

OCTOBER



THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

**Contents
Include**



*The Oppression of
Women - Criticism
of Old Lines*

*Racism, National Oppression and
Free National Development*

*The Anglo-Argentinian War
and Imperialism Today*

Vol. 1 No. 2

Price 50p

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE OPPRESSION OF WOMEN -
CRITICISM OF OLD LINES.....1

RACISM, NATIONAL OPPRESSION AND
FREE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.....8

ON THE QUESTION OF UNCONDITIONAL
SUPPORT FOR THE REPUBLICAN MOVEMENT
AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE IRISH PEOPLE.....18

RCLB POLICY STATEMENT ON IRELAND.....21

RCLB POLICY STATEMENT ON CHINA.....24

THE ANGLO-ARGENTINIAN WAR AND
IMPERIALISM TODAY.....27

Part 2 contains The Anglo-Argentinian war and Imperialism Today

EDITORIAL

This issue of 'October' is appearing later than we hoped. We planned for a regularity of 3 months i.e. quarterly. However, this has not worked out and given our exhortations in the first edition underlining the key importance of the theoretical struggle we think this should not go unnoticed. If insufficient resources are being devoted to developing the theoretical struggle, this must be rectified.

Regarding the response to the first edition, it should be said that in general it was favourable but there has been something lacking. Although the articles covered current and longstanding controversies, reactions have been slow. Some have been on the level of "whether all comrades should be able to readily grasp all articles in the theoretical journal." There has also resurfaced the old turgid debate about the relative importance of theory and the need to link theory with practice. Whilst not completely discarding such discussions where they are appropriate, it must be said that these are not the questions which should be agitating our thoughts at present. What is more, the concern of some comrades that articles in the theoretical journal should be "readily understandable" smacks of workerism which has bedevilled the emergence of a revolutionary theory, derived from the conditions in Britain, for decades, if not nigh on a century.

Study of complex questions demands effort and care on behalf of comrades who attempt to expose the contradictions in a thing and put it into writing, and on behalf of the reader. Life and society is complex and questions of theory should not be seen in the light of whether or not they can be easily explained over tea and a bacon sandwich in the canteen.

It often happens that no matter how much care is taken in explaining something, the 'canteen theorist' refuses to understand. Such obstinately obtuse behaviour is as much part of the class struggle against revolutionary theory as the antics of Reg Birch who parades crude workerism to berate the theoretical struggle as intellectualist. There is a link between the deliberately obtuse behaviour of some comrades towards questions of theory and the two line struggle which is at present going on in the League. Evidence of this was shown at a recent conference of League primary leaders when one comrade from London, who holds to the view that articles dealing with complex questions in the first issue were "incomprehensible", also asserted that the 2nd Congress of League made a "breakthrough" on the question of fascism. All that remains is for the League to carry this line out. What this "breakthrough" is nobody knows. It is certain, however, that this comrade has made no effort at all to study the article carried in the last issue of 'October' meticulously revealing the existence of two contradictory positions in the 2nd Congress programmatic document. a fact acknowledged by the Central Committee.

However, there have been some healthy responses to the first issue of 'October' which have enabled us to publish this 2nd issue. The depth and strength of the articles speak for themselves. In this editorial however, we would like to draw particular attention to the article 'Racism, National Oppression and Free National Development'.

The struggle on this question is becoming a focus for grappling with the major questions regarding the proletarian revolution in Britain. It has been said that there is a growing tendency in the League toward the development of an anti-working class line and that the 'Rights of National Minorities' line in the League's two line struggle negates work with the white working class because it believes it to be corrupted. The argument goes on - why are we promoting that a corrupt section of the people ally itself with black and national minority people? Further, if we as communists do not rely on the working class - which class do we rely on? And if we believe that the working class is corrupted, then we are saying that the working class of Britain has actually got a material interest in maintaining and furthering imperialism. These points are clear, and a serious attempt at dealing with the substance of the question, but their starting point is wrong. Their guiding line seems to be some belief in the purity of the working class in general as the most revolutionary class. To be relevant our starting point and guiding line must be that Britain is an imperialist power and an oppressor nation. Once this is grasped it is possible to understand the forces which are most revolutionary in relation to the British imperialist state. It is often stated that to make revolution in Britain we must understand the concrete reality of Britain. But having said this we do not go on to embrace the struggle of the most oppressed. We search for some new analysis which is not rooted in those struggles. Since the late sixties the phenomenon of black power and black pride has emerged. The threat this poses to imperialism and its decadent racist ideology was recognised from the beginning by the imperialists. In America, leaders of black power were shot dead in their beds while the American 'Progressive Labour Party' proclaimed the 'reactionary nature' of black nationalism.

Since the emergence of the Civil Rights movement in Northern Ireland in the late sixties, the republican struggle to end British partition of Ireland has resurfaced and played a dominant part in British politics. To be an Irish republican or a supporter of Irish republicanism is to be in the forefront of the struggle against the British state. However, most on the 'left' spend most of their time pre-occupied with questions of reform which the white working class stand to gain most from and ignore the struggle against British imperialism in Ireland.

Argentina, although ruled by a military fascist junta, dealt quite a blow against the British state and its economic and political power when it repossessed the Malvinas. Repossession by British imperialism and the Task Force dominated British politics for several weeks. During this time the 'left' in Liverpool, to give a concrete example, was pre-occupied with returning Labour councillors under the slogan 'Liberals out Marxists in'. This is an isolated example, but it is typical of the workers movement in Britain.

So, to return to our point. Which forces are revolutionary in relation to the British imperialist state? Saying that the working class is the most revolutionary class does not help us answer this question, because Britain is an extremely parasitic imperialist power which does to a large degree shift or export its contradictions. We would say that the revolutionary ideology for Britain which is based on Marxism-Leninism Mao Zedong thought is located in three streams of struggle against the British state. They are black power and the struggle of national minorities against racist repression and for free national development, Connollism or the struggle of Irish republicanism against British imperialism and for Irish self-determination, and Asian communism or the struggle of the Third World against imperialism and hegemonism.

We have no crystal ball which will tell us precisely and under what conditions the contradictions in British society will mature sufficiently to create a revolutionary crisis which can be used to advantage in the struggle to win power for the workers and oppressed peoples in Britain. But comrades should picture the opportunities presented by a combination of the 1981 summer uprisings and rebellions, a Middle East oil embargo, a republican offensive in Northern Ireland, and the stirring into political activity by the severity of the crisis of the otherwise dormant mass of the indigenous working class. Such a crisis is fertile ground for a revolutionary party to lead an all out attack to overthrow British imperialism. Such a party we do not have. At the present stage when the main task for communists rebuilding the party in Britain is to rally the vanguard, it is essential that we break with social-democratic prejudice or exclusiveness towards the struggle of the most oppressed in Britain, Ireland and the Third World. This can only be done by basing our thinking and our practice on furthering these struggles so that we become part of the vanguard. A party with such a stand would attract to it first those in the forefront of the struggle against the British state and only then begin to influence wider strata of the oppressed and working masses.

The Oppression of Women

Criticism of old lines

It was agreed at the RCL history conference of April 1980 that:

"The question of women's emancipation has been neglected. The incorrect over-concentration on industrial work negated the importance of women's struggles other than at the work place, and putting this right has not been an aspect of the rectification campaign. It is vital to strengthen both the line and our practice on this issue."

The Commission on Women's Oppression was set up to start this work and its first task was to sum up our past lines, and learn from both their positive and negative features. The article which follows does this in some detail.

In the process of summing up and criticising past errors in line, the Women's Commission was able to identify areas where work was needed in order to begin developing a better line. At the RCL Second Congress, a short resolution was passed which served to indicate the direction of future work on the nature of women's oppression:

"Within the capitalist system women are doubly oppressed, as women and as workers. They are particularly hard hit at home and at work by today's economic crisis. They are also bearing the brunt of the cuts within the welfare state."

At the basis of women's oppression lies the economic unit of the family. The family and women's role of privatised labour within it is necessary and essential for capitalism, which leaves the maintenance and reproduction of the workforce in women's hands and also uses women as a reserve army of labour."

Women's unequal position in society is the basis of divisions between men and women within the working class. The fight for women's equality is an essential part of the struggle of the class for socialism. Without women's participation it cannot be won. Only socialism can lay the material basis for the full liberation of women. However, we should also struggle now for reforms around women's demands."

Clearly locating the basis of women's oppression in the economic unit of the family, marks an advance over the previous line. The old line did correctly state this point, but as is shown in the following article, it then virtually negated it by the idealistic call to "build the proletarian family". With the emphasis on an abstract notion of the revolutionary unity of men and women, there was no serious analysis of domestic labour, its relationship to capitalist production and its relationship to women's wage labour.

We specifically refer to the economic unit of the family, recognising that the family has a dual nature, both as an economic unit which oppresses women, and as a place of warmth, support and affection. Working and oppressed people fight for a better life for themselves and their families, fight for a family life free from the distortions of capitalism and imperialism.

British imperialism pays lip service to the sanctity of the family and then ruthlessly attacks national minority families through state racism, it promotes the image of the ideal mother at home with the children and then forces working class and national minority women on to the labour market in order that their families might survive. We fully support the struggles of working and oppressed peoples for a better family life, but simply to concentrate on this re aspect, as we did in the past, is to lose sight of the way in which women are oppressed and how women's struggles are linked to the struggles of working and oppressed peoples against imperialism.

The following criticism marks a starting point in an attempt to develop a more dialectical analysis of women's oppression. Future issues of *October* will have further articles on the subject.

CRITICISM ON THE OLD LINES OF THE RCL AND ITS FOUNDING ORGANISATIONS

ON THE QUESTIONS OF WOMEN'S OPPRESSION

Communist Federation of Britain (CFB) Policy: background events

The policy on women cannot be separated from general developments in the CFB and later in the RCL. Prior to uniting with the Communist Unity Association (CUA) and founding the RCL, the CFB launched an ideological struggle centred around five main errors, in order to get to a higher level on the road to building a democratic-centralist organisation. In any struggle there is a tendency to overstress the negative and leave aside and often forget the positive aspect of any contradiction. Launching an ideological struggle was right at the time, what was wrong was to forget about political line and believe that if we waged the campaign successfully, the development of political lines would automatically follow.

The CFB tended to concentrate too much on 'pure' ideology divorced from questions of political lines and actual practice. We withdrew from our areas of mass work - TOM and Working Women's Charter, in order to concentrate on industrial work. We thought that any question could be resolved, mainly on an ideological basis. The line on Women's Oppression, (CFB Policy of 1976) which was in its infancy was prevented from developing, mainly due to the dogmatism of the kind of struggle we were involved in. Instead of using our reading well, instead of summing up our experience in the women's movement, (quickly labelled 'bourgeois feminist') instead of learning from our mistakes and using criticism and self-criticism to serve the development of line, we fell from one extreme to another, from intellectualism to employee mentality which contributed to the weakness and one-sidedness of the line on women's oppression endorsed in the Manifesto of 1977.

CFB Policy: the material basis of women's oppression

In August 1976, the Executive Committee of the CFB brought out the policy, "Combat women's oppression. Mobilise women for the socialist revolution", which was published in *Revolution No. 4* April 1977. Overall it took a generally correct theoretical position, but it was abstract in that it did not apply theory to the actual situation faced by women in the UK today. First it summarised the origins of women's oppression, rooted in the same social development as the division of society into exploiting and exploited classes - the private ownership of the means of production, as first analysed by Engels in "*Origin of the Family, Private Property and State*". It then went on to give a basic analysis of the oppression of women in capitalist society, making the correct point that "under capitalism, women's main tasks are still those of the domestic slave, isolated from social production, to reproduce and maintain the labouring power of waged workers in the family", and went on to point out that women's role in the labour force stems from this. It pointed out that it is in the bourgeoisie's interest that care and maintenance of the workforce is provided in the home, and the "social facilities, female employment and legal reforms are provided only as far as they are in the bourgeoisie's best interests".

CFB Policy: Bourgeois Family or Proletarian Fighting Unit?

Engels called for the "abolition of the family as the basic economic unit of the society". Communists have understood from this the need to put an end to women's privatised labour in the home, the need to socialise child care and domestic labour. In the women's movement, an analysis of the role of the family and women's part in it, which included many correct points, had led some elements to regard the family as always and necessarily reactionary, and to call for its abolition. Rather than take the correct point

from this analysis, the CFB siezed on the fact that the family is, for many, an oasis of warmth in a desert of drudgery, and attacking also petty bourgeois sexual radicalism, raised the slogan "build the proletarian family". On the one hand, the policy recognised the root of women's oppression as being her role in the family, which in bourgeois society is to maintain and reproduce the labour force for capitalism, whilst on the other hand it adjured communists to overcome this by making efforts to improve individual relationships within the family. This was a notion of what was achievable in the superstructure which completely ignored the material base. It is a prime example of idealism, in that it grossly overestimated the power of ideas alone to change reality. In a letter to branches which accompanied the publication of the line, it was put thus: *"The revolutionary unity of men and women is essential for the success of the proletarian revolution. This is a basic truth that we must grasp firmly. The most important concrete expression of this unity is the proletarian family."* !

CFB policy: Can Women-only Struggle as Workers?

The line also contained economist errors, which became full blown in the Manifesto. The introduction to the policies said, *"We will struggle for policies that enable women to take part in social production. It is at work that the working class is exploited, and where it organises collectively to defend itself. Working class women in industry will more easily be persuaded of their class interests and the contribution they must make to the class struggle, than will women isolated in the home"*. Though the point about the effect of being brought into social production is historically true, it is superficial to leave it at that. Without communist influence, struggles at work are mainly confined to the economic, and the part that women play in them are largely determined by their responsibilities in the home. This general outlook also overlooked the many struggles outside the workplace that women take part in, often leading them e.g. tenants organisations, struggles against the state relating to social security, fights against hospital and school closures, the struggle of national minority women against deportations and split families. It labelled all women who were not workers as politically backward. This just does not match up to reality.

CFB Policy: Women's Position under Socialism

In the section "Socialist revolution clears the path for women's emancipation", the line correctly pointed out that, *"only socialist revolution can lay the basis for the complete emancipation of women"* and explained that this was by a) providing full employment, b) the socialisation of domestic labour. It avoided idealism to some degree by pointing out that *"Under socialism women will not be oppressed although they will be unequal"*. By this was meant that there will be no legal or political discrimination against women, but that the heritage of thousands of years of oppression could not be overturned overnight. However, if a socialist economy is not able to provide full socialisation of childcare and domestic labour, doesn't this mean that women continue to be oppressed? We do not have any answers to this, though sharing the conviction that as class contradictions are resolved in the development towards communism, so the inequalities of women's position will be eradicated.

CFB Policy: "Bourgeois Feminism" - a sectarian label.

Under the section, "who are our enemies?", these are listed as i) the capitalist system, ii) opportunism and iii) bourgeois feminism. At that time, the CFB had a bee in its bonnet about bourgeois feminism: to the extent that bourgeois feminism gets a listing among "the enemies", while the bourgeois ideology of male supremacism is dealt with under the heading of "contradictions among the people". The CFB quickly labelled the women's movement as "bourgeois feminist" - not because we made a thorough analysis of its lines, (which were many and various), its social composition, the class it served, but because our dogmatism prevented us from looking at the lines and policies of the movement, taking the positive and building on it, rejecting the negative and criticising it in theory and practice.

4

What we did not see - and indeed couldn't see because of our lack of practice, is that for the class struggle to be successful it has to unite all those who can be united against the main enemy, the British imperialist bourgeoisie. For such an alliance to come about it has to overcome the many weapons used by the bourgeoisie to divide the working class and its allies, ie racism and sexism. It's no good talking about the class struggle if we don't recognise the contradictions amongst the people and don't try to resolve them. That the women's movement of the 1970's was mainly feminist is something we would probably agree on. That the movement as a whole was bourgeois is something that would have to be argued for.

This sectarianism towards the women's movement was part of the general development in the CFB which at the time was moving to a policy of concentrating its mass work amongst the working class. This is reflected in the line of both the CFB and the RCL, in that they dismissed any work with non-working class women. It was correct, and still is, at a time when ML forces are few, to focus communist political work among the working class, in this case, working class women, but not exclusively. Our sectarianism towards the women's movement meant that we missed anything that was positive. If we were to continue in this manner, we would be in danger of ignoring the growing anti-imperialist trend within the women's movement - a positive trend which we can and must unite with.

CFB Policy: Economism and Sectarianism Gain the Upper hand, 1976-1977.

The publication of the above line in *Revolution* was accompanied by a truly remarkable article, which though purportedly introducing it as "the correct line" in fact concentrates on magnifying all the erroneous elements in it, and in this foreshadows the line eventually encapsulated in the *Manifesto* published only three months later.

This article asserts that "*women's emancipation is a vitally important question for the working class*" -- not because women are oppressed under capitalism, nor because the struggle against their oppression brings them smack up against capitalism as the obstacle; but because "*the militant unity of all sections of the working class is essential to the success of the proletarian revolution*". A pretty odd idea of the relationship of the part to the whole, where the interests of the part do not even figure! It carries straight on to say "*Bourgeois propaganda on women is spread far and wide; it seeks to undermine and destroy the unity of men and women. Bourgeois feminist propaganda claims that men are the reason for women being oppressed; it consciously seeks to divide men and women...*" i.e. bourgeois propaganda equals bourgeois feminism! It does not even mention male supremacism: even when dealing with its effects on women: "*Their particular oppression as women, which is inevitable under capitalism, can have a crippling and demoralising effect. ... Communists ... can learn to give leadership to women in ridding themselves of the passive attitudes instilled in them by bourgeois society.*"

Backing for the "women can only struggle at work" attitude is found in a quote from Mao: "*Unite and take part in production and political activity to improve the economic and political status of women*", an inscription for the magazine *Women of New China*, July 1949, on the eve of the foundation of the People's Republic of China.

The following issue of *Revolution* No. 5 May 1977, included a reprint of a Chinese article of 1962 on "*Transform the family into a fighting unit of the proletariat*". The editorial pointed out "*The line stated that revolutionary communists should begin the struggle now to transform the family into a fighting unit of the proletariat. This article contains some valuable lessons for revolutionary communists in capitalist countries also. It is necessary to struggle now to mobilise women for the socialist revolution and the struggle*

to transform the family is a valuable part of this task." The article may indeed have given some guidance to communists as to how to handle relationships within their own family, but a homily on individual relationships in a youthful socialist country, very recently emerged from feudalism and colonialism, was hardly likely to help communists arrive at a correct analysis of the family in Britain.

The position of the Communist Unity Association

The CUA's line on women's oppression as put forward in *Women in Class Society* 1974 was, in contrast to the CFB's position, based on analysis of at least some of the features of women's position in contemporary Britain.

It located women's inferior position as beginning "on the basis of the existence of private property, in the family, for her central role in capitalist society is that of wife and mother. (page 5).

It also deals with the bourgeois ideology inculcated into women to fit them for their role as domestic slaves - as evidenced by the subjects studied by girls at school, and the small proportion of women university students and apprentices, and criticises briefly the idea of "maternal devotion", idealised by the bourgeoisie.

At work it documents women's role in the work force as an army of cheap labour - called on in times of crisis to replace or undercut men. Dealing with the unions, it supports the need of oppressed sections of the working class to have separate organisation within unions (although what form this should take is vague) while being against separate unions as such. It also recognises the problems that narrow craft attitudes and male chauvinism pose for women workers in unions.

