

INTERNATIONAL 11

February-March 1970

20 cents



REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST TENDENCY OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL



International Conference Report

New Guinea's National Revolution

Release Czech Revolutionary Socialists

Self-Management and Planning

EDITORIAL

THE COMING
COMMUNIST PARTY
CONGRESS

The Easter Congress of the CFA will undoubtedly be the most decisive one that organisation has held since its foundation

The majority National Committee Congress documents contain many valid points on which we have commented many times in past issues of INTERNATIONAL. The stress on self-management on the radicalisation of unions on the total model for socialism and socialist change, all mark a radical change from the past policies and a break with stalinism. While that remains so, what will really count will be what happens after the Congress, even immediately after and how far Party members themselves break with the past.

There are however some basic points that must be resolved :

(1) The Congress or the Party immediately after the Congress must break openly and in a crystal-clear way with stalinism and with the Soviet bureaucracy. This is necessary not only as a formal academic exercise, but basically because no organisation and no revolutionary can really act in today's reality unless he understands past tactics and strategies and critically analyses them. Secondly, the CFA is identified with stalinist dictatorship in the minds of the masses, and only a clean public break can begin to change that. And lastly, of course stalinism is has been and will remain something totally foreign to any revolutionary worth the name.

(2) The party must undergo its own little "internal revolution" in the days after the Congress. It is impossible to continue the present paralysis and if the stalinist wing continues to obstruct then the break must come quickly. TRIBUNE should be transformed into a revolutionary, militant weekly campaigning for self-management and workers control for revolutionary unionism against reformism in all fields. The factory branches and members must begin to implement the Congress documents

Through its activism and revolutionary confidence based on the Congress documents, the Party must seek to aid initiatives to help revive the faltering student militancy and in effect the concept to struggle around self-management.

The locality branches should take the initiative in helping establish revolutionary anti-war and anti-conscription centres in suburbia to appeal to and organise the rebellious youth.

That will not be easy, nor without cost. But it is essential if the Party is after the Congress to be transformed into a revolutionary Party. Such a Party would be a major step on the road to the Australian Revolution.

19 March 1970

ANTI-APARTHEID MOVEMENT IN DIFFICULTIES

While there has been a definite revival in anti-apartheid movement in this country it still leaves much to be desired. The revival began with the visit to Australia of South African Economics Minister Haak to Australia in June last year. The thousand-strong demonstration in Sydney with a massive paste-up and distribution of some 30 000 broadsheets promised well for the future. Yet the interest aroused then by the Apartheid Protest Campaign failed to continue and the movement lapsed. CARIS mobilised some very limited forces in protest against sports tours. The most recent incident at Drummoyne Baths illustrates however the limits of the CARIS activists. While a dozen of them were handing out leaflets outside the pool student militants threw black dye into the baths effectively disrupting the trials. Yet CARIS disowned the dye throwers and even attacked the attackers. Now we have a Sharpeville Memorial Day march and meeting which is due in less than a fortnight but which has been so poorly organised by the same CARIS group that a leaflet has not been issued nor a poster pasted up. Yet it is hoped to fill the Lower Town Hall to listen to prominent speakers.

If the anti-apartheid movement which should now be a militant solidarity with the southern African guerrillas is to get off the ground then there can be no exclusiveness nor can there be a fear of audacious action. There must be an involvement at all stages of all sections of the anti-war movement and the radical parties and groups. The attempt by a minority fraction in one Party to "make a point" can only be disastrous. Perhaps around August 15 -- the date of the first major battles by ZAPU and Umkonto guerrillas in Rhodesia -- could serve as a date for effective and militant action.

Denis FRENEY 10 March 1970

SUPPORT NEW GUINEA'S NATIONAL REVOLUTION!

New Guinea, the second largest island in the world, lies completely within the tropics, between Asia and Australia (between the equator and 12° south latitude).

Its terrain includes hot, wet, swampy lowlands and snow-covered mountains. Its seasons are described as the "wet" and the "dry" (or "not so wet").

Associated with this main island are the islands of the Bismark Archipelago, Bougainville and Buha in the Solomon Islands and about 500 other small islands.

The Bismark Archipelago (or Bismark volcanic belt) includes Kairiru and Mushu off Wewak, the Schouten Islands, Manon, Karkar, Long, Umboi (Rooke) and the Vitu Group, while within the general entity are the Admiralty Islands through New Ireland, the Solomons to the New Hebrides, the Ninigo group and the Hermit Islands.

The inhabitants are Melanesian, a branch of the great Negroid group of people. The indigenous population numbers about 2,200,000, and the non-indigenous about 35,000 European and Chinese (of whom about 42% are females).

There are five physiographic regions: the South Coast, the Central Cordillera, the Northern Intermontane Trough, the Northern Mountains, and the Islands.

Some areas are sparsely settled and there are three population concentrations. The main one is on the intermontane valleys (mild, equable climate) of the Central Cordillera between Wabag and Kainantu, where nearly half of the population of the territory live.

