemployed.

Only an international perspective includes propaganda and agitation capable of making the English workers conscious of this. The organizational consequence of such an international perspective would be a European revolutionary party.

The coming crisis in England will lead to attacks on the working class. This is shown by the new rent law, the coming Value Added Tax, rising food prices due to the Common Market, unemployment rising to 12-15% -- a 20-25% cut in living standards. Such a period requires the formation of soviets. If they are not formed now, they will never be formed.

Working class victories have been due to outside support, e. g. for the miners from other layers of the working class. This was a step toward a united front in the working class. A revolutionary group on the scene would push against the I.S. (GB) miners caucus reinforcing the parochial forms that the struggle had shown signs of leaving.

The July dock situation raised the question of power, but the militant docker delegates told the working class to go home. The result was no increase in the organization of the working class. The I. S. (GB) tailed the shop stewards.

The rent and welfare and strike struggles must be united on a common program.

#### Critique by L. O.

We are more ambitious than the NCLC, we want to build a world party of proletarian revolution. It is not enough to proclaim the necessity of organizing the employed and unemployed; we must come to their aid in building such an organization. Work in the unions is part of building such a party.

Marx started with reality. There is not much difference between an absurdity and an abstraction from concrete reality. Intervention in the unions is necessary to develop revolutionary militant workers and revolutionary intellectuals who know what they're talking about.

Evolution toward integration of the unions into the state and toward destruction of the unions, much as Trotsky described it before World War II, is irreversible, but it is necessary to work in the unions, including, as Trotsky said, in fascist unions.

In the Vichy unions in 1943, our comrades organized a struggle around the canteen, a struggle that forced management to retreat despite intervention by the Gestapo, and at Alstom we led a struggle that locked up management in spite of Gestapo intervention. Success was possible even then when militants have the workers' support.

Unions represent the reformism of many workers, so we must be there to introduce new perspectives, to influence some members of the bureaucracy through rank and file pressure, as at Renault in '71 the CFDT was forced to call for a general strike.

We must learn the limits to which the workers are ready to go.

#### On the Common Market

With the collapse of the dollar, the period of interimperialist rivalries is at an end.

The system set up at Bretton Woods in 1944 led to U. S. primitive accumulation through the massive devaluations of the European currencies and through dollar loans.

Two factors that led to the Common Market are not in the L. O. document: the completion of the rebuilding of the infrastructure, and the major depression of 1957-58 in the U. S. which put an end to expanded useful production in the U. S. Since then there has been an absolute decline in the labor force and only waste production. The GNP does not represent real economic processes.

The Common Market is a vehicle for further primitive accumulation. A large part of Europe's farming population has been bankrupted. Food prices and rents paid by the European working class are excessively high in comparison with their wages. High food prices don't help the big farming interests, but are looted by the banks. In 1963 debt equalled 75% of peasant income, or one and a half to two times the national income in France.

From 1958 to 1965 the U. S. made massive investments in the Common Market because U. S. capital was unwilling to make productive investments in the U. S. , while wanting freedom for movement of its goods. At the end of '65 U. S. capitalists began to buy up existing plant, because creating new plants would bankrupt the old outmoded ones. Stagnation of productive investment resulted. This brought an increase in all forms of primitive accumulation, including attacks on working class living standards in the advanced countries, and a turn to speculation.

Devaluation of the dollar would bring the collapse of Europe's credit structure -- which is why European central bankers support the dollar.

August 1971 was the first stage of a new world depression, like the one that led to the Nazi economic need to get rid of unproductive people. Fascism needs a fascist movement for which an ideology is needed. That ideology is now Zero Population Growth.

Increased protectionism and nationalism in no way mean inter-imperialist rivalry which requires an economic basis. An international trade war would lead to an immediate collapse.

There are two possible future programs for Europe: either Fascism-Zero Population Growth or the United Socialist States of Europe.

#### On Sino-American Rapprochement

We must see changes in Chinese foreign policy within the current rise of Stalinist Popular Front policies. China has no individual policy, only a variant of the CP-workers states' policy of detente. In a period of depression, this will lead to a holy alliance, because Russia and China recognize the world depression, and fear a violent imperialist reaction, the danger of fascism. They recognize this danger far more than does the western left.

In May 1972 the PRG won militarily; without Russian and Chinese imposition of a defeat, this would have resulted in a socialist government. We are thus seeing an imperialist defeat of the international socialist movement, which will demoralize some non-serious socialist groups.

