

MARXIST YOUTH JOURNAL



Service d'ordre I.C.R.

For A
Revolutionary
Youth
Organisation



Vol. 1
N° 3 1/-

EDITORIAL

The problems of the student movement in Britain are not unique, though exacerbated by the comparatively low degree of radicalisation among British students. Although the student movement internationally has established itself in the vanguard of the reviving revolutionary struggles in the advanced capitalist countries and in Eastern Europe as well as in the Third World, it has grave weaknesses. These stem basically from the transient and unstable milieu in which it exists and from its isolation from the workers movement. For a new rise of the student movement on an international scale after the decline which followed the spontaneous upsurges of the late 1960's these weaknesses must be corrected. The student movement must have a clear understanding of its own nature and its potential, a programme which can take it forward, an appreciation of the relationship between itself and the workers' movement, and forms of organisation which can minimise its intrinsic weaknesses.

The student movement is a Product of the conjuncture between the general crisis of bourgeois society and its ideology in particular and the specific crisis in the structures of higher education under neo-capitalism. But the contradictions which manifest themselves in the bourgeois education system cannot be resolved within its limits. The bourgeois university is an integral part of the society, and can only be destroyed in the context of the overthrow of that society. Thus, without confronting capitalist society as a whole the student movement is doomed to increasingly sterile activity within the confines of the university. Such activity will either lead into the blind alleys of purely ideological criticism, or economistic student reformism, or towards ultra-left confrontationist adventures.

To expand the struggle against the bourgeois university into a struggle against the capitalist system, the Fourth International advances the concept of the Red University. This concept has nothing in common with the various theories as to the possibility of the university becoming some kind of "liberated zone", an island of socialism within a sea of capitalism. It is a tactic of revolutionaries within the university which has as its objective the permanent mobilization of the maximum number of students in struggle against the capitalist system. This will incorporate the struggle against bourgeois ideology, the battle for student control, the combating of the increasing subordination of the university to capitalist interests, and the mobilising of support for workers struggles and anti-imperialist movements.

But the tactic of the red university is only a means of mobilising students against the capitalist system. It only has meaning within the context of a comprehensive anti-capitalist strategy centered on the working class. For students to play a full part in such a strategy means the unity of the student vanguard with the workers vanguard organically, in a revolutionary organisation. Ideally this would be in the revolutionary vanguard party off the British working class. The absence of such a party, and the bureaucratic nature of the existing workers organisations, presents serious problems. In our opinion the immediate necessity is the unity of student revolutionaries with the increasingly radicalised worker youth, who are generally independent of the labour and Communist parties and the Trade Union bureaucracy. This means the creation of a revolutionary organisation among the youth, which would possess both programmes for the immediate struggles of students, young workers and school students and an overall political analysis and perspective

in which to educate its militants. The International Marxist Group supports the creation of such an organisation which could become an effective instrument of revolutionary politics in Britain, and an important element in the creation of a vanguard organisation of the British working class.

PERMANENT REVOLUTION OR REVOLUTION BY STAGES ?

After the revolution of 1905 a big discussion opened in the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. In the light of the first Russian Revolution it attempted to define the strategy of proletarian struggle. What was the future of the Russian Revolution ? What would be the political tasks ? What would be the motivating forces. What would be the objective role of the proletariat in the revolution ? Which tactical alliances should the Russian workers' movement adopt ?

Three fundamental positions emerged in the course of the debate: these were the position of Plekhanov and the majority of the Mensheviks, the position of Lenin and the Bolsheviks, and the position of Leon Trotsky.

The Menshevik Position: Revolution by Stages

For Plekhanov, the theoretician of Menshevism, the evolution of Russian society was similar to the model of the great states of Western Europe. Russia would experience a "1789" and the "third estate" - bourgeoisie, workers, peasants - would overthrow Tsarist autocracy and establish a bourgeois democratic republic. Freed from its feudal carcass, the Russian economy would experience a rapid growth. Industrialisation would shake up the social structure of the country. The mass of the peasantry would rapidly come to swell the proletariat of the towns, and the working class would soon become the most numerous class. Then the hour of socialist revolution would sound. Thus the coming revolution would be a bourgeois revolution led by the capitalist bourgeoisie i.e. The workers would be an active element in the insurrection, for they were interested in the victory of the bourgeoisie over Tsarism. They should not, however, risk deterring the bourgeoisie from its historical role. The workers' insurrectionary activities of 1905-6 were a grave error. They frightened the bourgeoisie, isolated the proletariat and led to defeat. Just as in France, where nearly a century separated the bourgeois revolution of 1789 from the workers' uprising of the Commune, the whole of an historical epoch separated the Russian bourgeois revolution from the socialist revolution.

The Leninist Position: Uninterrupted Revolution.

Lenin opposed the Menshevik point of view on the basis of the experience of 1905. The Russian bourgeoisie wished to rid themselves of the Tsar. But they feared the young and combatative Russian proletariat even more than they feared the Tsarist autocracy. In 1905, when it looked as if the Tsar would agree to some concessions, the bourgeoisie had broken with the workers' movement and had retreated. From beginning to end it was the Russian proletariat which had led the movement.

The Russian working class would accomplish the bourgeois revolution despite the defection of the bourgeoisie, provided that it formed an alliance with the peasantry. A bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia would stimulate the working class of Western Europe who would initiate the conquest of power. The victory of socialist revolution in the West would reinforce the Russian workers and pose to them the tasks of the proletarian revolution. The Russian revolution would be an "uninterrupted" revolution. The condition for its success was a solid party of the working class, completely free of political ties with the bourgeoisie, and correctly allied to the peasantry. "The democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry - that was the strategic formulation of Lenin.

