

WORLD POLITICS

A REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S
TROTSKYIST AND REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

CONTENTS

APRIL 1967

Page	1	<u>A turning point in Great Britain</u>
Page	7	<u>Castro on the role of women</u>
Page	13	<u>The class nature of the Soviet Union</u>
Page	17	<u>Book reviews</u>
Page	19	<u>Americain war profits</u>

WORLD POLITICS

BUSINESS and EDITORIAL Address
c/o 4 Dane Street, Nottingham.

Annual Subscription
15/-

APPROACHING A DECISIVE TURNING POINT IN GREAT BRITAIN

(The following statement on the situation confronting the British Labour movement was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International December 4th, 1966.)

The situation in Great Britain is now approaching a decisive turning point. It is not the crisis of British capitalism, frankly admitted by all political forces in the country, that is new but the role played by the leadership of the Labour Party. This new role differs from the previous role of social democracy in which it defended capitalism by granting small reforms to the working class. Today the Labour Party leadership, while continuing to pose as the representative of the British working class, systematically endeavours to apply a plan of modernization and consolidation of British capitalism at the cost of the working class itself. This is the basis of the growing conflict between the mass of workers - above all those in the trade unions - and Harold Wilson's Labour government. The reflections of that conflict inside the British Labour Party and the working class could decide the possibilities of a breakthrough towards socialism in Great Britain for a long period to come.

The roots of the chronic crisis of Britain's capitalist economy are well known and need only brief mention. Britain's capitalist class is paying the price today of having been the pioneer beneficiaries of the first industrial revolution. Its present distress stems from this historic distinction. Even before the first world war it was clear that it had lost its great advantage as world leader in industrial productivity. That it could still retain for a period of thirty years the features of a major imperialist power was due to its enormous foreign capital investments, accumulated in the course of a century and more. This enabled and ensured substantial profits permitting it to live with a chronically negative trade balance without a real threat to the stability of the pound.

The second world war seriously depleted these foreign holdings in an absolute sense but even more so in a relative sense. Britain's "Invisible" exports proved less and less able in themselves to maintain a positive balance of payments. The relative backwardness of British industry and industrial productivity developed with increasing speed particularly during the decades of the fifties and sixties in comparison with its principal competitors in Europe (West Germany) and Asia (Japan). The latter's rate of growth and modernization outstripped Britain's particularly since they carried no great military and naval burden. This in turn brought the chronic balance of payments crisis and the periodic attempt to stop this crisis through government engineered recessions which could only accentuate the gap between the rate of growth of both productivity and production between Britain and its main competitors.

For many years now the leading spokesmen and ideologues of British capitalism have advocated a clear programme for rationalizing and streamlining the capitalist economy. Implicit in this programme is a callous stop to nominal wage increases in order to raise the rate of profit and capital accumulation. Also, a vast displacement of labour from the so-called backward and stagnating industrial branches toward the expanding ones, particularly those tied to exports. By ending the condition of full employment which the British working class has known for nearly 25 years (except during the Tory engineered recession of 1963-64) they could indeed go a long way toward "Rationalizing" capitalist industries. The aim was the crushing of working class resistance to capitalist super exploitation by the creation of an industrial reserve army, that would bear down upon wage increases and even present wage standards, and thus overcome the main obstacle which arises from the workers' stubborn defence of their living standards and social services, which they have won through long and successful struggle. This employers' strategy is also designed to prepare Britain's entry into the Common Market on the most advantageous basis.

A direct attack by the capitalist class through a Tory government would have provoked a generalized resistance of the working class which could have very well led towards a victorious general strike and a consequent social and political crisis for British capitalism. In the face of this the Tory party was restrained by various sectors of British capital from undertaking such an offensive. With refined political instinct they favoured a Labour government's undertaking of this dirty job, particularly since it would at first enjoy the good will and loyalty of the overwhelming majority of the working class. They calculated correctly that a Labour government could apply the employers' programme more directly than any Tory government since 1951 and that this would create divisions, confusion, and demoralization inside the working class sufficiently to reduce to a minimum the "social overhead costs" of the streamlining operation. The past year's experience shows that they did not miscalculate.

Through a skilful use of the traditional machine of Transport House and a no less skilful appeal to the basic loyalty of the British working class to the Labour Party, Wilson has been able to carry through step by step support to U.S. imperialism's dirty war in Vietnam, with a de facto recognition of the white settlers' apartheid regime in Rhodesia; a tacit abandonment of any extension of the social services including the promised return to a completely free health service; all this combined with the hypocrisy of an "incomes policy" - a thinly disguised form of wage freeze. When all these measures proved insufficient to rehabilitate Britain's sick capitalist economy he has - with the enthusiastic approval of the British bourgeoisie and the international bankers - gone to the point of stopping free wage bargaining between unions and employers; suspending already signed contracts that called for wage increases, imposing a total wage freeze and threatening punitive measures for trade unionists who resist these measures with industrial action. As the cost of living continues to rise partially also as a result of some of the measures taken by the Wilson government and as the latter specifically permits the increased indirect taxes to be passed on to the consumers, this policy means in fact a downward slide of real wages. The stringent credit restrictions linked with this decline of real wages can only lead to a real recession, i.e. mass unemployment which is already visible in the present wide layoffs.

Not much time need be spent on the cynicism of these gentlemen who were returned to power by promising the working class to eliminate the threat of periodic unemployment inherent in the Tories' "stop go" policy and who now revive this very same policy on a still greater scale. Nor should anyone who has studied the lessons of history be astonished that these "labour lieutenants of capital" who draw their strength by claiming to represent the interests of the working class cynically betray these interests for the sole benefit of "rationalizing" Britain's capitalist economy. This is the same role played by the Social Democratic leadership of Western Europe, who having integrated themselves totally into the bourgeois state, find themselves obliged to save that state and bourgeois society whenever the social contradictions impose decisions which the working class would never accept if they came from the direct representatives of the capitalist class.