Nixon doesn't fear the anti-war movement in the U. S. , which no longer exists. The CP and SWP have done everything possible to prevent the anti-war movement from confronting the problems of the working class. The Democratic Party no longer exists so Nixon needs a left cover. That is why he's attempting to liquidate the Vietnam situation.

Economic reasons for the right turn of the CPs derive from Russia's and China's dependence on the world division of labor. Russia can't raise the quality of its variable capital without western aid. \$5 billion in trade with the West is being planned. China can choose between autarchic growth and its current policy, but Russia is more dependent and sociologically incapable of autarchical ultraleftism.

Neither country bases itself on revolutions in the industrial countries. The need is for cooperation between socialist governments in the West and the workers states.

Popular Fronts in the West are part of the deal between the U.S. and Russia and China. Reformism will continue after the basis for reformism has gone, and will sabotage the construction of a revolutionary party.

The growth of fictitious capital leads to an imminent crash with drastic wage cuts -- as has already been decided for Phase 3 in the U.S. and by the International Monetary Fund and the Common Market.

The incompetence of the Revolutionary Left is shown by this conference which is the left's answer to the IMF conference of two weeks ago. No plan to combat the anti-working class offensive is being discussed.

Primitive accumulation against the working class in the capitalist countries will soon prove insufficient for the maintenance of the capitalist system. That will lead to fascism, and to a war of primitive accumulation against China and Eastern Europe. This will happen despite the Chinese and Russian desire to placate the western leaders as shown by the speed-up in the Fiat plant at Togliattigrad. That will not be enough, so concentration camps will be set up in Eastern Europe, and workers power there will be liquidated.

((It is hardly necessary to add anything to the use of the future tense in that last statement. Readers will already have noted that there is utterly no connection between Marx's "primitive accumulation" and the NCLC's use of the same words.))

### SPARK (U.S.)

((Consciously built on the L.O. model, Spark concentrates exclusively on work in and around the shops.))

Spark, in addition to a monthly newspaper, publishes 6 bi-weekly shop newsletters in large shops where they have contacts with inside militants, not necessarily members. They see this as a means of organizing around Spark.

Militants provide information, articles, help edit, provide money, help distribute the newsletters clandestinely. Newsletter content includes comment about political and social issues of the day, but focuses on shop events in order to show the validity of revolutionary ideas.

They expose the rotten actions of the companies and of the union bureaucrats -- and this makes the newsletter popular. They are uncompromisingly for the workers, and they reach a large number.

Spark has members in auto, steel, textile; they work in the unions which are bureaucratized and confined to economic battles. To try to democratize the unions, they try to construct broad-based caucuses and build shop floor struggles to counter the demoralization.

Unions in the U.S. are contradictory. The bureaucracy often represents the

interests of the ruling class and of the state; it fights only for economic interests, usually of only one section of the working class -- at the expense of working conditions. For example, in the auto industry, 50 to 60 hours of work, sometimes even 70, or even 84 are compulsory, plus speed-up, so that half as many workers now as 10 years ago still produce the same amount. In addition, racial division of the work force and racial exclusion from the better jobs (as well as exclusion from the construction industry) exist.

But the unions are still organizations the class has created to defend its interests, and are the only working class mass organizations in the U. S. However partial the struggles, the most significant are led by the unions, even if the bureaucracy only seeks to control the struggle as at GMAD. The workers still look to the unions to lead the fight.

The double nature of the unions must determine our work. We work in the unions to participate in the daily struggles of the class, to gain the confidence of the workers through being ready to defend their interests as well as to talk, in order to develop roots in the class.

#### INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISTS (U. S.)

Since many organizations present here have asked about our methods of internal organization, a description... ((omitted -- see Introduction.))

We do not have as centralized a structure as we would like, since structure depends on the state of political coherence of an organization.

No part of the U. S. working class has yet raised political ideas, so there is no left movement in the bureaucracy yet, but a potential for a left split in the future does exist. Though it is one of several contenders for such a position in the future, the CP does not yet play the role of a left cover for the bureaucrats. The U. S. is still more prosperous than other advanced countries, and can afford some superficial reforms, but the potential for the development of large social-democratic parties or CPs is not likely.

The traditional reformist role is played in the U. S. by bourgeois liberals, and bourgeois liberalism is the present ideology of the union bureaucracy. Due to the generally low level of consciousness of the working class, we expect the leap in consciousness to be slow in coming, but more rapid when it does come. We do not expect a long life for the reformist organizations.