TROTSKY'S POSITION: PERMANENT REVOLUTION

Leon Trotsky was the sole Social Democratic leader who saw who would play the decisive role in the revolution of 1905. For him determining the class nature of the revolution was not a matter of the mechanical application of the so-called Marxist schemas, but of a concrete analysis of the relationship of class forces in Russia. The development of capitalism in Russia was initiated under the aegis of the Tsarist state and with the aid of foreign capital. A modern working class had come on the scene while the bourgeoisie was still embryonic. In fact, for these historical reasons, the Russian bourgeoisie constituted a still-born infant. Tied to the landlords and the administrative bureaucracy, the bourgeoisie would rejoin the reaction which it appeared to menace. The peasantry constituted a considerable revolutionary force. When set in motion it would break the feudal agrarian relationships which held it down. But the peasantry could not constitute an autonomous political force. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry would continue the programme of the agrarian revolution - under the leadership of the proletariat.

The Russian working class was the only class capable of leading the bourgeois revolution. Allied with the peasantry it would seize power in order to carry out the bourgeois democratic tasks of the revolution. But the proletariat in power would not be able to stop at the democratic stage of the revolution. It would inevitably be brought to enact a whole series of socialist measures.

"In an economically backward country, the proletariat can find itself in power earlier than in an advanced capitalist country. The Russian revolution has brought together the conditions which will permit the proletariat to take power before the politicians of bourgeois liberalism have the opportunity to deploy all their resources"

(Results and Prospects 1905)

The victory of the proletariat in Russia would stimulate the class struggle in all the countries of capitalist Europe. It would constitute the starting point of the world revolution.

THE PARTIES FACE UP TO DUAL POWER

The Revolution of February 1917 was not foreseen and for that reason not prepared for by any of the workers' parties in Russia. The war had exacerbated all the contradictions of Tsarist society. The decomposition of the army was aided by working class agitation. The Petrograd proletariat and the soldiers of the garrison overthrew the Tsar without waiting for directives. At the time of the unleashing of the uprising the political organisations were unprepared: but they quickly prepared for the aftermath of Tsarism.

The workers - bolsheviks, mencheviks, social revolutionaries etc. - echoed the voice of 1905; in each factory, in every area, they formed soviets - new local powers. Delegates from the soviets met at the Tauride Palace to form the central power - the Petrograd Soviet.

The bourgeois liberal deputies formed a "provisional government", which they claimed to be the only legitimate authority. The working class insurgents recognised only the power of the Soviet, emanating directly from the workers and soldiers. The bourgeoisie, and reaction as a whole, rallied to the provisional government. Two central authorities - representing opposing classes - faced each other.

Only the Soviet was recognised by the masses: it possessed all the power and all the authority. But its leaders refused to sweep out the bourgeois politicians who had proclaimed the "Provisional Government". But the Soviet leaders were Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries. They analysed the significance of dual power from the point of view of the strategic line of their own parties: for them, the Russian Revolution was a bourgeois revolution. The task of leadership lay with the bourgeoisie. The Provisional Government, in the hands of the Cadets, alone could exercise the power to complete the tasks of the Revolution. The soviets were considered to be only workers' instruments to aid the bourgeois revolution. The two powers co-existed and co-operated together in calling for free elections to form a constituent assembly. But in the meantime the official state power was the Provisional Government.

It was this conciliatory attitude which Lenin characterised, upon his return to Russia as a "voluntary relinquishing of state power to the bourgeoisie" and attacked the line of the Bolshevik Party, in his absence under the leadership of Muralov, Kamenev and Stalin. At the national conference of 28th March 1917 Stalin declared that the Provisional Government was in fact in the hands of the Soviet, and had adopted the role, albeit hesitatingly, of consolidator of the conquests of February.

As soon as he arrived on the Russian soil, Lenin engaged in a merciless polemic against the orientation of the Bolshevik Party in Petrograd. For Lenin, the Provisional Government was nothing but an instrument of reaction which should be combatted without mercy.

Part 2 of this article, on Dual Power and the Bolshevik Party will be published in the next issue.

Essential Reading for all Militants

Permanent Revolution and Results and Prospects - Trotsky

The Revolution Betrayed - Trotsky

The Revolutionary Student Movement - Mandel

From Pioneer Bookshop, 8 Toynbee St., London E.1.

SEND FOR FREE CATALOGUE

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution

Phil Hearse

A key factor in the popularisation of Maoism on an international scale has been the so-called Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution (GPCR). Even those who completely reject Mao's organisational ideas have often been drawn closer to Maoism because of what they believe to be the purpose of the GPCR.

From about 1965 onwards the bourgeois press used the GPCR as a further means of attacking the Chinese revolution. Incidental phenomena, such as Red Guard attacks on "bourgeois culture", were seized upon to mystify the real significance of the upheaval taking place.

This attitude on the part of the bourgeois press may have been an important factor in the subsequent development and popularisation of a "counter-theory" of the GPCR amongst a wide layer of the revolutionary left. This theory, crudely stated, holds that the GPCR was in fact a largely spontaneous upheaval of the Chinese masses (although admittedly inspired and promoted by Mao) against bureaucracy and "the rightists" (led by Liu Shao Chi). In slightly differing forms, this theory has been advanced by left wing intellectuals such as Joan Robinson, Moravia, Karol - and in New Left Review by Bill Jenner.

