

5p

1/-

THE

communist

THEORETICAL JOURNAL
OF THE COMMUNIST
WORKERS ORGANISATION

'MILITANT'

PLAID CYMRU & CAPITALISM

BERT RAMELSON ON CARR'S BILL

TROTSKY & REVOLUTION

number 35

COMMUNIST

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SECRETARY

1000 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

TELEPHONE: (212) 697-5000

TELETYPE: (212) 697-5000

FACSIMILE: (212) 697-5000

INTERNET: WWW.COMMUNISTPARTYUSA.COM

POSTAL ADDRESS: 1000 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

POSTAL CODE: 10018

POSTAL OFFICE: NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

POSTAL SERVICE: NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

POSTAL DEPARTMENT: NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

POSTAL SERVICE: NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

POSTAL SERVICE: NEW YORK, N. Y. 10018

Editorial:

CLASS STRUGGLE

-3-

AND

PARTY STRUGGLE

The most notable political development since the Tory Party returned to power has been how quickly they transformed the political atmosphere in Britain. One journal described Britain in 1971 as being the only country which had led a counter-revolution, without ever having a revolution. Harold Wilson accused the Tories of 'dividing the nation' along class lines. The impression which has been created is that the Tories are drawing the battle-lines for class war clearly. In fact they are doing the opposite, i.e. obscuring the real conflict.

A minister of religion definitely captured the liberal bourgeois fears: 'We boast that the genius of the British political system is its ability to combine fundamental agreement about ends with genuine differences about means. But such a system could not survive all-out class war: and that is the way we are going at present.' (Rev Dr Colin Morris, Minister of Wesley's Chapel, London, in a sermon, quoted at the height of the power dispute by the Times in December)

The reality is that the attacks by Labour and Tory governments on the standard of living and conditions of the working class in the last few years are inevitably drawing a militant response, chiefly in the form of strikes; and, that the bourgeoisie, Labour and Tory are seeking to divert this response from developing into coherent political opposition by the working class. The basic trick involved is to make the Labour/Tory conflict out to be about ends not means.

The impression has been fostered that the Tories have fundamentally reversed the policy of the former Labour Government on vital questions such as 'industrial relations' and apartheid. As the Tories settled in, they stated their position on all major questions of policy, home and foreign. What emerged was that there has been no fundamental departure from the policy pursued by the last Labour government on any question.

A look at the most contentious government decisions, i.e. the Industrial Relations Bill, the wages policy at home, and the arms for S Africa question, abroad, will show this. The Industrial Relations Bill continues the work, begun by the Labour Govt's 'In Place of Strife' White Paper. It is an attempt by the capitalist class to create the legal framework in which to deal with the unofficial leadership in the economic struggle.

The wages policy, i.e. government interference in disputes in state concerns, to reduce wage claims gradually as a lead to private industry, coupled with tight money policy is the Tory's present approach. The Labour govt used statutory wage-freezes, credit restrictions, incomes policies. A variety of these devices are used by whatever government is in power in the stop phase of stop-go British capitalism, since the war. The only dispute is as before about means.

The 'conflict' in British politics over arms for S Africa is the most blatantly phoney effort of the lot. Labour's policy was to put pressure on the

S African government to modify and eventually scrap their apartheid policies in the bourgeois interest. There is no dispute in Tory/Labour politics over this policy. The impression is being created that the Tories are supporters of apartheid whereas Labour are not on the basis of the arms issue (this has more to do with internal Tory party politics and neo-colonial Commonwealth politics than the Labour/Tory conflict).

Only on questions like N Ireland and the Common Market can the British political parties appear^{not} to be split. Yet the atmosphere has definitely changed from that prevailing under Labour. Here is the only significant change of policy that has taken place: the decision to create the present political atmosphere, i.e. the appearance of fundamental conflict.

Under the Labour government the prevailing atmosphere in bourgeois politics was one of 'consensus' because the differences between Labour in government and the Tory opposition, on all major questions could ^{SCARCELY} surely be seen. There was no 'left/right' conflict only 'centre/right'. Undoubtedly it is the change of position by the parties that has facilitated the creation of the present 'left/right' polarisation again. Both parties have worked to create this polarisation. Labour in opposition must occupy the Left position, while the Tories provide a foil by adopting a Right approach in government (Carr's intransigence in introducing his bill, Heath's 'stubborn subjectivism' on the arms issue, Maudling's behaviour over the Rudi Dutschke affair). Labour are furiously creating political heat to refurbish their 'left' image and blur their government record (Mrs. Castle's behaviour in Parliament, scenes in the Commons etc)

The worker baiting during the power dispute was no accident, nor the handling of such emotional issues as the Dutschke and arms issues. This is 'healthy' left/right bourgeois politics being created. This is no direct reflection of class conflict, but of the efforts of the bourgeoisie to prevent class conflict emerging onto the political scene. There is every indication that their efforts must be successful.

The most notable working class development to emerge since the return of the Tories, has been the response to the Industrial Relations Bill, i.e. political strikes. The core of this is the unofficial trade union leadership in the factories up and down the country. They are chiefly threatened by the Bill. Their opposition to the Bill is an expression of political resistance, by the working class. This struggle unlike the Labour/Tory one is class conflict, even if it relates to only one aspect of capitalist rule. To replace the pseudo left/right polarisation of bourgeois politics would be a major step forward.

Every indication is, however, that far from attempting this the Communist Party is acting as a steward for the bourgeoisie, through the Liaison Committee for the Defense of Trade Unions. It is channelling working class opposition to the bill into support for bourgeois left politics, i.e. the Labour Party. The only coherent political lines emerging from the December 8 and January 12 demonstrations is summed up by the slogan 'Tories Out', which means Labour In. The propaganda on the Bill presents it as an attack on the official trade union movement, which it is not (See Communist No 33). This might appear to be clever tactically, fostering the social democratic image of the Tories as paranoid union-bashers (which they are not) but in practise it can only have

CONTINUED ON THE BOTTOM OF PAGE 15.

proletarian writers are 'apprentices'. That the proletarian régime is an apprenticeship, and so on. No one would deny that the regime was new, had to learn etc. But it is no accident that in 1948 Zhdanov had to state referring to literature that 'we are not apprentices'. He went on to say that Soviet literature was the most advanced and revolutionary. Apparently this whole theory was still in the air, and was being propagated still after twenty years,

Proletarian culture develops in the process of combatting petty bourgeois literature, by fighting against the pernicious influence of the petty bourgeoisie.

The fact is that Trotsky wishes objectively to perpetuate these schools of literature because, as he puts it, they will be the manure for the culture of Socialist society. This is another example of his failure to understand October. He sees nothing new in the revolution. He does not see the working class as now being the ruling class in alliance with the poor peasantry.

"Our revolution is the expression of the peasant turned proletarian, who yet leans on the peasant and lays out the path to be followed." So writes Trotsky in the introduction.

Here there is no differentiation of the peasantry. Particularly as this was written round about the time of N.E.P. With the retreat back into a N.E.P. in order that the proletariat could move forward it was perhaps natural that bewildering number of forms, ideas, groups, etc. should arise, but from a man of Trotsky's position and the claims he made of himself, we have the right to ask from him more than merely a reflection of the whole period.

It is a platitude that all proletarians in general arise from the peasant originally. The point is what distance divides them from this background. In Russia there were hereditary proletarians. They were known as this. They formed the core of the revolution. The revolution was the expression of the proletariat. They did not lean on the peasant. Rather the other way about. There was an alliance. This is Trotsky denying the leading role of the proletarian class. Indeed he hardly admits to their being a proletarian class at all!