Although recognising both the material basis of women's oppression, and its ideological aspects, the CUA documents went further than the CFB policy in its view of women as politically backward due to isolation in the home: forgetting that oppression breeds resistance. The only form of women's struggle that gets recognition is the economic struggle for equal pay.

The CUA also shared the sectarianism of the CFB towards the women's movement. The document sketched the recent history of the Women's Liberation Movement, and criticised it as being totally anti-working class since 1971 (the point at which the women's national co-ordinating committee foundered). Its characterisation of feminism was crude.

"Feminists see women as being condemned by their sex to their secondary position, rather than by the structure of society. Therefore they continually seek ways of overcoming their sex, through abortion, lesbianism or the reversal of the traditional male and female roles by suggesting that men stay at home to look after the children whilst the women go out to work". (Page 15).

But the Women's Liberation Movement's class basis and outlook was more realistically analysed (in the author's opinion) as petty bourgeois, rather than bourgeois. Strong and correct criticism was made of the blind emphasis by the WLM on free abortion and contraception and their total neglect of the defence of the right of working class, and especially black women, to have children. This stance of the WLM was not corrected until recently.

Analysis of the lack of provision of nurseries was accompanied by strong argument for the need for women to fight for them, specifically at the place of work or education. Finally, the document analysed why only socialism can lay the basis for women to be equal in society; but did not defer to that great day, the struggle against women's oppression.

RCL Manifesto of 1977

The positive aspects of the lines of both the CFB and the CUA sunk without trace. The eight short paragraphs devoted to the question of women in the Manifesto, itself showed the lack of importance attached to the question.

The understanding of the root cause of the oppression of women found in the CFB's and CUA's old line has flown out of the window; out of the window goes materialism, in comes idealism, and vulgar economism.

"Women have been oppressed since the beginning of class society because the exploiting class have continually forced them to accept an inferior position in social production and society". How nasty of the exploiting classes! The question of women's role as reproducer and maintainer of the labour force doesn't get a look in: *"Working class women are mainly oppressed economically. Women in social production are often superexploited".* Women's oppression is thus reduced to a struggle against low pay. But *"women also suffer political and social inequality"*. If the relationship between economic base and superstructure was somewhat crude in the old CFB line, here it is non-existent!

In the section on the struggle against bourgeois ideology and opportunism, there are four further paragraphs on divisions between men and women. Here bourgeois feminism is treated as an equal danger to attitudes of male superiority. Again there is no understanding of the need for communists to build a principled unity based on the demands of the most oppressed.

"Discrimination against women forces them to accept lower wages and this keeps wages for the whole class down. We must boldly call on men workers to see that the oppression of women is an attack on the class as a whole."

Having reduced the struggle against women's oppression to one of equal pay, the old RCL proceeded to pay no further attention to the question. The articles in *Class Struggle* that dealt with women (being half the population it would be hard to exclude them completely) dealt with women as workers, women as members of national minorities, but never drew out the specific oppression that they faced as women, and the resistance that they put up to that oppression. Even in industrial work, little if any work has been done in taking up specific questions relating to women in industry.

The Communist Workers Movement

The CWM, with whom the RCL united in June 1980, did not have a thorough analysis of women's oppression, but did in their demands for reforms include *"rape to be treated as a serious crime, the banning of pornography and indecent advertisements which exploit and degrade women and act as an incitement to rape"*, and also had a positive attitude towards the women's liberation movement, whilst paying attention to the need to point out that the main contradiction in society is not between the two sexes.

Some pointers for the future:

Our future line on women's emancipation must take into account and deepen our understanding of the following points.

We must reassert that women's oppression in capitalist society is located in the economic base, not because she is a low paid worker - that is vulgar economism - but because capitalism demands that the labour force is reproduced, reared and maintained within the private unit of the family - within which unit, women play the main role. The political economy of women's labour in the home must be analysed more deeply, because it provides the key to understanding why women can never be free under capitalism - just as the law of the falling rate of profit explains why capitalism can never satisfy the needs of the working class as a whole.

We need to build on the down to earth analysis shown in the CUA document of the facts, both economic and ideological of women's oppression in British society today - and avoid in future the dogmatism of thinking that a suitable quotation would do, in place of analysis of concrete conditions. We need to go further than we have done yet in analysing the effect of imperialism on women's position in the imperialist countries: what has been the main factor in raising the living standards of working class families? Why were national minority immigrants preferred (as a source of cheap labour) to women after the 2nd World War? What has the effect of the welfare state been in policing and controlling working class families? What effect has imperialism had on the kind of jobs women do? eg by creating large numbers of clerical jobs.

If we can understand in a materialist way the basis of women's oppression we can overcome the idealism of putting women's oppression down to a conspiracy theory on the part of the bourgeoisie, and of trying to overcome it by raising slogans like "Transform the family into a fighting unit". We will be able to arrive at a more dialectical understanding of the relationship between that base and its superstructure; the ideology of male supremacism, the conflicting bourgeois attitudes of sexual morality from porn to Mary Whitehouse, etc. We should also overcome the divorce between theory and practice which has characterised the past: the old CFB line remained a paper policy, for all its good points, while the line of the Manifesto was such as to stifle any practice.

Finally, we should overcome sectarianism, and look with unblinkered eyes at the struggles of women which do take place, both at workplaces and outside waged by working class women and non-working class women, and assess their contribution objectively, and seek to help build positive movements.

Racism, National Oppression and Free National Development

This is a contribution to the debate, now taking place in the RCL, on our line in relation to the struggles of national minority people.

This article argues that a policy of free national development is crucial to a strategy for revolution in Britain, taking into account both the strength which imperialism derives from national oppression and racism, and the strength of anti-imperialist struggle which resides within the oppressed nationalities. It does not deal with the question of the oppressed nations of Scotland and Wales. Its scope is limited to the position of the oppressed national minorities in Britain, who originate mainly, although not exclusively, from the Third World. In particular there is a need to examine the phenomenon of racism in this context.

There are many excellent critiques of racism produced by modern social and biological scientists. A classic description is given by the ethnographer Dr. Alfred Metraux:

"Racism is one of the most disturbing phenomena of the great revolution of the modern world. At the very time when industrial civilisation is penetrating all points of the globe and is uprooting men of every colour from their age-old traditions, a doctrine, speciously scientific in appearance, is invoked to rob these men of their full share in the advantage of the civilisation forced upon them.

"There exists in the structure of Western civilisation a fatal contradiction. On the one hand, it wishes and insists that certain cultural values, to which it attributes the highest virtues, be assimilated by other people. But, conversely, it will not admit that two-thirds of humanity is capable of attaining this standard which it has set up. Ironically, the worst sufferers from racial dogma are usually the people whose intellect most forcibly demonstrates its falseness." (1)

This illustrates three important points about racism. First, that it is based on a spurious pseudo-scientific theory of a correlation between physical attributes and mental traits. This is brought out in the definition of race by Pierre L. van den Berghe as:

"a human group which defines itself and/or is defined by other groups as different from other groups by virtue of innate and immutable physical characteristics. These physical characteristics are in turn believed to be intrinsically related to moral, intellectual, and other non-physical attributes or abilities". (2)

Second, that even while this uncouth version of racism is still prevalent, there is a more sophisticated version of racism reinforcing it, and waiting in the wings to take its place if it is popularly discredited. This is that, while physical characteristics may not justify the assumption of a hierarchy of races, there is a hierarchy of cultures, the superiority and infer-

urity of which may depend on some complex factors like geography, climate, historical accident or inherent weakness. Third, that it is the cultures of Europe within recent centuries which have been responsible for the creation and dissemination of the ideology of racism. Professor Essien-Udom points out:

"The modern ideas about race and the modern manifestations of 'racism' are of European origin. Their spread in Asia and Africa, in America and the Caribbean derives from superior technology, which made it possible for Europe to establish colonial rule in those parts of the world." (3)

Marxists have not developed any unique analysis of racism. Marxists do, however, locate the origins of racism in the material conditions of colonialism and imperialism. While an overall analysis of imperialism begins with an understanding of its internal economic development, the development of monopoly capitalism and the fusions of industrial capital with finance capital, in its external development its material base lay in the subordination and subjugation of nations. The relationship between racism and national oppression is clearly stated in the Programmatic Document of the RCL, 1981, para 70:

"Racism is a total ideology originating in the slave trade of developing capitalism and only becoming fully defined with the development of capitalism into imperialism. Imperialism oppresses and superexploits the nations and peoples of the Third World and theories of racial inferiority were developed in the late 19th century to justify the wholesale colonial enslavement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The economic basis to racist ideology continues to be national oppression by imperialism, although principally by neo-colonial means."

Imperialism did not develop this ideological justification primarily for the consumption of these nations themselves. To the extent that a self-deprecating form of it permeated the oppressed nations, this was a temporary bonus. The justification was meant for the populations of the white European nations. It was aimed at dissenting views among the bourgeoisie itself, and at the intellectuals. That this was essential can be seen from the 'heretical' views expressed by Darwin:

"As man advances in civilisation, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to the men of all nations and races." (4)

Primarily of course, the racist creed was meant for the subordinate classes in the white countries, and, above all, for the emerging proletariat.

It is a common oversimplification among progressive people that racism exists to divide the working class. Thus in para 64 of the Programmatic Document it is said that, *"the fundamental aim of racist oppression is to divide the working class"*. While there is some truth in this, it is far from an adequate picture. Most obviously, it cannot explain the function of racist ideology at its inception, for the simple reason that at that time the working class was all white. And if it cannot explain it at that stage, then it is also incapable of analysing the nature of a cultural phenomenon which has existed for at least a century.

For, although racism may be re-structured by the ideological apparatus of the ruling class in each phase of imperialist development, in order to relate it to the changing specific needs of that phase, it is also transmitted from one generation to the next within the working class.

Undoubtedly there are aspects of this "divisiveness" function even in the early stages of the development of racism, because this development was very complex. On the one hand, the concept of race is so amorphous that it can be applied to differences between nations, even when those nations do not exhibit marked physical differences from one another, such as skin colour. Thus in Britain racist antagonism was generated towards neighbouring white nations at the historical point when the doctrine of white supremacy was in its infancy. The obvious example is racism towards the Irish people. On the other hand, colonial penetration took the form of emigration of the surplus labour force from the imperialist nations, and racism played its part in dividing poor settler from indigenous population - as in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

But what must be grasped conceptually is the principal function of racism, which has been the ideological concomitant of imperialism's oppression of nations. As far as the subordinate classes in the imperialist countries were concerned, racism justified the subordination of other nations to the nation of which they were members. A former officer of the Indian Civil Service at the turn of the century pointed out that there was :

"a cherished conviction shared by every Englishman in India, from the highest to the lowest, ;..the conviction in every man that he belongs to a race which God has destined to govern and subdue." (5)

A conviction, it might be added, shared by almost every Englishman in England. The results of this were to prevent any opposition from the working class of the oppressor nation to the oppression of other nations and to take the edge off their opposition to their own exploitation by the ruling class of their own nation. Racism enlisted the support of the subordinate classes, principally the working class, in the process of subjugation and depredation of the oppressed nations.

Divisiveness, in various forms, is apparent at all stages in the history of racism. Racism has operated to prevent the proletariat of the imperialist countries from seeing their common interest with the oppressed colonial peoples since the 1st World War and the Russian revolution. With the advent of relatively large-scale immigration from the Third World to Britain, racism has prevented the white workers from seeing their common interest with black workers. But it would be to underestimate the true nature and strength of racism in the white working class to mistake these secondary aspects for the essence of racism, which is to create an alliance, however temporary, shifting and contradictory, between the classes of oppressor nation, directed against the oppressed nationalities.

For the oppressed nationalities, and particularly for the fragments of the oppressed nationalities in the imperialist countries, (national minorities) this development of racism has important consequences. Far from being a phenomenon distinct from national oppression, and one susceptible to a less radical solution than the national question, racism is an ideology derived from national oppression and intimately bound up with it. The objective form which racism takes in a racist society, which may be termed racist oppression, is the highest and most vicious form of national oppression. For the oppressed, their primary struggle is against that oppression, and it takes the form of a struggle between nationalities. So long as the alliance between the classes within the oppressor nation continues, it must be a struggle even against the subordinate classes of that nation.

It is a feature common to both right and left forms of opportunism on this question to regard the struggle against racism as a class question alone subsumed within the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The rightist form, seen within tendencies like the CPGB and 'left' Labour, is to call for the assimilation of the national minorities with the majority nationality. They regard all as "British", and argue that the contradiction posed by racist oppression will disappear once the assimilation is complete. The means of effecting it are state conciliatory bodies like the CRE, equal opportunities legislation, and certain liberal adjustments in society which recognise some superficial elements of the culture of national minorities. The leftist form is to reduce everything to the contradiction between workers and capitalists, and thus to condemn any attitudes which are seen as dividing the working class. The racist supremacism of the white working class and the assertion of identity of the national minorities are treated as equal or nearly equal, enemies. The roots of this chauvenism lie in the traditional Trotskyist downgrading of the national question in any context, exemplified by the Militant Tendency's arguments for replacing national liberation struggles by some imagined unity between workers of the oppressor and oppressed nations - British and Irish workers, Israeli and Palestinian workers etc.

Such approaches are intended to facilitate two consequences: the elimination of antagonism between nationalities and the provision of conditions for a successful re-structuring of power relations in society (right) or revolution (left). In fact they achieve the opposite. Denial of the existence of contradictions between oppressors and oppressed nationalities not only creates greater suspicion, fear and hatred in the minority nationalities, it also endorses racism. An assimilation policy reinforces the claims of racism of the superiority of the majority nationality (because it is always the minority which must assimilate into the majority). And, far from increasing the potential for revolution, these approaches put the roadblocks of chauvenism in its path. They ignore the weaknesses within the working class of the majority community which have historically held it back from developing its revolutionary potential. And they fail to recognise the tremendous force for revolution within the struggle of the oppressed national minorities, the manifestations of which, like the summer 1981 uprisings, have already shaken imperialist reaction and exposed the unholy alliance between the capitalists and the labour movement representatives more than any movement which the white working class can produce at present.

To reduce the struggle against national oppression to a class question, in the terms of the labour:capital contradiction, or to subordinate it to the struggle of the working class of the imperialist nation, leads only to the chauvenism which has characterised successive betrayals of the revolutionary cause in the imperialist countries. The contradiction between the oppressed national minorities and the majority nationality, emerging from national oppression and exacerbated by racism's recruitment of the white working class to the side of imperialism, must be recognised. The revolutionary force released by it has an integral part to play in the struggle to overthrow imperialism. The alliance brought about by racism is weak and vulnerable. The struggle of the working class against their subordination and the struggle of the national minorities against their oppression can only succeed by overthrowing imperialism. Mutual recognition of these two struggles, facilitated by the presence of most of the oppressed nationalities in the working class camp, can strengthen each by destroying the racist alliance. The present conditions of imperialist crisis are very favourable for this development: the shifting of the balance of forces internationally in favour of the Third World; the intensification of the revolutionary Republican struggle in Ireland; the growing dissatisfaction of the unemployed and underemployed; the disillusion and unrest among the youth; the weakening of the traditional organs of the labour movement and thus their control over the disenfranchised.

masses of British society. The catalytic element in this situation would be a revolutionary alliance between the working class and the national minorities.

The potential for, and necessity of, such an alliance is indicated by history. The Russian revolution and the 1st World War, events related to the development of imperialism as a world-wide system, brought about an objective alliance, on the international level, between the proletariat of the imperialist countries and the oppressed nations of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The struggle for socialism and the struggle against national oppression were from that point welded together in a single world revolutionary movement. National movements before that, which were part of the bourgeois revolutionary stage, may have contradicted the struggle for socialism. *The October Revolution was the product of the alliance between the proletariat and the oppressed nations within the Russian empire. The Chinese revolution was based on a co-ordination between the struggle of the whole Chinese people and the struggle of China's minority nationalities against Han chauvenism.

From the experiences of these countries certain general elements can be abstracted. Firstly, only the alliance between the struggle of the subordinate classes and the struggle of the oppressed nationalities can provide the necessary conditions for revolution. Second, socialism destroys the objective basis for national oppression, but it does not complete the process of the emancipation of the oppressed nationalities, nor extinguish the contradictions between dominant and subordinate nationalities. Third, positive measures must be taken, in the post-revolutionary society, to promote the oppressed nationalities and allow them to develop their national potential. Fourth, far from being a period of assimilation of nationalities, whether by force or by voluntary development, socialism is a period of the flourishing of oppressed nationalities, necessarily because only with the revolution have the shackles to their development been removed. The policy which sums up this process, and which can bring together the subordinate classes and the oppressed nationalities in the revolution, is "free national development".

There are clearly differences between the multi-national countries of the Soviet Union and China, where the oppressed nationalities existed, generally speaking, within their own territories and histories, for many centuries, and the situation in Britain, where the national minorities have immigrated only comparatively recently. It may be argued that developed capitalism provides the conditions for a fusion of nationalities, and that there is no historical potential of nation formation which has been frustrated by the oppressor nation. Such an argument neglects the contribution of imperialism and racism. Imperialism has brought about the suppression of national development for the whole nations from which these fragments have come, and their fragmentation is part of that process. The full development of the nationalities now in Britain has been truncated by a total process beginning with the slave ships in West Africa and the East India Company's occupation of South Asia, continuing through to the movements of Asian and Afro-Caribbean people to Britain in the 1950s and 1960s, and the racist oppression which has followed. Racism has raised that process to a new level, within which the British working class has been actively recruited for national subjugation. It is thus impossible for the Third World peoples in Britain to assimilate with the majority nation. They themselves would refuse this option even if it were open. For racism has created its own counterpart and antagonist, the anti-white consciousness of Third World peoples, particularly Black peoples, which transcends geographical boundaries. The policy of free national development is therefore appropriate in Britain, although its content will be different from the situation in a multi-national country with relatively established national communities.

* National movements of the oppressed from that point were not in contradiction to, but were part of, the struggle for socialism.

The elements of the policy were defined by Stalin as:

"to help the regenerated nations of our country to rise to their feet, to their full stature, to revive and develop their national cultures widely to develop schools, theatres and other cultural institutions functioning in the native languages, to naturalise - that is, to staff with the members of the given nation - the Party, trade union, co-operative, state and economic organs..." (6)

While China did not find appropriate the particular solution of a federation of autonomous republics necessary to the Soviet Union, she adopted a policy of regional autonomy. This is described in a recent article by Ulanhu, a CPC leading cadre from the Mongol nationality:

"Over the past 60 years, the Chinese communists with Comrade Mao Zedong as the principal representative have integrated the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism with the political situation of China's nationalities and formulated, implemented and developed a policy on regional autonomy of minority nationalities. The essence of our policy on regional autonomy of minority nationalities is the establishment of autonomous areas of minority nationalities on the basis of regions where minority nationalities live in compact communities within the country's integral and inseparable territories and under the unified leadership of the Supreme State organs. Autonomous organs are formed consisting mainly of personnel of the minority nationalities which practice autonomy. They can fully exercise their rights of autonomy on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism. In accordance with the State's general principles and policies and with reference to the practical situations of their own nationalities and areas, they can decide for themselves their specific principles and policies and act on their own in managing the affairs of their own nationalities and areas". (7)

The specific application of the policy of free national development must depend on the concrete situation of nationalities in Britain. But the general principles disclosed by the application of such policies by developed Communist parties are an important guide line, especially at this preliminary stage of development of theory.