The others are in the Meprik area of the Sepik District and on the Gazelle Peninsula of New Britain island (its northern end). This latter is the most economically developed area.

The basic social group of the indigenous people is the family; man and wife -- in some areas, wives -- and their children. Marriage is arranged by the elders and involves an exchange of valuables.

Except for the Trobriand Islanders, the New Guineans did not have an aristocratic system of hereditary leaders.

The lineage is a group of people who trace their descent from a common ancestor through named generations, either through the female line -- the matrilineal society -- as with the Tolai, or through the male line -- the patrilineal -- in the case of the Motu.

There are several lineages in every village, the leader of each being a senior man who has attained his position through his efforts and ability. These leaders are always men. The village may comprise up to 600 people.

The leaders meet in a village council (in Pidgin, a kivung) to make decisions concerning the land to be used in each gardening cycle.

Village land rights are jealously guarded. Each lineage has a number of small plots dispersed throughout the gardening land of the village. But the produce of each plot goes to the family which planted it -- the family has a usufructory interest in the land.

After use each plot lies fallow for 9 or 10 years before being planted again.

Subsistence gardening is the main occupation of the villagers. They are also occupied with fishing, hunting, gathering from the forest, trade, barter.

The great bulk of the adult population is still illiterate and uneducated. There are over 500 languages and not one is spoken by even 5% of the population.

COLONIALISM

Holland annexed West New Guinea in 1828.

The northern part of East New Guinea was seized by Germany in 1884, and the southern part, Papua, by Britain. The Germans established a number of plantations and carried on some trade.

From being a British "protectorate" in 1884, the southern half of the island was taken into outright British possession in 1888. In 1906 authority over it was transferred to the new Commonwealth of Australia and the name changed from British New Guinea to Papua.

With the defeat of German imperialism in the 1914-18 world war, Australian imperialism seized the Territory.

Under the Expropriation Ordinance (1920) the great proportion of Germans were driven out of New Guinea and their plantations and business interests were taken over by the Australian Government, which held the ex-enemy properties until they were disposed of to Australian owners.

They were put up for sale in 1927 to former servicemen of the Australian Military Forces, to whom generous purchase terms were given.

A Legislative Council was established in Papua in 1906 and in the Mandated Territory of New Guinea a Legislative Council and an Executive Council in 1934. They consisted of white men appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Papua or the Administrator in New Guinea.

In Papua, Village Constables were appointed as mouthpieces of the government.

The government *modus operandi* was to take a village leader, make him a petty chief, give him a badge of office and call him a *luluai* or a *lukurai*.

A second one, usually able to speak Pidgin English and thus act as an interpreter, was appointed and known as a *tultul*.

"Paramount *luluais*" were made responsible for the whole tribal group.

To secure the cheap labour required for the indentured system of employment, "blackbirders" visited the villages.

By 1926 the secret of the discovery of gold was out. The location was *Eide Creek*, a tributary of the *Bulolo River*, *Salamanda*, on the *Huon Gulf* 20 miles from *Lae*, became the beach camp-site.

(From 1920 to 1942 the Territory was administered by Australia under a mandate from the League of Nations).

Papua and New Guinea were separate Territories before World War II. Each had its own Lieutenant-Governor or Administrator and separate Public Services.

Japanese imperialism invaded New Guinea in 1942 and occupied most of the Mandated Territory for the rest of the war. After its surrender in 1945 Australia again became the Administrator or under a Trusteeship Agreement with the United Nations Organisation.

.....

The main island of New Guinea is divided politically into three parts: the western half, *West Irian*, administered by the Republic of Indonesia; the eastern half, administered by Australia, is divided into two parts, the northern part known as the Trust Territory of New Guinea and the southern part, the Territory of Papua.

Papua is under the direct authority of the Australian Government and is a territory of the Commonwealth like the Northern Territory or Norfolk Island.

The Trust Territory of New Guinea is the subject of a trusteeship agreement between the Australian Government and the United Nations Organisation.

By this agreement the Australian Government has undertaken to promote

the political, social, economic and educational welfare of the indigenous people so that they might achieve self-government or independence.

Under the Papua-New Guinea Act of 1949-66 the Australian Territory of Papua and the Trusteeship Territory of New Guinea were to be governed as one country. This is known as the Administration Union.

An Administrator, responsible for the combined Territories, was appointed head of the government in the Territory, responsible to the Minister for Territories.

In 1951 native members were appointed to the Legislative Council of Papua-New Guinea. Its location is *Port Moresby* (*Rabaul* on *Simpson Harbour* suffered volcanic outbreaks in 1878 and 1937 and ceased to be the capital of the Mandated Territory after 1937).

In 1964 the House of Assembly had:

- 10 members chosen by the Administrator;
 - 10 members from electorates in which all Territorians could be enrolled, but in which only expatriates could stand for election;
 - 44 members from electorates where any Territorian could stand (38 of these were indigenes, of whom 24 (37%) were illiterate or semi-literate).
- Each electorate contained about 45,000 voters.