This is also a reflection of Trotsky's familiar theme that Russia could not build a proletarian state. That is was impossible to build Socialism in one country. His diffusive words about the proletariat and the peasantry are an expression of his thesis that only the advanced states of Europe could really be successful in a revolution, because those countries had larger and older working classes. But all these statements, with all their contradictions, and inconsistencies, cannot disguise that, like the leaders of the Second International, he recognised (as they did) "the Soviets for struggle, but not for State power." (Lenin). And that is all.

But following from this it should be noted that these theories, remarks, themes etc., of Trotsky did not cease in the 1920's. These pernicious doctrines are with us now. They have in a sense grown stronger, more dangerous. This is a further proof that the class struggle intensifies after the establishment of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'.

It is notable for instance that in 1948 these old schools Trotsky writes of had raised their head again. The Leningrad affair exemplified this. Akhmatova who

Trotsky's case - and the first generation proletarians were more abundant than they - certainly corresponded with Lenin's view -

was a leading light of the original Symbolists, previous to and after the Revolution; was being published again, with exactly the same material. Of course she had new adherents. The manure was coming to the surface again! Has come to the surface! But as well known this was only one manifestation of this back-sliding on the part of the intelligentsia in the Soviet Union. It happened in music, art, science, etc., Revisionism reveals itself especially in the literary fields, the cultural field; for it is precisely this field that is the special province of the non-proletarian elements. Since Akhmatova, who has very little connection with Marxism, ... the Symbolists and allied groups existed also in the West.... had actually been published after the elapse of over twenty years, is proof that it was not 'only' revisionism, but anti-Marxism. This is not merely a question of a poetess being denied publication (which she was after the closure of a magazine in Leningrad) because in the past she was a participant in a bourgeois school of writing, but because the content had not changed one iota since those days of the pre-revolution. Also amazingly not even the style and form.

It is rather ironic after the Leningrad affair to read on page 219 the following: "The Party understands the episodic character of the literary groups of the transition period and estimates them, not from the point of view of the place which these groups occupy and can occupy in preparing a Socialist culture".

Episodic indeed! Trotsky has a non-class approach. It is precisely the class backgrounds of these 'literati gentlemen' which should be estimated most carefully. The petty bourgeois particularly in politics is always, if not in words, at least in actions, estimating most carefully the class background of people.

This quotation from Trotsky is petty bourgeois democracy with a vengeance. Various groupings occupying this or that place. He talks as if it were a parliament. This is the point. Indeed further on when he writes about Communism he talks about 'parties' in inverted commas, thinking this takes the odium from the word, or that he is only using the word in a derisory sense, and of course he does not believe in such things, but how large is the gap in the general circumstances from groups to parties? If there is any at all.

These groups, or more precisely these writers ought to be judged according to the attitude they take to the proletariat, the proletarian revolution, and finally to the proletarian dictatorship. Whether they are willing to serve the class or not. The degree to which judgement is passed depending on whether the writers were members of the Party or not. Of course it is also important who is responsible for publishing such people and their work. These writers can only prepare Socialist culture by identifying themselves with the working class, by adopting Socialism Realism.

But which segment of society takes up this non-class, above-class, freedom-for-the-artist position? The Petty Bourgeoisie. Such is Trotsky.

TROTSKY AND THE INNER CONTENT OF MARXISM

On page 218 we find this: "Art must make its own way and by its own means. The Marxian methods are not the same as the artistic. The Party leads the proletariat but not the historic processes of history. There are domains in which the

in which the Party leads, directly and imperatively." There are domains in which it only cooperates. There are, finally, domains in which it only orientates itself."

At first one would think that this is one way of putting a plea for persuasion in matters of art, for a non-rigid attitude; but it is deeper.

Marx wrote in reference to Proudhon:

"The solution of present problems does not lie for him in public action but in the dialectic rotations of his own mind. Since to him the categories are the moving force, it is not necessary to change practical life in order to change categories."

Trotsky is operating from a category. Trotsky might just as well have not read Marx. Because men make history with the material that lies to hand, i.e. the historic process. But this historic process is precisely what men have made. It is not expressed through them. Men make this process. If there are no men, there is no historic process.

"We make our own history, but in the first place under very definite pre-suppositions and conditions. Among these the economic ones are finally decisive. But the political, etc. ones, and indeed even the traditions which haunt human minds also play a part, although not a decisive one."

Engels

Tradition is indeed haunting Trotsky, (in the same fashion as it did with his cries about the Revolution devouring its children). But the tradition of Trotsky is on a lower position than even Hegel. Hegel stipulates a demi-urge, an absolute, which is expressed through the historical process, and this for Hegel was exemplified through the Prussian State with its feudal structure. But Hegel, at least, said it was an absolute idea, and further he did at least see history as a physical process, developing through contradictions. Trotsky sees historical processes as a 'system'.

The point is that by leading the proletariat consciously, the Communists are the first to understand the laws that govern history. The Communists are, and can change practical life, by allowing the productive forces full development through changing the economic base. Laws cannot be abolished but if conditions are changed new laws arise. The operations of laws can be utilised, manipulated for benefit. If new conditions are as far as possible consciously created, the laws that will arise will be understood in some measure before they commence to operate.

The more completely the world becomes Socialist, the more will the Communists be able to guide and utilise, and therefore, lead the so-called 'historic process'. Or more precisely make history consciously.

Ernst Fischer in his book on 'The Necessity of Art' differs very little from Trotsky in his conception of Art. (Fischer is a Communist, Austrian; the book was published in the early sixties). That is, that the petty bourgeois as artist must be allowed to continue to practise their art, in the same old fashion, with the same old licence, and even with more 'bourgeois freedom' than at present. According to Fischer this is so because the petty bourgeois are better equipped, and after all, Art is Art. They have, according to Trotsky and

and Fischer, a divine spark that entitles them to this privileged position. This is not talent or genius that is talked about, though one supposes it would have to be present with the divine spark. According to Trotsky and Escher this privileged position is because they save 'mankind' through their art. The Marxist position is that art saves this or that ruling class or social system.

According to Trotsky there is this thing Art, which because of its very indirect connection with the economic base has a special place above society. This is not the product of specific social systems. This is inevitable, because the petty bourgeois belongs not to a special class but to a strata, which vacillates between the two classes. Because of this, this strata feels, is under the illusion, that they stand apart, like a God, from others. They think that they can go on for ever, and have a special claim above all others in society. Therefore, it is easy to see that members of this strata, frequently gloss over, deny, the class content of social and artistic questions. This at the same time enables us to understand that individual members of this strata have come over and indeed provided the working class with its very ideology, Marxism. But we are not discussing this question. Actually Trotsky in this book makes a plea to let things remain as they are, minus the rottenness, vileness of capitalism. This is never said, written, but this is the general logic and viewpoint of his argument.

Implicit in Trotsky's thesis is the contention that Art is an absolute. But if one were honest what would this mean? It means God. Trotsky's position is that art is an absolute with different societies making formal changes in it.

The artistic material of mankind is made and developed by man. The achievements of one society are carried over, assimilated by following societies. Not only are these artistic productions changed, but new meanings are derived from the content, either hostile to the new forces in society or for the new forces. Previous contents wear older or even ancient forms. But also new content, and new forms arise. Immense variety can be exhibited. One thing is certain, that art is part of the ideological structure of society. It does not remain unchanged. The stock of artistic productions is added to, develops. And this is the struggle against the decaying artistic content of the old former ruling class of an outmoded society. No development is possible without struggle. Struggle is a condition for development.