The unions in the U. S. are just as integrated into the state as elsewhere, but the political forms are different. The unions are the working class' only instrumentalities even though they are entangled with the state. We therefore attempt to participate in the union movement.

As elsewhere, the problem is the gap between the present level of class consciousness and the necessary level. The union movement is objectively strong, and there are a number of unions that are capable of stopping the productive forces almost instantaneously. This strength acts as a conservatizing force on the bureaucracy. For example, in June 1971 the strike by the New York City bridge tenders effectively shut down the city. This power so frightened the union bureaucracy that they called off the strike after one day. They fear their own power could interfere with the working of capitalism. The working class itself is not aware of its power.

Our small forces are trying to build I.S. fractions and caucuses in the unions -- based on programs designed to link the divided sections of the working class and make them conscious of their power. The question of democracy must be addressed by shop floor organizations, fighting for shop stewards at the same time as they fight against the state, which entangles the union movement and presses for increased production and a lowering of the working class' standard of living.

We need to point to the need for independent political struggles by the working class. Since the class is not yet aware of this need, simply calling for a revolutionary party does not suffice. So we put forth a demand for an independent working class party with a revolutionary socialist program.

#### On Sino-American Rapprochement

We agree with the British I. S. that new alliances are not yet predictable, and with their criticism of the L. O. view in terms of its not correctly evaluating the threat of Russian imperialism.

But there are certain clear tendencies: a fundamental conflict still between, on the one hand the U. S. and Russia, the strongest imperialists, and, on the other, the fundamental internal weakness of China.

China's approach to the rapprochement is highly contradictory: China has a deep need for western technology, and must balance between the imperialist rivals due to her fear concerning her weak economy.

Russia is developing Siberia with the aid of the U. S. and Japan, imperialist rivals in Southeast Asia. And there is the danger of Chinese economic dismemberment by Russia, Japan, and the U. S.

The U. S. and China want stabilization in Asia. Russia and Japan don't want to upset the balance of forces. But Russia is tending to upset them, as for example in Bangla Desh.

We see the possibility of only a short term alliance between the U. S. and China in Southeast Asia.

#### On the Common Market

We agree with L. O. on the Common Market, that a unified capitalism in Europe is impossible, and that an enlarged Common Market helps U. S. imperialism.

But we have a slight disagreement: the multinational U. S. corporations will find it even easier to compete with European corporations, hampered as they are by national restrictions.

There is a problem in that the L. O. document doesn't answer the question posed. The document includes no economics, only political economy. There is no examination of the economic relations between Europe and the U. S. to tell us what the relationship of forces is. This includes the question of the relationship of forces involved in the recent Sino-U. S. rapprochement. Will any of these relationships be of short, or of long, duration?

If it is true, as we believe, that the conflict between the U. S. and the Soviet Union is the fundamental axis of the world struggle, then beneath that is the struggle between two class systems. Are the inter-imperialist rivalries between European countries and those between the European countries and the U. S. major or minor contradictions? Can imperialist rivalries again be subsumed, as during World War II, under a greater world struggle, or not?

European countries are in part mobilizing against a rival bloc. U.S. troops still remain in Europe, and there are potential conflict situations. With the loosening of the cold war, there is freer play for Western rivalries. These could even develop into a new polarization on the old basis.

### Criticism of the Conference

Any real discussion and agreement must be based on our basic disagreements on the nature of the Stalinist societies. What brings us here is that each of us is a candidate to replace the CP, to construct a revolutionary alternative. To build internationally is to discuss basic outlooks, theory, program strategy.

In the period of prosperity now ending, when the working class did not intervene -- and it is now reasserting itself -- but even during the greatest world prosperity the fundamental problems of capitalism remained, in Western Europe as well as elsewhere. Unsolved problems raise immediate problems for socialists on their way to the United Socialist States of Europe, problems such as those of backward regions, the relation of the national working class to immigrant workers, etc.

It is important that we discuss the programmatic answers, how to link democratic demands with transitional and class demands, and so on.

Political program and not organizational techniques is what links our groups.

We must build national groups and collaborate toward the formation of an International. There must be a basis of selection for these conferences in order to have serious discussions among groups who have a chance for unification. We need discussions either on theory or on concrete action proposals -- as opposed to the broad middle level discussions held this year. Discussion of concrete projects of international cooperation could lead to closer and more profound ties.