In 1968 the House of Assembly consisted of 94 members -- 69 elected from the Open Electorates, 15 elected from the Regional Electorates, and 10 official members.

(The U.N. Mission led by Sir Hugh Foot in 1962 had set December 1963 as the target date for a full representative parliament -- a freely elected House of Assembly of five Australian and 100 Papuan members).

Local Government Councils were

established in 1951. In 1967 there were 132 such Councils embracing some 1,700,000 people of 7000 villages (about three-quarters of the population). Of these 73 were multi-racial.

IMPERIALISM'S DRIVE FOR PROFITS

Of the \$120 million Territory receipts in 1966-67, \$70 million came from the Australian Government.

\$19,184,000 represented the native export production, made up of:

Copra 37,000 tons (\$5,550,000); coffee 7000 tons (\$5,600,000); cocoa 5000 tons (\$1,750,000); pyrethrum 250 tons (\$84,000); other exports, including crocodile skins, gold, rubber, passion fruit and peanuts, \$6,200,000. Total \$19,184,000.

But from Australian and other non-native businesses the exports amounted to \$30.8 million.

It is to be noted that of the native exports in 1965-66 \$5 million came from the *Tolai* of New Britain of the *Gazelle Peninsula* (near *Rabaul*), who number some 50,000 people. (5000 tons of copra, 4000 tons of cocoa).

Thus 50,000 *Tolai* are responsible for \$3.05 million and 2,50,000 people for the balance of \$16.5 million.

To allow the New Guinean to continue working in his own garden gives the Australian Government no perspective of reducing its grant to New Guinea.

The Administration wants to encourage the people to grow cash crops so as then to be able to tax them.

The introduction of cash cropping particularly for the export market, and involvement of the people in the cash economy as paid workers, is the basis of the economic changes in process.

Between 16 and 20 per cent of the adult male population now work for wages, most of them away from their villages in the plantations of the Bismark Archipelago — an absence which at times seriously disrupts the village economy.

With cash cropping, the individual controls several acres. Cocoa growers need a minimum of 500 trees, requiring 2 acres. Coconuts are in the ground for 70 years, cocoa for over 30 years.

This creates a problem for the young men. The land is used by older members of the lineage for so long. When a man dies the right to the land goes, not to the sons, but to the lineage. And in matrilineage the son is not a member of his father's lineage.

The Administration plans to change the system of land tenure to one of individual ownership. In this it is making little headway in densely settled parts. The pressure on land stems from the planting of cash crops, a rapidly expanding population and the difficulty of transport.

In 1965 there were 28,325 indigenous workers employed by the Administration and 63,428 by private industry.

THE ADVANCING NATIONAL REVOLUTION

The contradiction between the Europeans having big quantities of "cargo" while they had none gave rise to the "cargo cults", first reported in 1919. Gripped by the belief that a large ship was approaching loaded with a rich cargo, the people would abandon their village and means of subsistence to await its arrival.

Growing cognizance of the great disparity between the life of the foreigners and their own proceeded, with the development of a degree of sophistication, to put New Guinea on the threshold of the great phenomenon of our time — the colonial revolution.

The seizure of land for a foreign mining company at Bougainville last year produced a hostile reaction in the native population and a more accurate appreciation of the nature of the reactionary Administration, ever-ready to use modern coercive methods such as tear gas to impress its will.

The Tolais of the Gazelle Peninsula, the most advanced of the native people, moved into action on Sunday, December 8, 1969.

Previously the Tolais of the Gazelle Peninsula asked the Administration for permission to establish a sugar industry, which was refused.

The Australian Country Party, in the person of the Minister for Territories, Mr. Barnes, is equally against such a development as it is against rice, peanuts and tropical fruit industries.

Today the Tolais have no taxi licences in Rabaul, whereas in 1939 they held the lot. Their ever-present fear is that they will be reduced to the position of the Australian aborigines through the Europeans acquiring all the land.

Whereas their local Councils had consisted only of native members, the Administration decided to enlarge the Gazelle Peninsula Council area to take in new areas, now to include European members.

The reason advanced was that the area would now include plantation areas of Europeans who would have to pay the Council tax. The Council would now be multi-racial in character.

In opposition to this the Mataungan Association was formed with thousands of New Guineans as members. The Association advocated boycott of the election, with the significant result that of 33,000 on the rolls only 6720 voted.

In Rapindik village on December 8, 1969, newly-elected members of the Council were attacked.

Strong police action was decided on, reportedly at a meeting to which no senior native police were invited, while 7 former South African police officers now in the Royal Papua-New Guinea Constabulary took part.

Over 20 members of the Mataungan Association were arrested and are now serving gaol sentences of up to 12 months.

The Association wants an all-native body of its own choosing, withheld payment of taxes to the Council, refused to join in discussions of this question, and wants the multi-racial Council destroyed and the return of alienated land.

On the same day (10.1.70 — Telegraph) that Prime Minister Gorton was claiming that the government was prepared to test by referendum that the multi-racial Council was acceptable to the majority of the Tolai people, the Administration bloc in the House of Assembly was voting against a referendum!