Thus, proletarian art establishes itself by resolute struggle against the art of the decaying bourgeoisie. It does this by using the artistic weapons at hand or even forging new weapons (i.e. new content and form).

It is obvious that Trotsky's theory has nothing in common with the materialist method, nothing in common with Marxism. Indeed elsewhere in his book he states that out of the Revolution grew the materialist method! The point is the October Revolution was a confirmation of the materialist method. Trotsky presumably feels that by writing this he is being an advocate of 'practice'. One feels he is nudging us a sly dig on how practical he was. But to actually derive this from a revolution is really the most rule of thumb method. The materialist method, like other methods, did not come into the world fully armed. The materialist method existed before the October Revolution. But, if as Trotsky claims, the materialist method came in only with the Revolution, then, of course, Trotsky can claim to be one of the originators, as one of the leaders and, therefore, his theories are as good, and even better, than Marx's and

10.

Engels', because Marx and Engels did not participate in the October Revolution.

It also gives him an equal standing with Lenin - something he had to prove.

'The fullest proof that these are not just the isolated idiosyncrasies of a disgruntled politician is given once again by recent books and events.

Let us look at another statement from Trotsky's book.

"Finally, the nature of man himself is hidden in the deepest and darkest corner of the unconscious, of the elemental, of the sub-soil." Page 255.

Ernst Fischer expressed this idea almost word for word in his 'Necessity of Art'. On page 220 of Fischer's book, writing on art in classless Communist society:

"Tragedy will doubtless continue to exist because the development of any society - even a classless one - is inconceivable without contradiction and conflict, and perhaps because man's dark desire for blood and death is ineradicable."

Remarkable, is it not? Twenty five years after, the whole theory of Trotsky comes to the surface, from the manure, the word which for once Trotsky chose aptly. The whole crop of revisionist theories in art, biology, science and actual politics, the whole crop is discussed in 'respectable' Party circles. The crop derives directly from Trotsky, his petty bourgeois theories, and stand.

This is not the place to discuss the question of contradictions, and the form they will take in classless Communist society. But what kind of Marxist writes of the "elemental", the "sub-soil", "man's dark desire for blood and death". This is smuggling an absolute in another form. It is rank mysticism, religiosity, and all that is rotten from previous societies. The backwardness of man is here given respectability by these gentlemen. Something which Communists wish to fight against, eradicate, is accepted with 'poetic' resignation by Trotsky and Fischer. All just rotten bourgeois 'psychology'.

Trotsky writes that Marxian methods are not the artistic methods. What are artistic methods?

The processes of thought, in a given or suitable form, that go into the making of a novel, poem, play, painting, sculpture, film, etc. are not sacred or God-given. They do not need a special 'world'. Frederick the Great was a military genius and also a composer. Machiavelli was a statesman, poet, playwright. Other names spring to mind, Benvenuto Cellini, Leonardo da Vinci, etc. Their processes of thought operated in a diversity of directions. Stalin when young also wrote some essays, etc. Mao Tse Tung writes poetry. It is the division of labour (no doubt necessary at certain periods) derived from property-owning society, and more particularly capitalist society. It is this which makes one man an artist, another an engineer, etc.

Artistic methods are merely a general method applied to a special or particular field, i.e. Art.

Trotsky has an incorrect conception of technique. Writing about proletarian writers, and the necessity for them to learn 'technique', he says:

"Give us, they say, something even pock-marked but our own. This is false and untrue. A pock-marked art is no art and is, therefore, not necessary to the working masses."

But technique is not specifically a class question. The opportunity to learn technique is. Technique can serve either one class or another. The technique of rolling steel can take place in socialist society or bourgeois society. A socialist society could quicken the pace of the development of technique and invent new techniques; but the same technique could serve both social systems.

It is the same with art. The working class can learn technique, as all techniques can be learned. They have learned, will learn, are learning the technique of writing. But the most important thing which Trotsky never deals with is the content of art. The content of a proletarian novel etc. under Socialism (and in some cases before the revolution) will and should be different and better. So even if the proletarian art is pock-marked (technically inferior) it is and will be better than bourgeois art is, because the content is better. The more the proletariat frees itself from the ideology of the old society the better will it be. If the art is not proletarian, it is bourgeois, and therefore, inferior. This is a class question. Socialism is a higher and better society than all previous societies. The proletariat is the ruling class in Socialist society and, therefore, the proletariat is a better and higher class than all other classes. The working class will learn technique on the basis of the remoulding of the best art that has gone before, and in the development of their own new forms, will develop new techniques.

Contradiction exists in all things. What then is the contradiction facing the artist? It is the struggle to present subjective consciousness, by selection and development, into an objective content for others. It is a question, therefore, of what is typical, what is general.

The very job of the artist must be to submit to the discipline or follow the demands, the needs of the class he wishes to serve, or serves. The class asks that subjective consciousness is stripped of dross, that its particularity is made adequately objective. This is only the threshold for the artist. To get even this level is merely the ante-room of art.

For example much work is done that seems 'realistic', down to earth, because a series of facts, or events are recounted. But this is merely reportage. This is not art; this is journalism. Naturalism of the worst kind.

It is, therefore, precisely the demands, the constriction of wayward consciousness, the discipline that constitutes the spur to the artist. Artist is built on so-called limitations.

Trotsky's conceptions of contradictions and economies is imperfect. He writes (as Ernst Fischer) of the forces of competition as lying in the sub-soil. One of the 'dark forces' of mankind!

He conceives competition as something coming from outside like God in the shape of original sin. Not as part of and growing out of society. Competition comes from private property society.

Marx in his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (Estranged Labour) writes the following:

"Now, therefore, we have to grasp the essential connection.... between exchange and competition, value and devaluation of man, monopoly and competition, etc; the connection between this whole estrangement and the money system.

Do not let us go back to a fictitious primordial condition as the political economist does when he tries to explain".

This quotation was chosen as being an early one. Also quite original. Even at this time, 1844, when Marxism was being developed, Marx was quite clear.

Marx writes of the connection between exchange and competition..... "this whole estrangement and the money system". It is, therefore, between the market (i.e. exchange) and competition.

He further couples it with the fuller development of competition with the money system. Which, of course, is capitalism.

Landed property is immature capital, local, parochial, capital. Feudalism. Therefore, this competition which Trotsky speaks of is more associated with capitalism than previous societies. Or maybe Trotsky was muddled and really meant division of labour which indeed stretched back into the past, but not indeed into any sub-soil but to the family and tribe. It is indeed a division of functions. But Trotsky postulates the very thing that has to be explained. He takes for a fact, as given, the thing that must be understood.

Marxism, (and Trotsky claims Marxism) states that the mode of production determines consciousness. The mode of production gives rise to ideas, forms, etc. that include competition. Trotsky poses competition originally.

Competition can only arise (and this on a small scale) when there is a surplus product. When goods can be exchanged. Goods can be exchanged only when there is a surplus product.

Trotsky by erecting competition into original sin, for example 'sub-soil', 'dark forces', smuggles religion into Marxism. At least Christianity does state bluntly 'original sin'. Trotsky calls it competition, then puts its connections into the dark sub-soil.

Like the bourgeois he states that competition is rotten, but because it is necessary to capitalist society he puts it into the 'dark sub-soil'. Into part of nature. And not society. And man is created by society. Moulded, developed by society.

How can one take seriously a person who parades as a Marxist and yet can write in such a mystical fashion about competition? How can one treat Trotsky seriously if he glosses over class ideology? This is shown by the following:

"What are the metaphysicians of a purely proletarian science going to say about relativity? Can it be reconciled with materialism, or can it not?"