This treacherous behaviour of the Labour leaders has aroused widespread opposition and indignation among militant workers. But it has already created widespread confusion and disillusionment among the great mass of Labour supporters. For them it still remains unthinkable that their political party which they built through generations of struggle and innumerable sacrifices, so as to defend their interests against capitalism, should now turn, at least in its top layers, into an instrument for the defence of capital against labour. There is a very real danger that while opposition to Wilson will slowly and constantly grow inside the Labour and inside the TUC, and while these large bodies will slowly swing to the left, actual militant reactions to Wilson's anti-working class policies will remain episodic, fragmented and largely isolated from the great mass of the workers. While able to achieve some partial results as the Seamen's strike did, they would be unable to prevent the main goals of the employers' policy - a cut in real wages for the mass of workers and the reappearance of a permanent body of unemployed - from being achieved.

The most advanced militants of the British working class must be very conscious of this danger. It is true that the British workers today have a tremendous confidence in their organized strength. It is also true that they have never experienced an important defeat in open battle for an entire generation. They have experienced 25 years of uninterrupted full employment. All this explains the anger and violence of the workers' reactions to Wilson's betrayal. It explains why a new mass left wing will certainly arise in the Labour Party. This time, in contrast to the experience of Bevanism of the 1950's it is based mainly on the unionized industrial workers. All these considerations are fundamental in assessing the increasing difficulties with which Wilson's government will be faced, and in expressing confidence that the British working class will not permit its standard of living to be cut down without putting up a vigorous struggle against the employers' offensive.

But for all this it nevertheless remains true that the offensive has overall goals, in every sector of the economy, which cannot be prevented by fragmented reactions of isolated sectors of the working class. Only a generalised struggle by all the main sections of that class, for general objectives and with an alternative solution and alternative leadership clearly appearing before the mass of the working class, could really and decisively defeat the employers' plan and Wilson's measures. In the absence of such a generalised struggle the most probable variant is that these plans and measures will succeed with only partial concessions won from the government by the most militant sections of the working class.

Obviously the need of the hour is the preparation of a general counter offensive of the working class, to defend its past conquests and present standard of living, and to impose an alternative, truly socialist, solution to the crisis of the British economy and society. To be able to prepare and actually realize such a general action it is necessary to formulate a clear programme of action and to achieve the widest possible unity of action inside the trade unions and the Labour Party for the mobilization of the workers around this programme.

A major void that impedes a wide working class mobilization is the absence of an alternative leadership recognized by the mass of workers themselves. As revolutionary Marxists we are fully conscious of the need to build in Britain a revolutionary socialist organization which, embodying all the lessons of past and present experiences of the British and international working class, could become an effective instrument for leading the British workers toward overthrowing capitalism. But we also are fully aware of the fact that the overwhelming majority of the British working class is not yet ready to follow such an organization and that it will not readily abandon its historical allegiance towards the Labour Party.

For that reason to restrict oneself to declamatory calls for the building of a revolutionary party instead of proposing concrete steps for common action to all those unionists and workers, particularly within the Labour Party and in the large factories who are aroused over Wilson's betrayal, means in reality to abandon the perspectives of a real struggle in the immediate future for the pipe dreams of sectarian self-indulgence. In reality, a revolutionary organization with a real mass following will be built precisely through constant and patient efforts by the vanguard to participate in a constructive way in common activity with the broad mass of the class conscious workers.

Up to now, no real alternative leadership to the Wilson-Brown team has appeared on the scene inside the Labour Party, and no initiative from the outside can substitute for such a leadership. But all advanced working class militants and conscious socialists could and should undertake an immediate effort to regroup all those sections of the working class willing to fight the employers' policy and Wilson's measures around a common programme. Such a unity in action expressed in great mass meetings and demonstrations and widespread industrial action could become in itself a powerful lever for organizing and strengthening the left forces inside the Labour Party and put strong pressure behind those union leaders who are prepared to challenge the employers and Wilson. This alone will pose the immediacy of an alternative socialist programme.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International is of the opinion that such a programme constituting an answer not only to the employers' offensive and to the measures of Wilson but also to the overall crisis of British economy and society should be built around the following central lines:

1. Immediate cessation of the wage freeze and restoration of full freedom of negotiation for the trade unions.

2. Immediate repeal of all anti-union legislation and withdrawal of all threats of legal penalties against unionists defending the material interests of union members.

3. Introduction of a universal sliding scale of wages (as, for example attained in many American industries and in Belgium) automatically insuring commensurate wage increases after each rise in the cost of living and thereby at least safeguarding the purchasing power of wages against the worst erosion resulting from permanent inflation. Immediate introduction of the 40-hour week without reduction of weekly wages, in order to establish full employment

4. Radical reduction of military expenditures, an end to the "east of Suez" expense and an end to the expense of the nuclear deterrents.

5. Nationalization without compensation of "the big five banks", the big insurance companies, the automobile, aircraft and chemical industries as well as steel, all under workers' control. State control over imports and exports and overseas investments as a transitional stage to the establishment of a state monopoly of foreign trade. Systematic expansion of trade relations with the workers' states and the countries newly established in the wake of the colonial revolution.

6. Immediate elaboration by the trade unions of a general plan of development of the British economy under common ownership and workers' control, geared to a steep rise of social expenses in favour of the most disinherited parts of the British people, to increasing collaboration with the countries having a socialized economy and with the countries going through colonial revolutions. Such a plan should be designed to free the British economy and the hard won social gains from the dictates of the City and of the international bankers, and to modernize the British economy without imposing the burden on the working class.

7. Opening of the books of all employers and suppression of the commercial and banking secrets in order to expose before the whole country the real truth about the relations between the total amount of wages, the total amount of capitalist profit and the rise in productivity. Introduction of control by elected shop stewards over all productive operations in all factories private as well as public. Control of prices in retail trade by housewives' committees.