Essential to the policy is a territorial component, the establishment of autonomous territorial units in the areas where "minority nationalities live in compact communities". There are "practical" arguments put forward against this in Britain, on the grounds that the communities of national minorities are too small, that the national minority people are too scattered among the majority nationality, that they are too intermingled with each other. The argument of size is itself a product of big nation chauvenism. In China, a country of over 900 million people, "Regional autonomy was even given to the Orogen nationality, which had a population of only about 2,000 in the early post-liberation period". (8). The argument of scattering among the majority nationality is essentially an argument relating to the fear of "domination" by the national minority in autonomous areas, and will be dealt with as such. The argument of the intermingling of minority nationalities stems from a failure to recognise the capacity of oppressed nationalities to co-operate with each other, once the fetters of national oppression are broken and the domination of the majority nationality removed. All these arguments are in fact quibbling over details, in order not to confront the basic question of whether to support the struggle against national oppression or to oppose it.

There are three facets of free national development, the political, economic and cultural. The first is a question of the distribution of power in national minority areas. In those areas decisions are made by politicians, officials, police and judges belonging to the majority nationality. The outstanding struggles today are in relation to the repression of the black communities by the police and the fascists. In this context the demand for the right to community self-defence has arisen. The seeds of the demand for

autonomy lie within this demand and related question like the police force and jury composition. But the Chinese example show that free national development goes much further:

"Nationalisation is the prerequisite for exercising the right to autonomy. There are several aspects of nationalisation. The key link is the nationalisation of cadres in autonomous offices. The organisations and work of autonomous offices should be primarily handled by personnel of local minority nationalities. This means: Principal leading posts in autonomous offices must be held by people of local minority nationalities, and the number of cadres of minority nationalities should be proportionate to the size of their population. It is imperative to guarantee that every cadre of a minority nationality be truly entrusted with the responsibility and authority that should go with his post". (9)

In the field of economics, national minorities suffer from the worst living standards, the highest rate of unemployment, the worst housing and public facilities. Partly this results from discrimination, partly from the fact that racism has kept them, in general, in the lowest socio-economic echelons of society. In order to overcome this, free national development must include the allocation of a disproportionate share of the resources of socialist society to develop national minority areas and to ensure employment, training, and education for national minority people. Autonomy will ensure that the resources are administered by national minorities themselves.

In the field of culture, national minorities are gravely disadvantaged. It is always difficult for a smaller national group to retain its cultural identity in the midst of a dominating one. This is exacerbated by the dominance of the bourgeois materialist values of Western culture throughout the world, and the control of the basic technology of communications by the imperialist ruling class. Above all there is the racist assumption of the hierarchy of cultures. An example of how racism attempts to destroy cultures is the position of the languages of the Caribbean. While Western educationalists treat the syncretic language of an oppressor nation like Afrikaans, as a language, the Caribbean languages are downgraded as mere dialects of European languages - English, French or Dutch. National minority cultures can only flourish in all their aspects in the context of free national development.

The policy of free national development can only be implemented under socialism. But the adoption of this policy can provide a framework for the support of particular democratic demands of national minority people in imperialist society, such as the right to community self-defence, affirmative action and specialised education. In the longer term, the policy is the basis for the alliance between the twin streams of struggle against 'British imperialism' the struggle of the working class and of the national minority people. It is the means of freeing the working class from the ideological bonds which tie them to imperialism, and thus of winning the trust and co-operation of the national minorities.

Three arguments against this policy must be discussed. The first is that the policy is itself divisive, alienating the white working class from the struggle of the national minorities, and isolating the national minorities from the white working class. The logical conclusion of such an argument is the abandonment of the struggle against racism. The struggle against racist oppression is carried out by the oppressed. Such a struggle inevitably divides them from the white working class because racism is the predominant ideology within that population. If divisiveness is the test, the struggle against racism must stop. The argument also suggests that the anti-racists within the majority population will be driven back into the imperialist fold by the

policy of free national development. Those who are not genuine anti-racists may, but they would anyway exhibit their intrinsic chauvenism as the struggles of the national minorities are stepped up. The argument entails that the struggle against racist oppression must be waged at the pace which the majority nationality can accept. In other words, the national minorities must wait until the white working class (whose struggle against capital is, after all, much more important!) are ready to support them, and to divest themselves of their racism spontaneously. In essence, the argument transfers the responsibility for the divisiveness of racism from the imperialist bourgeoisie to the national minorities themselves.

The second, and related argument is that the policy will provoke antagonism from the majority population because of resentment or fear of "domination" by the national minority in the areas of autonomy. Such attitudes are inevitable when imperialism and racism prevail. Racist thinking endorses the domination of the oppressor nationality, and cannot conceive of the equality of nationalities. But under socialism the objective basis racism and national oppression will no longer exist. The majority of the whole population will be in command of the whole country. Ulanhu clearly demonstrates the fallacy in this "domination by the oppressed" argument :

"Because in many autonomous areas of minority nationalities, there are more Han people than minority nationality people, some comrades do not agree to the predominance in the autonomy organs of personnel of the nationalities exercising autonomy and even think that this is unfair to the Han people. This is obviously wrong. Here two points need explaining: First, citizens of all nationalities in autonomous areas of minority nationalities are masters of the country and they all enjoy equal rights and have to perform equal duties. This is a different question from having the predominance in the autonomy organs of the nationalities exercising autonomy. Second, when we say regional autonomy of nationalities, the word "nationalities" means minority nationalities making up the main body of the population there. The word "regional" means places where minority nationalities making up the main body of the population live in compact communities, and the word "autonomy" means autonomy of the minority nationalities making up the main body of the population there. The Han nationality makes up the great majority of the population of the country and there is no need for them to practise autonomy in the autonomous areas of minority nationalities, nor is it necessary to have Hans predominate in the autonomy organs... of course, all autonomy organs of autonomous regions of minority nationalities should definitely ensure equal rights among different nationalities, encourage different nationalities to respect one another, to learn from one another and to help one another, continuously strengthen solidarity among nationalities, make the relationship among nationalities closer and eliminate prejudice and estrangement among nationalities." (10)

The third argument is of a different order. It begins from the premise that racist oppression is not national oppression, but racial oppression, a question of black and white. Therefore any autonomy would be racial autonomy - black regional autonomy. This would be wrong because black people are not a nation, and because it would perpetuate racial categorisation. The error lies in the premise, which elevates the concept of racial difference a product of false ideology, to the status of an objective basis for oppression.

It is useful, however, to examine the reasons which obscure national oppression in the context of the imperialist metropolis. Firstly, the development of racism against Third World (mainly black) peoples has made the oppression they face within Britain far more intense than the oppression of white national minorities. Second, there is the growth of anti-white

consciousness, by which the oppressed black nationalities resist national oppression and racism. This leads to an identification between the oppressed and a development of solidarity in struggle which, though as yet not complete is an important factor in the effectiveness of resistance to national oppression. It is impossible to say exactly how this will effect the policy of free national development. If the increasing unity of black people should lead them to demand black autonomy rather than autonomy on nationality lines, this will be a progressive development. It is certainly not for the majority nationality to seek to reverse it. A general policy of free national development can encompass the specific needs of the concrete conditions in any given country.

This development of a common struggle by black people shows the strength of the resistance of the nationally oppressed as a distinct stream of struggle against imperialism. The ideologies of black power and black consciousness are basic elements of anti-imperialism, and a rich and fertile theoretical and practical tradition for national minority peoples. The common struggle of black people provides a closer link with the increasing unity of the Third World against imperialism, with the spirit of Afro-Asian unity exemplified by the Bandung Conference. (11) In the British context, the ready identification by black resistance movements with the cause of the Irish freedom struggle shows their clear anti-imperialist nature.

The uprisings of summer 1981 demonstrate four elements, which are marked developments of the struggle in Britain: black consciousness, defence of national minority areas, anti-imperialism and rejection of the traditional methods and organs of the bought off sections of the labour movement. It is significant that the uprisings drew into the struggle against the state forces members of those sections of the white working class with the least identification with the social democratic and social imperialist tradition, in particular the unemployed youth. The concrete struggle of the oppressed itself develops the links between different streams of struggle against imperialism. The traditional framework of analysis, based on the reducibility of all contradictions to the terms of the labour:capital contradiction, is incapable of grasping the distinct elements of anti-imperialist struggle, and thus obscures the living relationships between those elements which are developed in the course of that struggle.

NOTES

1. *Unesco Courier*, July, 1950.
2. *Race and Racism*, New York, 1967.
3. "Tribalism and Racism", in Kuper (ed), *Race, Science and Society*, Paris and London, 1975.
4. Charles Darwin, *Descent of Man*, 2nd edn., 1875, pp. 187-8.
5. Collins and Lapierre, *Freedom at Midnight*, London, 1982, pp. 21-2.
6. Stalin, *The National Question and Leninism*, 1929, Works 11, p. 369.
7. "The glorious course of regional autonomy of minority nationalities", *People's Daily*, 14th July, 1981.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. "Race was an important criterion used for determining the countries which were invited to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955." Essien-Udom, op. cit.

"The number one thing that was not allowed to attend the Bandung Conference was the white man. He couldn't come. Once they excluded the white man, they found that they could get together. Once they kept him out, everybody else fell right in and fell in line. This is the thing that you and I have to understand. All these people who came together didn't have nuclear weapons, they didn't have jet planes, they didn't have all of the heavy armaments that the white man has. But they had unity."

Malcolm X.

Breitman (ed), *Malcolm X Speaks*, New York, 1965, p. 5.

On the Question of Unconditional Support for the Republican Movement and the Struggle of the Irish People

The main priority for anti-imperialist solidarity work directed against the British bourgeoisie is in solidarity with the armed struggle of the Irish people for self-determination and the destruction of the partition system....We stand for unconditional support of the armed struggle and its republican leadership.

The above stand was taken by the RCL at its 2nd Congress last year on the question of 'unconditional support'. This is one which is at variance with that of most of the British 'left' and indeed, one which some Marxist-Leninists would hesitate to support. The Standing Committee of the Central Committee of the League therefore asked the League's Ireland Sub-committee to prepare a document on this upholding the line of the 2nd Congress. The following is the result: we hope it will produce discussion and rally support for the position we hold to be correct.

The Ireland commission majority report made clear firstly that the Republican movement is an anti-imperialist movement with a mass base amongst the most oppressed sections of the Irish people and, secondly, that communists have a duty to support colonial revolutions as a vital part of the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and hegemonism.

These views are based on long and deep experience in the International Communist movement.

"Parties in countries whose bourgeoisie possess colonies and oppress other nations must pursue a particularly distinct and clear policy in respect to the colonial and oppressed nations. Every party wishing to join the Third International must ruthlessly expose the colonial machinations of the imperialists of its 'own' country; must support - by actions and not merely by words - every colonial liberation movement, demand expulsion of the imperialists from colonies, educate the workers in a spirit of brotherhood with the labouring population of colonial and oppressed nations and conduct systematic agitation among the armed forces against all colonial oppression." (1)

and again,

"...the semi-colonial countries, like China, Persia, Turkey and all colonies, which have a combined population amounting to a billion. In these countries the bourgeois-democratic movements have either hardly begun, or are far from having been completed. Socialists must not only demand the unconditional and complete liberation of the colonies without compensation - and this in its political expression signifies nothing more or less than the recognition of the right to self-determination - but they must render determined support to the more revolutionary elements in the bourgeois-democratic movements for national liberation in these countries and assist their rebellion - and if need be, their revolutionary war - against the imperialist powers that oppress them." (2)

Thus for Lenin and the Comintern, solidarity was a matter of practical action - not mere words. On this basis, there can be no doubt that our duty

Thus for Lenin and the Comintern, solidarity was a matter of practical action - not mere words. On this basis, there can be no doubt that our duty is to identify ourselves wholly with the Irish struggle - there can be no question of remaining at a politically safe distance. It was in this spirit that the early CPGB was formed in 1921.

"The Communist Party in assisting Ireland does so as part of its international policy. We believe in a Republic for Ireland because this is precisely what the majority of the Irish workers want. We believe in helping Ireland because she is the victim of capitalist imperialism, and we are against imperialism all the time. It is nothing to us that our fight for Ireland brings us into opposition with the imperialism of Britain...

"But above all, when the Irish proletariat decide to take power in their own hands, we shall be prepared to render them all the assistance that is humanly possible. And we promise them, here and now, that whatever cost we may have to pay, our life's blood will be the test of our comradeship and the price of our solidarity." (3)

Now, it may be that some on the 'left' have reservations over whether the Republican movement is an anti-imperialist representative of the most oppressed sections of the people. In thinking this they are in disagreement with the British Army!

"The Provisional IRA (PIRA) has the dedication and the sinews of war to raise violence intermittently to at least the level of early 1978, certainly for the foreseeable future. Even if "peace" is restored, the motivation for politically inspired violence will remain.

"The PIRA is essentially a working class organization based in the ghetto areas of the cities and poorer rural areas... Nevertheless there is a strata of intelligent, astute and experienced terrorists who provide the backbone of the organization.

"Our evidence of the calibre of the rank and file terrorists does not support the view that they are mindless hooligans drawn from the unemployed and unemployable.

"PIRA will probably continue to recruit the men it needs. They will be able to attract enough people with leadership, talent, good education and manual skills to continue to enhance their all round professionalism. The movement will retain popular support sufficient to maintain secure bases in the traditional Republican areas." (4)

Another problem may be that comrades have doubts about the correctness of this orthodox tactic of the Republicans - perhaps they do not conduct people's war in the best orthodox manner for Irish conditions (!) Here is what Lenin had to say about the Irish rebellion of 1916.

"To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts by a section of the petty bourgeoisie with all its prejudices, without a movement of the politically non-conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against oppression by the landowners, the church and the monarchy, against national oppression etc. - to imagine all this is to repudiate social revolution. So one army lines up in one place and says, "We are for socialism", and another, somewhere else and says, "We are for imperialism", and that will be a social revolution! Only those who hold such a ridiculously pedantic view could vilify the Irish rebellion by calling it a "putsch". (5)

We may be getting nearer to the mark when we note that for many on 'left' reservations seem to arise when the PIRA carry the Irish war to the British Mainland. As communists we recognise the right of the Irish to bring the war to Britain.

Only the most cowardly chauvinist would say that it is fine for republicans to fight and die in Derry, Belfast or Armagh so long as they keep the carnage off British streets. In the course of their campaign against political, military and economic targets in Britain, civilians have most

regrettably, been injured or killed. Such is the nature of war. However, if we are to detach ourselves from the republicans at those moments when there is a chauvinist chorus raised against them - then our support is worthless, for the bourgeoisie have no problem in co-ordinating such a chorus and would bomb British civilians themselves if they thought it necessary to create one. If we adopted this attitude we would be more contemptible allies than even the Labour 'left', who make no bones about their rejection of military tactics. And we would win no support or respect from the most oppressed in Britain itself.

In a related vein, some may take the view that Republican tactics in Britain or Ireland are mistaken and, viewed from our standpoint, do not promote the Republican cause. That is a quite straightforward position. Those who hold such a view are of course aware that our own strategic conceptions are exceptionally immature and also know that in the course of our future progress we will make a million and one mistakes that the bourgeoisie will use to conduct campaigns against us. All that being so, we should, whenever we think it necessary, convey our views to the republicans - in fact we should aspire to be on the friendliest terms with them. But this is quite different from public criticism which would align us with the heroes of the gutter press and the safety-first readership of *Socialist Worker*.

Some people have apparently taken the view that the term "unconditional" is metaphysical. They say, "what if the Republican movement changes its nature?" or "what if we find ourselves supporting fascist ideas?" Now in the most formal sense there is a point to this. Everything in the world can change - even the ML movement has changed its positions on a number of important questions. But such a point is abstract mischief-making taken in the present context. On the one hand stand the bourgeoisie and their allies, making bloody war on the Irish and increasing their neo-fascist oppression of the most oppressed sections of the people in Britain. On the other hand stand these oppressed elements and their leadership; and in particular the Republican movement. Where will the communists stand? Not amidst a welter of qualifications and equivocations. No, we must stand for active, explicit and unswerving support for the Irish people and their Republican leadership. We call on all friends and comrades to uphold the call for unconditional support for the Republican movement.

Ireland Sub-committee, May 1982.

References:

- (1) *Conditions for Affiliation to the Communist International* July 1920
- (2) *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination.*
(theses) 1916
- (3) CPGB pamphlet 1921, reprinted *British Labour and Ireland* 1969-79
- (4) British Army Document, Leaked late 1978
- (5) *The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up* July 1916

RCL POLICY STATEMENT ON IRELAND

- 1) The revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle of the Irish people for national independence is part of the world-wide struggle against imperialism, colonialism and hegemonism. The Irish people's struggle is one of the longest national struggle in history and remains unresolved after many centuries. The success of the Irish national democratic revolutionary struggle and the struggle for socialism in Britain have always been closely linked. Directed as it is against British imperialism, the Irish national struggle will increasingly become an important source of support for the struggle for socialist revolution in Britain. The Irish people today face more sustained and developed forms of fascist oppression by the British imperialist state than those yet faced by workers in Britain, and in turn have learned through their experience more advanced methods of resistance to it. For all these reasons it is our proletarian internationalist duty to build solidarity with the Irish people's struggle against British imperialism for national independence and re-unification.
- 2) British imperialism and colonialism have always systematically tried to break the national unity that was born in the period of rising capitalism in Ireland. After centuries of oppression and exploitation of the people of Ireland, the British bourgeoisie were faced with a powerful and armed national liberation movement in Ireland; in order to maintain their control of Ireland they secured the collusion of the comprador bourgeoisie in southern Ireland and introduced, under threat of warfare, a partition system which left the Orange bourgeoisie in control of the six north-eastern counties. The partition of Ireland effectively divided the working masses in Ireland, North from South, and, in particular, cemented the alliance between the Orange bourgeoisie and the relatively privileged Protestant working class, putting the local state machine into the hands of the Orange bourgeoisie and destroying any possibility of a Protestant-Catholic working class alliance in the north-east of Ireland. We firmly oppose all attempts by British imperialism to continue its oppression and exploitation of Ireland by a policy of divide and rule which obstructs the process of uniting the Irish people in the struggle for national independence and democracy. The particular organizational forms that Irish unity will take will be resolved in the course of the national struggle by the Irish people alone.
- 3) The present stage of the revolution in Ireland is a national democratic one. The partition system remains the central prop of British imperialist control of Ireland; at this stage of the national democratic revolution, the destruction of the partition system remains the central task of the Irish revolution. The general content of the national democratic revolution is therefore: the destruction of the Northern Ireland state; the enactment of genuine political democracy throughout Ireland as a whole; the economic re-integration of the Irish economy and its independence from imperialist control.
- 4) While dominating Ireland as a whole by means of partition, Britain at present directly controls Northern Ireland as a colony by military occupation and by using the fascist armed power of the extremely reactionary Protestant bourgeoisie while the South is dominated by neo-colonial rule in which British imperialism still plays the major role, although a somewhat declining one relative to other imperialisms. The main enemy of the Irish people is British imperialism, the crucial obstacle to the Irish national revolution has been British support for the partition system it rigged up.