These are the words of someone hostile to the proletariat. Notice the sneer. One cannot separate Marxism from the proletariat. Proletarian science is Marxism.

Trotsky is giving himself a many-sided attack. He sneers at the fact that Marxism is purely 'proletarian'. At the same time he is saying that it is too pure. Again he is saying it should not be purely proletarian. And at the same he is saying it is not purely proletarian.

It is also a vicious sneer against the leading ideologists of Marxism as a class science, against those leaders who use Marxism as an instrument of the proletarian dictatorship, because of their "purity" which just means the desire to protect Marxism from revisionism.

The use of the word "metaphysicians" in the context is meant to suggest that there exists some sort of, something similar to, a priesthood, who, therefore, are the same as cardinals. Trotsky is saying that if it is a 'purely proletarian science' it is revealed religion. Like Christianity.

This is the cry of whole swathes of the "petit-bourgeoisie for decades, the cry of pretentious intellectuals. It is nowhere near Marxism.

Marxism is not some sort of eternal absolute for all classes, above classes. All classes have a world outlook, an ideology. Marxism is the ideology of the proletariat.

Trotsky treats Marxism as a science hostile to the proletariat.

Trotsky hangs his work together as it were, by questioning whether Socialism is being built (1924). One has only to note his references to the world revolution, and to the fact that the new Soviet State cannot exist for any appreciable time without this revolution.

This is borne out most significantly by his reference to revolutionary art, in contradiction to Socialist art.

But true Revolutionary art is the beginning of Socialist art; because it is a Socialist revolution. To Trotsky, as has been emphasised, this was not a Socialist revolution. He did not want it to be. He could not admit the real character of the revolution, because this would mean the beginning of the end of his class position. Not only for him but for the entire petty bourgeois. Therefore it is denied that it is a proletarian revolution: things are as 'they were'. The position according to Trotsky's theory has changed very little since the period 1900-1917. And of course this fully fits in with his attitude concerning the roles of all the various schools of literature, his 'liberal' attitude to them. Some it must be said on a lower level than various bourgeois literary and artistic groups than say in Germany, and France of even pre-First World War vintage.

His glossing over of class struggle because the proletariat has to learn technique.

continued on page 27

Comment: Ramelson on Carr

As a follow-up to his 'Productivity Deals' pamphlet's success, and as a parallel to the CPGB's organisational success in containing the militancy created by Carr's Bill, Bert Ramelson has once again set pen to paper. His latest pamphlet claims to be an exposition of the Bill, a class assessment of it, and advice to the working class as to how to 'kill it'.

As a description of the Bill, the pamphlet is fair enough--except on one point. Under the heading 'Object: to Weaken, Divide and Disrupt', Ramelson writes: 'To escape heavy liabilities a punitive compensation under the terms of the Bill, union leaders will be obliged to act as the Tories' unpaid gendarmes and narks...It doesn't require much imagination to see what bitterness this will create between the leaders and officials of the unions on the one hand and the most active and influential members of the Union on the other, which can only undermine the status and authority of the officials,...(and)lead to ...the overall weakening of the unions.'

The objective of the Bill is not to divide the union leaders from the men. This has already occurred, indeed L Daly was glad to have been divided from his members recently--by the police force. The Bill aims at strengthening the officials in relation to the men, at making them even less responsive to the demands of the workers. Because the bourgeoisie has the official trade union movement under its political control--mainly via the Labour Party. The Industrial Relations Bill is being used to strengthen the hold of the relatively 'safe' officials over the unofficial movement.

Ramelson is correct in foreseeing 'bitterness', i.e. class struggle. It is a petty bourgeois reaction to decry this, however. A communist reaction is to explain the forces involved, that the working class may be aware of the roles played by the various organisations. One of these organisations whose role is to be explained is the official trade union movement. But since the CPGB went over to the bourgeoisie, i.e. since the victory of revisionism, it has ceased clarifying things, and has busied itself with the spreading of lies and confusion. Ramelson's contribution to this task in his latest pamphlet is brought out by looking at his views on the reasons for the bill, its significance and the way to 'kill it.'

What must the workers do about this Bill? 'The key to success is the total mobilisation of the working class and Labour movements in defence of democracy and the trades unions. Success in this campaign could very well lead to a speedy and welcome end to the Tory Government'

'The sooner we get rid of it, and replace it with a Labour Government committed to the policies adopted by successive TUC and Labour Party conferences the better.'

In other words, the way to stop Robert Carr in his tracks is to replace him by Barbara Castle, author of 'In Place of Strife' etc. Ramelson would no doubt object that the present Labour leaders are not committed to 'policies adopted by successive...conferences'. But they never are: 'No-one has ever seriously claimed that a Government which must be responsible to Parliament can be instructed'. (i.e. by conference) said Harold Wilson in 1968, at the Labour Party Conference.

What Ramelson presumably means is a 'left wing Labour government'--as is spoken of in the 'British Road to Socialism'. But that's just what we had--Wilson, Castle etc are all ex-Left wingers. The only thing left-wing about them was their reputation. And that is why they exist, to give the Labour Party as a whole the air of being a working class, socialist party (which it obviously is not).

The role of the CPGB is now to bolster that image by spreading illusions about the class nature of the Labour Party. But because there is no opposition to the CPGB, since there is no communist organisation with the political strength to expose the CPGB, naturally they sweep the board. Not in the sense that the CPGB was able to mobilise thousands of workers to demonstrate against the Bill. They would have come anyway. But the CPGB was able to place itself at the head of these workers and spread illusions about the Labour Party among them. (At the same time of course it proclaimed to the bourgeoisie 'Don't worry about these demos and strikes. They are only in support of your Labour Party'.) The need of the working class is for its own political party, independent of the bourgeois Labour Party. This does not, of course, interest the revisionists.

Not only does Ramelson spread illusions about the Labour Party, he spins a great yarn about the present situation. It is one in which the workers bargain with the owners on something approaching a 'basis of equality' (p 4); the working class has the 'gains' (p23) of the nationalised industries. But the Tories have upset this balanced constitution--they have 'unleashed' 'the class war' (p 19) with the Bill which is 'the most vicious piece of politically motivated class legislation since the Combination Acts'. (p 3). And even worse: 'Today it is introduced to punish workers...it could very well be extended to other fields tomorrow'. It is 'a fascist conception...' (p 8 and p 13)

Small matters like how the bourgeoisie have survived for 300 years without this type of 'class legislation', or why, after their stunning victory (i.e. revisionism) they should resort to a last ditch tactic like fascism, are not explained.

D.R. Stead

EDITORIAL CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4

the effect of weakening resistance to the bill when it becomes law.

The CPGB is doing this, because having ceased to be a communist party, it is now a part of the bourgeois social democratic left.

There is no doubt but that the class struggle in Britain has sharpened. This is the underlying basis, motivating the bourgeoisie to brush up its politics,

to contain the working class response. In this situation there is not the semblance of a communist movement explaining the real issues to the working class. All this points to success for the efforts of the bourgeoisie. The CPB(ML) maintains that the bourgeoisie are moving towards fascism to deal with the working class (See Communist No 27). What we have described is the bourgeoisie, containing working class struggle within social democratic bounds. As long as it continues to do that there's no need of fascism.

Meeting with 'Militant'

THE TROTSKYIST MILITANT GROUP AND THE TWO NATIONS IN IRELAND

On 15th January 1971 a debate between the trotskyist "Militant" group and the Irish Communist Organisation (Communist Workers' Organisation) was held in the Conway Hall. Approximately 150 people attended, being mainly members of the two organisations and at least one member of the Provisional IRA.