Perhaps the most abject piece of Maoist apologetics to have emerged from the "non-engaged" left intelligensia is Joan Robinson's "Cultural Revolution in China". Nowhere in her book is there the slightest attempt to place any political struggles against the background of the contradictions of Chinese society and the pressure of social forces; her book is a very good example of the idealist method in historical analysis.

This article will attempt to argue that:

- a) In order to defend the Chinese revolution against the crude distortions of the bourgeois press it is not necessary to engage in any brand of apologetics; indeed defence of the Chinese revolution can only suffer at the hands of such apologetics. (Mrs. Robinson's book is remarkably similar in attitude to the Webbs' attempts to come to grips with Soviet society in the thirties)
- b) the GPCR, far from being an attempt to carry on the struggle against re-grouping counter-revolutionaries and bureaucrats, was in fact the direct result of disagreements amongst the Chinese leadership about the course of action to be taken in resolving the major contradictions in the Chinese economy
- c) the GPCR was initiated by Mao Tse Tung because he was defeated in the Central Committee of the Party; and in attempting to re-establish his hegemony Mao in the first instance appealed not to the proletariat, but to those most loyal to him - the army and the youth trained in the cult of Mao
- d) despite the reasons for the initiation of the GPCR it transcended the limitations marked out for it by the Maoist leadership and gave genuine expression to the frustrations and anti-bureaucratic sentiments of Chinese youth
- e) the struggle was resolved - after considerable dislocation - by a partial victory for the Maoist section of the bureaucracy

f) in the course of the struggle small groups of militants - loyal to revolutionary socialism but critical of the bureaucratised nature of Chinese society - did come together and publish manifestos. The real nature of what these groups were saying was of necessity obscured by the fact that all debate had to be carried out in terms of formal loyalty to Mao Tse Tung.

g) Mao's partial victory was due to a large extent to the loyalty of the Peoples' Liberation Army, which in many ways holds the whip hand in Chinese politics.

II

Any exposition of the GPCR must start by analysing the objective contradictions in Chinese society which brought Mao into conflict with some of his fellows in the Chinese leadership (most of whom had been there for a very long time indeed) as early as 1955 or '56. Most of these spring directly from the problems of economic growth in an under-developed country - with only limited help from an industrialised country and none at all after 1960.

Any industrialising country faces the problem of the necessity both to maintain and improve agriculture to feed the growing population: to create an agricultural surplus to promote industrialisation: to invest in light industry in order that there are enough consumer goods to exchange for the peasants' agricultural surplus; and to start investment in heavy industry. Precisely what should the relationship between industry and agriculture be?

In the Soviet Union there were two main erroneous approaches to this problem - the ultra-right policy of "Bukharinism" in the period following N.E.P., and the ultra-left policy of Stalinism in its post-1929 phase. Trotsky and the left opposition took a mid-course between these two extremes. The implication of Trotsky's position, first expounded systematically in The New Course (1923) is that a much greater emphasis must be placed on light industry and the production of consumer goods than is admitted by the schema of Stalinism - which placed the main emphasis on heavy industry and an extremely severe approach to the peasantry in order to wring surpluses out of them.

The Soviet situation in the twenties and thirties is not completely analogous to that in China in the fifties and sixties. Arguably it would have been more rational for the Chinese to place even greater emphasis on light industry than Trotsky advocated for the USSR. After all the industrial base from which China started was much weaker than that from which the USSR started.

But the Chinese, in the event, faithfully reproduced the Soviet model of development: despite the Mao-Stalin split on the practice of the Chinese revolution, the Chinese CP had not transcended Stalinism on an ideological level. In the first five year plan (FYP) - 1952-1957 - both light industry and agriculture suffered at the expense of heavy industry (which received over 60% of state investment).

Although it is incontestable that by creating a national market for food the Chinese regime had objectively solved the problem of feeding the population, this gain was in the mid-fifties severely threatened by the rate of population growth. One indication of the neglect of agriculture - and its corollary, the neglect of light industry - was the fact that during the first FYP the agriculture labour force

increased by 75 millions while only 6.2% of the state investments went into agriculture. The task of providing consumer goods for the peasantry is directly related to the political task of winning them to the idea of the socialisation of agriculture. The failure of the Chinese leadership to encourage light industry resulted in a continuation of individualistic attitudes on the part of the peasantry. A further source of dissatisfaction was the lack of employment opportunities for those who, for the first time, had received the benefits of education.

At the end of the five year plan Mao made a decisive attempt to break out of these contradictions: the Peoples' Communes and the Great Leap Forward. The Peoples' Communes were a massive attempt to collectivise agriculture without providing the peasantry with any material incentives: their central task was the provision of labour for water conservancy work. Private plots were abolished or reduced to a minimum: even the relatively high level of revolutionary enthusiasm of the Chinese masses was neutralised by this massive upheaval.

The Peoples' Communes were accompanied by the 'Blossom and Contend' movement (1957). The 'Blossom and Contend' movement, aimed at creating at least a limited debate on the significance of the failures of the first FYP, gave rise to a great wave of opposition, which was ruthlessly clamped down on from June 1957 onwards.