- 5) Soviet social-imperialism is playing an increasingly active role in Irish political and economic life and in the long term is a particularly dangerous enemy of the Irish national democratic revolution.
- 6) British imperialism's policy is one of national oppression by neo-colonial means in the South and by either direct means in the North, or by using the Orange fascist machine. In giving leadership to the movement in Britain to support the Irish national democratic struggle, our contribution must be to oppose this policy and to uphold the Irish people's right to self-determination. In particular, we must oppose British imperialism's oppression in Northern Ireland, campaign for the immediate withdrawal of British troops, oppose all British military and financial assistance to anti-national and Orange fascist forces in Northern Ireland and oppose all violations of national democratic rights by British imperialism and its agents. We will also unite with the Irish people in exposing the imperialist aims of all British schemes which attempt to divert the Irish struggle from the goal of full national independence into neo-colonial reformist solutions.
- 7) The present phase of the national democratic revolution in Ireland is under the leadership of the Republican movement.** For over ten years, it has waged resolute armed struggle against British imperialism and for the overthrow of the partition system. Supported by the most oppressed people the Republican movement has shown itself capable of fighting British imperialism face to face and, step by step, learning how to wage a people's war integrate political and military struggle and gradually expand the base of their support. British revolutionaries must firmly support their struggle.
- 8) At important phases of the Irish national democratic revolution, the nationalist proletariat has played a conscious part, notably during the years 1913 to 1923 and as expressed in the socialist ideas and revolutionary stand of James Connolly. Through its own self-reliant struggle the Republican movement is more and more grasping the importance of combining class and national struggles and is integrating the fight for national freedom with the fight for the emancipation of the working class, the stand of James Connolly and Bobby Sands. We are convinced that in coming years, the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought will be increasingly applied to the concrete conditions of the Irish revolution.
- 9) The overwhelming emphasis of our work must be to strengthen solidarity with the progressive struggle of the Irish people as a whole without in any way making this conditional on the struggle being under proletarian leadership or free from any mistakes, and without commenting on the positions of particular groups in detail. We unite fully with the desire of the Republican movement for reconciliation and unity with the Protestant community in Northern Ireland; our best contribution to the realization of that is remorseless attack on British imperialism which operates every day to deepen the divisions in Ireland. Our propaganda must carefully explain the necessity for armed struggle in Northern Ireland and support it. We must firmly uphold the right of the Irish people to attack the British bourgeoisie in its own headquarters - Britain.
- 10) In summary, the purpose of this statement of our basic position on Ireland is to affirm the revolutionary significance of the Irish national democratic struggle and the immediate tasks of British communists in promoting solidarity with that struggle. The essence of our stand is solidarity with the Irish people's struggle against British imperialism for national independence and re-unification and against the partition system. Our priorities are to oppose and expose British imperialism's oppression of the Irish people, in particular to fight for the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland, and to strengthen fraternal

links with the Republican movement. We must unite with the oppressed and other progressive people in a broad front directed against British imperialism in Ireland.

** The Republican movement consists of Provisional Sinn Fein, Provisional IRA, Irish Republican Socialist Party, Irish National Liberation Army, and their associated organizations.

* RCLB POLICY STATEMENT ON CHINA ... APRIL 1982

- 1) China has and will continue to have great importance for the revolution in Britain:

- I. China is a genuine socialist country.
- II. Mao Zedong Thought, a crystallization of China's revolutionary experience is a creative development of Marxism-Leninism.
- III. The Communist Party of China's polemic against modern revisionism and the CPSU was in many ways a point of departure for the revolutionary movement today and is still of relevance.
- IV. China's international line, expressed in the Three Worlds Theory is correct and in the interests of the world's people, and China itself plays a major role in the Third World, the main progressive force.

- 2) The RCL has failed to take proper notice of the major changes and developing situation in socialist China for several years now.

The Central Committee makes a self-criticism for this. It considered it basically correct to get away from a situation which once prevailed in much of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain of being obsessed with details of developments in China to the point where concrete analysis and sound leadership to struggles in Britain were neglected. The RCL aimed to break away from this tradition but has overcompensated by neglecting the promotion of support for China and other socialist countries. The Central Committee has not given a strong lead on the overall situation in China, and this is badly needed now that a revisionist-bourgeois offensive against it has built up, and former "friends" have turned against it.

- 3) Our lack of attention to the socialist countries to the danger from liquidationism in the RCL. Promotion of solidarity with the socialist countries must be an integral part of the work of communists in the non-socialist world, particularly in the imperialist countries, and failure to promote such solidarity means liquidating an important component of communist leadership and proletarian internationalist duty. It also helps blur lines of demarcation with the trotskyites and revisionists and detracts from the RCL clearly establishing its credentials as an organization set apart from the opportunist left.
- 4) Solidarity with the socialist countries does not mean being starry eyed about them; such an attitude is idealist, can not promote strong support for them anyway, and only leads to disillusionment later. This has been demonstrated by the experience of the last few years, when people who had wholeheartedly supported the "Cultural Revolution" and accepted all the claims about what was being achieved then have become disillusioned, sceptical and even anti-China as China's policies have changed and strong criticisms of that period have been made.
- 5) The RCL must have a materialist view of the socialist countries, which recognizes their problems, and the errors they are bound to make from time to time, but must support them strongly, and, in its propaganda must uphold solidarity with them, and stress all that is strong in them, while, in general, reserving differences on developments in their party and state policies.
- 6) Socialism is the lower stage of communism. It is a historical period when classes are eliminated and when the political, ideological and economic foundations are laid down for communist (classless) society. Reactionary influences are left over from the old society: new bourgeois and even feudal elements may emerge within socialist society. Furthermore as relatively new phenomena in the world, the present day socialist states have little experience to draw on in deciding their way forward, and must inevitably make mistakes as any trail-blazers will.

- 7) All the socialist countries are in the Third World. They have long been oppressed and exploited by Imperialism, which crippled their pre-revolutionary economic and social development. This means that they are faced with difficult tasks, and must find ways and means of building up their strength, and aiding the peoples of the world in their revolutionary struggles while preserving and defending themselves from imperialist subversion and aggression. They have to adopt complex strategies and tactics and must be supported in this.
- 8) If the working class and its allies hold state power in a country, under the leadership of a genuine Communist Party, then that country is socialist and must be supported. Of course in the states of Eastern Europe which are under the Soviet sway it is claimed that these conditions exist, but that is not true; if the working class has state power in a country and is led by a genuine Communist Party then that is demonstrated by a whole series of policies and by the economic, social and political conditions prevailing there over a period of time, as it is if the claims of a country to be socialist are false too. A fundamental criterion by which we judge whether or not a country remains in the socialist world is whether or not it guards its own national independence and respects the national independence of others.
- 9) It is from this standpoint that any shortcomings in the policies of the socialist countries must be assessed. Any errors of the party and state of a socialist country do not detract from its socialist character if the overall correct orientation is maintained, and the RCL should oppose any attempts to use such errors to discredit the socialist countries and socialism.
- 10) The Central Committee considers that the Communist Party of China is successfully leading the Chinese people through a difficult period of re-adjustment after the damage done during the "Cultural Revolution", with the objective of building China into a modern, powerful socialist country.
- 11) The "Cultural Revolution" was launched for honest motives - to prevent the rise of revisionism and the turning of China into a capitalist country. But it proved not to be a sound instrument for realizing these objectives, and the damage done to the proper functioning of party life made it difficult to correct errors. Lin Biao and the "Gang of Four" pushed an ultra-left line as a cover for their attempts to seize power vilifying and hounding veteran Communist leaders, rank and file communists and anyone else who got in their way. They took advantage of the chaos and divisions created by the "Cultural Revolution", and if they had not been defeated in time they would have ended up doing the things which the "Cultural Revolution" was supposed to prevent from happening. This and various errors made by the genuine communists in the CPC at the time severely damaged the prestige of the party and socialism among the masses of the Chinese people, especially the youth, who grew up during those years, and often suffered psychologically, physically and educationally as a result.
- 12) In the aftermath of the "Cultural Revolution", it was inevitable that the Chinese Party and state would over-compensate to some extent in rectifying the damage of that time, and would make some rightist errors - ones which are being rectified to some extent even now. This sort of thing is not unusual historically in the international communist movement.
- 13) In the light of this we consider the following aspects of China's stand to be the main positive ones:
 - a) The stress laid on upholding the four fundamental principles: adherence to Communist Party leadership, the socialist road, the dictatorship of the proletariat and Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought.

- b) The materialist assessment of Communist leaders such as Comrades Mao Zedong and Liu Shaoqi.
- c) The work to realize the four modernizations, which will strengthen the material basis of Chinese socialism, help China to continue to advance towards communist society, and enhance the standing of socialism in a world where the countries under imperialist sway are plunged into crisis.
- d) The promotion of socialist democracy, which will help protect China against bureaucratic degeneration and with the development of the socialist economy, reduce the danger of capitalist forces arising. It will make the Chinese people's control of their own country and their own lives more effective and develop the political, moral and cultural well-being of the people.
- e) The campaigns to purify the Party, and combat corruption in the state apparatus, the stress on political and ideological education - eg socialist ethics month, learning from Lei Feng, education on the two different social systems - socialism and capitalism.
- f) The stressing that while the market mechanism should have an important role in the economy and other reforms should be introduced, the leading and main role must be played by central planning and the state and collective economy, The new responsibility systems in agriculture are economic systems which correspond with the level of development of China's socialist economy and they fall under the guidance of the state plan.
- g) Combatting the dogmatist and idealist approach to party history and other questions which has hampered the international communist movement for many decades.
- h) Implementing the policy of letting a hundred flowers bloom and distinguishing between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions.
- 14) The negative aspects of present day China's stand include an underestimation of the danger of new capitalist elements emerging, although many of the measures of the Party and state in practice make the rises of such forces unlikely.
- 15) In international affairs China's central orientation of opposing hegemonism and defending world peace is correct. In recent months China has clarified its position of supporting the people's struggles against US and Western Imperialism for example in El Salvador.
- 16) The diplomatic policy of a socialist country is by no means necessarily a model for the policy of a revolutionary communist organisation in a country such as Britain.
- 17) In terms of party to party relations, despite a great diversification in contacts the CPC continues to maintain relations with the genuine Marxist-Leninist parties and organizations.
- 18) In summary the Central Committee holds that, without necessarily endorsing each and every policy of the CPC and Chinese state, and without believing China to be free from short-comings, it is correct to uphold China as a great socialist country deserving of support from the communists and revolutionaries, workers and oppressed people of all countries; furthermore that its role in world affairs makes it the main defender of world peace.
- 19) The RCLB will maintain, safeguard and develop its fraternal links with the CPC.

The Anglo-Argentinian War and Imperialism Today

CONTRIBUTED ARTICLE

1. Spirit of Resistance of the Oppressed

The early nineteenth century, Buenos Aires, major city in the crumbling Spanish empire. The Napoleonic wars raging over Europe, over Spain itself. The British bourgeoisie, their industrial revolution in full swing, desperately seek economic space abroad. Learned literature abounds with studies of the Spanish American empire, its fabulous potential largely untapped. France's expansion threatens to encompass this empire as well, so trying to pre-empt it, Britain sends two military expeditions to colonise Buenos Aires, in 1806 and 1807.

But they got more than they bargained for. Throughout the continent the oppressed masses were rising up to throw out the old colonial master. Spanish rule was being weakened by the popular forces, including revolts by the native Indians and the black slaves who were to play a major role in the armed liberation movement. These forces were not ready to accept one colonial master trying to replace another. When Britain invaded Buenos Aires, according to one contemporary report (couched in racist terminology, but the main point is important), *"The streets were full of Negroes, mulattos and young men, fearless and ready to face death."* A people's army was formed in which these oppressed nationalities formed a basic combative element, and officers were democratically elected. In 1807 a force of 9000 British troops was resoundingly defeated and the British commander reported that his position was not worth maintaining *"because of the very hostile disposition of its inhabitants."* (1)

2. Britain's Economic Domination

This was not the only case of armed conflict or Britain's only defeat. In 1833 the Malvinas were seized from Argentina. A decade later, Britain, carrying forward the old Spanish divide and rule policy, was playing off Argentina against Brazil and using the buffer state of Uruguay which it had created for this purpose. Finding Argentinian nationalism growing too strong in 1845 Britain and France jointly undertook a blockade of the Rio de la Plata, and attempted an invasion. This was again defeated. San Martin, the hero of the Latin American national struggle, bequeathed his sword to the then Argentinian leader Rosas as a token of the ongoing tradition of struggle.

But although the popular resistance forces could win the battles they lost the war, and Britain's domination over Argentina only increased during the coming period. To understand this we have to see that the local propertied classes could not give the kind of leadership needed to produce a real break with colonialism, the revolutionary nationalist current which exists today could not have developed under those conditions, nor could there be at that time anything like a broad movement against the exploitative world economic system.

So the existing economic system in Argentina was destroyed: imports of British textiles wiped out the industry which had provided for local needs; the native Indian population was literally exterminated and large agricultural

estates created which supplied Britain with wheat and then increasingly beef. In order to conduct this exploitative trade more effectively Britain built and itself controlled the railways system. The introduction of refrigeration in the late nineteenth century further increased the scope and systematic character of this exploitation.

3. Accumulation

During the colonial period a process was going on which created the basis of the world system as it exists today. This was the original or primary accumulation of capital involving the violent destruction of the existing self-functioning economic and social systems and the creation of systems of a dependent kind which characteristically serve to absorb industrial imports, producing cash crops and mineral raw materials etc. In Latin America's case the main agent of this process was England, and it took place mainly outside the formal structures of colonialism. But we can say that it required the prevalence of the colonial system as a general rule in order to provide the economic, military and political conditions for this informal colonialism to exist as a special case. Semi-colonialism was accompanied by violence just as much as formal colonialism was - witness the war against the Taiping uprising in China as just one example. (2) This phenomenon anticipates some features of modern neo-colonialism, but the era where this existed as an exception is qualitatively different from the modern era where it is the rule.

The result of this phase of accumulation was to create a mode of production on a world scale which, while it is not organised (it suffers precisely from the anarchy which characterises capitalism) nevertheless works to exploit the labouring masses through the momentum of the system itself which operates according to objective laws characterising human society at a certain historical stage. (3)

It is not simply a question of robbery by force. The revisionists don't understand, or deliberately befog this point; (4) they pretend to argue that simply by altering a formal colonial force-relationship one has altered colonialism. The effect of this degenerate thinking in our case would be to conclude that Britain today, having only very much reduced capacities for violent repression in the Third World, is by this token only partially imperialist. But in fact the system will work by its own momentum in favour of the industrialised countries - until there is a revolutionary change in the mode of production.

Marx has pointed out: "*All the internal organisation of peoples, all their international relations, what are they but the expression of a certain division of labour? And must they not change with the change of the division of labour?*" (5)

4. Reproduction of Capital on a World Scale

Capital moves through a cycle in the course of which it assumes different forms:

$$M - C \begin{cases} L \\ MP \end{cases} \dots P \dots C' - M'$$

(Where M is money, C is commodities, L is labour, MP is means of production, P is the process of production, the dots indicating that the process of circulation is interrupted, and C' and M' are greater than C and M). (6)

Even in this basic form, it is clear that the circuit of capital has by implication a world character, since a crucial element of the means of production is drawn from the exploited nations, while the realisation of an augmented quantity of commodities also points to the development of the world market. The events we have recounted concerning the relationship between Britain and Argentina express what is inherent in the whole capitalist mode of production.

This is not an economist point but above all a political one.

"The production of capitalists and wage labourers is thus a chief product of capital's realisation process. Ordinary economics, which looks only at the things produced, forgets this completely." (7)

The world market brings with it the domination of exchange values, commodities, as against use values. This is also fundamental in understanding the history and position of Third World countries today in relation to the industrialised world. What is really being produced, through the cycles of reproduction of capital, is not so much goods (which are incidental) but relations of production. The reproduction of relations of production in the metropolitan countries is interdependent with the relations of production being created at a world level.

These facts are clearly evidenced in Marx' analysis of capital. The qualitative change is that whereas these were latent tendencies in his time, in the era of imperialism they are issues of burning immediacy.

5. Creation of Relative Surplus Value

Let's look at this question a little more closely with respect to Argentina. The goal of capitalism is profit. Particularly important in the overall development of capitalism is the creation of relative surplus value: this involves decreasing the proportion of necessary labour (which goes to making up the value of labour power) so that more surplus is being worked, even without lengthening the working day. (8). This can be achieved through producing more cheaply the articles of consumption which enter into the means of subsistence of the working class, for example by introducing more modern technology in the sectors producing them so that they will contain less crystallised labour time. But this inevitably means increasing the scale of production, i.e. a wider market will have to be found to absorb the increased productive capacity.

Thus concretely the creation of a market for textiles whereby the traditional dress produced in Latin America was wiped out in favour of British imports is inseparably linked with the reproduction of capital (thus also the reproduction of capitalist relations of production) in the metropolitan country itself. Moreover another crucial element enters in, in that the products which Argentina was forced to supply, particularly beef, also enters into the consumption of the metropolitan working class. If they are produced more cheaply than they would be in the metropolitan country itself, this also helps to increase relative surplus value.

6. Exploitation Breeds Resistance

If we have insisted upon the creation of a self-propelled system operating by its own laws and logic, this is because there has been a tendency to neglect precisely this fact, hence neglecting the real sense in which Britain is still a fully imperialist country. Our purpose is not to discount the political dimension but on the contrary to highlight the fact that there must be an internationalist revolution of the greatest

profundity which breaks with the ideas associated with the whole present mode of production, and struggles to smash that mode of production in practice.

As the old colonial system became the exception rather than the rule, a new form of politico-military domination has arisen on the neo-colonial base, which adapts itself to conditions of formal state sovereignty and tries to empty this sovereignty of its substance. In turn a movement has arisen with its epicentre in the Third World which - while drawing on the seminal influence of the slave revolts of the early colonial period - is equipped through its consciousness of the hegemonic threat and of neo-colonialism, to win successes which they could never have won. In the most advanced currents, the mass movement and the consciousness of neo-colonialism and hegemonism are welded closely together. Taking the Third World movement as a whole, different elements of the positive trend are unevenly present in different areas.

7. Genesis of Modern Hegemonism

Hegemonism and neo-colonialism acquire their developed form in the post second World War period, the period of superpower imperialism, but they have historical roots. In Latin America in the pre-imperialist period and in that of transition to imperialism, the embryonic forms of both phenomena appear but they are sprung apart from one another. Britain was the dominant semi-colonial power economically. In the politico-military sphere the USA put forward its Monroe Doctrine at the time of the collapse of the Spanish empire presenting this as an anti-colonial doctrine to prevent the area being recolonised by other powers. But its substance contradicted this anti-colonial form: it was in essence a new colonial doctrine but still qualitatively different from traditional colonialism in that it adapted itself to the existence of formal state sovereignty. Statesmen from this area fought back, and accompanying the physical battles of Latin America against US intervention there was an ideological-political battle in the international superstructure. At the Hague Conference of 1907, a major great-power dominated forum of incipient imperialism, Latin American jurists fought the USA in defence of the Calvo principle which argues that "*the sovereignty of states admits of no limitation.*" In 1914 Argentina, Brazil and Chile joined to oppose US intervention in the internal affairs of Mexico.