We also question the basis for inclusion of some of the groups present, particularly in view of the exclusion of a revolutionary trade union militant with over 30 years experience in the movement because he is presently unaffiliated.

### CRITIQUES OF LUTTE OUVRIERE POSITIONS

I. S. (GB): We don't understand the details of L. O.'s internal structure.

And regarding revolutionary candidates in the coming elections being able to reach tens of thousands of workers who will welcome an alternative left of the CP -- this seems to be in contradiction with the fact that L. O. is so organized that they recruit only individuals. What about the others whose vote you win?

I. S. (U.S.): We don't understand L. O.'s political strategy outside the factories. Are there any transitional vehicles?

ICP (Italy): L. O. does not have the proper conceptions of building the party. L. O. is based only on cells in the big factories and doesn't fight in the intellectual milieu, which makes them theoretically empiricist. That they have roots in only one small part of the working class makes them a semi-spontaneist workerist organization.

NCLC (U.S.): We recommend to L. O.: be honest, be the best militants, fight

for democracy, and perhaps radicalize the demands of the unions; be members of a revolutionary party. But make no connection between work inside and outside the unions. Compare this with Trotsky on the United Front in the '30s, a United Front of the employed in the SPD and the unemployed in the KPD on a program of socialist reconstruction. ((?????!!!!))

ACCION COMUNISTA: Why in France don't you openly publish your paper as the central organ of L. O. ? What kinds of conferences does L. O. itself hold?

### Further CRITIQUES OF THE CONFERENCE

POUM: When all the groups present have developed significant influence, determining influence in their own countries, we will be able to create a revolutionary international. Until then, meetings like this are useful, though they would be more useful if the discussion were coherent.

ACCION COMUNISTA: We must organize on an international level, but new ways other than this conference must be found. We agree with I. S. (GB) on the dangers of sectarianism and opportunism, and about the groups here. Advance documents would allow us to have broader theoretical discussions. Another sort of meeting where, on the basis of common agreement, concrete discussions of international cooperation would be possible.

International cooperation is necessary, in particular in regard to the Spanish worker emigrants, who make up 2 out of 12 million Spanish workers. Because of them we do systematic work in Germany together with comrades who are present at this conference, and in Belgium with comrades who are not here. We would like to generalize this to all countries.

We work with other immigrant workers, but we want to do more systematic work.

Work in unions is outside Spanish experience. Working in bourgeois democratic countries is educational for us.

We will engage in international cooperation by participating in struggles in all the countries where we find ourselves.

I. S. (GB): On the subject of international cooperation: we are in agreement with Accion Comunista that building a party and an international are inseparable. So international discussions in international conferences are important in the struggle against dogmatism, as for example discussions we have had with L. O. have been very valuable not because we agree with their criticisms, but they can objectively see problems due to particular national problems. So we welcome every chance for international discussion.

The first two conferences were organized jointly by L. O. and the two I. S. We regret not being able to continue as sponsor due to the fact that the conference was not limited and there was no clear framework for the discussion. Some here think it is not yet necessary to construct open revolutionary parties, and are therefore involve in deep entry into the Labor Party. And there are those here who characterize others as nationalist and racist. If such a charge were serious, I would demand the immediate exclusion of such groups. We are happy to discuss with them, but the questions we discuss with them are different from those we discuss with other groups with whom we



have fundamental agreement but differences in strategy and tactics. We cannot conduct both discussions at the same time.

We want to continue the discussion on the possibilities of constructing an international.

### L. O. RESPONDS

#### On L. O. positions:

((See International Bulletin, #3, Part I, pages 44-45, regarding the elections.))

In the unions, revolutionaries must work for a real internal life, that is democracy. First of all this means fighting for meetings to be held so that workers can decide their own demands, the kinds of struggles they want to engage, can choose their own leaders, kicking out the bureaucracy in order, little by little, to return to the unions' democratic beginnings. The link between the unions and Stalinism can be broken only by a revolutionary party.

Defense of union democracy is an important part of working class democracy in general, and as such is important for revolutionaries in their struggle to prepare the working class to take and exercise power. To take power, the working class must be mature, must discuss its own solutions and apply them. To the slogan "Neither God nor Caesar" we must add "nor the Bureaucracy".

There can be no revolutionary activity inside the unions if there is no revolutionary organization outside. Otherwise there will exist only militant trade unionists.