8. Immediate return to a completely free health service. Included clauses to implement laws against racial discrimination, particularly in employment and wage scales. Immediate introduction of a £15 national minimum weekly wage for workers, applicable especially to women. Immediate acceleration of a low cost housing programme with a national target of 750,000 houses a year. Drastic measures to implement comprehensive education.

9. Immediate break with Wilson's shameful support to U.S. imperialism's aggression in Vietnam. Support to the revolutionary freedom fighters of the South Viet Nam National Liberation Front. Withdraw recognition of the rotten Saigon puppet regime; stop material assistance to aggression in Malaysia and Laos. Recognise the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

10. A call to all trade unions and organizations speaking in the name of the working class in Western Europe, to convene a European Congress of Labour which would work out concrete plans for a Socialist United States of Europe in place of the capitalist Common Market.

Around these and similar proposals, all left groups and tendencies should as quickly as possible achieve a large degree of consensus enabling them to prepare common action. They should act in common to have systematically elected trade union delegates who pledge themselves to a relentless struggle for the implementation of that programme. They should mobilize themselves to support and extend all industrial action of the working class in defence of their standard of living and of their elementary rights. They should undertake the utmost efforts to co-ordinate their actions on a regional and national basis in order to prepare the great general wave of the working class counteroffensive which will defeat the employers' policies and crisis.

HIGH COURT REFUSES TO REVIEW MITCHELL 'NUREMBERG' CASE

The Supreme Court has ducked the legal questions raised by the Vietnam war by declining to hear the appeal of David Mitchell, who has refused to report for induction on the grounds that the war is illegal. Mitchell has been sentenced to a five-year prison term. He bases his defence on the precedent set at the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals, which held that individual soldiers are responsible if they commit war crimes, even if they do so under orders. Mitchell charges that the Vietnam war is a war of aggression, and for him to participate in it would make him a war criminal. In a dissenting opinion, Justice William O. Douglas declared that "there is a considerable body of opinion that our actions in Vietnam constitute the waging of an aggressive war". According to the 'New York Times', Douglas agreed with Mitchell's contention that he should have been allowed in his trial for draft evasion to offer proof that the United States was violating the Nuremberg Charter. Douglas said that since treaties are a part of U.S. law, an accused "draft evader" should be permitted to raise in his defence questions of the war's legality, whether it violates the Nuremberg Charter, whether the Nuremberg Charter is part of U.S. law, whether the war is aggressive, etc.

At Mitchell's trial, Judge T. Emmet Clarie barred from evidence any testimony as to the legality of the war or testimony on U.S. atrocities in Vietnam.

FIDEL CASTRO ON THE ROLE OF WOMEN
IN REVOLUTIONARY CUBA. (from The Militant.)

One of the principal gains of the Cuban Revolution is the changes it has achieved in the status of women in that country. The impressive degree of equality achieved by Cuban women since the Revolution was most recently testified to by Georgie Anne Geyer, correspondent for the Chicago Daily News, in a special report from Cuba last Sept. 8.

The systematic efforts to integrate the women into Cuba's productive process, and the beneficial effect this has had in emancipating them from their previous status was discussed by Fidel Castro in two speeches. One was his May Day 1966 speech. The other was an address last December 9 to the Fifth National Plenary session of the Federation of Cuban Women meeting in Santa Clara. The following are extracts from these speeches.

From The May Day Speech:

If there's something that really catches the attention in these May Day parades, and especially in this one, it's the process of integration of women into the labour force.

In the past the possibilities of work for women were extremely limited. In this sense, discrimination certainly existed. But aside from this, it was logical that in a country where there were hundreds of thousands of men without work there would be little or no work opportunities for women. Prostitution.

We already know what kind of work was reserved for women in the capitalist society. We know how prevalent was the custom among the bourgeoisie of hiring working class women, pressed by necessity, to work in amusements in bars, as just one more kind of commercial attraction.

We know of the considerable numbers of women in our country who were forced into that most lamentable form of survival that is prostitution. We know that our bourgeoisie had established many brothels in this country; brothels in every Cuban city, brothels for the Yankee tourists, for the Yankee marines, in Havana, in Guantanamo.

We know also that the bourgeoisie of the region of Guantanamo were so ingratiating that they not only supplied the Marines with brothels but also, on many occasions, with their own daughters. In Guantanamo many stories are known about the parties that went on at the naval base. Many of these people sent their daughters to those parties. In any event, it can be concluded that this type of work is one of the types that capitalist society - all capitalist societies - reserves for women.

It was not possible, of course, to eradicate this evil from our country in one day. But we can say with pride and with satisfaction that just as the Revolution has eradicated other vices, such as gambling, for example, just as the Revolution has rid the country of beggars, just as there are no longer poverty-stricken children roaming the streets (and there is no capitalist society in which there are no beggars, homeless children, brothels, gambling, vice and corruption of all kinds), the Revolution has also eradicated practically all prostitution from our country.

Today a tremendous number of dignified and decent activities are accessible to Cuban women. Many thousands of Cuban women have gone into ^{public} health work during these years of the Revolution. Many thousands of young women have become nurses' aides, assistants in the field of medicine in general. Thousands of women work in the scholarship students' centres.

Other thousands of women, tens of thousands, are teaching. Today the number of women who go into technological institutes and technological training centres is incomparably greater. The fact that the number of women studying in the school of medicine almost equals the number of men, will serve to illustrate the idea. Thousands of women are working in day nurseries and thousands are working not only in these public service jobs, but also in the production of material goods. Women are working, for example in the planting of seedlings in tree nurseries, or planting coffee seedlings.

The whole poultry plan of four million - now we have somewhat over four million laying hens, and by the end of this year we will have 5,800,000 hens in order to cover our needs all year round - this entire important branch of our nation's food production is manned by women workers. Hundreds of poultry centres are managed by women. Women have joined agricultural production in other activities, such as vegetable production, the raising of calves, and rabbit breeding. In sum, new job opportunities are constantly opening up, in which an extraordinary number of women have found decent, remunerative and satisfying employment. For that was the agonizing worry of the immense majority of our people. How to get a job? How to earn a living? It is really incredible how men suffer in capitalist society over this vital question, this elemental matter of how to assure oneself of a job in order to earn a decent living.