IRELAND AND IMPERIALISM

The trotskyist "Militant" was represented by Ted Grant and P. Taffe. Taffe spoke first by putting forward the traditional Catholic nationalist line on the Partitioning of Ireland, i.e. that British imperialism was alone responsible for Partition.

He said that "the reason that British imperialism Partitioned Ireland" was part of their policy of "divide and rule". "The 1913 lockout (in Dublin) was a great boost to the labour movement", he said, and this was the motivation for British imperialism to divide the working class by Partitioning Ireland.

He went on to say that the "opposition to Home Rule was not economically based". Far from this being the correct view, it was precisely the antagonistic economic interests of the Protestant bourgeoisie and the Catholic petty bourgeoisie, arising from the uneven development of capitalism in Ireland which gave rise to the Home Rule crisis. (see 'THE ECONOMICS OF PARTITION' by the ICO). The existence of two nationalities in Ireland would not of itself have given rise to the creation of two states in Ireland in the absence of this economic conflict.

WORKING CLASS UNITY

He also stated that there was a tendency for Catholic and Protestant workers to come together in 1969. Who then was building the barricades and who was attacking them? The trotskyist "Militant" would like to believe that the Catholic and Protestant workers were on one side and the 'agents of imperialism' were on the other. But history is very mean to the trotskyist "Militant" (and all trotskyists for that matter) - and the real history of Northern Ireland in 1969/70 is a history of conflict between the Catholic and Protestant communities which are both dominated ideologically by the nationalism of their respective bourgeoisies. And there is no suggestion in the real history of the period of a tendency for Protestant and Catholic workers

to come together.. (The example which trotskyists often quote of unity between Protestant and Catholic workers is the Harland and Wolfe shipyards in Belfast where the "great" trade union leader, Sandy Scott, is supposed to have pioneered this unity. It is implied that this unity was on a class basis. In fact what happened was that the sectarian conflict broke out in the Belfast shipyards towards the end of 1969 resulting in a few hundred Catholic workers being sent home for safety, as they were in the minority. Three days of discussions followed between unions and management, at the end of which the management agreed to dismiss on the spot any man who practiced sectarianism (or brought his nationalism to work). The unions agreed not to fight a reinstatement case for any individual who was sacked for this reason. And thereafter a great "unity" of the working class prevailed in the Belfast shipyards).

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT NATIONALISM

Ted Grant was the second speaker for the "Militant" group. He said that the ICO had changed from a position of Catholic chauvinism to a position of Protestant chauvinism. Before the ICO became aware of the existence of the Protestant nationality it held a position which was strongly influenced by Catholic nationalism, which is the present position of all political organisations which deny the existence of the Protestant nationality. The ICO broke with Catholic nationalist ideology on becoming aware of the existence of two nationalities in Ireland. All research on this subject and all changes in ICO positions have been published. Now Grant says that he does not accept that there are two nationalities in Ireland. He recognises that there are two predominant chauvinist positions in Irish bourgeois politics: referred to for simplicity of identification as Catholic and Protestant. Collins Dictionary describes chauvinism as "aggressive patriotism", and patriotism as a "love of or loyalty to one's country". If that is so, what does Grant's position amount to? Perhaps in trotskyist "dialectics" it is possible to conceive of two positions of chauvinism, or "aggressive loyalty to one's country (or state)", which, although they are completely antagonistic, are both based on one nationality.

CONNOLLY AND PARTITION

Grant also agreed with Connolly's position on the "Orange phenomenon" and said that "Connolly always put forward an internationalist position.. This is a fine piece of phrasemongering, and nothing more. How could Connolly have put forward an internationalist position in relation to a nationality of whose existence he was unaware. Connolly deduced that the economic basis of the opposition to Home Rule in Ulster was landlordism, and that Orangeism was religious bigotry which the landlords were exploiting. He therefore concluded that Orangeism would die out in time. But it hasn't! And when the Home Rule crisis came to a head the landlords took sides geographically: in Catholic areas they were Home Rulers and in Protestant areas they were Unionist. Connolly was mistaken on the question of the economic basis of the opposition to Home Rule in Ulster; history has proven him wrong. It is also true to say that if Connolly had lived beyond the establishment of the Free State and Northern Ireland he would have realised that something infinitely more substantial than religious bigotry was involved in the Ulster Volunteers and the Orange Order. And what was a mistake on Connolly's part 60 years ago cannot be considered a mistake on the part of Ted Grant in 1971, who has 60 years of history to learn from. His attempt to use Connolly's mistaken position as a

justification for his support for Catholic nationalism, far from being a mistake, is in fact an opportunist position.

TROTSKYIST TACTICS

When the contradiction between Catholic nationalism and Protestant nationalism in Northern Ireland exploded into aggressive conflict in 1969, the "Militant", according to Ted Grant, called for "the arming of Catholic and Protestant workers" and for "trade union defence organisations". Now it is a fact of life that the only reason that there were not more deaths in the early days of August 1969, before the British army intervened, was that there was a severe shortage of guns on both sides. Ted Grant and his band of romantic trotskyists would have "put forward a clear class position" of adding fuel to the fire of sectarian strife by arming both sides in the national conflict. The sectarianism, looting, death and arson, which were a feature of life in Belfast in August/September 1969 were described by Taffe as "150,000 workers setting up their own law and order" and an act of "social liberation".

IMPERIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

When the British army intervened the ICO explained that it was intervening to stop the conflict between the two communities which was not in the interest of imperialism. The British army was performing a democratic role of preventing an open full scale armed conflict between the two communities. In August 1969 a section of the Northern Ireland state machine got out of the control of the Stormont government. This section was the B.Specials and the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC): the armed militia of the Protestant state. The first task performed by the British army was to replace the B Specials and the RUC in Catholic areas, thereby decreasing the tension between the two communities.

Ted Grant criticised the ICO for holding that the British Army, in the situation outlined above, was a democratic force, and said that it was an imperialist force. This ability to counterpoise two distinct things as being two extremes of the same thing is a favourite trick of trotskyist "theorists". Imperialism is a mode of production; the highest stage of capitalism. And democracy is a form of government; i.e. bourgeois democracy etc.. Imperialism can be democratic, reactionary or fascist etc., depending on which form of rule serves its interests best at any given time. The attitude which Ted Grant and the "Militant" adopt towards imperialism is one of moral indignation rather than political opposition. In their eyes imperialism is an "evil" force and not a mode of production. This is in marked contradiction to their great leader, Trotsky, who held that the era of national liberation struggles was over in 1915 because the productive forces of the world had outgrown national boundaries. The consequences of this, as far as Trotsky was concerned, was that what existed was world economy and world society under the hegemony of finance capital, and that the international division of labour, which is the basis of imperialist exploitation, would remain even under socialism. Trotsky, far from being opposed to imperialism, considered it essential to the building of socialism. On this question, as on most others, Trotsky's and Lenin's positions are worlds apart.

PROTESTANT WORKING CLASS

Grant went on to say that the reason the Protestant working class was resisting attempts at a united Ireland today was that they were afraid of the Catholic bourgeoisie. Not because they constituted a separate nationality from the Catholic nationalists but because:

'The Protestant working class was afraid that they would be victims of the same monstrous repression under a 32 Co government as they had used against the Catholics in the North.' (our emphasis)

But why did this 'monstrous repression' of the Catholic minority in the N Ireland state take place. Grant would have us believe that the two communities in Ireland, which have been in conflict for 100 years and which have established and maintained their own separate states for 50 years, and which resulted in the 'monstrous repression' of the Catholic minority in the Northern state, could be reconciled and united if it was not for the fear of the Protestant working class that the Catholic bourgeoisie would take its revenge on the Protestant community by 'monstrous repression'. Has there ever been a more static view of history?