The Great Leap Forward (June 1958 - July 1959) was a novel attempt to utilise the whole population in industrialisation; it was accompanied by a further drive to push all the peasantry into the Peoples' Communes. It was aimed at communalising totally the peasantry within a five year period: by the end of five years not only would all the peasantry be members of the Communes in a formal sense - but every aspect of their lives would be communalised. Needless to say, all this was accompanied by much dissatisfaction and resulted in acts of individualistic peasant resistance - precipitating a crisis in agriculture which reached its peak in the summer of 1959. At about the same time it became clear that the Great Leap Forward had also failed: the backyard steel production campaign had led to the production of a great deal of very inferior steel at the cost of great dislocation - it is not even certain that it resulted in a net investment

III

It was in 1959 that the differences inside the Chinese leadership came to a head, with the opposition of the Peng Teh Huai tendency, which was defeated at the Central Committee plenum in August 1959 (the "Lushan Conference"). Peng Teh Huai, until 1959 defence minister, argued for a retreat in the industrialisation programme, and following from this a decrease in the amount of agricultural surplus appropriated from the peasantry.

The defeat of Peng Teh Huai was followed by the opposition of the Teng-To - Wu Han tendency (these were not so much party leaders as prominent intellectuals), who attempted to defend Peng Teh Huai. The next serious opposition group to emerge was Peng Chen's group in the middle-sixties. The precise nature of Peng Chen's opposition to Mao is not clear, because none of the charges against him were made explicit, and none of his

internal party writings ever made public. It has been assumed by many that he demanded a democratisation of the party. But there is no evidence to suggest that he supported the criticisms of Peng Teh Huai and the Teng To - Wu Han group.

The major challenge to Mao's leadership came at the August 1966 Plenum of the Central Committee, and led by Liu Shao Chi and Teng Hsiao-ping. Once again we cannot be fully sure of the nature of the opposition, but it is generally assumed that Liu Shao Chi was afraid that Mao was on the verge of repeating the catastrophic experiences of the Great Leap Forward and the early days of the Communes.

IV

The foreign policy of the Chinese CP is very contradictory. On the one hand it is obviously well to the left of the Russian CP. The Chinese have provided material support for struggles on their borders (Burna, the Nagas, Vietnam). They have done nothing which can be compared with the Russian actions in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Nevertheless, their inability to break out of the Stalinist straight-jacket has been a key factor in the most catastrophic defeat the revolutionary movement has suffered in the post-war world - namely the massacre of the Indonesian Communist Party in 1965-66. The Chinese leadership was under the tutelage of Mao: both the general strategic conceptions of the PKI and specific tactics were handed down from Peking. Everywhere the Chinese leadership have found "friendly" petty-bourgeois nationalist regimes, they have prevented their followers there from adopting a revolutionary position. Indonesia was no exception. The defeat of the PKI was a grave blow to the international prestige of the Chinese, and indisputably one of the reasons for dispute inside the leadership of the CCP.

The relationship between the Soviet Union and China has for a long time been a source of dispute between the Chinese leadership. While it is indisputable that many of the Chinese criticisms of the Russians are correct, and that the action of the Soviet Union in withdrawing aid from China was a criminal one - equally Mao's sectarian approach to the problem has tended to exacerbate it. The best example of this is the Chinese refusal to form a united front in support of Vietnam.

V

The brief sketch above cannot do full justice to the differences within the Chinese CP: a full analysis of these differences is anyway rendered impossible by the Maoists' suppression of the views of their opponents. But a number of points should be made in conclusion:

- a) Mao's opponents did not consist of one homogenous opposition, but of different groups with different criticisms
- b) None of the opposition groups were anti-bureaucratic in the sense that they stood for the lessening of the power of the opposition as a whole.
- c) It is extremely difficult to classify any of the opposition groups as being more or less reactionary than Mao.

VI

Although the Cultural Revolution was launched prior to the formal split between Mao and Liu Shao Chi, it is quite evident that the differences had been emerging for some time. The actual point of the unleashing of the Red Guards movement was the launching of the "big character posters" campaign at Peking University in June 1966. The response to the Red Guards movement was overwhelming: even given the fact that the educational institutions had been closed down it is necessary to give an explanation of this response. The explanation can only be that wide sections of the Chinese youth felt frustrated by bureaucracy, lack of opportunities etc. When Mao said "Bombard the headquarters", he really meant "Bombard the headquarters of Liu Shao Chi". But the Red Guards, despite their excesses and despite their universal expression of rebellion in terms of loyalty to Liu Shao Chi Mao, did undertake criticism of bureaucrats, high and low, Maoist and non-Maoist. Anyone who has read the eye-witness reports of the struggles between the Red Guard factions cannot fail to accept that the Red Guard movement gave genuine expression to differences and genuine opportunity for debate.

Mao's ability to mobilise the Red Guards was a great success for him in trying to turn the tables on his opponents who had forced him to compromise at the August 1966 plenum. But it was a double-edged success. First, Mao had not anticipated the diverse issues which would be taken up by the Red Guards. Second, the activities of the Red Guards alienated sections of the bureaucracy whose support Mao needed. Third, the Red Guards were fomenting a general crisis into which the working class and the peasantry could have been pulled. The change of attitude towards the Red Guards on the part of the Maoist faction can be dated at or around the beginning of 1967. Mao decided to launch the "Triple alliance" - revolutionary organisations (e.g. pro-Mao Red Guards), party cadres and the army. What the triple alliance in fact meant was the massive intervention by the army on Mao's behalf. Joan Robinson has some interesting words to say on this subject:

"The adventure of launching the revolution and allowing the popular movement to boil up as it might was not so dangerous as it might seem, for all the while the PLA was at hand, in case things should go wrong....(at) the end of Jan. '67 the PLA was openly brought on the scene and instructed to support the left."

The intervention of the army does not necessarily mean that Mao's victory has been total. In marked contrast to Stalinist Russia, Mao's enemies have not been murdered and sent to labour camps. Equally, although Mao may have secured an effective compromise amongst the differing sections of the bureaucracy which leaves him, together with Lin Biao, in command, this does not mean that Mao has total freedom of action.