Therefore, on a day like today, this phenomenon of which I am speaking can be understood directly as we see the composition of our labour force. But there is something more. The women of our country are not only entering production work en masse, but are turning out to be workers of high efficiency, and we have heard many commentaries in praise of the work of our women, of their sense of responsibility and their lack of absenteeism. For this reason the Revolution is making efforts to create more day nurseries, more schools, to establish more school cafeterias, to make it constantly easier for women to work. But when we speak of making it easier for women to work in production, this does not mean simply that society wishes to help women, not only that.

Society has a duty to help women, but at the same time society helps itself considerably by helping women, because it means more and more hands joining in the production of goods and services for all the people. As it is known, one of the means to make it possible for women to work is the creation of day nurseries. The women workers themselves pay certain amounts, in accordance with their income, for their children's care in the nurseries. But the women who have entered agricultural production have the added benefit that they do not have to pay for the day nursery. And it is the intention of the revolutionary government that by the end of the year, that is to say by next year, no woman worker will have to pay for her children's day nursery. We believe that this will contribute in encouraging Cuban women to work, and we also believe that this is just. Society profits from the work of every woman.

From The Santa Clara Speech:

Arriving here this evening, I commented to a comrade that this phenomenon of women's participation in the Revolution was a revolution within a revolution. And if we were asked what the most revolutionary thing is that the Revolution is doing, we would answer that it is precisely this - the revolution that is occurring among the women of our country! If we were asked what things in the Revolution have been most instructive for us, we

would answer that one of the most interesting lessons for revolutionaries is that being offered by our women. You all know perfectly well that in saying this, we are not uttering given words with intent to please the camareras who are here tonight, but that we say it because it is what we firmly believe and feel.

But why is this one of the most interesting lessons? You yourselves may ask why. In reality, the most honest answer that we could give - and I assure you that the person who offers this answer is precisely one who has always believed himself free from prejudice - the answer is, I believe, that in reality all of us were prejudiced in regard to women.

Castro Prejudiced?

And if anyone had ever asked me if I considered myself prejudiced in regard to women, I would have said absolutely not, because I believed myself to be quite the opposite. I believed that an enormous potential force and extraordinary human resources for the Revolution existed in our women. But what has happened? What has occurred, or rather, what is occurring? We are finding that, in reality, this potential force is superior to anything that the most optimistic of us ever dreamed of. We say that perhaps at heart, unconsciously, something of bias or underestimation existed. For events are demonstrating even now the possibilities of women and the role that women can play in a revolutionary process in which society is liberating itself, above all, from exploitation, and from prejudices and a whole series of circumstances in which women were doubly exploited, doubly humiliated.

What have we found, for example, in regard to the work of women? I have been talking with several comrades, and, following my visit to the Banao Plan, I told Comrade Milian: "I have the impression that the women working in this Plan are more responsible and more disciplined than the men. I have the impression that they will dedicate themselves to the work with more enthusiasm, more passion, more dedication."

And Milian - although I certainly don't want to give this comrade a bad name with the women of Las Villas - argued with me: "Well, but really ...the case of the young men who are in the Juragua Plan of the Young Communists..."

Enthusiasm.

I told him that finding a spirit of discipline and enthusiasm for work in a program involving selected Young Communists was not as extraordinary as finding the same spirit of discipline and enthusiasm in a program carried out by women who had not been specially chosen for this program, who had not been chosen by any organization, but had simply volunteered to do this work.

What have we found? What is being found everywhere in this revolutionary program, as far as the Cuban women are concerned? Well, we are finding a whole series of things, such as those I mentioned before: a great sense of responsibility, great seriousness, great discipline and enthusiasm. What have we found right here in the province of Las Villas? Well, let us take the Banao Plan, for example; this program was growing and needed a cadre. Comrade Milian sought a cadre from the Party; Comrade Santiago Acosta, from the Santo Domingo zone, I believe, and sent him to the Banao Plan as administrator.

But one day Comrades Santiago Acosta and Rena Acosta - the specialist on technical matters - had to go abroad. They were the men holding the positions of greatest responsibility in the plan. Someone had to be appointed to take their place and we decided to appoint Comrade Oscaria,

who was representing the Federation of Cuban women on the directing board of the plan. We firmly believe that this even may some day have historic significance, for it was the first time that a woman had been assigned to such a task, not for political reasons or to impress anyone, but simply because she had, objectively speaking, proved herself capable of heading such a program. And from that moment on, we thought it would be reasonable and an excellent thing, indeed, to have a woman directing a plan involving thousands of women workers. Moreover, when it became necessary to organize the work brigades, a number of women who had distinguished themselves for their great spirit of work were chosen as brigade leaders.

This gave us an idea. We had to train a group of technicians for this type of work and, at first, ten comrades from the Technological Institute had been sent here to specialise in this branch of agriculture. We decided that 20 additional students who were to be sent here to specialise in this field should be chosen from among the girl students at the Technological Institute. Thus, the workers, the brigade leaders, and the technicians - that is, the technical and administrative staff - is going to be made up almost entirely of women. Yes, women!

This is one of the great lessons we spoke about before: one of the great lessons and perhaps one of the greatest victories over prejudices that have existed, not for decades or centuries, but for thousands of years. We refer to the belief that all a woman could do was wash dishes, wash and iron clothes, cook, keep house and bear children - age-old prejudices that placed women in an inferior position in society. In effect, she did not have a productive place in society.

Such prejudices are thousands of years old and have survived through various social systems. If we consider capitalism, women - that is, lower-class women - were doubly exploited or doubly humiliated. A poor woman, part of the working class or of a working class family, was exploited simply because she was poor, because she was a member of the working-class.

Within Working Class.