These struggles anticipate contemporary anti-hegemonism, but only in an embryonic form. Modern hegemonism exists in its full form when used to protect a neo-colonial economic base. Just before World War I the Monroe Doctrine was explicitly extended to take on the sense of excluding outside economic interests, and parallel with this US political intervention increased. Between 1898 and 1933 the US attacked or intervened in Cuba, Panama, Nicaragua, Mexico, Dominica, Costa Rica, Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, some of them several times. The inter-war period was a transitional one: in 1919 president Woodrow Wilson had openly declared that the Monroe Doctrine had become a world doctrine, but this far-sighted view of America's world-hegemonic role was only really applied after World War II. In the developed form it acquired in the cold war period, this theory came to embody two elements: the refusal to recognise exclusive spheres of influence of other imperialist powers (in this it differs radically from traditional colonialist politics) combined with the insistence on an exclusive sphere for the USA itself in the case of Latin America. In this it strikingly anticipates the Brezhnev Doctrine put forward by social imperialist USSR which combines insistence on exclusive control over Eastern Europe with assertion of a right to intervene anywhere else in the world it chooses.

During this transitional inter-war period, the Monroe Doctrine was written by name into the Covenant of the League of Nations, and this explicit identification with hegemonism was one of the major reasons why the healthy forces in international politics could not be mustered to check fascist aggression. In 1920 Argentina introduced a resolution in the league assembly emphasising the equality of all member states. This resolution was defeated under the influence of the big powers, and Argentina effectively withdrew from participation in international diplomacy in disgust.

The situation in the inter-war period was that there existed a number of small or weak states which were nominally independent and were subject to bullying by the big powers: Nicaragua, Egypt, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, etc. A Soviet spokesman pointed out in 1936 that to try to regulate world affairs through the big three, five, or seven was "just the same as to have recourse to the distaff and spinning wheel in the era of the machine." (9)

This represents a correct line, which was offset by Eurocentric and other tendencies. These positive national forces were scattered and isolated and were unable to cohere as a single force. Yet the historical current represented by these aspirations remains. The bitter experience of these years only added fuel to the later rebellion of the oppressed nations

*"Lasst die Rechnung der Tyrannen
Anwachsen, bis ein Tag die allgemeine*

Und die besond're Schuld auf einmal zahlt " (10)

(Let the tyrant's reckoning build up until one day will pay off the general and particular debt in one go.)

8. Development of Underdevelopment under Imperialism

We have pointed out that capitalism is a world system, but by extending its relations of production to a world scale it is far from just being a question of capitalism encompassing greater numbers of workers within its industrial army. The central question, which comes to fruition in the era of imperialism, is the exploitation of nations, the super-exploitation of their working people by the imperialist powers.

In speaking of the relationship between an exploiter country (Britain) and exploited countries, the crucial thing to bear in mind is that the economic development of the former feeds on the underdevelopment of the latter, and that this is a continuing process.

Some writers, notably Samir Amin, have argued that within the world capitalist economy there exists a centre - which dominates the whole system of production - and a periphery confined by the mechanism of the system to a role where its 'development' is actually the development of underdevelopment. These views have been attacked from an apparently Marxist-Leninist perspective by D.W. Nabudere. (11) We do not have space to enter into this controversy in detail, but we must state plainly that we think Amin is mainly right and Nabudere's critique obscures precisely the question of national oppression which for us is essential. He accuses the centre-periphery theorists of 'keynsianism'. Now, Keynes sought to get capitalism out of trouble by using government spending to create a domestic market for capitalism's own products. (12) There is also a trend which seeks to apply Keynesian, new deal type policies at a world

level by using development 'aid' to create an expanded market in the Third World. This view is particularly represented in the Brandt Commission, more on this later. (13) But our disagreement with the Keynesians is not on the question that there exists a contradiction between the potential scale of production and the ability of the masses to consume these products. In making this point, Edward Heath and co. are entirely correct and in accordance with Marxism, where we differ is precisely on the point of whether this contradiction can be resolved within the scope of the capitalist mode of production. We don't think it can.

"Human knowledge is not (or does not follow) a straight line, but a curve, which endlessly approximates a series of circles, a spiral. Any fragment, segment, section of this curve can be transformed (transformed one-sidedly) into an independant, complete, straight line, which then (if one does not see the wood for the trees) leads into the quagmire, into clerical obscurantism (where it is anchored by the class interests of the ruling classes)." (14)

This applies to the theory of global Keynesianism. The resolution of this contradiction can only come about through the revolutionary resolution of the contradictions which arise through the exploitation of nations and the existence of super-profits. These are the facts which the Brandt commission deliberately conceals. But these facts are also swept under the carpet by Nabudere, instead of being placed right in the spot-light as they should be. (15)

The problem is that people like the centre-periphery theorists have been somewhat out on a limb. With the rise of modern revisionism Soviet theory - which for a long time had been pretty dogmatic anyway - turned more and more to justifying reactionary dominationism, whereas the ML movement concerned itself very much with defending basic principles rather than developing them. Hence the centre-periphery theorists made secondary errors of individualism in failing to see how the phenomena they were analysing actually constitute dialectical developments of what Marx and Lenin were talking about, and particularly in being cut off from the mass movement of the people in struggle. Both these errors we must strive to avoid in taking what is positive and valuable in their work.

"And there is much that is valuable because a writer like Amin arrived by his own route at the same reflection of objective reality which we find has been the major original breakthrough by the Marxist-Leninist movement in recent years, namely the three worlds theory." (16)

Thus we believe that the economy of a third-world country like Argentina is of a dependant type, its place in the international imperialist division of labour ensuring that it is exploited for the collective benefit of the industrialised countries. These countries dominate its industry through financial and technological control. The operation of the scissors differential (17) makes certain that they have permanently to produce more in order to buy less, they fall into debt and have to pay off vast amount of interest to the creditor imperialist nations (British banks play a major role in this respect). These are all aspects of unequal exchange, though it must be emphasised, trade relations, we see as a reflection of production relations embodied in the international division of labour. In essence it is imperialism which is exploiting the country and the repulsive junta only serves as its agent in so doing.

9. Super Exploitation

Thus the relationship between a Third World country and an imperialist country must be seen as an oppressed-oppressor relationship because of the respective places they occupy in the world economic system. (18) Key to this is the concept of super-exploitation. Our tentative definition contains the following aspects:-

- (a) The value of labour power is established at a lower level in the Third World in comparison to the industrialised countries because the 'accepted' definition of 'subsistence' is much more restricted.
- (b) The conditions of a dependant economy (large numbers of poor gravitating around urban centres, etc) give rise to the availability of a plentiful labour source which can thus be burnt out and discarded after a few years.
- (c) Part of the articles of consumption which enter into the value of labour power of the worker in the Third World are generated by sectors which are not more than partially integrated into the capitalist economy and are thus not paid for at their value.
- (d) The fascist regimes which are dependant on imperialism in many parts of the Third World help to crush aspirations for reasonable working conditions.
- (e) Wages can be paid which are below the value of labour power. This renders the reproduction of labour power impossible, but transitional finance capital can always ruin it in one part of the world and switch investment elsewhere. In the long run this approach undercuts the basis of the capitalist system itself and is 'illogical' even from the capitalist point of view. However we are talking about a desperate and anarchic imperialist system in crisis. Linked with this is the absence of environmental constraints in the Third World so that imperialism in its last throes wantonly destroys the ecological balance which is necessary to provide the basis for any mode of production.
- (f) Super-exploited sectors play a fundamental role within the imperialist countries themselves (national minorities, Gastarbeiter, Mexicans in USA etc, etc.).

10 The Impact of Crisis

Crisis is a time when the reproduction of capital, hence also the reproduction of capitalist relations of production, runs into trouble. In more normal circumstances capitalism is a unity of opposites (eg buying and selling) which in crisis are prised apart. Crisis thus exposes the contradictory realities of the system more starkly. The super-exploitation we have been talking about is stepped up in order to offset the other tendencies which lead to the drying-up of profit. Heightened contention between the powers, leading to war, reflects the same contradictions and is thus linked with the stepping up of exploitation: the powers are trying to grab more territory and squeeze more from it. All this produces heightened struggles by the masses which probe and expose the real character of the system, and the need to change it, and are themselves the forces for bringing about this change.

In the period of frantic imperialist expansion leading up to World War I, Britain was intensifying its exploitation of Argentina through the development of refrigeration of beef, control of finance capital being

extended over the wheat and linseed markets, etc. At the same time as heightened exploitation there was also heightened contention. In 1907 the United States Beef Trust broke into the Argentinian market, laying the foundations for a long-term undermining of Britain's position. (19) But even after the war Argentina continued to be regarded as part of the British Empire. A story from the period concerns an Englishman saying to an American: "You can take Canada from us, but you will never take Argentina." (20) But the crisis of the 1930's caused markets to dry up, and placed Argentina in the shameful position of having to beg Britain to continue the imperial relationship. Thus following the Ottawa Conference of 1932 where Britain - in a world atmosphere of retrenchment and protectionism - had tightened Commonwealth preferences, a treaty was concluded in 1933 whereby Argentina retained some access to British markets in exchange for undertaking to spend all the income from this trade on buying British industrial goods. This is a classic example of the unequal bargaining between rich and poor nations whereby 'reciprocal' trade in essence means superprofits for the exploiter nation.

Within this general pattern there were many specific instances of humiliation which Britain was able to impose. Public transport in Buenos Aires was notoriously dear and inefficient; still, Britain was able to force the supposedly sovereign Argentinian government to accept renewal of the monopoly control over the public transport system by a British company in 1935. Around this time an Argentinian communist wrote: "*The dominance of British imperialism brings about the misery and ruin of the people, but likewise the upward surge of the masses.*" (21)

Even in 1942 60% of the total \$2,500 million foreign investment in Argentina was British, and in 1945 Britain accounted for 37% of Argentinian exports, though by that date Britain's dominant position in terms of imports into Argentina had disappeared, and United States influence was advancing rapidly. (22)

The fundamental condition for Argentina's humiliation was its dependence on the imperialist world market. Naturally these experiences stoked up hatred for the neo-colonial power, Britain which had created this situation and mainly profited from it. After the second world war, Peron pursuing a populist-nationalist policy, managed to strike back and secure higher prices for Argentinian produce. Moreover he attempted to promote industrialisation on the basis of creating a domestic market, some successes were achieved and living standards rose (to a level which was comparatively high for a Third World country - but this has collapsed over recent years). However, an important condition for Peron's successes was the anomalous behaviour of the world market at the time of the Korean War. During this period raw material prices and prices of primary products exported by the Third World were in many cases very high. Looked at against the background of the whole post-war period, this interlude can be seen as an exception to the overall pattern of declining raw material and primary produce prices, rising prices of goods produced by the industrialised countries.

11. The Currents of Revolutionary Struggle

In a sense then Peron had it easy. The general rule is one of a system which generates overwhelming pressure to keep the imperialisms powers on top, relative to the Third World (relative to each other they fluctuate according to the law of uneven development).

Our argument is not that the situation of the third World is hopeless - quite the opposite. By stressing the immense difficulties we are saying that decisive change can't be won without fundamental struggle against a whole mode of production. This is precisely why the Third World is revolutionary. The force for change must come through a fusion of different elements of struggle (or, a struggle at different levels). There must be struggles to change the existing social structures in the Third World because these structures were created by colonialism and semi-colonialism and today provide the basis for neo-colonial domination. And there must be a general campaign against the existing world politico-economic system carried out by a broadly-united Third World movement. This is typified by the Non-aligned Movement, founded in 1961, which put forward the historic demand of the oppressed states to the effect that "...the further extension of the non-committed area of the world constitutes the only possible and indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs..." (23) And the Group of 77 founded at the time of the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in 1964 and which has urged the demand for the new international economic order.

Che Guevara was an Argentinian who fought for revolutionary social change. Raul Prebisch, an Argentinian, became the secretary-general of UNCTAD, the first international institution which began in some degree to reflect the demands of the oppressed nations. Among these currents, there is no doubt that the internal struggle for revolutionary change is fundamental in beating imperialism. There is a saying from West Africa that, "if the death inside doesn't kill you, how can the death outside harm you?" This reflects the fact that internal causes are the basis of change and external causes are the condition of change. But the broader international movement of the Third World is also revolutionary because it is objectively directed against imperialism as a system and in fact it develops under the impulsion of the increasingly radical pressure from within each country.

From the beginning of the 1960's the struggle in Latin America moved on to a higher plane with US imperialism initially on the offensive. It was Kennedy who with passion and cunning threw himself into the struggle against popular liberation movements; his era also saw the beginning of the Alliance for Progress, a vile and sinister neo-colonialist scheme for intensified exploitation of Latin America. Repression produced heightened resistance. This is a law of history. The events of this period are beyond the scope of this article, but we will see later how, with United States Latin American policy now in tatters, the Anglo-Argentinian war has brought about the fusion of these different revolutionary currents to an unprecedented degree.

12. The Crisis of the 1970's, Argentina and the EEC

The imperialist crisis of the present period which began at the beginning of the '70s and is still intensifying is characterized by the following features: The heightened superexploitation of the Third World and the rising up in resistance of the Third World and other oppressed nations and superexploited sectors; the tendency to monopoly on the part of the superpowers, and in particular for Soviet social-imperialism to an expanded monopoly sphere of influence; the accentuation of uneven development, with the rise of the USSR relative to the USA and, among second ranking imperialist powers, the relative decline of Britain; the weakening of the US' politico-economic-military role at the hub of the Western imperialist bloc; the heightened contradiction between expanded productive capacity and the shrinking ability of the world market to

absorb these products; and the accentuated tendency for the rate of profit to decline in circumstances where the organic composition of capital is changing fast with the introduction of new technology. We will expand on some of these points later.

As we have pointed out, even in its apparently more economic manifestations, this is really a political crisis with the reproduction of capitalist relations of production at stake. It is a crisis which increases the factors of exploitation and of war. Now, second world countries are imperialist powers whose reaction to the crisis has a dual nature. The most important single element within the second world is the European Community. (24)

The approach of the EEC in its relations with the Third World, in reaction to the crisis, is typified above all in the Lome Convention, and this needs to be looked at dialectically. We have seen in looking at the Anglo-Argentinian relationship in the '30s how 'reciprocity' in trade between an imperialist and an oppressed country is bound to embody exploitation. This is a result of the system itself.

"The so-called neutrality of the world market place turned out to be a neutrality between the exploiter and the exploited, between the bird of prey and its victim." (25)

The full development of capitalist relations of production in a particular country can only come about when feudal obstacles to 'freedom' and 'equality' are removed; at a world level, the establishment of independence of states and in particular the flourishing of the US sponsored 'free trade' system after World War II, have been conditions for the development and intensification of the exploitative relationship, which takes place precisely in the context of 'free' and 'equal' exchange. Hence at the time of the first UNCTAD conference, the demand was put forward that preferences should be non-reciprocal, in other words the developed countries should give concessions which developing countries were not expected to accord in return. Furthermore another major problem was posed by developing countries' exports, which are overwhelmingly primary products: a way needed to be found to counteract the two deadly tendencies of the post-World War II market, namely the fluctuation of prices of primary products, and their overall tendency to decline. A whole decade of further struggle was needed before these principles came to be embodied in a major agreement and this required moreover the full pressure of the crisis including its politico-military manifestations (the October War in the Middle East, etc) to be brought to bear on the countries of the second-world.

The Lome Convention thus marked an enormous breakthrough: it embodied non-reciprocal preferences as well as the export stabilisation fund (Stabex). Its more consistent advocates took the viewpoint of global Keynesianism, in other words they conceived that the way out of the crisis for the countries of the second world was to promote to a degree the development of the Third World, thus raising the living standards of their people and enormously expanding the potential world market. Light industry in the developing countries would fill much of the demand at present met by imports from the industrialised countries, and would indeed itself export to these countries, thus wiping out important sectors of traditional industries there (e.g. textiles, conventional steels, etc). An enormous restructuring of industry in the developed countries would thus be indispensable, but the reward would be a new and profitable international division of labour in which - at a greatly expanded level of world production - the existing industrialised

countries would retain and indeed intensify their dominant position, their industries now reconverted to overwhelming concentration on the leading high technology sector while the Third World would be the scene of labour intensive low technology industry.

This theory is one of the few real ideas to emerge among the imperialist bourgeoisie in recent years. Although now completely repudiated by the Reagan-Thatcher axis within the western imperialist bloc, it still retains some influence, e.g. in the present French government. It is beyond our scope to give a full critique here, but the following three fundamental aspects of the communist position must be stated: firstly this theory cannot possibly work. It attempts to resolve one of the contradictions of form of the capitalist-imperialist system (the contradiction between expanded production and the declining purchase power of the masses) without attacking the basic contradiction of substance (between the social character of production and the existing system of appropriation) and - far from removing - actually seeking to perpetuate the major expression of this fundamental contradiction, namely the contradiction between oppressor and oppressed nations. Secondly the policies which concretely result from this theory can often be positive in allowing the Third World room for manoeuvre in their struggle; a struggle which above all targets the superpowers and which tends in a direction far different from what the global new-dealers imagine. Thirdly, while supporting those policies like the Lome Convention which benefit the Third World, we must strictly demarcate ourselves from the neo-colonial logic they reflect, and in particular from the idea of a new imperialist division of labour: failing this it wouldn't be communist solidarity with the Third World, we would just become a ramification of the bourgeoisie.

The Lome Convention thus marked a positive direction. Today we have to question whether this promise has been fulfilled. But even at the time it had a dual nature, and this may be important in understanding the subsequent course of events. Although it includes Caribbean and Pacific countries the core of the Lome Convention is undoubtedly the Europe-Africa connection. The Third World signatories undertake not to give better terms of trade to other developed countries than they do to the EEC. Thus in a certain sense we have a regrouping of Europe's interests in order to give primacy to the link with Africa, partly conceived as a geographical link, with south Europe and the Mediterranean acting as a bridge; this reflects a long-held aspiration of, for example, the French imperialists to found a new-style sphere of influence in Africa. This is undoubtedly a secondary aspect of the Lome Convention, but a significant one nevertheless. Thus just in the closing stages of negotiation the EEC was so to speak retrenching on its other interests as part of a very complex regrouping of forces which was necessary in the transition from a number of spheres of influence of particular metropolitan powers into a single collective sphere.

Several European powers had extensive interests in Argentina apart from Britain. Germany for one had devoted considerable attention to expanding its influence there prior to both world wars; Italy is another, since a large proportion of Argentina's population is of Italian origin. But the regrouping of forces meant that Argentina had to be sacrificed. In 1974 the EEC put up its tariff barriers against Argentina while dropping them in relation to another part of the Third World. In the early '70s, despite US penetration of the area, the EEC was still absorbing about 50% of Argentina's exports; a decade later (with an EEC now including Britain), this had sunk to 30%. (26)

13. Social-imperialism Muscles In

Thus having had its economic structure built to serve imperialism, Argentina has found itself ditched when it suited the imperialists to do so, in both this centuries' major world economic crises. Like a proletarian on the labour market who confronts the conditions of his own labour in a form where they are alienated from him, the Third World country finds it hard to avoid looking around for another superexploiter to sell itself to. This materialised in the person of Soviet social-imperialism. If the initial fillip to this relationship was provided by the pre-Lome EEC adjustments, a further stimulus was to come in the form of Carter's 1979 grain embargo on the Soviet Union following the invasion of Afghanistan.