VII

The Chinese Revolution was an incredible feat of self-activity on the part of the Chinese masses. The length of the Chinese revolutionary experience meant that an enormous body of experience of self-organisation was built up. The contradiction between this experience, this tradition, and the bureaucratised structure of the Chinese CP is the main grounds for optimism about the future of the Chinese Revolution: a genuine political revolution may not be too far away.

A reply to the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals statement "University development in the 1970s".

by J. Peters.

The growing conflict between students and junior lecturers on the one hand, and College Authorities on the other - as shown by Guildford, Hornsey and L.S.E. - has its roots in the Government's policies.

Some years ago the Government produced a plan for the modernisation of higher education under the title of the "Robbins Report". This plan required an expansion of facilities in higher education - expanding the older universities, building new ones, increasing student numbers and halls of residence. So far the Government has implemented (over implemented) only one proposal - increased student numbers.

On the following points Robbins has been ignored, and in practice rejected. 1. Staff/student ratios have not been maintained, rather they have deteriorated. 2. Research facilities have not been maintained. Today there is little or no money available from the university to finance research. 3. The demand of Robbins that "more teaching should be undertaken in small classes" has been completely abandoned. 4. The required number of new universities has not been built. 5. Many university departments are now in debt - and unless they receive extra cash they will they will be forced to make further cuts. 6. Refectory prices and halls of residence fees continually increase. 7. There has been a decisive cut-back in the numbers of halls of residence required by even the present student population let alone for the increase.

The crux of the latest Government proposals are an exact parallel with its notorious Incomes Policy. Educational productivity is to be increased by cutting back the "cost" per unit student while increasing the output of graduates and technicians. Grants, wages and salaries are held down while prices rocket upwards. Working conditions plummet, whether through having no place to sit during lectures, or because of increased work load.

The university Vice-Chancellors have, in principle, accepted the Government's proposals and in this have betrayed the interests of both students and lecturers. They have implemented an enormous student expansion with inadequate funds. The ever-increasing demands of the monopolists for more technocrats, administrators and social scientists in order to revitalize their decaying system has led to a massive expansion in student population. The system is, however, incapable of meeting the needs of the expanding university population which it itself created.

As a result we have a racist policy towards overseas students regarding hall fees. At L.S.E. the authorities sack lecturers and students who oppose Government policies, while Adams and Frederick Seebohm of the Standing Committee of Governors get knighthoods.

Having accepted the Government's policies the Vice-Chancellors are forced to take autocratic disciplinary measures against those who oppose them. The future of education is too important to be left to be worked out as a deal between the Government, Vice-Chancellors and Student Union Presidents. Students themselves must have a decisive say in their own future.

2. THE PROPOSALS.

Each and every one of the Government's proposals is part of a plan whose declared purpose is to cut both the number of students at universities, and the living and working conditions of those students left. Because of this it is suicidal to discuss this or that proposal as better or worse than the others. Or whether this one is acceptable while that one is not. We must reject the whole concept of the plan and in doing so uncompromisingly resist each and every proposal.

However, it is necessary to outline the implications in each point, so-moving from the general to the specific, let us consider the points.

- (i) A reduction or removal of student grant aid, coupled with a system of loans.
- (ii) A similar policy at postgraduate level only.

These meet all three of the Government's basic plans for university education. Economy, in that something like 15million pounds a year would be saved in 1980/81 - less than one tenth of the cost of a modern nuclear submarine! Students would be dissuaded from entering university at the prospect of being burdened with a relatively large debt on graduation(and of course, the poorer student will have to bear in mind that if he is chucked out of college his parents could be lumbered with a heavy financial burden). Also they ensure that research would have to be financed by industry, which means that those projects (artistic, biological, medical, etc.) which did not offer immediate return would suffer severely.

- (iii) A more restrictive policy as regards the admission of foreign students.

Remembering that 60% of overseas students are privately financed we see this proposal for what it really is; - racist to the core! It further shows the absolute lack of principle of ~~this~~ this Labour Government.

- (iv) The requirement that grant aided students should enter specified kinds of employment for a period ~~of~~ after graduation, which might have the effect of reducing applications.

It certainly would! This is an attack on the basic right of the individual to decide his own life. But in its period of decline the capitalist system has to turn on the very basics of its own philosophy! The "freedom of the individual" counts for nothing when the profits of the monopolists are in question. Driven as it is by the needs of an historically doomed system the Labour Government is forced to propose direct state intervention in a way that would not have been conceivable even five years ago.

- (v) Greater use of part-time and correspondence courses as alternatives to full-time courses.

- (vi) The possibility that the most able should have the opportunity to complete a degree course in two years.

- (vii) The possibility ~~that~~ of some students not proceeding to a three year course, but to a two year one with a different qualification.

- (viii) The possible insertion of a period between school and university which would give school leavers a better opportunity to formulate their views as to whether or not they wished to proceed to some form of higher education.

These four points have two things in common, first they are aimed at cutting down the student population, and secondly to steer the majority of students to increasingly less vocational training.

Of all the demands these raise most clearly the question of what education is for in this society. Are we to consider ourselves merely as fodder whose job it is to run the ruling classes industries as smoothly and as profitably as possible? Or has education something to do with human beings, to do with benefitting humanity, human endeavour and achievement?

Perhaps the employers will eventually propose aptitude tests at a tender age, in order that we should be saved from the worry of deciding our own future with suitable punishments if we refuse, and incentives (i.e. non-imposition of the punishment) if we agree.