But in addition, although she was a woman of the working class, even her own class looked down on her and under-rated her. Not only was she underestimated, exploited and looked down upon by the exploiting classes, but even within her own class she was the object of numerous prejudices.

So all these events have been a great lesson to all of us, to every revolutionary. Naturally, a considerable amount of prejudice still exists. If women were to believe that they have totally fulfilled their role as revolutionaries in society, they would be making a mistake. It seems to us that women must still fight and exert great great efforts to attain the place that they should really hold in society. If women in our country were doubly exploited, doubly humiliated in the past, then this simply means that women in a social revolution should be doubly revolutionary.

And perhaps this is the explanation, or at least the social basis for the resolute, enthusiastic, firm and loyal support given by Cuban women to this Revolution. This Revolution has really been two revolutions for women; it has meant a double liberation as part of the exploited sector of the country, and secondly, as women, who were discriminated against not only as workers but also as women, in that society of exploitation.

The attitude of the Cuban women toward the Revolution corresponds to this reality; it corresponds to what the revolution has meant to them. And the support of the popular masses for the Revolution is directly proportionate to what the Revolution has meant to them in terms of their liberation.

There are two sectors in this country, two sectors of society which, aside from economic reasons, have had other motives for sympathising and feeling enthusiasm for the Revolution. These two sectors are the Negro population of Cuba and the female population. I suppose that you recall that in Cuba's old bourgeois Constitution, there was an article which declared illegal any discrimination for reasons of race or sex. Now the problem of such discrimination has disappeared from our country, because the basis for these two types of discrimination - which is quite simply the exploitation of man by man - has disappeared.

Much news reaches us from the United States, for example, about the civil-rights struggle for Negroes. Nevertheless, racial discrimination in the U.S. will not disappear until capitalist society has disappeared.

Need Revolution.

Discrimination will never be wiped out within the framework of Capitalist society. Discrimination with respect to race and sex can only be wiped out through a socialist revolution, which eradicates the exploitation of man by man. Now, does the disappearance of the exploitation of man by man mean that all the conditions are immediately created whereby women may elevate their position in society? No. The conditions for the liberation of women, for the full development of women in society, for an authentic equality of women with men in society, require a material base; they require the material foundations of economic and social development.

I described before the opinion held by many men concerning the functions of women, and I said that among the functions considered to belong to women was - almost exclusively - that of having children. Naturally, reproduction is one of the most important of women's functions in human society, in any kind of human society. But it is precisely this function, relegated by nature to women, which has enslaved them to a series of chores within the home.

There is a sign here in front of us, for example, which says: "One million women working in production by 1970." Unfortunately, it will not be possible to have one million working in production by 1970. We feel that this goal may be reached, perhaps, within ten years, but not within four. We could propose it as a goal to be reached by 1975. Why can't this goal be reached in four years? Because in order to have one million women working in production, we must have thousands of children's day nurseries, thousands of primary boarding schools, thousands of school dining halls, thousands of workers' dining halls; thousands of centres of social services of this type must be set up. For if not, who is going to cook for the second or third grade child when he comes home for lunch?

Who is going to care for unweaned infants, or babies of two, three and four years of age? Who is going to prepare dinner for the man when he comes home from work? Who is going to wash, clean, all those things? In other words, in order to reach the social goal of liberating woman from all these activities that enslave her and impede her from full incorporation into work outside the home and all these activities she can engage in in society, it is necessary to create the necessary material base, to attain the necessary social development.

It is impossible to construct the required thousands of children's day nurseries, school dining halls, laundries, workers' dining halls, boarding schools in four years. In fact, merely to meet present needs, great effort is necessary on all fronts. Everywhere women are working, it has been necessary to make a special effort to establish day nurseries, set up boarding schools and all the necessary institutions, so that these women

could be free to work...At this stage of scarcity of cement, machinery and construction equipment, the problem can be solved only through maximum efforts on all fronts: sometimes at a regional level, other times at a national or a provincial level, using the resources we have at hand. Nor can we expect the day nurseries to be perfect, that the constructions will be perfect, or the service. They must be as good as possible, but they cannot be perfect.

These problems will have to be solved in many areas of the country, little by little. One million women cannot be employed in one day. A whole series of economic steps must be taken, and agricultural plans set in motion.

Statistical Study.

It would be interesting to know how many women have already started to work in the production of consumers' goods as well as in services since the triumph of the Revolution; how many are working as nurses' aides, technicians, industrial and agricultural workers. If a statistical study were made as to how many women have begun to work since the triumph of the Revolution, the number would probably be close to 150,000, and certainly no less than that! This figure, of course, is not based on exact statistics, and it seems to us that a study should be made in order to learn precisely how many women have found work in newly created jobs, in jobs created by the Revolution.

Next year the number of women working will be considerably greater. Why? Because a whole series of plans will get under way, mainly in agriculture. Several thousand women are to be incorporated into the Banao Plan and when that plan reaches its maximum development, it will require six or seven thousand women. In Pinares de Mayari some eight thousand women will be working by springtime. In the coffee-plant nurseries set up for the 1967-8 coffee-growing plan, 30,000 women will be needed and many thousands will work in the reforestation plans, in vegetable cultivation, and other thousands are being incorporated into jobs in the cities.

Enormous Effort.

This means that more than 50,000 women will be involved in tasks related to production by next year, and this will require an enormous and simultaneous effort to be made, so that all of the problems related to the dining-halls, schools and children's day nurseries may be worked out.

I am going to tell you something. Without the incorporation of women, the Banao Plan could never have gotten off the ground, nor could the plans for micro-climate vegetable cultivation in Oriente Province have been carried out. Without the incorporation of women, the plans for coffee-growing could not even have been considered. Many of the plans that the Revolution is today drawing up and beginning to carry out could not have been conceived until the great reservoir of human resources that our society possesses in its women was clearly seen for what it was.

These plans, which stand for extraordinary contributions to the economic development of our country, to the increased well-being of our people, could not have been conceived without the mass incorporation of women into work.