It cannot be denied that the social-imperialists were ready. The Great Soviet Encyclopedia published before these developments, carries a little phrase which includes a whole world of meaning: "*Argentina's place in the international division of labour has continued to be determined by agriculture.*" (27) No mention by the Kremlin gentlemen that this is an imperialist, exploitative division of labour. They have good reason for keeping mum on this point: for many years they have been actively and systematically promoting the further development of the imperialist, exploitative division of labour in the Eastern European Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) which has now (in an important qualitative development of the last few years) expanded its tentacles outside Europe, to South-East Asia and the Caribbean. To 'justify' this they put forward a pernicious pseudo-Marxist argument to the effect that division of labour will naturally exist in future, classless society. Now, nobody would deny that certain parts of the world possess particular raw materials and natural conditions which form the basis for a certain objective division of labour which may arise. But the whole essence of the question is that free and equal co-operation of nations - leading eventually to the transcendence of national boundaries altogether - can only come about through the revolutionary resolution of the most acute contradiction of contemporary imperialism, namely national oppression and superexploitation. Far from proposing the revolutionary destruction of this system the Soviet Social-imperialists have become its foremost propagators.

14. Soviet Complicity with the Fascist Junta

The spectacular Soviet growth as a recipient of Argentina's exports has meant that it has by now fully stepped into the place vacated by Britain as chief imperialist beneficiary from Argentina's place in the exploitative division of labour. In 1962 the Soviet share of Argentina's exports was only 0.8%. (28) By the late '70s the Soviet east European bloc was absorbing about 10% of that country's exports. (29) The vast growth in Soviet involvement, even if given an initial fillip by the EEC's treatment of Argentina in 1974, really burgeoned forth only after the coup d'etat of the fascist military junta in 1976. In that year the Soviet Union alone accounted for \$219,118,000 out of a grand total of \$3,916,057,000 of Argentinian exports, having nearly caught up with the US share which stood at \$270,156,000. (30) Already an important development, but this was to be eclipsed by what followed. By 1980 Argentinian exports to the Soviet Union accounted for a value of \$1,614,167,000, having leapt ahead of the US total of \$695,998,000. Another significant point emerging from these figures is that Argentinian imports from the USSR stood at only \$14,592,000 (compared with the US figure of \$2,362,523). Thus between 1977 when the value of Argentinian imports from the Soviet Union had stood at nearly 10% of the value of its exports to the Soviet Union (20,264,000 as against \$210,743,000) by 1980 this ratio had dropped to less than 1%. (31)

We will return to this startling fact later, but first we must look at the politics of the question.

Peron tried to build an industrial base resting on a home market. The aim was to break Argentina's traditional dependence on the imperialist international division of labour. The aim of the fascist junta in power since 1976 has been to reverse this, and accentuate Argentina's role as a purveyor of primary products and an importer of industrial goods. The policy of Martínez de Hoz, the hated economic supremo under the regime of General Videla, was inspired by the 'Chicago School' of US imperialism. (32) His successor under General Galtieri, the still more hated economy minister Alemann, intensified this policy which is, in his own words, to "*deflate, deregulate and denationalise*." (33) Alemann, a kindred spirit of Thatcher, was the object of violent abuse during popular demonstrations in support of Argentina's struggle for the Malvinas. The policy consists of allowing Argentinian industry to be wiped out by foreign competition, forcing down wages to sub-starvation levels and stimulating agricultural exports. The proletariat, with its bases in heavy industry, is relatively large and organised in Argentina. Thus the fascist terror is an inseparable and indispensable part of this policy, which has brought unprecedented misery to the country.

But this policy suits the Soviet Union down to the ground, because it intensifies Argentinian dependence on the imperialist international division of labour, allowing the USSR to extort the primary products it needs. Hence far from being accidental, it is completely logical that the Soviet-Argentinian relationship developed precisely during the period of fascist terror.

Hence also the enthusiasm which the Soviet Union has shown in supporting the junta in its internal repression. During the period when the repression was at its most pitiless the pro-Soviet revisionist 'Communist' Party of Argentina provided the regime with one of the main elements of its political support, in a manner sadly reminiscent of the role of the 'Communist' Party of India during Mrs Gandhi's state of emergency. In 1977-8 when Videla put forward a national project as blatant window-dressing for the fascist terror, the Soviet and Argentinian revisionists drooled forth their praise. A statement by an Argentinian revisionist leader in East Germany referred to a key task being to prevent a so-called 'Pinochetisation' of the Argentinian regime. (34) This is really rich. Even a four-year-old child with the slightest knowledge of the situation could not fail to be aware that the terror at that time was already far more systematic than that practised by Pinochet, who appears as something as an amateur in comparison. To cap it all, a typical Soviet article of the same period in a context of gushing praise for Videla's democratic intentions, timidly states that "*the authorities have not taken effective enough action to deal with the ultra-Right terrorism*." (35) This prettily well encapsulates the utter degeneracy of modern revisionism. Even the most pathetic philistine who had gleaned a smattering of knowledge about Argentina would be aware that 'ultra-right terrorism' was being carried out by the security forces, albeit sometimes in civilian clothes and driving unmarked Ford Falcons, as part of the junta's systematic policy. But the beneficiaries of that systematic policy are precisely the imperialist powers, with the Soviet union as one of the principal beneficiaries.

In insisting on the fascist character of the Argentinian regime, we are not trying to give credence to British imperialism's futile attempts to 'justify' its aggressive war. On the contrary the war against Britain is the cause of the whole Argentinian people. A true understanding of the

contradiction between oppressed and oppressor nations precisely requires that we support it. The still more profoundly important point is that the struggle of the Argentinian people against British imperialism is in essence one and the same as the people's struggle against fascist military rule, because both are anti-imperialist tasks of the national democratic revolution. The struggle against domestic fascism in the Third World is a struggle against imperialism. And in Argentina's case, this includes the Soviet Union.

It is notorious that the Soviet Union has been the main force preventing the junta's crimes being given international publicity and, it must be admitted, with a certain degree of success since relatively much more publicity has been given, for example, to the Chilean junta's crimes. At the last meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, it was the Soviet Union alone which prevented Argentina receiving any criticism. (36) This assertion does not depend on hearsay, but is amply attested by Soviet sources themselves. Typical articles on Latin America always pass in complete silence over Argentina when on the subject of reactionary regimes, mentioning only countries like Chile and Uruguay which are more pro-American. (37) A recent article which purports to deal specifically with the question of 'Anti-Popular Regimes in Latin America' talks about countries like Chile, Paraguay, Guatemala and Haiti and breathes not a syllable about Argentina. (38)

15. Clash of Imperialist Interests

Why this selective vision on the part of the social-imperialists? From their angle, any state which draws away from the western imperialist bloc and identifies itself with social-imperialism ceases to be reactionary and becomes virtually ready to embark on the 'non-capitalist' road, which is in fact a road which accentuates dependence on the imperialist international division of labour. In their view the dependence of the Latin American countries on imperialism is *"in no little degree connected with the considerable economic and sometimes also political isolation of many Latin American countries from the socialist (sic) community countries."* (39)

As we have pointed out, the policy of the junta, at least prior to the Anglo-Argentinian war, has been to accentuate the dependence of the country on exporting primary products and importing manufactured goods. For example between 1975 and 1979 the value of exports in sector I (animal products) rose from \$240 million to \$1154 million, whereas the value of imports in sector XVI (machines and electrical material) rose from \$641 million to \$1429 million. (40) But we have already seen that while the primary product exports are overwhelmingly going to the USSR, the industrial imports are overwhelmingly coming from the USA, (as well as other imperialist powers like the EEC states). Argentina thus falls into the category of oppressed nations which are simultaneously exploited by different rival powers, unlike countries such as, say, Chile or Vietnam which are overwhelmingly dominated by one power or bloc.

The theoretical implications of this question deserve to be examined, but we can only do so sketchily here. The phenomenon of superprofit decomposes into two aspects, namely that arising from monopoly and that arising from other forms of super-exploitation we have already analysed. Theoretically it could appear that exploitation would be more intense in a monopoly sphere of influence than it would in a place where different powers were in competition. There are cases where this does indeed seem to be true, for example in the case of jute in Bangladesh shortly after the Soviet-backed Indian dismemberment of Pakistan in 1971, or the case of natural gas in Afghanistan today: in both these instances it would seem that Soviet social-imperialism was able to cull exceptional advantages from its monopoly position by buying goods way below the value they would command even on the imperialist world

market, if competition had prevailed. In Argentina there is intense inter-imperialist competition over the supply of generating equipment for the Parana development project, an important hydro-electric scheme, and it is reasonable to conclude that in the absence of this the imperialists could more easily sell goods above their value.

However, overall - and here we may take India as an example of a country which falls into the same category - it must be accepted that countries which are simultaneously exploited by different rival imperialist powers or groupings are still very heavily exploited. The factor of monopoly can, at worst, only play a subsidiary role in relation to the other aspects of superexploitation. This fact has very important implications for our understanding of British imperialism. There are only very few oppressed nations - apart from Ireland, Malaya would be an example - where British imperialism enjoys a dominant, let alone a monopoly position. Obviously Britain's role in South Africa is of fundamental importance. Still, if we were to take account only of Britain's ability to be number one in a particular area we would hardly take it - or for that matter any of the other EEC powers - very seriously as an imperialist power. But it is precisely one of the central theses of our argument that the imperialist countries jointly oppress and exploit the oppressed nations by the very functioning of the system itself. The fact that Argentina or Ireland have changed or are changing from being the exclusive preserve of one power into the joint preserve of several powers from the point of view of economic exploitation does not fundamentally alter their character as oppressed nations, nor does it alter the character of the former exclusive exploiter as an oppressor country.

We have hammered this point very heavily because there is a danger of failing to appreciate properly Britain's neo-colonial role. However, having grasped this phenomenon we must proceed to a yet more important step in the argument. This situation where there are several imperialist exploiter nations holds within its core, within its very essence, the tendency for powers to assert their exclusive domination. This tendency is greatly stimulated by the crisis, which is precisely why we need a deep grasp of the crisis in order to understand anything about contemporary international relations. China used to be an area where the great powers collaborated to maintain an 'open door' policy where they could jointly exploit the country. But in the world crisis of the 1930s Japan 'broke the rules' and tried to dominate it exclusively. One aspect of this is stepping up the rate of super-profit by adding the element of monopoly to the other elements of super-exploitation, but far more important is simply increasing the mass of super-profit by grabbing the lot instead of sharing it with other predators. The phenomenon of neo-colonialism carries within it the contradictory aspects of joint exploitation and exclusivity, but the latter is the aspect which grows into dominance when neo-colonialism is projected into hegemonism, its acutest expression in the politico-military sphere.

Thus the striving for exclusivity is manifested within the present situation of joint imperialist exploitation. Soviet social-imperialism would like to replace its present 'one-sided' exploitation of Argentina by a more complete domination. On the one hand it planned to advance its existing dominance of the Argentinian grain market to a position of virtual monopoly where it is likely this year to be taking 80% of the country's major export. (41) The Argentinian-Soviet agreement for 1981-6 allows for exports of 22.5 million tonnes of corn and oilseeds plus yearly exports of 4 million tonnes of fodder seeds. (42) Furthermore, moving into the beef market social-imperialism purchased 130,000 tonnes during 1980. (43) An agreement signed a year ago provided for further purchases of \$1,000,000,000

worth over five years. (44) On the other hand, however, what really concerns the Kremlin bosses is breaking into the Argentinian market with their industrial exports, and it was precisely a major feature of these negotiations to use the already built up dependence of Argentina on the Soviet market for its grain in order to force them to accept more industrial goods in return. Fourteen sets of Soviet turbines were to be mounted in the Salto Grande hydroelectric project. (45) But according to some reports the functioning of these was not very good. When these bitter negotiations had been hammered out, the Argentinian government had had to agree to purchase half a billion dollars worth of Soviet machinery and equipment over the period up to 1985, marking an enormous increase over the figures given above for Argentinian imports in 1981. (46)

Further more other aspects of the growing relationship between the Soviet Union and the Argentinian junta show a more clearly strategic character. In an interview with the Brazilian paper 'O Globo' Vice Admiral Castro Madera (Argentinian minister responsible for nuclear energy) said that Argentina was considering a nuclear agreement with the USSR, in the same breath boasting that Argentina had the capacity to make nuclear weapons. (47) Already earlier (probably in 1980) Argentina had bought five tonnes of heavy water from the USSR to fuel its nuclear reactors. (48) Moreover there is already Soviet-Argentinian collaboration in the exploitation of economic resources precisely in the south Atlantic area, in the form of joint prospecting for krill. (49)

Behind this striving for economic and political control, there is also the strategic question of controlling key lines of communication in preparation for a major world conflict. Some time ago the South African racist regime proposed the creation of a South Atlantic Treaty Organisation grouping itself together with Latin American states; this was never formalised, but there is no doubt that it had an informal kind of existence in the strategic thinking of the western imperialist bloc, and the former co-operation between the South African regime and the Argentinian junta in the field of repressive techniques also reflected this strategic conception.

It is a fact that the opening stages of both world wars were marked by intense activity aimed at winning control of this precise area. In December 1914 the British fleet destroyed a German squadron off the Malvinas after a fierce battle. In December 1939 the so-called 'Battle of the River Plate' involved a British force based in the Malvinas.

Among the two superpowers, the Soviet Union - despite its systematic and vile support for the fascist junta and its failure to support Argentina's just claim to the Malvinas - is probably much more favourably placed to influence any post-junta democratic regime which may evolve in Argentina in the course of or after the present war. This follows from the dialectics of the situation where any favourable evolution in Latin America must inevitably go through the historical stage of positing the USA as enemy, as we will point out later.

16. Socialist in Form, Imperialist in Essence

One of the factors we have been insisting on strongly throughout is that the imperialist powers live in a sort of parasitic symbiosis with the exploited nations, their very economic and social structure fuelled by what they draw out of these nations. Thus the Soviet position as a supporter and propagator of the imperialist exploitative division of labour is by no means simply a question of 'external policy'. It is sometimes said that we are making an error in characterising the Soviet Union as imperialist.

purely by talking about its 'external' behaviour, but this is a completely false way of posing the question showing a failure to understand imperialism's characteristics. This is not to deny the need for a close analysis of Soviet economy and society once we have correctly appreciated the essential importance of its links with the world system. Only a few brief points can be made here.

Because of its specific characteristics, the Soviet Union is dependent on importing foodstuffs. This creates problems for which an ideal solution cannot be found. While Carter's grain embargo was in force the USSR had to pay slightly above market prices for Argentinian grain, since this was the only source. But Reagan, as mouthpiece for the US farming interests which wanted to compete with Argentina for the Soviet market, scrapped the embargo in April 1981. This is an important event in its own right, because it demonstrates clearly how Reagan's supposed toughness in opposing Soviet expansionism is in fact a smokescreen to cover US aggression against the Third World. Concretely this means that the Soviet Union is now able to screw better terms out of Argentina. Moreover the Kremlin leadership is faced with difficult choices: the political and strategic influence it gains through its preponderant position in the Argentinian export market is important, so too is the fact that grain from the USA can be bought on long-term credit terms, which the Argentinians could not possibly afford to give. Moreover Lloyds has refused to underwrite the insurance risk on shipping in the South Atlantic. The USSR has been trying to diversify its sources with purchases from Thailand and Canada. All these factors may be involved in the fact that right in the midst of the war, when Argentina's need for smooth trade relations was at its most deperate, the Soviet Union suddenly left Argentina in the lurch by delaying the conclusion of further agreements on grain imports. Possibly it is trying to take advantage of Argentina's difficulties to extract still better terms. At the time of writing the outcome is not clear, but these facts only go to confirm the systematic dependence of the USSR on food imports.

In talking about the Soviet Union, we must distinguish between the shortcomings which existed when it was socialist, and the fundamental contradictions of the capitalist mode of production which now prevails there. The former were secondary questions which could have been resolved, whereas the latter are fundamental contradictions which are irresolvable within the context of the capitalist mode of production. However the former weaknesses were fundamental, and they also helped to determine the specific form in which the basic contradictions of capitalism manifest themselves in the USSR today. The present Soviet position in the world market reflects a peculiar form of the contradiction between town and country, very different from the form taken by this contradiction in other imperialist countries.

Past weaknesses in handling the relationship between industry and agriculture led to the creation of a model whereby a large surplus was extracted from the peasantry as a basis for launching industrialisation which was in turn strongly biased towards heavy industry. Essentially this served to undermine the worker-peasant alliance which is an indispensable foundation for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Formally, the structural weaknesses of Soviet agriculture determined that after the restoration of capitalism the Soviet Union would be dependent on plundering staple foodstuffs from the Third World (or importing them from other imperialist countries) to provide a support for its heavy industrial sector which is now increasingly military-industrial. In any industrialised economy a division of labour is necessary so that there can be an industrial population which does not produce its own food. In the modern imperialist world the

division of labour is essentially international. Typically the system works as follows: the industrialised country, with a very modern 'industrial' agriculture, produces a large surplus; the Third World country, although 'agricultural' rather than industrial, does not produce enough food for itself, because it is forced by the system to concentrate on producing cash crops which the imperialist countries 'need' as non-staple foods, industrial raw materials etc. Both the Soviet Union as an imperialist country and Argentina as a Third World country are untypical in this respect. Undoubtedly the relationship with Argentina serves as a basis for the existence in the Soviet Union of a parasitic military-industrial sector which is exceptionally bloated, even by imperialist standards.

It follows from our whole analysis that the attitude of communists in theory and practice to the key questions of neo-colonialism revolving especially around the international division of labour is a matter of fundamental importance in establishing their credentials as revolutionaries. We should not just condemn the Soviet Union, but draw the necessary conclusions. The Soviet revisionists started as apologists for neo-colonialism and developed into its most ardent practitioners. This is very easy to do for communists in an industrialised country, which is willynilly in a position of advantage in relation to the oppressed nations. If they don't actively target the international system of exploitation they will be sucked in. The CPGB precisely failed to grasp this question clearly. There are vital lessons for us here.

17. Crystallisation of the Anti-US Struggle

Historically, the liberation struggle in Latin America can only advance by targetting US imperialism. This fact is determined by the concrete results of well over a century of bitter historical experience.

At first sight the Anglo-Argentinian war appears as something weird and peripheral. In relation to the earlier imperialist wars waged by Britain it conjures up Karl Marx's remark that major historical facts occur twice - the first time as tragedy, the second as farce. *"Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given, and transmitted from the past."* (50) It has acted as a catalyst, crystallising Latin America's struggle, it has gathered diverse currents of struggle into a single stream. It has brought together Britain's apparently anachronistic gunboat diplomacy - reopening those powerful early wounds which still need to be avenged - with the electronic age repression of US hegemonism, and revealed these to be a single enemy. We have been saying for some time that among the oppressed nations there are struggles waged by states against hegemonism etc., and struggles waged by peoples for revolution and that these share a common enemy. Over the past few years there has been the glorious upsurge of the revolutionary movement for example in Nicaragua and El Salvador. At the same time there has been a movement involving a very broad range of forces aimed at affirming a Latin American identity, which can only define itself in opposition to the USA. The US concept is epitomised in the Organisation of American States, a 'hemispheric' organisation based in Washington and which they have dominated for most of the post-war period. In 1974 at a meeting in Ayacucho (Peru) to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the defeat of Spanish colonialism, a strong plea was put forward in favour of 'Latin American nationalism'. This in essence stands in opposition to the United States' 'hemispheric' concept.