- (ix) The more intensive use of buildings and equipment, including re-organization of the academic year.

This hardly needs comment - instead of merely sitting in the aisles during lectures let's take out the seats and stand up! As for the academic year, a working party has already been set up to examine the four term year. The Box and Cox expansion scheme, by which student intake is increased by 20% with no parallel increase in expenditure and by which students alternate five weeks in college with five weeks at home.

- (x) More sharing of facilities between adjacent institutions.

Sharing to economise of course, not to allow decent but unpopular courses to exist.

(xi) More home based students.

This would mean that choice of university, and consequently of course, would be determined by geographical considerations, not on the candidates desires or suitability. Working class students, who tend to come from crowded urban areas, are thus limited to already overcrowded institutions.

(xii) The development of student housing associations, and other forms of loan-financed provision for student residence.

These "student housing associations" might sound a good thing, but really they will only place another huge debt on the students' shoulders. It would also mean that students would be forced to look for the cheapest possible lodgings, and consequently put up with facilities that would be incomparably worse than even the present inadequate ones.

(xiii) Some further increase in student/staff ratios.

Note: further increase! But who wants to have a tutor, or talk to a lecturer anyway? Perhaps the authorities intend installing closed-circuit television, and having only one lecturer for each subject per university?

We can only fight these proposals if we oppose their underlying motivation. We must counterpose to them a programme of demands that both answer the problems students face and at the same time expose the essence of the present educational system.

PROPOSED DEMANDS.

That all college principals reject the document "University development in the 1970s" in its entirety.

That all college fees, halls of residence fees, and refectory prices be frozen, with overseas students paying no more than any other student.

That the universities be prepared to go into the red to provide satisfactory courses and facilities, and should bring pressure to bear on the Government to provide the extra finance.

That students should sit on all decisive bodies and committees of the universities and colleges, and that all meetings of these be in public. The finance in each department in a college to be controlled by a committee of undergraduates, postgraduates, staff and technicians from that department. All correspondence between the principals and the Student Union Presidents to be made public.

That the education and teaching system be reformed in such a way as to enable students to pursue their work in full health and seriousness so that they can better equip themselves to fully understand society, and to work for a just society for all mankind.

That there be full civil liberties for all students. Freedom of speech, assembly, petition and travel and the right to demonstrate against Government or university injustice without reprisal. Also there be freedom of political association for all students and lecturers,

That all spying on students, whether by police or college authorities stop at once. The full autonomy of student unions in every university or college. No control of student unions and their rights by university authorities. No state control of student bodies.

That all ties between the universities and the military be broken. Abolish all secret and classified research by the universities on behalf of warfare.

That there be a vigorous fight in every university and college to ensure that the present NUS leadership carries on an all-out fight for an immediate increase in grants. If this leadership fails to carry out this task then campaign to replace them with a leadership which will place the interests of the ordinary student before its own.

Israel and Zionism have aroused considerable sympathy on the left in Britain. Israel is supported against the Arabs because of the guilt and sympathy that the left feels towards the Jews, because of the mass murders of Nazism. Zionists have played on these feelings and have directed them into a pro-Israeli position by equating Anti-Semitism and Anti-Zionism. By this method the Arabs have been made to bear the consequences of an essentially European problem.

For those on the left who need more concrete reasons the Zionist left has been able to win considerable support for Israel by stressing its "progressive" and even "socialist" character. According to the political position of the observer, Israel is seen as an outpost of Western democracy or a socialist island in a feudal and reactionary sea. This myth pictures Israel as a land of Kibbutzim, with workers' parties dominating the government and steering Israel in a socialist direction.

The holders of this view must ask themselves why, if Israel so progressive is her foreign policy so reactionary. Everywhere Israel supports the suppressors of independence and progress, as in Algeria where Israel supported the French, or Vietnam where she supports the United States. And why does Israel receive so much support from Marshall Ky and Richard Nixon. It must also be remembered that the kibbutzim (communal farms) comprise only 3% of the population and 4% of the production of Israel: Israel's prosperity is in fact received from Jews in the United States, grants from the US government, or compensation from the German government. This amounts to somewhere near £1,000 per head of the population in peak years.

It was very easy to see Israel as a progressive force in the Middle East when the forces opposing her were typified by Jordan, Saudi Arabia and even Egypt, and their policy identified from calls for a jihad (holy war) and calls for the Jews to be driven into the sea. But this situation has changed to such an extent following the June war, that many people on the left are having to reconsider their attitudes. The new element in the continuing confrontation between Jew and Arab is the Palestine Fidayeen (guerilla groups). These groups express the feeling of national identity of the Palestinian people and their strong desire for national self-determination - something which has previously been ignored by the Arab regimes who either wanted to seize Palestine territory (Jordan) or were afraid of the consequences in their own countries of allowing a national liberation struggle in Palestine (Egypt). They were only able to do this because the Palestinians believed the promises of the Arab rulers to liberate Palestine. The June War showed decisively their inability to do this. The choice which faced the Palestinians after the Arab defeat was either to give up all hope of returning to their homeland or to take up the struggle themselves. The rise of the Fidayeen shows that they have taken the road of national liberation.