PARTITION--AN IMPERIALIST PLOT ?

This view of the Protestant/Catholic conflict in Ireland ignores the basis of this conflict. It does not consider why or how the conflict arose in the first place. But in fairness to Grant and the trotskyist 'Militant' group, they do offer an explanation! As P Taffe said: 'The 1913 lockout (in Dublin) was a great boost to the Labour movement' and this was the motivation for British imperialism to divide the working class by Partition in Ireland. Somehow, the Protestant community must have been 'tricked' or 'duped' by British imperialism into opposing Home Rule since according to Taffe, they had no economic interest in this opposition, and Partition resulted from this. But the conflict did not begin in 1913! In 1886 the first Home Rule Bill was opposed by the Protestant community. But let the 'Militant' away with their historical inaccuracies for a moment and consider the practicality of this theory. Somehow, British imperialism succeeded in convincing the Protestant community to oppose Home Rule for Ireland. The British imperialists persuaded the Protestants that they should buy a load of guns from their enemy, Germany, only 2 years before the First World War broke out, and also persuaded 100,000 Protestants to arm themselves to oppose inclusion under a Catholic Home Rule government. The imperialists then persuaded Carson, a prominent spokesman for the Protestant community to declare that if Britain did not support the Protestant Unionists, they would get the support they needed from the German Kaiser. The next 'trick' imperialism performed was to order the British Army at the Curragh in S Ireland to deal with the Protestants who opposed Home Rule and at the same time 'tricked' the same army into a mutiny against the order. This may sound very 'dialectical' to the great trotskyist 'theorist' Ted Grant. But to any sane worker, not to mention a Marxist, it must appear as a most bizarre trotskyist nightmare.

CONCLUSION

Grant continued:

'We have a different position: Lenin and Connolly's position..The solution is to put forward a proposal for a united Socialist Ireland'. (our emphasis)

So there you have it! The solution is to put forward a proposal for a United Socialist Ireland. Like Bernadette Devlin, Eamonn McCann and various other trotskyists have been doing for quite a long time! So they must be pretty close to bringing about a Socialist United Ireland then? Well, not exactly. The problem is the Protestant community, including the working class which refuses to have anything to do with the nation of a united Ireland whether it's called 'Socialist' or 'Catholic'. The Protestant community is of the impression that the Devlins, Mc Canns, and all the other trotskyists and revisionists are nothing more than a creation of Republicans or Catholic Nationalists in left wing camouflage. Now where did they get that idea from?

*

*

*

Jim Birne

*

PLAID CYMRU's plans for CAPITALISM in WALES

"Some suggest that the capitalist system can be 'reformed'. That is not our belief. The need is not for the reconstruction of capitalism, but for its destruction. Revolution in some form or other is the only way by which an adequate system can be substituted for it." (Welsh Nationalist Policies and Aims, 1930's, p 10)

Plaid Cymru's annual conference in October showed clearly how its leadership now understands the need to present a radical appearance to the Welsh working class. The majority of Welsh workers still give political support to the Labour Party, but the last Labour Government was forced to introduce clearly anti-working class measures--a high unemployment rate, the prices and incomes policy, the attempted industrial relations bill, cuts in the social services.

Since the Labour Party's defeat in the last General Election it has once more set about the task of winning support as a 'socialist' party by opposing the Conservatives' industrial relations bill and economic measures. Plaid Cymru's leadership recognises the urgent necessity to prevent the Labour Party regaining its lost support. The election of Phil Williams to the post of Party Chairman and his criticisms of Labour policies as 'not socialist' mark the beginning of a serious campaign to present Plaid Cymru as the workers' party of Wales.

At the annual conference Phil Williams stated: "If we are to be an important force in Welsh life, and if we are to campaign on a wide front, we must have a socialist policy, but it is essential that that policy should be in the Welsh tradition... the Party needs to define its policies on wages and benefits, workers control, housing and education and the whole range of social and industrial policies. This has been the one gap in our policies, and when we have a coherent social and industrial policy it will complete the spectrum." (Western Mail, 26 Oct 1970)

Plaid Cymru will be basing its social and industrial policy on the Economic Plan for Wales it published earlier this year. This plan is dedicated "to the working people of Wales, who have never had the economy they deserve", and is the foundation on which it is hoped to build a socialist image.

The development of nationalist politics in Wales to the point where this has become a credible tactic for Plaid Cymru is currently being dealt with in a series of articles appearing in The Communist. This article attempts to examine whether its economic aims, which form the basis of Plaid Cymru's politics, amount to a genuine socialist policy in the interests of the Welsh working class.

Planning

Like all features of capitalist society economic planning plays a class role. Where the capitalist class resorts to the regulation and actual ownership of parts of the economy, it does so because it is in the interests of the dominant force--capital--to do so. Planning is used to help the market function and is (except war-time measures) subordinate to the market.

Under socialism planning is used by the working class to destroy all remnants of the capitalist system of production for profit and to establish a system of planned production for use. In both capitalism and socialism, planning serves the interests of the class which is politically dominant.

The view that there is something exclusively socialist about economic planning has been one of the weapons used by the social democrat and revisionist left to confuse the aims of the working class movement.

"Planning means different things to different people, but I suggest that the essence of it lies in trying to identify, and where possible quantify, the problems that face us, and then seeking to work out, in the light of available resources, the policies that best promote their solution...Because our problems are continually changing, planning must be a continuing process, and this document is a first step." (Labour Government White Paper, 1967, p. v) (emphasis mine, N. McK.)

Economic planning is a device for sorting out problems within capitalism. How does Plaid Cymru's conception of planning differ from the Labour Party's?

"Certain parts of the plan could be implemented now, without the complete measure of autonomy sought by Plaid Cymru, provided that Wales was given substantially more self-determination than at present." (Economic Plan for Wales, p 226). "Plaid Cymru aims to achieve these targets not only in Wales as a whole, but within each region, so that balanced economic development is possible throughout Wales. in this way the existing social structure will be strengthened rather than replaced." (Economic Plan, p. 8)

The Labour Party is more modest in its claims only because it is faced with the realities of running a capitalist economy. But both it and Plaid Cymru are agreed on the function of planning. It is to solve problems of uneven development "in the light of available resources" so that "the existing social structure will be strengthened." Neither sees economic planning as a tool for eliminating the power of capital over the economy, neither envisages any change in property relations because neither is talking about a situation in which the working class holds political power.

Plaid Cymru and British Capitalism

How would the new radical Nationalist Party affect the interests of British capitalism?

Just as the differences between Labour and Conservative are over how to plan, not whether to plan, so the difference between Plaid Cymru and the establishment parties is over where to plan. For the British bourgeoisie, planning is a device for evening out uneven development in the interests of the unified British market. It is anxious to improve transport and communications between industrial South Wales and the Midlands, and between North Wales and Merseyside and the North of England because they need cheap and efficient links within the UK market. Because there is no unified Welsh market the British bourgeoisie treat Wales as a 'region' that needs development if it is to provide more profit.

Plaid Cymru is not opposed to these links, or to the content of regional development policies. It wants the links supplemented between North and South Wales as the basis for developing a more unified economic life in Wales while the links with the rest of the British market are retained. And it wants development policies to assist capitalism to continue, in Wales, while demanding that these be administered by a National Parliament in Cardiff.