The crisis caused the USA to tighten its exploitative screws in the mid '70s. Just when the EEC was adopting relatively progressive policies

towards the Third World in the Lome Convention the USA passes a particularly reactionary trade act, discriminating against states which were members of primary producers' organisations. This caused tremendous resentment in Latin America, to the extent of strong criticism of US policy even being made in the OAS over the past couple of years. With the formation of the Latin American Economic System (Sela) in 1975 we find the beginnings (tentative of course, and inevitably riddled with contradictions, as one could expect with an initial, painful attempt to struggle out of the accumulated mire caused by centuries of colonial and semi-colonial plunder) of a development strategy which breaks with the neo-colonial schemes associated with the Alliance for Progress, and situated itself within the overall struggle of the Third World for the New International Economic Order. In 1981 we find, according to the Inter American Development Bank, 'growth' for the whole region having slipped to 1% on a per capita basis, and in nearly half the countries having declined. This is what the crisis means concretely for the Third World, and in Latin American terms it reveals the complete bankruptcy of the past two decades of so-called 'development' backed by US imperialism. But from a political point of view, nothing could be more important than the complete identification of the USA with an enemy which unites the whole of Latin America against it. (51) Thus the already-developing isolation of the USA on economic grounds has now grown for the first time into a political isolation. This is the real significance of these events. Even Costa Rica, for example, has called for the seat of the OAS to be transferred, and Ecuador has called for "*continental solidarity*" against colonialist aggression. One event which encapsulates a whole historical trend has been the offer by revolutionary Nicaragua to send its armed forces to help Argentina, pointing out that this "*is not a question of supporting a government, but the decision of a whole people to liberate itself from colonialism.*" (52)

This joining-together of different progressive trends at a continental level had been reflected within Argentina by a joining together of the anti-British and anti-US struggle for the Malvinas with the democratic struggle against the junta, both of which are facets of the anti-imperialist struggle. The popular forces have coined numerous slogans which combine support for the Malvinas action with opposition to the junta's political and economic repression. This is brilliantly reflected in an appeal recently signed by a long list of organisations supporting human rights and revolutionary struggles in Latin America which points out that the present war brings together "*a reactionary government, ally of the Reagan policy, defending the remains of one of the most arbitrary and violent colonial empires endured by the Third World, against a people who - although subject to a pitiless dictatorship - possess a burning desire for liberation. If it is legitimate for the European countries to contest the consequences of Yalta (i.e. the division of Europe into Soviet and American spheres of influence) it is legitimate for the peoples of the Third World to contest the whole legacy of colonialism.*" (53)

Before the Malvinas conflict broke, the Argentinian junta was pathetically trying to establish Argentina's position as a kind of outpost of Europe, denying the country's Third World character and saying that it belonged with the Christian West and that there was no point being part of the Non-aligned Movement. Came the war, and a person like the foreign minister N. Costa Mendez switched practically overnight to putting forward diametrically opposing views. But the important point is that in essence the Third-worldism expressed during the war constitutes Argentina's true character coming to the surface, and is undoubtedly here to stay.

18. Gains for the Soviet Union?

The war has shown that the western imperialist powers still to some extent constitute a bloc vis-a-vis the Third World. The fact that the Third World sees them, and combats them, in this light, has a positive aspect. The fact also carries with it the profound danger that Soviet social imperialism, the most expansionist power, will realise important gains. We must recognise this - bland assertions to the contrary will get us nowhere. With the liberation struggle positing itself in opposition to western imperialism, in a certain sense the Kremlin warlords only have to sit back and think of ways of usurping the fruits of the popular struggle later.

While we must insist on recognising this fact, which is very important in assessing the buildup of forces leading to war, at the same time if we have proper understanding of the historical dialectic we will also be able to pinpoint the positive forces which exist.

19. The Forces for Change

In his work *Capital* Marx put forward an analysis of the historical tendency of the capitalist mode of production, pointing out that this led to a necessary conclusion - the expropriation of the expropriators. (54) We believe that the inevitable tendency is indeed as Marx described it, only with the projection of this whole process onto a world level, the forces acting as agents of this historical change are different, broader, take on more of a national form, etc.

He first refers to an original expropriation of the small producers, and, at a world level, we have described how this happened in the case of Argentina, with the whole story of slavery and genocide it involved. This laid the basis for the accumulation on which capitalism developed. The second step is the expropriation of the small capitalists by the large ones, which leads to increasing concentration. In this sense the tendency to imperialism is already included in Marx' analysis.

Today the whole official world order is built most fundamentally on the labour of the masses of the Third World, it is their labour, objectified, presenting itself in a form totally alien to them. What could epitomise Marx' theory of alienation more thoroughly (and at a much broader, truly world level than at his time when he was thinking mainly of the proletariat of the industrialised countries) than the attitude of the Third World labouring masses to the official world system and to the objectified and alienated form acquired by the conditions of their own labour?

Yet Marx' analysis of course implied that the revolt of a primarily peasant country would be essentially conservative, i.e. attempting to negate this original expropriation by turning the clock back to the era of small production. Yet with the development of imperialism there have been profound changes, one of the most important being, from the point of view of our argument here, the fact that survivals of pre-capitalist forms of production are integrated as essential elements into the system of super-exploitation - and thus are revealed more and more clearly as non-starters, making it clear that the only negation possible is the forward-looking one. The next step must be the expropriation of the expropriators, whereby the conditions of labour including the land are to be repossessed in a new co-operative form. This negation of the negation is precisely what is on the agenda on a world scale, and the demands of the Third World tend objectively in this direction. The agents of this trend are the popular masses,

whose action embodies the profound objective forces in human society. In revolutionary struggle they come to the consciousness that the objective forces are not outside and above them, they are them.

Looked at from this point of view, in relation to the really important things which are happening, we can say that the Soviet revisionists are isolated. They deny the mass movement and attribute everything to the relative relationship between two power blocs: *"The change in the balance of forces of the two social systems (sic) constitutes a decisive factor in restructuring the system of international relations, because this balance is a key issue determining its very nature."* (55) The social-imperialists thus identify themselves fully with the old and decadent forces, the tyranny of dead labour over living, and oppose the real restructuring of international relations being carried out by the popular forces. But we can identify with the movement to isolate the Soviet revisionists only if we really recognise and become part of the positive forces. In past historic eras the objective forces seemed to be prised apart from humanity and at loggerheads with it. For Shakespeare there is a powerful sense of the historical dialectic working through and at the same time opposite to man. Hence the importance of the supernatural element in his plays. Scientific socialism creates the possibility of understanding society's objective laws and, understanding, making them part of humanity's conscious action. Yet despite these possibilities our movement is still at the stage of confusedly contemplating objective forces as something external and saying liberally along with Shakespeare's Cassius that we *"partly credit things that do presage."* (56)

The positive forces are those which realise that the masses are responsible in a full sense for their own liberation; this is already the revolutionary term in the dialectical progression described by Marx in the chapter we have referred to. From this viewpoint it is also possible to conduct revolutionary struggles within the official world of international relations precisely with the purpose of revolutionising this world, e.g. diplomatic struggles in favour of non-alignment and the democratisation of international relations which go counter to the dead, tyrannical, hegemonic actions of the superpowers.

If we mention Korea, Zimbabwe, Ireland, Eritrea as examples where the positive forces can be identified, it is obvious that the element of national struggle plays an immensely important role. Now this raises one of the most vital questions of all. There is a tendency to see the present role of revolutionary national struggles as a kind of ersatz revolutionary situation or a holding operation prior to the resuscitation of the more conventionally-conceived proletarian movement which lies awaiting the kiss of life in the cobweb-and nettle-encrusted castle of opportunism in the industrialised countries. But such a view shows a misunderstanding of the historical dialectic. In the era of imperialism the struggles of the oppressed nations are part of the proletarian revolutionary movement in their own right. This is not to say that we should confuse the Third World movement with the proletarian socialist movement. The Third World movement as a whole is diffuse and bourgeois in form. It requires a leading element to give it impulsion. But the most advanced trend within the movement of the oppressed nations - where the objective and subjective forces are very closely fused, in other words where there are risen peoples - in an important sense points the way forward not just for the Third World but for the revolutionary movement as a whole. How does this trend come together with the movement in our country? Before answering this we must take the argument a further step.

20. Tragedy of Lord Carrington

One of the striking facts about this case is that the EEC, despite its second-worldism, came down strongly on the colonialist side. The EEC states are concerned about the 'prestige' of a fellow imperialist power; other arguments were most likely used to 'sell' the policy: that Britain's firmness in this case is a token of its firmness with regard to any other aggressor. But the complete hollowness of this is amply demonstrated by the fact that the European Community failed to take any decisive action with respect to what is likely to be the only serious aggressor, the Soviet Union, when it invaded Afghanistan. This shows more than a hint of a tendency - not as marked as Reagan's, but reactionary nonetheless - to be strong against the oppressed nations, weak with Soviet social-imperialism. With the Soviet Union acting as an all-round oppressor there is no doubt that the assertion of independence by European states in response to aggressive threats provides a progressive aspect in the nationalism even of these imperialist powers. But the nationalism embodied in the war against Argentina is clearly reactionary, and this is the aspect which the European Community has chosen to identify with.

On Britain's part, the choice of this particular response to the conflict with Argentina does not appear at first sight to be very obvious. We have already said that our viewpoint today should be different from that in Shakespeare's time; but if we were to write a new tragedy about a nobleman swept up in contradictory forces which end up destroying him, an interesting subject would be Lord Carrington. The Lancaster House agreement on Zimbabwe was an excellent example of second-worldism: the situation appeared to be that if the fighting went on the opportunity for Soviet intervention would grow and there might come about a Soviet lackey regime as in Angola (we are not saying this is in fact what would have happened, just describing the perception of the bourgeoisie). The alternative of a genuinely independent popular regime was appalling to the British imperialists, but it was preferable to this. Now this line of policy is really different from the most reactionary trend (for example the trend within the South African racist regime of working actively to destabilise Mugabe's government for the express purpose of pushing Zimbabwe into the arms of the Soviet Union). In the last analysis the USA, like the Soviet Union itself, would practically prefer a country to be in the enemy camp rather than following a genuinely independent line which it hates and fears like the plague. (57)

The logic behind this second-worldist policy is not hard to find. The neo-colonial exploitative division of labour makes the second world dependent on markets and raw materials in the Third World, and if the latter falls under the control of the superpowers, then so will the second world. We will return to this point later. But in this specific case, from the point of view of second world logic - which is entirely in tune with the bourgeoisie's neo-colonial interests, it would have made a lot of sense to hand over the Malvinas to Argentina. For example there could have been co-operation in oil prospecting where the imperialist power would play the dominant role through its control of the levers of finance capital and advanced technology. After all, in the era of neo-colonialism, formal sovereignty is not a barrier to exploitation, it is a condition for exploitation. The Argentinian junta, which is pro-imperialist in its instincts even though history has now cast it willy-nilly in an anti-imperialist role, would have made a tractable partner. A decision to hand the islands over would have been second-worldist, it would have been fully imperialist as far as Britain's motives were concerned, at the same time it would have been progressive in terms of the use Argentina might make of it in the long run, and naturally we would have supported it. But in the event this didn't

happen, and it is clear that profounder reactionary forces were at work to counter weigh the logic we have just outlined

21. A Vehicle for Historic Forces

It is clear that the crisis acts as a vehicle for profound historic forces which inevitably sought a means of expression. To understand these forces is the main question we have been giving our attention to, because if we fail to do this our grasp of the specific circumstances of the particular case could only be superficial. However, the latter question is also important.

The crisis only came about in this way at this time because Britain chose to defy a logical calculation of its interests as a second world imperialist power which would seem to dictate handing back the islands to Argentina; and because Argentina chose to repossess them at this time. The subjective motives of the decision-makers are not necessarily the most important thing because they are themselves vehicles for historical forces which they probably comprehend only very imperfectly.

As far as the Argentinian junta's decision is concerned, we should strive to understand it, but at the same time it must be made perfectly clear that it is not up to communists in another country, particularly the oppressor country, to bargain their support for a just cause according to whether they consider that the decision was 'opportune' or not. The islands are Argentinian territory, and if the leadership made tactical errors in the manner of its attempting to recuperate this territory, this is entirely a question for the Argentinian people to settle. Our own estimation is that the Argentinian junta had been preparing this as a policy option for some time, and had thought up quite a Machiavellian scheme. They had understood something about the infinite blood-lust of the imperialist vultures who, whether in Britain, France or elsewhere, were simply drooling over the prospect of a fratricidal war between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel dispute, where they could make fabulous profits, by selling weapons to both sides. (58) Blinded by their vampire-like delight at this bloody vision, the imperialists do not think for a moment that the weapons would be turned against themselves. The actual occasion for the junta to take the decision to repossess the territory by force was presumably taken in response to the dramatically increased isolation it was suffering on a domestic level. (59) As we have pointed out, the junta thought it could control and canalise the popular sentiment for national resurrection but this was only wishful thinking on its part.

As connoisseurs of how stupid imperialists can sometimes (unfortunately not always) be, we cannot but admire the comprehensive way they fell for this pretty simple ploy. But although the junta exhibited a certain cunning in a profounder sense - the Argentinian revolutionaries have pointed out - they committed major errors. They gave the factor of weapons precedence over the human factor, and their strategy was by its very nature the antithesis of popular mobilisation. But history shows that *"when the people was able to organise itself democratically and freely"* it was able, in the past, to defeat the apparently invincible English imperialism, whereas on this occasion the Argentinian dictatorship *"preferred to place its trust in the hypothetical support of the two superpowers, offering these superpowers concessions in exchange behind the backs of the people..."* (60)

22. Trials of Strength with the Third World

The major question which remains to be answered is why British

imperialism went to such lengths to defend its colony. To begin with there is the question of 'remnants of empire'. We have already said that, in the colonial period, the dialectics were such that the prevalence of colonialism as the main thing enabled informal colonial relationships - as in the case of Latin America - to exist as a special case. In the contemporary world, this proposition is reversed: neo-colonialism is the dominant oppressive system, but within its context a number of remnants of old-style colonialism can exist, and each is important in its own right. In this case, there are important interests in terms of petroleum resources and lines of communications, both of which become increasingly important as the politico-economic crisis grows in intensity.

Britain, like some other second world countries, wants to have its cake and eat it, in other words to maintain second-worldist relations with the Third World and at the same time to exercise domination where it can. (61) Looking at this same question from another angle, we can say that relations between second and third worlds are determined by a continuing series of trials of strength. The progressive trend, (which never exists in a pure form, but precisely only in the form of a struggle against its opposite) is for the second world countries to adopt policies which objectively favour the interests which the Third World is trying to promote, thus progressively isolating the two superpowers as the main enemy. This trend establishes itself insofar as the second world imperialist powers lose out in these trials of strength. (As in the period leading up to the signing of the Lome Convention, as in the period leading up to the Lancaster House Agreement, etc.) But at times the imperialist powers get delusions about "*putting the Third World in its place*", which is what Britain has been trying to do in this case. The objective result of this policy is to weaken the unity of those forces defending national independence against the superpowers, and thus to favour the interests of the superpowers, which threaten third and second worlds alike. But the British imperialists, by their very nature, are too ignorant and shortsighted to realise this.

In periods when the threat of world war is growing, local wars tend to grow in frequency and intensity. The Anglo-Argentinian war was only one of several major wars being fought at the same time: the three outstanding armed liberation struggles against Soviet or Soviet backed aggression (Eritrea, Afghanistan, Kampuchea), as well as the gulf war, Chad, El Salvador etc. From a certain angle, history casts these in the role of 'practice' wars. Quite consciously and cynically they are used by imperialism to try out new weaponry - as in the case of Hitler's use of the Spanish Civil War to try out his airpower for example. The British imperialists were certainly delighted to have some real enemy people to kill in order to test out the effectiveness of their anti-personnel cluster bombs which were used with hundreds of casualties on the Malvinas. At the same time, in a period of intense world crisis, strategically significant areas are naturally drawn into becoming the focal points for such conflicts. The Soviet Union has rushed into orbit an ultra-sophisticated spy satellite whose sole and express purpose is to observe the conflict in the South Atlantic. It is persistently rumoured in Argentinian anti-imperialist circles that Britain has offered the USA permanent base facilities in the islands as the price for its support. The South African apartheid regime is pursuing its previous active involvement in the area by apparently aiding both sides. Finally, underlying all these factors, there are the great themes of contemporary history: the struggle of the oppressed masses to assert control over their own lives, to liberate their nations from the domination of the exploiters.

But if the subjective motives of the British imperialists are less important than the objective forces they reflect, it is nevertheless true

that the Anglo-Argentinian war is of immense significance in the evolution of Britain as a second world country.

We must first state clearly that in our opinion what British imperialism is trying to get out of the war has more to do with the effect of the crisis on the situation in Britain, and in Britain's relations with Ireland, than it has to do with the situation in the South Atlantic.

23. The Irish Dimension

The Irish dimension will lay the foundations for understanding this point. British imperialism is tied down in a colonial war there, and the continuing successes of the patriotic forces cannot but be galling to it. Here imperialism has sensed the opportunity of winning a victory in the full glare of publicity, thus raising its prestige and morale. This, it is hoped, could be won relatively easily against inexperienced troops fighting on unfamiliar terrain, and in particular by using the most hefty weapons, such as nuclear submarines, originally conceived for defence against Soviet aggression. This action has to be read as a threat to the Irish people about what Britain could do (imagines it could do) by employing still more violent means. One snivelling BBC reporter even remarked how similar the terrain in 'East Falkland' is to that in Ireland!

24. The Function of Chauvinism

This latter point brings us to the essence of British policy, but we must also look more closely at what the war represents in terms of events in Britain. Some of the left has argued that chauvinism has been whipped up to justify the 'Falklands' war; but we would turn this argument the other way round. Chauvinism is itself more important to British imperialism than anything it could possibly achieve in the South Atlantic. This is not to say that British imperialism's motives are mainly 'domestic': what it is concerned with is the internal conditions which it needs to create in order to adapt to the international crisis. In the First World War the main effect of chauvinism was to support contention between the big powers over spheres of influence, but an important effect was also to defuse class conflict and isolate the revolutionary forces. In the present situation we are arguing that the latter aspect is predominant. An aspect of this nationalism is being exploited by Thatcher for party-political purposes; but this is only a purely superficial aspect, as we can see from the fact that the dominant Labour party and trade union forces are in no way lagging behind the Tories in propagating chauvinism. What we must look for then is the deeper economic roots.

25. Struggle of Labour versus Capital under Imperialist Conditions

The Anglo-Argentinian war has turned into a ghastly imperialist Walpurgisnacht where all the old ghosts and monsters of chauvinism are prancing around. It is important to note that this comes at a time when the 'labour movement' is already on the defensive and in fact in disarray. Why? Because the official working class movement is essentially geared to fighting under conditions where the imperialist bourgeoisie has had room for manoeuvre, to make concessions; superprofit has fundamentally determined the whole manner in which the class struggle in imperialist countries has been conducted.