Socialists in Australia must discern and grasp the implications of this incipient national revolution against Australian imperialism.

The Mataungan Association is but the first of many such sizeable militant formations that will emerge in New Guinea.

It is implicitly anti-colonialist and its sentiments will be echoed throughout the country.

The recent 10,000-strong meeting outside Rabaul on Mr. Whitlam's visit gives the measure of the developing temper of the people.

The happenings in New Guinea will be a major subject of discussion in the new Australian parliament and the press.

Minister Barnes' \$15 "payment in kind"

in the shape of a lap lap, etc., will be revealed for what it is really worth and the rapacious exploiters (backed by the Australian imperialist government) of this simple people exposed in their true light — inducing Australian and international sympathy and solidarity with the people.

SELF-MANAGEMENT IN ALL SPHERES

Coincident with the forward political development now under way, the most reactionary elements of the Administration are in the ascendancy dictating a harsh, repressive reaction, while the Gorton government intervenes daily with detailed instructions on all questions.

It will not set clear goals or target dates for New Guinea and is rapidly confirming for the people the existence of only one viable road — that of the national revolution.

The army in New Guinea does not enjoy the people's respect or confidence, and its real power declines in ratio to the growing awareness of its partisan anti-patriotic role.

We are entitled to adopt the perspective that national independence for the New Guinea people through their own struggle and solidarity will not be long delayed.

This raises sharply for them and the Australian labor movement the utter fallacy of posing either the Westminster or the presidential government system as appropriate to the furthering of their legitimate aspirations.

For their struggle to be really worthwhile, self-government must be spooled out as self-management in all facets of their life, implemented through the most democratic forms they can devise.

Their problems will be the tendency towards fragmentation, tribalism, secessionism by richer islands, drift to the towns and growth of urban problems.

But history has shown that national "unity" enforced by an exploiting class or a privileged bureaucracy involves payment of too big a price for alleged progress, and that local self-determination and self-management represents the wave of the future for the political development and sophistication through which truly viable national unity will be fashioned.

DOWN WITH AUSTRALIAN IMPERIALISM!

LONG LIVE NEW GUINEA'S NATIONAL REVOLUTION!

SELF-MANAGEMENT AT ALL LEVELS!

N., 24/1/70

DEFEND VICTIMS OF NEO-STALINIST

REPRESSIONS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Statement from the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the Fourth International, Paris, January 20, 1970

In Czechoslovakia, the persecution of intellectual, student and working-class militants who are ceaselessly struggling for the total liquidation of all the legacies of Stalinism and for self-managed, democratic socialism is being intensified.

It takes the shape, among other things, of odious amalgams aimed at giving credence to the idea that it is all a matter of repressing terrorist agitation which seeks to further undermine the country which in fact the neo-Novotny reaction itself is irresistibly leading to total disaster.

But the programme of the accused organisation — the Revolutionary Socialist Party of Czechoslovakia — is well enough known for us to consider that essentially the members of this organisation represent those forces in Czechoslovakia struggling for democratic, self-managed socialism.

What is striking in the denunciations by the Czech "thermidorians" is that, after having gone on ad nauseam about the danger from the "right" which of course justified Soviet intervention, they now all of a sudden discover the powerful "left" opposition organising an

"anti-bureaucratic revolution" which threatens not only the regime in Czechoslovakia but also the regimes of the USSR and its other satellites.

They thus confirm that the fundamental current expressed in the "Czech Spring" was composed of forces aspiring to the establishment of democratic self-managed socialism, which would have been a real contagious threat to all of the Stalinist and neo-Stalinist bureaucratic dictatorships.

We call on the world revolutionary forces to organise the systematic defence of all those who in Czechoslovakia, and in the USSR too, are now struggling to safeguard the future of socialism in these countries and by this struggle rendering an inestimable service to the cause of the World Socialist Revolution.

We suggest the setting up of a qualified international commission which would intervene to defend the political honour, life and liberty of these victims of the neo-Stalinist repression.

From West to East the "witchhunt" against the authentic, independent revolutionary forces is now raging. It is imperative that we act.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST TENDENCY OF THE IV INTERNATIONAL

The third international conference of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency of the 4th International met in Europe at the beginning of November 1969.

More than forty delegates and invited observers took part in the Conference. Its sessions extended over three days and were mainly concerned with the actual position and perspectives of the Colonial Revolution, the peculiar development of the Workers' States and the crisis of the international communist movement, the situation in the advanced capitalist countries and the new tempo of the Socialist World Revolution.

The Conference commenced by paying homage to the dead or imprisoned fighters of the World Revolution as well as to the comrades of the Tendency who were victims of reactionary repression in Latin America, in Africa, in Greece and elsewhere. It also received different solidarity messages addressed to it by Sections and by comrades who could not attend for various reasons.