WHAT IS THE CLASS NATURE OF THE SOVIET UNION? (PART 11)

By Barry Sheppard.

(From The Militant.)

The question remains: What is the nature of the Soviet Union if it cannot be correctly defined as capitalist?

All those educated in the school of Stalin contend that a socialist society was established in Russia under his regime. The Communist Party continues to maintain that socialism exists there, while the Progressive Labour Party (PL) now says that the USSR has slid peacefully back to capitalism.

In reality, the Soviet Union has gone beyond capitalism but is still far from having reached socialism. Even to approach socialism, a society would have to possess greater productive power, higher living and cultural standards, and more freedom than the most advanced capitalist nations. The Soviet Union, despite all its impressive achievements, has not yet come near that point.

Enormous differences remain between city and country; there are two major classes, the workers and the peasantry; there is no workers' democracy; and the level of production and available consumer goods remains below that in the U.S. The existence of a parasitic bureaucracy is both a refutation of the claim that socialism exists in the Soviet Union and an obstacle on the path to socialism, which will have to be removed before socialism can be established.

Having gone beyond capitalism but not having reached socialism, the USSR is a transitional social formation called a workers' state. This state in between capitalism and socialism contains highly contradictory features.

In the previous article I discussed why the elimination of private ownership of the means of production coupled with the existence of the nationalized and planned economy and the monopoly of foreign trade, differentiates the Soviet Union from capitalism and gives it a proletarian class character. While these relations of production are the fundamental determinants of the class character of Soviet society, we must also examine the relations of distribution.

Even a socialist revolution in the U.S., the most advanced capitalism in the world, could not immediately guarantee the satisfaction of all human needs. That can only be accomplished through the final victory of workers' power and the creation of a classless society on a world scale, on the basis of a level of productivity much superior to the present level. For a time, a workers' state in the U.S. will be compelled to spur production and to use, with various changes and mitigations, the method of labour payment worked out by capitalism: "To each according to his work."

As Engels explained in Anti-Duhring: "Each new mode of production or form of exchange is in the beginning fettered not only by the old forms and the political institutions corresponding to them, but also by the old mode of distribution. It is obliged to engage in a long struggle to obtain the mode of distribution corresponding to it."

The old methods of distribution- the payment of labour according to

work and the selling of commodities - are inescapable in the first stages of the socialist revolution. A workers' state can only gradually replace the principle of payment according to the work performed with the principle of socialist distribution: "To each according to his needs." The more backward the economy a workers' and peasants' revolution inherits from the past, the harder it will be to overcome the old inequitable methods of distribution.

Harsh Conditions.

The young Soviet republic was crippled by all the backwardness of Czarism. The world war and civil war depleted already exhausted resources, shattered industry and led to famine. Under such circumstances, even after economic conditions improved in the 1920s, the state had strictly to enforce the bourgeois norms of distribution. From the beginning the Soviet State took on a dual character: socialist insofar as it defended social property in the means of production; bourgeois insofar as the distribution of life's goods was carried out under bourgeois norms.

The early Soviet state was highly democratic in structure. It was based upon the direct, representative democracy of the soviets, or councils which began as agencies of the workers, soldiers and peasants in the revolutionary struggle, and then became the organs of the new workers' state. But under the harsh conditions the Soviet masses faced, the state suffered from what Lenin called bureaucratic deformations. As the arbiters over distribution, Soviet officials were able to provide themselves with goods and privileges which were not available to the masses. These were small privileges, at first. But office-holders began to develop a material interest in clinging to their positions. Since Soviet democracy implied mass control over bureaucrats, the developing stratum of office-holders resented and subverted these representative institutions.

Counted On Aid.

The Bolsheviks counted on the victory of the revolution in one or more of the advanced countries to come to the aid of the beleaguered and impoverished Soviet Union. Such aid would have eased the material situation and countered the forces enhancing the power of the bureaucracy. But revolutions elsewhere either did not materialize or were defeated where they did.

Lenin advocated the strengthening of workers' democracy as a counter to bureaucracy, and spent the last years of his life attempting to combat its growth. In more favourable circumstances, and certainly in any industrialized country, at a more advanced stage of world revolution, workers' democracy would be able to contain and eventually eliminate bureaucracy. But the working class was a small minority in Soviet society and had seen the best of its fighters cut down in the civil war. These factors, together with the isolation of the revolution and the low standard of living of the masses, helped to dispirit the workers and aided the bureaucrats in their subversion of soviet democracy.

The bureaucracy found its chief spokesman and leader in the person of Stalin. Given the above objective conditions, Stalin was able to lead the growing bureaucracy to power, through corruption and purges of the Bolshevik Party (which, since it contained the most politically advanced workers, was the strongest opposition to the bureaucracy) and the soviets. The result of this political counter-revolution was the crushing of the

soviets and the rise to full power of the bureaucratic caste. The principle of "to each according to his work" is inherently unequal, since it rewards according to unequal output. In addition, the bureaucracy, as arbiter over distribution, could define how much work was worth. Thus their "work" became very valuable indeed. Having won political supremacy, the bureaucracy was able to amass more and more privileges. The gap between workers and bureaucrats widened. The bureaucracy developed into a caste separate and apart from the workers. The existence of this parasitic, self-seeking, privileged caste makes the Soviet state a far cry from a healthy workers' state - let alone socialism. To indicate its deformed nature, Marxists call it a bureaucratically degenerated workers' state.

Reactionary Role.

The bureaucracy views all problems from the narrow standpoint of its special interests. It is a fundamentally conservative formation which desires to maintain its position, privileges and power and keep things generally as they are. In international relations it aspires to make peace with imperialism, in the vain hope that the imperialists will let the Soviet Union alone. In return for a promise of live and let live, the bureaucrats are ready to use their influence in the world communist movement to sell out revolutions. Having lost all faith in the world revolution, the bureaucracy transformed the world's Communist parties into docile appendages of its foreign policy - pressure groups seeking alliances with "good" capitalists. This policy was first projected by Stalin in the doctrine of "socialism in one country". The same policy is now called "peaceful coexistence."