Today an extraordinarily profound and complex crisis grips the imperialist world. Superexploitation continues and the Third World's lot is in some ways getting worse, but at the same time the realisation of

superprofits gets more difficult for the imperialists, and in particular for Britain because of its relative decline, as we have already pointed out. Hence the established conditions for the hitherto circumscribed class struggle are changing. Now the concrete situation is that in the years just before the crisis broke (i.e. around the beginning of the '70s), the working class had managed to win concessions which in essence probably meant establishing the value of its labour power at a higher level. The condition for these victories - even though won through some bitter and important struggles - was that superprofits enabled the bourgeoisie to make concessions without eating into 'ordinary' profits. It must be emphasised that it is a good thing for the proletariat to grab what it can from the bourgeoisie. This is a classic feature of the class struggle, and of course we support it. But the imperialist preconditions were not appreciated. If the value of labour power were to be maintained at its present level, this could only be through the medium of a heightened struggle in order to eat into the 'normal' rate of profit of the capitalist class. Theoretically, this is perfectly possible within the laws of the capitalist system. But this is just what the official labour movement proves itself totally incapable of conducting. Instead of moving forward to heightened struggle it hankers back to the days of plentiful superprofits, thus making itself an accomplice of imperialism. The present outburst of chauvinism thus strikes a deeply resonating chord within the labour movement itself.

26. Accelerated Decline in the Rate of Profit

If it was just a matter of clawing back the victories of the past ten or fifteen years this would not be so difficult in the present atmosphere of demoralisation and demobilisation. However there are important additional factors causing the rate of profit to shrink, and this means that the bourgeoisie will mount still more savage attacks on the working class in search of absolute and relative surplus value.

The Labour Party and trade union leadership accuse Thatcher of 'lunacy' in putting forward policies which destroy the domestic market for British industry. But in fact such policies only appear lunatic from the narrow-nationalist Keynesian viewpoint. In contemporary imperialism the world market counts for more than the domestic market. Thatcher aims to allow the British economy to be devastated to such an extent that some of the conditions of the defeated countries at the end of World War II can be reproduced, and a new, restructured and competitive economy arise on the ruins. Labour flinches at the rigour of this approach, but fundamentally they are in agreement on the need for an imperialist assault on the world market, backed by the fervour of a nationalist 'consensus'.

The fact is that the new imperialist international division of labour can, as we have pointed out, only be based on a restructuring of the whole economy of the imperialist countries so as to endow them with the high-technology sector which would hold the key to their dominant influence over the entire world integrated system. But the introduction of new technology can only mean a major change in the organic composition of capital, with the proportion of constant capital vastly increasing. But since only variable capital can be a source of profit, the rate of profit is bound to plunge. This could be offset through an increase in the mass of profit, brought about by selling a greater quantity of goods on the world market. But with the global Keynesian aspiration to increase Third World purchasing power being counteracted by a search for increasing superexploitation, it is practically impossible to see where such an expanded market could possibly come from.

27. Reactionary Form of Nationalism

Hence, since the guiding principle for the bourgeoisie can only be to maintain the rate of profit, an increased attack on the living standards of the working class is certain to come. To defuse whatever resistance may arise, the bourgeoisie is making preparations, and the current outburst of reactionary nationalism is thus closely linked with the trend towards fascism. But certain forces are already fighting back against British imperialism. The essential element in these forces is the national minorities. In the reactionary, chauvinist idea of the British 'national character' promoted by the ruling bourgeoisie, they have always been excluded, regarded as a hostile, alien force, in fact treated as part of the enemy. In the present reactionary hysteria whipped up in connection with a war against an oppressed Third World nation with which their own experience leads them to identify, the national minorities once again find themselves targetted as the enemy.

The vitally important point is that the spirit of struggle for national independence against Soviet expansionism is indeed ^{the} task of the future. But the foul, chauvinist nationalism which attains its filthy epitome in the 'Falklands spirit' is not only useless in this respect, but, far more important, is diametrically opposite to the trend which must be built. It treats as the enemy precisely the main positive forces on which we must build. It lumps together as the enemy the two main components of the positive forces, namely the combative forces within Britain with the national minorities as their main element, which would form the backbone of a people's resistance against Soviet aggression and the struggle of the oppressed nations for control over their own destiny, free from dominationism, which is the main inspiration we need to draw on. Since the 'Falklands spirit' unites these positive forces in opposition to it, it also lifts the struggle for this positive evolution to a higher level, a struggle which inevitably passes through the negation of this reactionary chauvinism. Of course there exists a positive aspect to the assertion of national independence against super-power domination, even under the bourgeoisie. But the Malvinas crisis starkly poses the limitations of this trend, and leads us to question its historic destiny.

28. Evolution of the Anti-superpower Trend in Europe

The essence of second-worldist policy is that these countries are neo-colonialist in the full sense in their exploitative relations with the Third World. But they are unable to be hegemonist in the full sense. There is thus contradiction as well as unity between the economic base and the politico-military superstructure which protects it.

Their relationship to hegemonism must be viewed under two aspects. On the one hand they would like to be but can't, on the other hand they are themselves threatened by hegemonism. With regard to their relations with the Third World, on the one hand the threat they suffer is qualitatively different from that facing the Third world, on the other there is the possibility of unity. Both these aspects must be taken into account.

Why qualitatively different? Because the threat suffered by them is a threat by the superpowers to deny their independent existence as imperialist powers. As imperialist powers, their economy depends on the preservation of their exploitative relationship with the Third World. The USA, with regard to western Europe after the last war, sought to destroy the effective state power of these countries by (if we may paraphrase a line from the old RCL Manifesto!) 'working at it from both sides': establishing its hegemonic position both in the metropolises themselves and in the colonial spheres of

influence they enjoyed. Soviet social-imperialism today, with its politico-ideologico-military threat to western Europe and particularly its monopolist line towards building spheres of influence in the Third World, poses this threat still more acutely.

In the contemporary world there are only three choices open to second-ranking capitalist powers. For a long time there seemed to be only two: to turn the clock back to the heyday of their colonial empires or to tag along behind the coat-tails of the dominant imperialist powers and grovel for some crumbs of their super-profits. It was above all De Gaulle who looked for a different line. Insofar as the first of these options posits itself as futile and the second as capitulationist and degrading, the attitude of second world imperialists towards the Third World inevitably changes. The choice now comes to appear as one between a Third World dependent on the superpowers - and for the reasons we have explained, this automatically means that the second world too will be dependent - or an independent Third World. Hence the possibility of unity on a basis of mutual respect for independence.

29. Limitations of the Positive Bourgeois Trend

But the lesson we are now learning is that the negation of these two first alternatives is by no means absolute. The progressive aspect of the second world bourgeoisie in support of independence is fragile and precarious, and the reactionary aspect keeps reasserting itself.

We can now give an outline of the dialectical progression of the current of independence in the second world. In order to do this, however, we must make a break with our previous wooden and absolute way of thinking:

"Though ordinary thinking everywhere has contradiction for its content, it does not become aware of it, but remains an external reflection which passes from likeness to unlikeness, or from the negative relation to the reflection-into-self, of the distinct sides. It holds these two determinations over against one another and has in mind only them, but not their transition, which is the essential point and which contains the contradiction." (62)

There exists a link between second world imperialist anti-hegemonism and the anti-hegemonism which we are trying to build for the future, but the two are nevertheless opposites. The growth of hegemonism and its concentration in the hands of the superpowers meant that the second world imperialist powers asserted their independence in a new way, qualitatively different from the great-power rivalry of the past. That this could happen is evidence of the increasing importance of national contradictions in the contemporary period. But because the second world imperialisms remain oppressor nations, the historic trend towards positive independence struggles on the part of the second world remains, insofar as it is articulated by the imperialist bourgeoisie, burdened by a limitation which is its own negative. Second-worldism has now, in the crisis, increasingly come to be at odds with its own self, it is fast exhausting its potentiality and it becomes clearer all the time that the trend towards positive anti-super-power independence struggle cannot be carried much further under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. This trend has a momentum of its own, but in order to be carried forward it requires a leap bringing about qualitative changes in its present imperialist content. We have spoken of the second world imperialist powers, but there also exists within Europe itself countries like Ireland and Poland which are themselves oppressed nations without being burdened with the limitation of being oppressor nations.

They will exercise an important influence in bringing about this transition.

30. Inspired by the Positive National Forces

It is only the revolutionary forces which can carry us forward from the impasse which the anti-superpower independent trend has reached under bourgeois leadership. The present trend must be negated with respect to its imperialist essence, and at the same time through this negation carried forward.

There has been a line put forward which argues that the contradiction between our country and the Soviet Union is the principal one, and that all other contradictions, class or national, must be subordinated to this. This line is rightist and deserves to be criticised, but the way in which we previously criticised this line was itself undialectical, and opened the way to different errors. The purely anti-Soviet viewpoint did at least have the merit of posing centrally the political question of national anti-hegemonic struggle. It posed this in such a way as to deny the struggle against British imperialism, which is the only way the revolutionary movement can advance beyond its present level, and this was its fatal weakness. But in the way we used to criticise this rightist error we tore asunder the questions of national independence and struggle against British capitalism, regarding these as entirely distinct, and not grasping their contradictory unity. We argued in effect that unless we built a strong base in industry at the current stage by struggling against British capitalism, there would be no communist force worth speaking of to take up the cause of defeating Soviet aggression later. But this argument neglects the vital fact that the example of the revolutionary national struggles in the Third World, and the struggles of the national minorities are elements which need to be injected into the class struggle in Britain at the current stage in order to begin raising it to an anti-imperialist level. Our possibilities for defeating the bourgeoisie's current offensive are very problematic, given the appalling character of the 'labour movement' leadership, but this offensive also produces its opposite. Defeats in fighting the economic battle have the effect of posing more centrally the political question, and the 'Falklands factor' has the merit of crystallising this with unprecedented precision. Those elements in the working class movement which are prepared to fight back, as well as the left-wing forces, are lumped together with those forces which have long been the enemies of chauvinist nationalism, namely the Third World, Ireland and the national minorities. Together they are accused of breaching the nationalist consensus. This poses sharply the fact that the only road to progress, democracy and socialism lies through a struggle against imperialism. This evolution also points to the fact that the unity between these forces is the crucial factor in making this step. Out of this junction of forces a new spirit and a new concrete reality will come about which will be completely firm against Soviet social-imperialism as well, that most dangerous embodiment of dominationsim, insidious neo-colonialism and reaction. Such is the dialectic of history. Among the left, only the Marxist-Leninist forces have the equipment to grasp this dialectic as a whole, and this confronts us with an extremely heavy responsibility.

NOTES

1. For these quotations see Lynch, J. *The Spanish American Revolutions 1808-26*. London, 1973, pp. 40-1.
2. Several colonial powers sent their armed forces jointly to suppress popular movements which threatened the 'interests' of the oppressor powers on a number of occasions, including the Taiping movement in the mid nineteenth century.
3. There may also at times be certain formal mechanisms such as the Bretton Woods agreements (1944) which exercised a regulating influence over monetary and commercial relations up to the outbreak of the present world crisis - but these mechanisms must not be confused with objective laws.
4. It is however clearly explained by Engels in his discussion of the 'force theory' in *Anti-Duhring*. Part II, sections II-IV.
5. Karl Marx, letter to P.V. Annenkov, Dec. 28th, 1846.
6. The circuits of capital are discussed in detail in Marx' *Capital*. Vol. II.
7. Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, London, 1973, p. 512.
8. The old CPGB textbook *Political Economy - Marxist Study Courses* gives a good exposition of this theory, without however stressing the international implications, as it should.
9. Royal Institute of International Affairs, *Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy*, Vol III, p. 186.
10. Schiller, *Wilhelm Tell*, II, 2, lines 1459-61.
11. D.W. Nabudere in his *Political Economy of Imperialism*, London, 1977, has developed a view of imperialism today which, notably in part 5 of this book, he pits against the 'centre-periphery' theorists, and in particular he gives a critique of Samir Amin's *Accumulation on a World Scale*, New York, 1973.
12. This capitalist philosophy largely influenced the thinking of both Labour and Tory bourgeois parties after world War II. It has now been ditched by Thatcher, but continues to dominate the thinking of the TUC and Labour 'left'. They in fact hold to a narrow nationalist form of Keynesianism which seeks to build industry behind tariff barriers on the basis of the domestic market, whereas someone like Heath for example takes a much broader view comprehending the world economic system.
13. The Brandt Commission is a group of political figures from the EEC and elsewhere which holds to the global Keynesian perspective. Its recent report is published under the title *North South*, London, 1980.
14. V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 38, p. 363.
15. C. Palloix, in his book *L'Internationalisation du Capital*, Paris, 1975, also questions the centre-periphery distinction in a way which seems to us to run the danger of neglecting the fundamental question of national oppression. However his detailed study of the circuits of reproduction of capital in the context of the role of the transnational corporations is immensely valuable, and really indispensable if we are to develop the theory of imperialism creatively.

16. Thus Nabudere has correctly pinpointed Amin's individualist error in misreading Marx on the question of India (see Nabudere op. cit., pp. 228-30). But this is a point of secondary importance only. In his recent work *L'Avenir du Maoïsme*, Paris, 1981, Amin with courage and honesty pins his colours firmly to the socialist model as embodied in China, thus going against the tide of confusion which prevails among large sections of the 'left'.
17. This refers to the tendency for prices of raw materials and primary products to fall, while prices of goods produced by the industrialised countries rise.
18. A. Gunder Frank, *Crisis in the Third World*, London, 1981, p. 159 ff. gives a very valuable study of this question, although we differ from him on some points.
19. See *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, Vol. III, 1959, p. 332.
20. H. Herring, *History of Latin America*, London, 1968, p. 744.
21. Luciano, 'The Political Strike Against the Argentine Federal Government', *International Press Correspondence*, 1935, No. 59, p. 1455.
22. Herring op. cit. p. 744; Chambers' Encl., 1950 edition, Vol. I, p. 578.
23. Declaration of the Belgrade Conference on Non-Aligned Countries, December 1961. Text in L. Mates, *Non-Alignment*, Belgrade, 1972, p. 390.
24. However, among major imperialist powers forming the second world, we should not forget that Japan refused to take a pro-British stance on the Malvinas conflict.
25. Julius K. Nyerere, Speech to the Fourth Ministerial Meeting of the Group of 77, Arusha, February 1979. Text in A. Sauvart, *The Group of 77*, Appendix A, p. 131 ff.
26. Economist Intelligence Unit, *Quarterly Economic Review of Argentina*, First Quarter, 1981.
27. Great Soviet Encyclopedia, Vol. II, p. 283.
28. Ibid., p. 285.
29. UNCTAD, *Trade and Economic Relations between Latin American Countries and Countries Members of the CMEA*, Manila, 1979, TD/243/Supp. 2, p. 19.
30. Republica Argentina, Ministerio de Economia, *Intercambio Comercial*, December 1976, p. 668.
31. Republica Argentina, Ministerio de Economia, *Intercambio Comercial*, 1981; Boletín Estadística Trimestral, Enero-Junio 1980, p. 151.
32. For a good description of this policy, see A. Gunder Frank op. cit., pp. 20-7.
33. See for example *Latin America Regional Reports*, Southern Cone, January 29th, 1982.
34. *Neues Deutschland*, January 6th, 1978.

35. *New Times*, 1977, No. 51, p. 24.
36. See *Le Monde*, March 14th, 1982.
37. See for instance L. Lozinov, 'The Liberation Struggle in Latin America', *International Affairs*, Moscow, 1977, No. 8, p. 38 f.
38. By Y. Korolyov, *International Affairs*, 1980, No. 9, p. 114 f.
39. L. Klochovsky, 'The Multinationals in Latin America', *International Affairs*, 1977, No. 10, p. 46.
40. Republica Argentina, *Anuario Estadistico*, 1979-80, p. 521.
41. See *Class Struggle*, May 1982. The same figure is given in *Latin America Regional Report*, Southern Cone, April 9th, 1982. This was the tendency, but it may have been modified by the new developments in the midst of the Anglo-Argentinian war.
42. *Neue Zurcher Zeitung*, July 15th, 1980.
43. *Le Monde*, April 24th, 1981.
44. *Financial Times*, April 23rd, 1981.
45. *Soviet News*, May 5th, 1981.
46. *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 29th and April 10th 1982.
47. Quoted in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, March 2nd, 1982.
48. *Neue Zurcher Zeitung*, January 15th, 1981.
49. *Neues Deutschland*, April 18th, 1980. Krill is a kind of prawn which abounds in the South Atlantic area and which is considered to be one of the major strategic food sources of the future. For the Argentinian Marxist-Leninists' analysis of this agreement, see *Class Struggle*, July, 1982.
50. Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Ch. 1.
51. Only Chile was an exception, but even it declared its neutrality.
52. *Le Monde*, 18th May, 1982.
53. *Le Monde*, 16-17th May 1982.
54. Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Ch. 32.
55. N. Kapchenko, 'Socialist Foreign Policy and the Restructuring of International Relations', *International Affairs*, April 1975, p. 5.
56. Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*, Act V, scene III, line 79.
57. This can be seen clearly in Kissinger's policy in the closing stages of the Indochina war. Under Carter we find contradictory strands of policy, some of which pull in a different direction, but these have been negated again under the present administration.

58. A legacy of the colonial period, the delimitation of the frontier between Argentina and Chile in the region of Tierra del Fuego is extremely complex. An arbitration treaty was signed in 1902, and - not surprisingly from what we know about Britain's preponderant neo-colonial influence at the time - the arbitrator was none other than Britain. At issue in the current dispute are mainly three islands in the mouth of the Beagle channel which carry with them a certain influence over the Antarctic. Having spent six years deliberating, the arbitration court delivered a verdict in 1977 which, having been rejected by Argentina, formed the basis of the current conflict.
59. According to some reports Argentina was on the verge of acquiring the 'Blowpipe' portable surface to air missile (which the British invasion forces used successfully against Argentina's Pucara ground attack aircraft), and Britain was considering selling it one of the assault ships which were eventually used to launch the British invasion of the Malvinas.
60. See the leaflet "Organizarse para Defender las Malvinas!!" (Partido Comunista Revolucionario, Comite Central, 12-4-82). A fuller survey of progressive opinion in Latin America can be found in *Class Struggle*, July 1982.
61. Another example is France, whose so-called socialist president - with a long personal record of favouring French colonial interests - came down stoutly on the side of reaction in the Anglo-Argentinian war.
62. Hegel, *The Science of Logic*, Vol. I, Book II, Sec. 1, Ch. 2.

New Era Books

203, Seven Sisters Road, London N4

Tel. 01-272-5894

New Era Books stocks revolutionary and progressive books and Journals from Britain and around the world

CURRENT ITEMS NOW IN STOCK INCLUDE:

Guerilla Days in Ireland by Tom Barry, £2.50 + 26p (p&p)

Soledad Brother by George Jackson, £1.95 + 26p (p&p)

Imperialism and Unequal development by Samir Amin,
£2.70 + 44p (p&p)

A Different Hunger: Writings on Black Resistance
by A. Sivanandan, £3.95 + 26p (p&p)

China's Socialist Economy by Xue Muqiao, £2.80 + 50p (p&p)

Our Roots are still Alive: the story of the Palestinian
People, £3.95 + 56p (p&p)

Ireland Unfree: Essays on the History of the Irish
Freedom Struggle 1169 - 1981, Ed. by Martin Mulligan,
£2.95 + 32p (P&P)

The World and Africa: an enquiry into the part which
Africa played in World History, by W.E.B. DuBois,
£3.75 + 50p (p&p)

MAIL ORDER CATALOGUE AVAILABLE ON REQUEST.

Subscribe

c/o New Era Books

Class Struggle

Monthly paper
of the RCLB.

October

	INLAND	ABROAD
6 issues	£2.25	£3.50
12 issues	£4.50	£6.50
4 issues	£2.75	£3.50

Airmail rates available on request