The report on the Colonial Revolution submitted by cde. Pablo and the very fruitful discussion which followed it had bearing, in particular, on three questions: on the still-continuing central place held by the Colonial Revolution within the overall process of the World Revolution; on the experience of the revolutionary struggles in Latin America; on the phenomenon of "Nasserism".

On the first question, the following points were stressed: the importance of the Colonial Revolution has not diminished by virtue of the resumption of revolutionary struggles in the advanced capitalist countries. The importance of the Colonial Revolution lies in the permanency of the objective conditions (analysed in detail) which bring about an incessant revolutionary activity by the masses (although varying from one part of the world to another, varying also in time, as is inevitable) against imperialism and native reaction.

The struggle for power always remains easier in many places of the Colonial Revolution, than in the case of advanced capitalist countries, while the struggle for the construction of Socialism presents more obstacles in the former than in the advanced countries.

On the question of the experience of the revolutionary struggles in Latin America stress was laid on the need to extract all the critical lessons from a certain conception of guerilla struggle which prevailed following the schematisation of the Cuban experience and of its erroneous interpretation by its uncritical expositors.

Guerilla struggle is the revolutionary expression of the indispensable alliance with the peasantry in the struggle for power peculiar to Latin America. Guerilla struggle demands therefore a political preparation of the terrain on which it arises, fights its battles and expansion, i.e. a political preparation of the peasantry. It also demands a political preparation of the whole of the revolutionary forces of the land, so that the struggle would be manifold and so as to adequately support the guerillas, the main armed force of the struggle for power.

Hence the need for a political organisation rooted on a national soil which will prepare the ground in all fields, which will evolve further and will become the veritable national revolutionary vanguard on the strength of the armed struggle conducted mainly by the guerillas. Without a correct interpretation of the interplay between these different factors, one would run the risk of making a caricature of the idea and function of guerilla struggle and finish up with the worst disaster. Actually, the centre of gravity of the revolutionary struggles in Latin America has shifted towards the most developed countries (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay) where great mobilisations of student and worker masses have occurred, combined in places with forms of urban guerilla struggle.

The errors to be avoided in this context are either the under-estimation of these forms of struggle in favour of a "classical" beginning to be sought by the guerillas, or the exclusive limitation to these forms and neglecting to correct them with classical guerilla struggles, i.e., with the indispensable armed mobilisation of the peasantry. Only revolutionary-marxist leaderships, their basis ever so restricted as it may be in the beginning, are capable of raising the struggle in Latin America to an advanced level, having an overall insight into the whole of the conditions of the revolutionary struggle and having been able to extract all the lessons from the very experience of this sector of the Colonial Revolution.

On the third question, that of "Nasserism", emphasis was placed on the following points:

The question acquires a more importance which cannot be belittled in any way since the evolution of "classical" Nasserism in Egypt and the appearance of "nasserist" phenomena in Latin America (Peru, Bolivia) and Africa (Libya, Sudan, Somaliland.)

For a correct appreciation of the phenomenon it is necessary to grasp it in the whole of its historic development, i.e., in the stage of its rise as well as in the stage of its decline.

For us, "Nasserism" is a phenomenon peculiar to "under-developed" countries. It arises in the Army and, in particular, among the layers of "nationalist" officers of rural or urban petty-bourgeois origin. It invariably starts out with anti-imperialist measures and then proceeds to a dynamic extension of the State economy, since only the State is able to promote a certain industrialisation of the country and confront the reaction of imperialism and of the national oligarchy.

From a political point of view, "Nasserism" is therefore a bonapartist regime, based on the fringe of "nationalist" officers, and using for the

achievement of its own equilibrium the antagonism between the classes internally, and that between them and imperialism externally.

But by proving incapable of linking the masses with the conduct of the economy and the State in a sincere, systematic and lasting manner, it becomes through the constant development of the State sector of the economy and the reinforcement of the Army, the prisoner and the spokesman of the administrative, economic and military bureaucracy, and leads the unachieved Revolution into a dead-end. Only a new revolution, under proletarian leadership, will make it possible to emerge from this dead-end.

Our tactics towards "Nasserism" flow from these considerations: Critical support for all measures which are progressive as such as well as support against every attack forthcoming from imperialism and the de-throned oligarchy; constant call for independent organisation and mobilisation of the masses with a view, at the same time, to drive "Nasserism" to the extreme of its positive possibilities and to safeguard against its reactionary backsliding (constant and inevitable by its very nature.)

The report on the peculiar development of the Workers' States and on the crises of the international communist movement was given by cde. Michard. In this report and the very full discussion which followed it, various points attracted the attention of the conference in a special manner. In the first place, it is necessary for us to repeat that we are confronted by Workers' States preparatory in various degrees to socialism and that the bases of a truly socialist development, the speedy overcoming of the market, of money, and the equally speedy development towards equality, the withering away of the State, etc., do not exist as yet (because of the limitations of each "socialist" experience within a narrow national framework and a low economic and cultural level.)