The reactionary role of the bureaucracy in defending and extending inequality and repressing democracy within the Soviet Union and retarding and betraying the struggle for world revolution, does not mean, however, that it is capitalist. The bureaucracy's own privileges flow from its position in the nationalized and planned economy which it is obliged to defend and develop, poorly and in its own way. To call the Soviet Union capitalist because of the many crimes committed by the bureaucracy would be like saying the AFL-CIO is no longer a workers' organization because its leaders uphold capitalism, support the war in Vietnam, don't offer the workers proper leadership, and vote themselves enormous salaries. In fact the unions remain workers' organizations in spite of the bureaucrats. The job ahead of the workers is to build a new, class struggle leadership which can throw the bureaucrats out, democratize the unions and make them effective instruments to combat big business.

Similarly, the job before the Soviet workers is to throw out the Soviet bureaucrats, re-institute soviet democracy, and in the process build a new class-struggle leadership in the tradition of Lenin and Trotsky.

Marx and Lenin.

It is instructive to note that, in detailing the crimes of the Soviet leaders, Progressive Labor, which follows Stalin and Mao, does not mention the lack of workers democracy. To Marx and Lenin workers democracy was the very life breath and life blood of the socialist movement, whether it was preparing for power or had won it. The re-institution of soviet democracy, now possible on a higher plane than in the early Soviet republic thanks to the successes of planned economy, will restore the workers state in Russia to health. The struggle against bureaucratic domination will centre around this demand which expresses the deepest needs and interests of the Soviet workers.

Progressive Labor's analysis, then, defaults on two major aspects of the Soviet Union. First, by incorrectly labelling the Soviet Union capitalist, it calls into question the necessity of defending the first workers' state from imperialist attack. Second, Progressive Labor presents false and misleading conceptions on how the Soviet masses can return the Soviet Union to the path of Lenin.

1966 WAR PROFITS Continued from page 19

At that point he was interrupted by Senator Clark, who asked: "The cost is going up very fast, is it not?". Russell's cryptic reply was: "Yes, the cost of aircraft is going up rapidly." Whether the two senators were more concerned about prices or deaths in this colloquy is something known only to themselves.

20 TOP WAR CONTRACTORS

	Rank	%profit increase in 1966	Volume of War contracts
Lockheed Aircraft Corp.	(1)	9%	A
General Electric Co.	(2)	-5	B
United Aircraft Corp.	(3)	-10	A
General Dynamics Corp.	(4)	22	A
Boeing Co.	(5)	-3	B
McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	(6)	31*	A
AT & T	(7)	10	B
Textron, Inc.	(8)	31	A
General Motors Corp.	(11)	-16	B
Avco Corp.	(12)	31	A
Ford Motor Co.	(14)	-12	B
Westinghouse Electric Corp.	(17)	12	A
Martin Marietta Corp.	(18)	21	A
General Tire & Rubber Co.	(20)	17**	B
Grumman Aircraft Corp.	(21)	30	B
Ling-Temco-Vought, Inc.	(22)	125	A
Honeywell, Inc.	(26)	18	B
Collins Radio Co.	(27)	47***	A
RCA	(28)	29	B
Litton Industries, Inc.	(30)	28***	B

* Six months ending Dec.31st; ** Year ending Nov.30th; *** Six months ending Jan.31st.

Profits of 20 of the top 30 war contractors show average increase of 21% in 1966 according to initial reports. Average p.increases for country about 8%. Corporations with contracts totalling more than 50% of income A; Less than 50% B.

BOOK REVIEW:

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LOGIC OF MARXISM

BY GEORGE NOVACK.

(Merit Publishers, New York.

The nine lectures printed in this book were delivered to a New York audience in 1942. This fourth edition, which contains the lecture on "The categories of dialectical logic", indicates the increasing demand for the book in the sixties. The growth in this demand is something that cannot be easily explained by those who maintain that "dialectics is mystical nonsense that no sensible person can comprehend or apply." It can, on the other hand, be easily understood by those who have grasped the essentials of dialectical logic. In fact, the history of this book might well be used as an illustration of its theme. That is to say, the increasing demand is not simply a reflection of its intrinsic merits of a rare and illuminating clarity; it reflects also the growing urgency of the need for a social transformation that will eliminate the threat of annihilation that hangs over the entire human species.

More and more people are beginning to understand that the required transformation is contingent upon the revolutionary abolition of capitalism from the whole world. They are realising, too, that most of the professedly revolutionary parties have no intention of ever leading a revolution. Thus, if one wishes to know which party to join, one must begin by equipping oneself with a knowledge of the principles of dialectical materialism. Novack's book provides an excellent introduction to that knowledge. Hence the increasing demand.

By starting with an examination of the axioms of formal logic, the author traces the historical development of the science of logic, pointing out that human thought develops and changes with human society. The axioms of formal logic are valid only if we assume that the universe to which they apply is static and unchanging. But the real world is always changing; "complex forms of motion, evolution of the species, the development of society present formal logic with difficulties...The unquestionable universal process (of change) forms the material foundation of the theory of dialectical logic." Dialectics, then, emerges from a critical examination of formal logic, and its limitations.

Novack gives us a very clear picture of the contribution that Hegel made to the construction of a logic of change, and of the radical development from this effected by Marx when he substituted a materialist philosophy for Hegel's idealism. "Marxist logic - the dialectic - takes an unambiguous stand on the relations between the laws and forms of thought and the rest of reality. What goes on in the minds of men, both in substance and structure, is inseparable from what happens in their social relations and the physical world."

"Just as Marxism denies the eternal reality of capitalism, so does it deny eternal validity to the forms of thought most characteristic of such class societies as capitalism." Using telling examples taken from contemporary history, both in the lectures and in the preface to the third edition (1963), Novack vividly illustrates the dialectical process. "The science of logic", he writes, "has to break through and smash the petrified shell of formal logic." It is difficult for us to rid our minds of habits of formal thinking, absorbed from society, but Novack leaves no doubt about the superiority - and necessity - for the use of the dialectic in our thinking.