L. O. does have conventions, but they are not public.

On the Common Market on the questions of bourgeois rivalry, and the role of the national states in the rivalry: U. S. hegemony hasn't been suppressed. The rivalry is based on competition which will disappear only with the disappearance of capitalism.

Even with legitimate workers' opposition to the Common Market, to oppose it will inevitably lead to our finding ourselves fighting against it with the nationalists and with the right. We are for the unity of Europe which the Common Market is not. We are against the bourgeois Common Market and against frontiers. We can fight only in the name of the United Socialist States of Europe. The working class must organize struggles over all of Europe over its own demands and with its own forces.

On Sino-American Rapprochement: Our positions -- that the Soviet Union is a degenerated workers state, that China is not -- allowed us to foresee what has happened. There is no need to invent a new category of state capitalism. There are two basic classes in the world: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Relations between them determine the nature of the state. It is the Chinese bourgeoisie which is trying to develop the economy by state capitalist means, much as did Peter the Great.

The Russian proletariat, as part of the world proletariat, took power and set up the Communist International to spread the revolution. Because the revolution didn't spread, the revolution degenerated and the working class was expropriated from power. That is not true of China.

The Chinese example of a country freeing itself from imperialism gave it influence on liberation movements in spite of its will to the contrary.

For us, the problem of the independent organization of the proletariat on the national and international scales is fundamental, determines the class line.

China first had to fight against Japanese imperialism. As soon as the Sino-Japanese war was over, they had to fight against U. S. imperialism for national liberation. The choice made by U. S. imperialism in the long run left China isolated, and resulted in China and the USSR being on the same side -- not because of Stalinist ideology or close economic ties, nor because of their imperialist relationships with the underdeveloped countries, but as a necessary alliance against the U.S., a circumstantial alliance, depending on the attitude of U. S. imperialism, because from a class standpoint the Chinese state is on the same side as the U.S. and there is deep opposition between Russia and China. This was shown by China's taking power against the will of Stalin, which allowed the U.S. to drive a wedge between Russia and China.

We don't expect an immediate U.S. - China bloc, nor an immediate cold or hot war against the Soviet Union.

The U.S. is considering abandoning its containment policy, but the 3 powers' guarantee of the status quo is necessarily unstable, since there will always be liberating movements, and because capitalism is unstable, as shown by the monetary crisis which is possibly the first sign of the beginning of a general crisis which would lead to war. In such a war, whatever diplomatic games occur beforehand, the U.S. and other imperialisms would necessarily oppose the Soviet Union.

#### Concluding the CONFERENCE:

The first conference drew 7 organizations from 5 countries, the second 13 organizations from 7 countries, and the third 16 organizations from 10 countries. So it has been a certain success, and we have had a free discussion among ourselves. We set no limit because of the basic necessities for the reconstruction of a real organization, and setting limits would force us to end up resembling the United Secretariat or the International Committee, which we reject. We are not opposed to a centralized international, we need a centralized world Trotskyist party of revolution, but it can't be built by rules or agreeing to exclude.

The first condition is free discussion between all revolutionary groups who want it, getting to know each other, to understand bit by bit what is going on in other countries and groups, and by this process better collaboration, and intervention by some groups in others on the basis of reciprocal confidence and generally accepted authority. Until a revolutionary leadership is created internationally, we need a means of intervention since confidence is lacking; otherwise we get involved in bureaucratic nonsense.

We are aware of the limits of the conference, which is only part of our international work.

The conference concretizes bilateral relationships. The discussion was confused due to various viewpoints, traditions, and methods, but the conference was a first step between conferences the groups can strengthen links with whomever they want.

Regarding the basis of choice: there was no choice, all groups present claim to be revolutionary Marxists and working for a revolutionary Marxist party. No choice was made on an organizational level, but individuals with whatever experience were not invited because that would not be useful. The limits set were not narrow, but the conference was limited to comrades under the discipline of a group.

TRANSLATION by PETER CAM

An important book on the Spanish revolution, Jalones de Derrota: Promesa de Victoria, by G. Munis, was published in Mexico in 1948 and is presently very scarce. A limited photo-copied edition has been made recently in Paris, and Munis has written an introduction to this new edition.