Next it is a case of deepening the understanding for the objective and subjective reasons of bureaucratic degeneration and its experiences. This means to understand that the cause of this phenomenon must also be sought in the erroneous approach to the problems of transition, both economic as well as the political level. The extreme centralisation of the "nationalised" and "planned" economy, and a certain idealisation of the concepts of the "Workers State" and of the "Revolutionary Party" monopolising the power in practice, contribute towards the uncontrolled proliferation of the bureaucracy and to the practical expropriation of the Class in so far as its own effective management of the economy and the State is concerned.

Even trends, calling themselves "Trotskyist", avoid undertaking the critical examination of this already lengthy experience of the Workers States, and remain attached to schemas which they consider correspond to the Leninist years of the October Revolution and to the innermost ideas of Lenin. Or they forget quite simply with what flexibility full of "realism" (in the best sense of this word) Lenin evolved on, e.g., the economic plane, etc.

Apart from these thoughts on the Workers States which the text of the report put before the comrades taking part in the Conference, more specific questions were highlighted.

First of all, that the calcified economic and political structures of the USSR were actually becoming ever-increasing fetters on the development of the productive forces, once more highlighting the lagging behind the American economy in a number of spheres.

The structure of the bureaucracy, by its very nature, is not homogeneous. In a society directed by a "unified, monolithic Party", the various pressures within it, its tensions and problems, express themselves, of necessity, in the first place through a differentiation within the ruling stratum and through rifts in its ranks.

For this reason a concrete study of the condition of the bureaucracy is useful and necessary since it serves to reveal the fundamental pressures and to determine the perspectives arising from its crises, which in turn favour the upsurge of the mass movement.

From this point of view, and in spite of appearances, the Soviet bureaucracy is also not homogeneous at the present stage.

In its actual leadership its most conservative wing predominates --- a kind of alliance between the Party politicians and the military leaders. It is this wing which has overthrown that of Khrushchev, more susceptible to the demands of the technocrats, the intellectuals and the elites of the different nationalities comprising the USSR.

But people like e.g. Kosygin, represent more "liberal" trends among the present leadership than those represented by Brezhnev. These liberal shadings could acquire a great importance in the event of a new upsurge of forces occurring in the USSR, which in the midst of the bureaucracy are, in effect, the forces of the technocrats striving towards a streamlining of the economy and of the intellectuals aspiring to achieve freedom of cultural creation and of the elites of the various nationalities pressing for a relative decentralisation of the regime which has a strangling effect under the very strict control of the Russian bureaucracy.

As for the obvious crisis of the Communist Parties, it was the subject of a minute analysis on the part of the reporting comrade, with emphasis placed on the need to follow it clearly (especially in the case of the Communist mass parties), and on the validity of the tactic of entrism sui generis in their respect, with the part of the independent sector actually acquiring greater weight than in the past.

The third item on the agenda of the Conference was concerned with the situation in the advanced capitalist countries and with the new dynamics of the World Revolution.

The report was presented by cde. Pablo, and the very full and very lively discussion which followed revealed differences on various points, in particular with regard to the evaluation of the new stage in the advanced capitalist countries and the economic perspectives of capitalism.

The new stage in the advanced capitalist countries (USA, France and in particular, Italy) is not yet the result of a major economic crisis, but that of the interaction between the revolutionary youth movement

(ripened within the range of the effects of the colonial revolution in these years and by the manner in which the youth experience the consequences of the development of "neo-capitalist" society) and the fluctuations of the economic conjuncture which affects the working class in particular.

Until now these fluctuations have remained those peculiar to a "boom": inflation, continuous down-grading and regrading of the labour force, intensification of the work tempo in the factories.

However, the workers, especially the new layers, have set out on the movement demands which exceed the strictly "material" wage struggle framework and raise, against the opposition and the conservatism of the traditional union and political machines, problems concerning the change from the proletarian condition in the enterprise and in society: self-organisation and self-direction of the workers' struggles; workers' control and workers' power in the enterprises; self-management. This means that the current trend among the working class is also towards a more fundamental challenge to the "neo-capitalist" society, a challenge which arises from the very development --- economic and cultural --- of that society.

The events of May 1968 have eloquently illustrated that trend.

The same events, which constitute the most important revolutionary experience in France since the Commune and the most important among the whole of the advanced capitalist countries since the Second World War, have at the same time given meaning to the basic theme of Self-management as a guide line for the democratic content of a socialist reconstruction of society.

The reporter expounded at length on this theme, redefining our ideas on this question. Qualitatively, of course, our concept of Self-management differs basically from that of the Anarchists.

For us it is a matter of viewing scientifically the period of transition from capitalism to socialism; a large part of this period will evolve under the sign of a regime combining Self-management with forms of a trade and money economy as well as with planning, together with the inevitable existence of a central political power, which would, among other things, have the task of reestablishing a balance between these three elements. But our concept of Self-management also differs from other models (including that of Yugoslavia) by the following two qualities which should characterise its application: to "deproletarianise", right from the start, the proletariat --- economically and culturally.