October, 1965, a catastrophic military fascist coup in Indonesia, backed by imperialism, overthrew a Communist Party (PKI) of three million members, massacred at least 125,000 people and jailed 250,000. Subtitled: Three articles on the fatal consequences of Communist Party policy, this pamphlet by Ernest Mandel, editor of the Belgian socialist weekly, La Gauche; the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, and T. Soedarso, himself a young member of the PKI, now in exile, performs the vitally important task of analysing the causes of the disaster and drawing the essential lessons from it. Too often have the workers and peasants, struggling for liberation, been betrayed by false theories, compromise and opportunism that always play into the hands of ferocious counter-revolution.

In his introduction, Joseph Hansen, editor of The Militant, further stresses the international context of the defeat. He sees it as a grave set-back both to the colonial revolution and to the international workers' movement; it magnifies the danger to the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese; it has heightened the political tensions in China, which is revealed as playing an opportunistic role in failing, no less than the Soviet Union, to criticise the policies of the PKI in Indonesia - fathered indeed by Stalinism.

Ernest Mandel underscores the failure of the PKI leadership to prepare the workers and peasants for the take over of power by armed struggle, basing its fatal tactics on a false assessment of the nature of the state in a country nominally independent, but still economically strangled for the profits of imperialism. Peasants are still landless, workers hungry for employment, because the real master is still imperialism and its local agents. These are problems that the workers and peasants must grapple with in Africa, Latin America and Asia. The Statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International amplifies the erroneous tactics of the PKI leaders who boasted about their close collaboration with the Indonesian bourgeoisie and its spokesman, the demagogue, Sukarno. Inside the facade of what was falsely designated a "people's state", the reactionary forces: the army generals, the comprador bourgeoisie and semi-feudal landowners made their preparations for unleashing terror and repression.

T. Soedarso's analysis of PKI policy is relentlessly forthright; it betokens the determination of the young sector to utilize the lessons of this grim misdirection that left the people completely unprepared. "The most fundamental error," he writes, "was that the PKI believed that socialism could be achieved by peaceful means." Again and again they seized property of the foreign imperialists, or occupied plantations and factories, only to be driven out by the Sukarno regime, with the help of the army. Yet the PKI leadership restrained this militancy with the treacherous slogans of "agreement through consultation" and "a United National Front" with the "national" bourgeoisie. It was not a revolutionary front led by the workers; it was collaboration, with the initiative in the hands of the enemy. Repudiation of the armed struggle of workers and peasants - he writes - was a PKI policy as far back as 1945, when, in the newly proclaimed republic under Sukarno, the people's armed units were disbanded. Even after the coup of October, 1966, the PKI issued no clear directives to the people.

However, "the revolutionary movement has not been destroyed - it cannot be," writes Soedarso. The present corrupt regime can solve none of the country's problems. The workers themselves are mounting armed resistance in Central Java and other islands - and they have learned a grim lesson.

No matter how you look at it, war is good business for capitalists. With initial reports in on earnings for most American corporations in 1966, it is evident that profits in the war industries outpaced profits in the rest of the economy by almost three times. And this is true despite the fact that profits for the economy as a whole reached new highs in 1966. According to the February 4th 'Business Week', corporate profits for 1966 were roughly 8.1% higher than corporate profits for 1965, in America as a whole. During the same period, wages for workers in manufacturing industries increased only 4.1%; and if you take into consideration rising prices and higher taxes, the purchasing power of many workers actually declined last year. The accompanying table shows the profit increases and volume of war production for 20 of the 30 prime war contractors as ranked by 'Business Week', December 3rd. These figures are based on preliminary reports which may be revised before these corporations issue final 1966 figures later this spring. (I did not have comparable figures for the other 10 top war contractors in 'Business Week's listing. Profit figures for instance, were available for Kaiser Industries, ranked 13, and Raytheon Co., ranked 16; but I was unable to estimate the volume of war contracts in these two companies. Raytheon marked a 67% profit jump last year, and Kaiser Industries a fantastic 900%.)

Even so, the picture emerging from these 20 corporations is significant. The average profit increase was higher than 20%, compared with the 8.1% for the economy as a whole. And with two exceptions, the rule was, the more the contracts, the higher the profit rate. The exceptions were two aircraft corporations, United and Boeing. Both of these giants actually recorded sales increases in 1966, but their profits declined, largely because they invested large sums in new plants and machinery. The other three corporations in the table which showed declining profits were mainly hit by recession of sales of consumer items which began late last year. Both General Motors and Ford sold fewer cars in 1966 than in 1965. And both corporations would have done a good deal worse if it hadn't been for their substantial government contracts. If you narrow it down to corporations which do over 50% of their total business with the government, marked by "A" in the diagram, the profit story was even more spectacular. For these ten corporations, profit increases averaged 32% in 1966!

Why do war industries do so well? The answer is simple: they have a guaranteed market and guaranteed high prices. Last year's sales were spurred to new highs by the escalation of the war; and prices were spurred to new highs by profit hungry corporations. In one industry after another the story was the same: "Martin Marietta Corporation realised a 21.1% increase in profits last year", the 'New York Times' reported, "on a sales increase of 11.1%." Of course, factual details on the concrete prices of weapons and quantities sold are nearly impossible to get since they are classified by the Pentagon. In the coming year, it is apparent that Washington is planning a large increase in its budget for aircraft. But it is another matter to determine how much of this reflects an escalation of the war and how much reflects an escalation of prices.

Senator Richard Russell, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, stated in a Senate debate on February 24th: "The value of aircraft lost in fiscal year 1966 (ending last June) is estimated to be 900 million dollars. The estimated value of aircraft lost in fiscal year 1967, some of which, of course, lies ahead, is estimated to be 1.6 billion dollars." Cont'd on page 16