The complete text of this introduction has been published by the bulletin Alarma, organ of the Fomento Obrero Revolucionario (FOR), of which Munis is the leader. Among other political attitudes, this organization contends that the unions, by virtue of their very function, are integrated into the capitalist system, however good might be the intentions of some union leaders. The FOR is also hostile to the support of the movements of national liberation which they consider irrelevant or reactionary in the present period.

Besides his book on the Spanish revolution, Munis' thoughts have been expressed in various pamphlets published in Mexico and France. The early articles deal with his divergencies with the Fourth International on the Russian question, as well as with the attitude of the SWP during the war. His most recent work is For a Second Communist Manifesto, written with the collaboration of the poet Benjamin Perret.

The following translation is not literal -- 5 or 6 sentences have been deleted, and others simplified.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Spanish revolution assumes more and more importance as the year 1917 fades more and more into the past. The Spanish revolution was more profound than the Russian revolution, and more intense in human participation; it clarified political positions until then obscure, and paved the way for important tactical and strategic initiatives for the future. Today, any political theory which neglects the Spanish experience will reveal serious gaps, particularly where the Spanish revolution contrasts, positively or negatively, with the Russian experience.

The revolution destroyed the economic, political, and judicial structures of the capitalist society in Spain, and created or inserted its own structures. Without any shadow of doubt, the revolution assumed a socialist, proletarian character. The Russian revolution did not destroy the capitalist economic structure, except that after a vacillating period, state capitalism superceded private capitalism. It was a bourgeois-democratic or permanent revolution, made by the proletariat, and dead before reaching the socialist stage...

At the very time the Spanish revolution reached its apogee in 1936, the Russian counter-revolution consolidated its power for many years through the extermination of millions of people. Consequently, Spanish Stalinism, from the 19th of July, carried the banner of the counter-revolution against a proletariat which was liquidating capitalism. A conditioned response of the different segments of the Fourth International ascribes to Stalinism in Spain an opportunist or reformist role, of the type of Kerensky or Noske. But Stalinism in Spain was not an apologist or an auxiliary of the bourgeoisie -- it led the counter-revolution and implemented it with its own politics and its own thugs. It showed itself as the party of extreme reaction, the indispensable tool for the destruction of the revolution. This is the definitive character of so-called communism, illustrated for the first time in Spain, and very soon after elsewhere in Europe and Asia. Wherever

it reaches power, the proletariat is crushed, and the possibility of a revolution disappears for a long time.

Regarding tactics, the Spanish revolution invalidated or overcame those of the Russian revolution. The slogan of a government without the bourgeoisie and constituted by the representatives of the workers' organizations, so useful in Russia against Kerensky, was void of meaning in Spain, or had a negative content. The day after the defeat of the militarists and fascists, the real power was in the hands of the proletariat, through the committees which were non-existent a few days before.... From this day on, the most mortal menace for the proletariat emanated from the Stalinist party, not from any bourgeois party. The bourgeoisie and social democrats were astonished by the treacherous proficiency displayed by this so-called workers party in fighting the revolution, but they acquiesced.

The slogan "workers' control of production", still advocated by numerous leftists, was completely transcended by the economy, although, as we can see in the book, general coordination was hindered -- and at the top prevented -- by the state apparatus which had been reconstituted with the participation of the two labor confederacies, the UGT and CNT (the final pact of which officialized state capitalism).... It was demonstrated in Spain -- and not only there -- that the proletariat cannot control the capitalist economy without getting itself enmeshed, like a bird in a net. If workers' possession of the means of production is the cornerstone of socialism, workers' control is the ultimate recourse of capitalism at bay, or its first step in reconquering power under conditions like those of Spain in 1936.

The division of the large landed properties among the peasants is a bourgeois measure, as irrelevant or negative as would be the transformation of the great industrial concerns into a multitude of small shops. The organization of kolkozoes, or their present Chinese equivalent, agrarian communes, means only the proletarianization of agriculture, concordant with state capitalism and its political totalitarianism. Both measures were disdained in Spain in favor of the collectives, the development of which implied the suppression of the wage system and of mercantile production.... We cannot consider nationalization as a socialist measure, in any way whatsoever, whatever might be the power which realizes it....

Whenever the proletariat seizes the economy, nationalization would be the most insidious way to lose its conquest. We saw it in Spain. On this account, the tendencies which ignore the above-mentioned experiences condemn themselves to defend odious systems of exploitation and oppression: Russia, China. Worse, they condemn themselves to their own transformation into exploiters, if by accident power should fall into their hands.