Economically --- by introducing a mode of remuneration based on the value created by the labour of each; culturally --- by including the time devoted to the continuous political, general and professional education of the workers in the socially necessary daily work-time to be remunerated by society.

To be sure Self-management is a process which could not be applied in its most perfected form immediately. But this process should be launched right from the beginning and it will be subject to continuous perfecting as the economic and cultural level of the transitional society is raised.

The Tendency must make itself known in the international communist and revolutionary movement as the proponent of this kind of socialism, in particular in the transitional period. We are the militants of the Socialism of Self-management (in its explicit sense) which implies a different concept not only with regard to the economic essence of the "model", but also a different concept of the essence of the "Workers State", the "Revolutionary Party", the "Socialist Democracy", the relation between State and Party and Party and Class and of the proper role of each.

The Transitional Programme towards socialism must be developed precisely around these topics. The necessary consideration for the immediate application of propagandistic and agitational slogan of Self-management, rather than of its general concept, is as follows: in pre-revolutionary periods untiring propaganda for Self-management must be combined with agitation for workers control of the enterprises. In the periods of revolutionary crisis the passive occupation of enterprises and services must be transformed into active occupation with self-management of the enterprises and services and the arming of the workers.

To approach this stage would signify unleashing the movement and logic of the struggle proceeding from the partial struggle to the conquest of the whole power.

As for the question of economic perspectives the following must be kept clear:

In the past we have opposed all those who made the outbreak of revolutionary struggles in Europe (and in the advanced capitalist countries generally) dependent on the outbreak of a major economic crisis of the type of that of 1929-1933, (which haunted and still haunts the hearts of the "Old Trotskyists" and other revolutionaries). We have maintained the proposition that the overall consequences of the development of the "neo-capitalist" society plus the peculiar and inevitable fluctuations of the economic conjuncture in its phase of "booms" or "recessions" (inflation, partial unemployment, intensification of labour) are sufficient to set off such struggles, and that the obstacles to their development are rather of a "subjective" order: the weight of the traditional conservative apparatus, the absence of clear perspectives and of a programme with regard to the "model", the "new society" for which we are struggling.

Actually prospects of a "recession" graver than in the past have come into focus, especially in consequence of the monetary crisis which advances and persists in spite of provisional palliatives (special withdrawal rights, practical impossibility of converting dollars into gold, Eurodollars, etc.) and which means a change in the relationship of forces among the capitalist economies, again favouring the economy of the United States.

But it is nevertheless unlikely that this "recession" (which is a cyclical crisis like every "recession") will degenerate into a major world crisis of the type (and scope) of that of 1929-1933.

And this for all the reasons which we have explained on various occasions.

The dead-end for capitalism will not be economic (stemming from the peculiar economic evolution of capitalism) but political and social. Actually, the revolutionary struggle of the masses in the advanced capitalist countries is the factor worsening the economic climate.

The future struggles will open up revolutionary perspectives in the very midst of the "boom" or of economic expansion, as is now, for example actually the case in Italy (where production still continues to expand as well as the export from this country with a still "firm" currency.)

It is a matter, so to speak, of applying dialectics to the concept of the revolutionary crisis, the product of interaction (dialectic) between multiple factors of a "structural" and "superstructural" order... acting within the framework of the general evolution of "neo-capitalist" society (engendering its crisis by its own specific economic and cultural development, as is experienced at the level of the living standard of the masses.)

On the programme level a definition is given which has a particular value for the countries in which Workers Parties and mass unions are active. The "algebraic" formula of transitional power and of that in its first phase (to be made concrete according to each case) will be that of the Government of Workers' Parties and Unions, based on a network of Committees in the Enterprises, the Services, the Universities, the villages. To oppose the Committees to the traditional Parties and Unions is to be avoided at the risk of blocking the forward wave of the unleashed process and miscarrying the victory. On the contrary, proof must be given of flexibility relying on revolutionary logic and tempo which will, for the first time, force the traditional organisations to take all the power subsequently to become subject to the increasingly decisive control of the Committees, the organs of self-management of the Class.

Both in France and in Italy, the situation could evolve in a manner rendering acute and more urgent than ever the question of the accession to power of the Communist and Socialist Parties and the unions which they influence. It will then be a matter of deflecting the trend for a "Popular Front" towards a power exclusively "Workers" based on the Committees.

The Conference concluded by a preliminary discussion on the perspectives of work and on the future name of the Tendency. Due to lack of adequate preparation and sufficient time, it was decided unanimously that these questions will be the topic of a Special Conference which could be held at the end of January, 1970, and which will be called on the basis of a document submitted for discussion and bearing on the above questions.

The deliberations of the Conference were brought to a close with a vote on the submitted documents, and the election of a new I.S. of the Tendency. Concerning the vote on these documents, it was decided that it would apply to their general line with the maintenance of the right to submit amendments written before the end of November 1969, and which will be taken into account in the final drafting of the documents.

Introduction to
SELF-MANAGEMENT, SOCIALISM AND PLANNING

We are reprinting the following article because it has special relevance to the debate on the post-revolutionary society which is now going on inside the Communist Party of Australia.