In my article I will try to show that the struggle of the Palestinian people against Zionism is inseparable from the struggle against imperialism in the middle east in general and that Zionism is closely associated with imperialist aims in the area. I will try to show that the struggle, which in essence is a struggle for national rights and independence, when it becomes a socialist revolution - a permanent

It was very easy to see Israel as a progressive force in the Middle East when the forces opposing her were typified by Jordan, Saudi Arabia and even Egypt, and their policy identified from calls for a jihad (holy war) and calls for the Jews to be driven into the sea. But this situation has changed to such an extent following the June

Any analysis of the nature of Zionism must begin by looking

at its origins. Zionism is essentially a reaction to European anti-semitism. It aims at establishing a national Jewish home in Palestine where the Jews can escape from

persecution. Since the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 there has probably always been a small Jewish community in Palestine, and Jewish Jews of the Diaspora have always

dreamed of their restoration by the will of God, the of the temple and the Kingdom of David, by the 19th century the majority of Jews had come to regard these ideas as part of

religious myth and not a practical proposition. Jews had become increasingly secularised and integrated into Western society. However, there was a growth of anti-semitism in

the late 19th century typified by the Dreyfus affair. This has a shock effect on many Jews who for perhaps the first time came to realize their Jewishness. One of those was

Theodor Herzle, the founder of political Zionism, who was himself a highly integrated Jew. He became convinced that anti-semitism was an hereditary aberration of humanity in

Europe. In his own words "In Paris, as I have said, I achieved a freer attitude towards anti-semitism, which I began to understand historically, and to pardon. Above all

I recognized the emptiness and futility of trying to combat anti-semitism". Another quote, this time from Y.L. Pinsker, the founder of Zionism's ideology shows us the essential

nature of Zionism. "Now that we have grasped that Jew-baiting is a kind of hereditary demonopathy, unique to the human race, and that anti-semitism is inherent in the hereditary aberrations of the human spirit, we must draw a conclusion which is important for us, namely - we must give up

the attempt to overcome these trends of hatred, just as one must give up the attempt to overcome any other psychological hereditary trend". (Y.L. Pinsker - Auto-emancipation).

Zionism shares with anti-semitism a common premise: that Jews cannot live a normal life as a minority amongst non-Jews. I can do no better than quote Lucien Wolf, a leader

of British Jewry during the last world war, when he said of Zionism, "I've spent all my life fighting against these

views when they presented to me in the guise of anti-semitism."

In order to establish the Jewish state in Palestine the Zionists were prepared to make a deal with anyone who would help them. Herzle appealed to both the Ottoman Empire and to

Germany. He wrote to the Duke of Baden in 1898, "It is clear that the settlement of a neutral people on the shortest road to the east can be of immense importance for the German

Orient policy. And what people is meant by that? That people which.....is compelled nearly everywhere to join revolutionary parties." The British government was also approached.

Dr. Dayyin Weismann, a leading British Zionist (he was responsible for the conversion of Balfour to Zionism) in 1916

formed the 'British Palestine Committee'. The only non-Jewish member of this committee, the journalist Herbert Sidebotham, claimed that it was the needs, political and strategic of

British policy which definitely inclined the scales in favour of Zionism.

In 1917 the British issued the Balfour declaration, which announced support for the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine. This was designed to win Jewish backing of

Britain in the First World War. It was later revealed that Britain had earlier agreed to support Arab independence in the same area.

And in the Sykes-Picot treaty the British agreed to share the same area as France : These schemes were revealed by the Bolsheviks who discovered copies of secret agreements in the Czar's vaults. It was consequently not a double but a triple cross which generated the eventual collision of Jew and Arab, and which until 1948 enabled Britain to wield power in a divided Middle East.

Modern anti-semitism is rooted in the world decline of capitalism, whose national boundaries, cut-throat competition and lack of planning restricts the production forces of the world and squeezes out vulnerable nations and peoples who are too poor and weak to protect themselves. In this respect Jews have common grounds with forces the world over who have no recourse in their anti-imperialist struggle other than the path of socialist revolution.

For the Jews to try to create any sort of stable capitalist republic in the image of the classical capitalist states forged two hundred years ago was, and is, utopian. But their efforts have proved useful for the imperialist powers, who have used Zionism and Israel to divide and rule the middle east, and so have had an interest in ensuring Israel's survival. The basic Zionist aim, defined as early as 1897 - the establishment of a Jewish nation-state in Palestine characterises Zionism as a specific form of foreign domination - territorial colonialism. To achieve this aim they had to establish a decisive Jewish majority in Palestine; this caused problems because right up until 1948 the Jews were a minority in Palestine. Zionism is therefore a new form of colonialism; it aims not to exploit the native population but to remove them and replace them.

Obviously any population would resist such a movement, and the Arabs resisted Zionism all the more strongly because at the same time as the Zionists were moving into Palestine, Arab nationalism was becoming the dominant force in the area. The fight against Zionism has all along been only another aspect of the struggle against foreign domination in the area.

Western imperialism has always had a strong interest in the middle east. In the nineteenth century British policy in the area revolved around the need to defend the route to India and so British involvement in the area grew as the century progressed. In this century the interest of imperialism in the area has been oil. After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Britain and France established their control over the area by splitting it up into small states, and installing regimes sympathetic to imperialism.

After the war and the domination of U.S. imperialism over Britain and France, most of the states in the area achieved political independence. Since then imperialism's hold on the area has been achieved by an alliance between the U.S. and Arab oligarchies. This has ensured the profitable flow of Middle East oil to the West. The importance of oil to the west is demonstrated by the fact that the west will depend on oil until the last decades of the century, and that the Middle East harbours more than half of the world's total oil supply. Oil from the Middle East is by far the cheapest in the world. The cost of producing one barrel of crude oil in the middle east is 15 cents as against 1.63 dollars in the United States and 62 cents in Venezuela. As the eight giant oil companies fix prices in the world market according to the cost of production at the Gulf of Mexico, Middle East oil is really a gold mine.