Plaid Cymru says that:

"The Government in London have also tended in recent years to acknowledge the necessity of different levels of economic stimulus in different parts of the United Kingdom by their policies of 'regional' investment incentives and employment premiums. Plaid Cymru's proposals take this a step further by investing in a Welsh Government the power to design such economic measures as meet the requirements of the Welsh economy." (p 258, *ibid.*, my emphasis, N. McK)

Plaid Cymru's demand is for the 'economic region' of the British market to be placed under the political control of the Welsh Parliament (through peaceful means), so that the Welsh petty-bourgeoisie will be in a better position to look after its own interests within the British market. Plaid Cymru's economic plan is neither anti-imperialist nor anti-capitalist; its aim is an adjustment of the market under political 'self-government'.

"Plaid Cymru is committed to a policy which allows the free movement of capital between the countries of Britain, and an essential feature of the plan is that a Welsh Government would provide the basic infrastructure of communications and services which will attract capital investment to Wales. The Welsh Government will aim to make the Welsh economy an area of profitable investment for international capital...In so doing it will be possible to release the latent resources of manpower and materials which exist in Wales, so that Wales itself will benefit from capital investment." (p 267, *ibid.*, my emphasis, N. McK.)

How does Plaid Cymru propose to make an 'independent' Wales a profitable area of investment for foreign capital (by 'foreign', 'non-Welsh' capital is meant)?

Since its policies--like the Labour and Conservative Parties'--are devised to operate within a capitalist economy in Wales, Plaid Cymru identifies the

previous weaknesses of the Welsh economy as the failure of state planning to make the economy attractive, i.e. profitable enough. Its proposals, for solving Wales' economic problems, simply take state planning for capitalism "a step further". What it calls for is a more consistent and thoroughgoing use of the state to ensure that capital is attracted to Wales. Plaid Cymru proposes the setting up of a National Development Authority in Wales, "responsible to the Welsh Parliament and financed jointly from the Welsh budget and from private funds".

"The NDA would have responsibility for the setting up of industry in growth areas; the organisation of industrial parks at growth centres (which may be delegated to the local authorities); the setting up of a National Road Building Company; the overall performance of the nationalised industries including steel, gas, electricity, water, telecommunication and postal services, railways, airports and ports; liaison with Government departments and other bodies such as the Universities to ensure that all national economic developments are co-ordinated, the setting up of Colleges of Business and Industrial Affairs." (Welsh Nation, October 1970)

The National Development Authority

The private financing of the NDA is planned to operate through the Welsh Government borrowing money on the market at 8 per cent. This will be used to try and attract capital to Wales through the NDA. Through an expenditure from the Welsh Budget of £8 M in its first year, it is planned that this will enable £100 M to be immediately available to try and attract industry to Wales.

"The NDA will be given the task of setting up industry, with the possible options of encouraging and assisting Welsh private enterprise to start up industrial plants, or of attracting industry from outside Wales, or of creating publicly owned industry directly". (my emphasis N. McK.)

"The NDA in Wales will be empowered and directed to create the right circumstances for industry to develop profitably and efficiently in a growth area on its own feet, rather than to spend public funds to subsidise industry to run at a loss (though the NDA will be permitted to assist with initial losses incurred in setting up). To this end, the development of transport and communication on the one hand, and the necessary industrial infrastructure at the nodal points in the growth areas on the other hand, combine to take priority over a system of direct cash subsidies."

"The NDA will be empowered to offer grants and inducements to industrialists in any part of Wales, to any extent, at their own discretion, subject to the broad control of the Welsh Government. In this way the inflexible aspect of the current system operated by the UK Government will be overcome, and the grants which an industry gets will be a matter of negotiation between the NDA and the company concerned." (p 232, *ibid*)

Criticism of previous regional development policies introduced by the Labour Government is here made from a similar position to that taken by the Tories. There has not been sufficient 'flexibility' in applying the system, industry must learn to stand 'on its own feet'. The argument is not against the power of capital, but that planning has not properly released its power.

"The grants will be part of a legal agreement between the NDA and the company concerned, and the company will be expected to give certain undertakings as

their part of the agreement. The grants paid will be proportional to the benefit which the venture brings to the community. One of the main criteria which the NDA will consider will be the number unemployed, and the total value added within the Welsh economy for a given investment of public capital." (p 233, *ibid*, my emphasis N. McK.)

For Plaid Cymru, the demand that the Welsh economy should be more profitable neatly fits in with their claim that their intention is to provide employment for the Welsh working class. Since profit is created out of the exploitation of labour, it is in the interests of capitalism that the maximum proportion of the labour force should be employed. Unless high unemployment has a significant effect on reducing the bargaining position of labour, the objective interest of the capitalist is in providing employment. This is a basic necessity of the modern capitalist economy. If the gradual collapse of his market is to be avoided. It is typical of petty bourgeois economic 'planning' to try to turn something which capital needs, into a service which is being virtuously provided in the interests of the working class.

How would the party dedicated to the Welsh workers try to make sure that Wales is absolutely safe for capital? The NDA would offer the following inducements to private capital to exploit the Welsh working class:

- (1) Free or rent reduced occupation of factory premises
- (2) Immunity or partial reduction of taxation on profits
- (3) Loans interest free, or at reduced rates of interest
- (4) Grants towards machinery and equipment costs
- (5) Guarantees to cover a proportion of losses incurred during initial period of operation
- (6) Guaranteed markets for manufactured goods which can be used by NDA departments or Government departments
- (7) Guaranteed return on capital to private investors
- (8) Aid in technological, management, marketing or service activities.
- (9) Cheap rates of utilities and service which come under the NDA
- (10) Full partnership with private companies in any venture

(p 234, *ibid*)

All of these powers, with the exception of numbers 6 and 7, are powers that have already been taken in principle, though not always to the extent Plaid Cymru would like, by the British (Labour^{or} Conservative) Governments. What the British bourgeoisie do not accept as in their interests are demands 6 and 7. These would have the effect of strengthening a weak petty bourgeois class in Wales by giving it a guaranteed return on investment and assisting the development of a Welsh market. Demand No 7 would also aid the big British company, but a more or less guaranteed return on investment would not be exclusively offered by Wales. Its main effect would be to help the petty bourgeoisie in a situation where left to market forces alone, it would tend to lose to the British bourgeoisie. The demands are pro-capitalist and pro-British imperialist. But they would effectively discriminate in favour of a petty bourgeoisie which is trying to use state planning to aid its development into a big bourgeoisie.

This is made clear by the way Plaid Cymru describes how a typical NDA operation for the generation of a Welsh bourgeoisie would work out in practice:

- " 1. The NDA will decide on the location and the amount of grant that it can offer, in relation to the expected size and nature of the project;
2. The NDA will then approach companies already in Wales to see whether any are interested in the project;"

IF NONE ARE INTERESTED, THEN...

3. "The NDA will approach foreign concerns to see if any are interested;"
again, IF NONE....

4. "They will advertise in Wales for any entrepreneur to enter a joint venture with the NDA to establish a semi-publicly-owned concern;"

IF NO ONE IS INTERESTED...

5. "The NDA will launch a subsidiary company (for which public capital subscription may be sought) and employ suitable expertise, recruited from anywhere in the world to manage the Welsh concern."

"In this way it is intended to give private enterprise every opportunity to take the lead in the matter, but if private enterprise fails to respond, the matter will not be left forgotten, as is now the case, but instead, public enterprise will undertake the work. Whichever way, development will not be halted or delayed for anything but the most fundamental of reasons." (p 235, *ibid*, my emphasis N. McK.)