G. Munis, March, 1972

---

\* There is some ambiguity regarding the use of the word "control". In Spanish, "control" is opposed to "gestion" (ownership). "Gestion" is the seizure of property and its administration by workers. "Control" is only the right to share management with the capitalist owners.

---

((This is a discussion article.))

Table of Contents, continued

	page
CRITIQUES of LUTTE OUVRIERE	53
I.S. (GB), I.S. (U.S.), ICP (Italy), NCLC (U.S.)	
CRITIQUES of the CONFERENCE	54
POUM, Accion Comunista, I.S. (GB)	
LUTTE OUVRIERE RESPONDS	
On L.O. positions	55
CONCLUDING the CONFERENCE	56
Translation by Peter Cam:	57
G. Munis, introduction to <u>Jalones de Derrota: Promesa de Victoria</u>	

Table of Contents, continued

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

CONTENTS OF PARTS QUATRE  
 1.2 (G), 1.3 (G), 1.4 (G), 1.5 (G), 1.6 (G), 1.7 (G), 1.8 (G), 1.9 (G), 1.10 (G), 1.11 (G), 1.12 (G), 1.13 (G), 1.14 (G), 1.15 (G), 1.16 (G), 1.17 (G), 1.18 (G), 1.19 (G), 1.20 (G), 1.21 (G), 1.22 (G), 1.23 (G), 1.24 (G), 1.25 (G), 1.26 (G), 1.27 (G), 1.28 (G), 1.29 (G), 1.30 (G), 1.31 (G), 1.32 (G), 1.33 (G), 1.34 (G), 1.35 (G), 1.36 (G), 1.37 (G), 1.38 (G), 1.39 (G), 1.40 (G), 1.41 (G), 1.42 (G), 1.43 (G), 1.44 (G), 1.45 (G), 1.46 (G), 1.47 (G), 1.48 (G), 1.49 (G), 1.50 (G), 1.51 (G), 1.52 (G), 1.53 (G), 1.54 (G), 1.55 (G), 1.56 (G), 1.57 (G), 1.58 (G), 1.59 (G), 1.60 (G), 1.61 (G), 1.62 (G), 1.63 (G), 1.64 (G), 1.65 (G), 1.66 (G), 1.67 (G), 1.68 (G), 1.69 (G), 1.70 (G), 1.71 (G), 1.72 (G), 1.73 (G), 1.74 (G), 1.75 (G), 1.76 (G), 1.77 (G), 1.78 (G), 1.79 (G), 1.80 (G), 1.81 (G), 1.82 (G), 1.83 (G), 1.84 (G), 1.85 (G), 1.86 (G), 1.87 (G), 1.88 (G), 1.89 (G), 1.90 (G), 1.91 (G), 1.92 (G), 1.93 (G), 1.94 (G), 1.95 (G), 1.96 (G), 1.97 (G), 1.98 (G), 1.99 (G), 2.00 (G)

CONTENTS OF THE COMPANION  
 PART I, Action Committee, 1.1 (G)

PART II, QUATRE, 1.1 (G)

On 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.30, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.40, 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47, 1.48, 1.49, 1.50, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.59, 1.60, 1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.69, 1.70, 1.71, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.80, 1.81, 1.82, 1.83, 1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.90, 1.91, 1.92, 1.93, 1.94, 1.95, 1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2.00

CONCLUDING THE COMPANION

Translation by Peter Carr  
 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.14, 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18, 1.19, 1.20, 1.21, 1.22, 1.23, 1.24, 1.25, 1.26, 1.27, 1.28, 1.29, 1.30, 1.31, 1.32, 1.33, 1.34, 1.35, 1.36, 1.37, 1.38, 1.39, 1.40, 1.41, 1.42, 1.43, 1.44, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47, 1.48, 1.49, 1.50, 1.51, 1.52, 1.53, 1.54, 1.55, 1.56, 1.57, 1.58, 1.59, 1.60, 1.61, 1.62, 1.63, 1.64, 1.65, 1.66, 1.67, 1.68, 1.69, 1.70, 1.71, 1.72, 1.73, 1.74, 1.75, 1.76, 1.77, 1.78, 1.79, 1.80, 1.81, 1.82, 1.83, 1.84, 1.85, 1.86, 1.87, 1.88, 1.89, 1.90, 1.91, 1.92, 1.93, 1.94, 1.95, 1.96, 1.97, 1.98, 1.99, 2.00