Israel has become an integral part of imperialist domination of the Middle East. She provides a useful weapon to use against the Arab revolution when the ruling pro-western oligarchies fall. The joint Israeli, British and French attack on Egypt in 1956 proves this conclusively. Egypt had stepped out of line by nationalising the

Mr. D. J. S. Johnston
198. 4293
Dr. Bowden

Suez canal and by making friendly advances towards the Communist countries. A similar picture emerges from the June war. The Israeli attack came at a time when western interests were increasingly threatened and pro-Western governments on the verge of falling from power. An editorial in the Daily Telegraph a few days after the war made it clear why the west benefitted from the defeat of the Arabs. "As a result of the amazing victory by Israel, the whole balance of power in the middle east has decisively changed. The world should be profoundly grateful to Israel. President Nasser has long been a danger to the west and world peace." Israel became the main enemy of all Arabs, and so reactionary rulers were able to retain power by making anti-Israeli noises and calling for national unity in the face of the enemy.

Although the Israeli victory tipped the balance of power in the Middle East in favour of the pro-imperialist oligarchies, the main goal of the Zionist-Imperialist aggression was not achieved; the Nasserite regime in Egypt and the Baathi regime in Syria did not collapse. The Arab masses identified with the regimes which had proved to be the main enemy of their enemy, and forced Nasser to withdraw his resignation.

The most important consequence of the June war is the appearance of a Palestinian National Liberation struggle. This has radically changed the whole situation in the area. The rise of the Palestine fidayeen organisations and the rapid growth of the national consciousness of the Palestinian people is due to the rise of a new generation of Palestinians who pose the problems in a radically different way to their parents, and to disillusionment with the leadership of the anti-imperialist and anti Zionist struggle in the area; Nasserism and the Baath. Palestinians played a prominent part in these organisations in the belief that they could lead to independence from imperialism and achieve some kind of Arab unity, and then Palestine could be liberated by Arab armies. The Palestinians have now finally taken the struggle into their own hands and have come to realise that the end of Zionist occupation is only the fulfillment of their right to national-determination, and that this can only be achieved by armed struggle.

The Arab regimes see the Palestinian fidayeen as auxiliaries to their own forces, carrying out military operations behind enemy lines in order to pressure Israel into implementing the U.N. resolution. The fidayeen, of course, would not accept such a solution which did not mean the complete liberation of Palestine from Zionism. This is the essential contradiction which exists between the Arab regimes and the Palestine National Liberation Movement. The Palestinians, by taking the struggle into their own hands, have given the struggle a relative autonomy. The Arab regimes can no longer manipulate the struggle for their own ends. The nearer the "big four" powers come to imposing a "peaceful" solution on the area, the more acute becomes the contradiction between the regimes and the fidayeen and the more pressure will be put on the Arab regimes to liquidate the guerillas.

The Arab Revolution is the struggle which has been going on in the Middle East since the beginning of the century, to rid the area of foreign domination. The petit-bourgeois regimes of Syria and Egypt are the furthest points of this struggle. They have been proved incapable of achieving complete independence from imperialism or liquidating Zionism in Palestine. The growth of the Palestinian struggle marks a new stage in the Arab Revolution and provides the way ahead in both sectors of the struggle: anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist. It is the policy of Israel which is providing the concrete means of connecting the two struggles. The

classic Israeli response to the operations of the fidayeen is attack against the neighbouring Arab countries, to try to make them control the fidayeen and start negotiations. By doing so Israel is digging its own grave and that of the moderate Arab regimes as well. Each Israel raid shows the limits beyond which no Arab regime can go in opposition to Zionism. The limits are set by a common allegiance to imperialism and the inability of the petit-bourgeois regimes to achieve independence - political or economic - from imperialism. The masses ask themselves, "if our government is so opposed to Zionism why do they arrest and try to smash the Palestinian fidayeen." This has led to a situation in which the fidayeen cannot be crushed without facing the forces in the country which are most violently anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist. This is what has happened in the Lebanon recently when the bourgeois government's attempt to crush the guerillas was foiled by the Lebanese workers, peasants and students, the very groups this bourgeoisie exploits internally. The anti-Zionist struggle is merging with the class struggle.

The struggle of the Palestinian people is a national struggle and yet it has no national solution. The logic of events leads them into opposition to the Arab regimes. The victory over Zionism is conditional on the victory of the Arab revolution, which will only finally succeed when it becomes a workers and peasants revolution aiming at the establishment of an Arab Socialist Republic with full rights of self-determination for Jews and all other national minorities.

A defeat for Israel does not mean as some Zionist supporters in the west have claimed, that all Jews will be "driven into the sea." The fidayeen have made it clear that they only require the ending of Zionist domination of Palestine, Israel as the state of Jews throughout the world, and the return of the Palestinian people to their homes. In the words of the Platform of El-Fatah, the largest fidayeen group, "El-Fatah is not fighting against the Jews as an ethnic or religious community. It is fighting against the Zionist and colonialist state of Israel, with its racist, theocratic and expansionist structure."

The Middle East is one of the most important areas for imperialism. A successful socialist revolution in this area would be a great blow to imperialism and a great step forward in the fight to establish a world socialist system. It is essential that socialists in the west realise the importance of the Palestine National Liberation struggle in this process and give their complete solidarity to the Palestinian fidayeen.

Marxist Youth Journal is the youth bulletin of the IMG.

Communications to: P.Hearse, 81, Heslington Rd., York