Place in the sun for the home petty bourgeoisie

So Plaid Cymru's anti-imperialism and anti-capitalism consists of giving the home petty bourgeoisie first refusal of opportunities for profit which are guaranteed by the state. And its 'socialism' consists of establishing, as a last resort, companies in those areas of the economy where even guaranteed profits and all the other inducements fail to lure private enterprise.

Under Plaid Cymru's plan the number of state enterprises established on this basis would probably be kept to the absolute minimum. Given such a cushioning system it is doubtful if even the weakest sections of the Welsh petty bourgeoisie would be frightened off by any risks. They would have very little to lose anyway.

Plaid Cymru's categorical statement that "the party does not advocate any further nationalisation of manufacturing industry" describes the future which the petty bourgeoisie sees for itself in Wales. It doesn't propose to de-nationalise any of the basic large scale industry in Wales--even the monopoly capitalist has found that these are better run by the state. What it wants, and what the NDA is designed to achieve, is the maximum opportunities for the petty bourgeois to develop in the new manufacturing industries. This is the economic motive behind the 'socialist' call for a balanced and diversified economy. Where Plaid Cymru's old 'perchentyaeth' (co-operative democracy) aims conflict with the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, they are of course thrown out. But not so crudely that the co-operative wing in the party sees its support is simply being exploited for capitalist ends. It is all dressed up in talk about the need to adapt realistically to modern technological conditions, just as Wilson adapted the Labour Party's 'socialism' to monopoly capitalism's needs.

"Perhaps the most appealing policy for industrial development would be one which reflects the existing community pattern and attempts to maintain a full economic life in each town or village... Many people in Wales would share these sentiments in their hearts and Plaid Cymru has always reflected this in its policy: in the pamphlet 'Develop All Wales' development was proposed for sixty specified small towns and villages throughout rural Wales; the exact strategy of development was not described, but a population increase of 1000 was proposed for each centre within ten years. As Wales moves towards self-government, however, it is essential that we should realise the difficulties faced by any government attempting to stimulate industrial growth in all existing communities: our aim in this economic plan is therefore to select a limited number of centres where the budget available for economic development can be concentrated to provide the full range of amenities ^{needed} by modern industry. By locating such centres strategically, every district in Wales can benefit by being within 30 miles of such a centre." (pp 77-80, *ibid*, my emphasis, N. McK.)

The petty bourgeois leadership of Plaid Cymru sees its future in the development of small manufacturing industries, with the Welsh Parliament providing the necessary infrastructure, guarantees and incentives for capital. Its economic future depends on the rapid development of the market in Wales, which in turn requires an increase in the size and spending power of the Welsh proletariat. Its call to the Welsh working class to support Plaid Cymru policies because this is the only way to eliminate unemployment thus serves two purposes. It is in the direct economic interests of the petty bourgeoisie at present, and it allows Plaid Cymru to claim that it has a radical social policy that is in the interests of the Welsh working class. It also provides a political link with the old idea in the party of a 'co-operative democracy' in Wales that is neither capitalist or socialist. On this basis the last annual conference passed a resolution promising to look at the old policy—which included workers control of industry—and to bring it up to date in line with modern conditions. (It remains to be seen exactly what Plaid Cymru will substitute for the old policy—it will certainly be difficult to come to power on a programme of attracting foreign capital to Wales to set up firms that will be controlled by the Welsh working class. The most likely outcome is some sort of Fabian scheme for workers participation through electing trade unionists onto the board of exploiters.)

Political openings for Plaid Cymru's economics

In devising the radical social and industrial policies Dr Phil Williams talks of, Plaid Cymru will use the old social democratic device of presenting measures to develop capitalism as socialism. As the planning measures Plaid Cymru wants in Wales will be radical ones designed to aid the development of the petty bourgeoisie, they will be more easily presented as 'socialist' than the previous regional development policies of the British bourgeois parties. Thus the need to expand the market can be presented as the 'socialist' elimination of unemployment and uneven development; the system of bribes to foreign capital as the planned growth of the national economy; and the political independence of the petty bourgeoisie in the Cardiff Parliament as the independence of the Welsh working class from the uneven effects of the world and British capitalists' markets.

Clearly the petty bourgeois leadership of Plaid Cymru is confident that it now has the economic and political basis in Wales to develop its influence

amongst the Welsh working class which has hitherto rejected it. And it must be admitted that in the absence of a genuine communist line on the national movement, Plaid Cymru's future in this direction looks considerable.

It is also clear that the revisionist CPGB has no intention of exposing the class aims of Plaid Cymru. To do so would reveal the opportunist nature of the CP's past and present attitudes to the nationalist movement,--this will be dealt with in future issues of The Communist. It has no interest in developing political understanding among the working class of the way in which the petty bourgeois interest is opposed to the working class' interest, and of the circumstances in which an alliance for Welsh independence would advance the working class interest. At present this possibility does not exist simply because a genuine working class communist party with a Marxist position on the nationalist movement does not exist. The building of a Marxist-Leninist position on the national question and the other issues at present facing the working class movement is the major task of communists in Wales at the present time.

Neil Mc Keown

Trotsky article continued from page 13.

All Trotsky's utterances in this book fully bear out his anti-Leninist stand. Fully bear out that he was in the final analysis a politician of the Second International type.

Lenin, unlike Trotsky, firmly links proletarian culture to the development of the economic basis of society. He firmly links proletarian culture to the proletarian revolution. Lenin states that the proletariat makes the revolution, remoulds society and just as surely creates and develops its own literature. The proletariat remakes society in its own image. To deny this is to deny the role of the superstructure in society.

"We can only remould the Party and the world in the image of the vanguard of the proletariat." Mao-tse-Tung

Trotsky's book is written as a polemic against the proletarian dictatorship against the working class, against Socialism, and for petty bourgeois democracy, which means finally the ordinary bourgeois democratic republic. Such are Trotsky's theories. Stalin's words of 1931 still apply, and with even greater force:

"Trotskyism is the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie."

R. Rivers

WATCH FOR NEXT ISSUE OF THE COMMUNIST, NO 36:

ARTICLES ON: The Socialist Labour League, Origins of Plaid Cymru Part II, Czechoslovakia, and Khrushchev's Memoirs.

ICO/CWO LITERATURE LIST

Ireland

The Economics of Partition	2/6
Birth of Ulster Unionism	1/6
Ulster and Home Rule	1/6
The People's Democracy	1/6
The Connolly-Walker Controversy	2/6
Workshop Talks by J Connolly	2/-

Political Economy

Capital and Revisionism	1/6
The Economics of Revisionism	1/-
In Defence of Leninism	2/6
On Stalin's Economic Problems I	2/-
II	5/-

Stalin

Concerning Marxism in Linguistics	3/-
On Trotsky	2/-
On Lenin	1/6

Miscellaneous

Neil Goold: The Twentieth Congress and After	1/6
The Internationalists	2/6
On the National Question in Britain	2/-
The Working Class and the Housing Crisis	1/-
The Connolly Association (an his- torical account of its degenerat- ion)	2/-
Trade Unions and Productivity...	
A Communist Analysis, by Les Cannon	1/6

Magazines and newspapers:

The Irish Communist. monthly theoretical journal of the ICO	1/6
Communist Comment. fortnightly newspaper of the ICO	6d.
The Communist. monthly theoretical journal of the CWO.	1/-
(subscription rates for these on request.)	

All literature available by post from:

G Golden, 28 Mercers Road, London N 19.
ICO, 9 St Nicholas Church Place, off Cove Street, Cork.

Add 4d per item for postage.