Judging by the content of the CPA's main document for its forthcoming national congress, the majority of the leadership have discarded the Stalinist model for the building of socialism and have opted for a democratic, self-management model, though their references to this model are generalised and vague in places. While clearly recognising how decentralisation and self-management can counter and combat bureaucracy, they place much power - especially as regards planning - in the hands of a centralised, national representative organ far removed from the base of society.

By this reprint we hope to give a more precise view of how generally we consider a socialised, self-managed economy would operate in conditions short of abundance, and particularly how we consider the overall plan would fit in with the self-managed units at the base without robbing them of most of their power.

In the future International will publish further essays on the main principles and problems of the "self-management model" for the building of societies preparatory to socialism.

The following article is reprinted from the January 1965 issue of Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme.

Originally, the article was part of a campaign to popularise and implement self-management in Algeria.

As is well known, Algerian and non-Algerian members of the Revolutionary Marxist Tendency belonged to the FLN during the Algerian war of national liberation and were active in Algeria from Independence in 1962 until the coup of Colonel Boumedienne in June 1965.

During those three years in Algeria our members sought to develop the "socialist opening" of the Algerian Revolution which occurred when tens of thousands of workers and peasants occupied and managed the properties left behind by the French colons. We supported this active occupation, helped draw up the regulations and statutes for these self-managed enterprises, fought for their full implementation and for aid to be given to these enterprises.

Until the bureaucratic putsch our members openly campaigned for socialist democracy, for the deepening and extension of self-management, for further expropriations and Agrarian Reform, for a people's militia, for a national Plan and measures to safeguard and improve the living conditions of the workers. Such a platform brought our militants into constant conflict with the bureaucratic excrement which was developing around the centralised organs of the government.

SELF-MANAGEMENT, SOCIALISM AND PLANNING

I SELF-MANAGEMENT AND SOCIALISM

UNDER THE BANNER OF SOCIALISM, an organ of Revolutionary-Marxism, is known, among other things, for its persevering struggle for the genuinely democratic organisation of the Workers and Peasants Power after capitalism.

For that reason, all the efforts being made now, both in the Workers States and in the States on the non-capitalist road of development which seek a more democratic organisation of the Power of the working masses, link up on this question with the tendency that we represent inside the international workers movement.

The criteria upon which we class the different tendencies appearing at the present time inside the world revolutionary movement, depend greatly on these tendencies' attitude towards the essential question of the democratic structure of organisations and Governments claiming to be working-class and Socialist.

For both the already long and rich experience of the Workers States and of the States of the "Third World" which have become independent, show that victory over capitalism or imperialism is not sufficient to avoid next the rise of bureaucratic regimes, which gravely deform the content of socialism, or prevent rapid and healthy progress towards socialism.

The combat for socialism is therefore intimately and organically tied to the combat against the bureaucratic danger.

The revolutionary struggle of the worker and peasant masses, and the oppressed people against imperialism, carried out by genuinely democratic organisations, must be orientated towards setting-up a democratic Power in which the masses are effectively organised into ruling classes, managing the economy, State, and Society as directly as possible.

In that lies the genuine content of Socialism, and the real social development and liberation of the exploited and oppressed.

But the bureaucratic danger lies in wait for any Revolution, any Party and any Revolutionary Power.

It is certainly insufficient to speak in general of bureaucracy and of the bureaucrat. The truth is concrete, and the need to specify the phenomenon in each case is imperious.

The bureaucracy which exists in the different Workers States is very different to that which emerges in the States emerging from colonialism to independence. In the case of the Workers States, it is a question of a bureaucracy formed through the exercise of Power in the framework of a State which has carried out the radical structural transformation of the country, thanks to the victory of the Proletarian Revolution, led by a Party calling itself Marxist-Leninist.

The bureaucracy in these cases is a product of the general degeneration of the original proletarian Power, or of an original deformation of this Power, due to the fact of the importation of the Revolution from outside by an already-bureaucratised Power.

What is important in these cases, is that it is a question of a bureaucracy of States which have already acquired the economic and social structures of a Workers State, that is where there is a largely, if not almost totally, nationalised and planned economy.

Thus the bureaucracy draws its privileges and power from these structures, and as a result feels in some way or another the need to defend these structures in its own way against

the danger of capitalist restoration and imperialist invasion. But in the case of the countries becoming independent, the exercise of Power forms a specific bureaucracy in which are grouped elements of the former privileged classes of the country, together with elements coming from the petty bourgeoisie and from the national revolutionary movement (where the latter exists and has played a role).

This bureaucracy quickly becomes the major privileged social layer above all in the countries with a weak economic and social development.

Starting from that moment, the road to socialism is blocked. For either this bureaucracy becomes the instrument of imperialism and of the comprador bourgeoisie through the State and neo-colonialist regime in the service of these two forces in alliance, or it proliferates as a managerial bureaucracy of a more and more substantial State sector of the economy.

The latter case already exists in certain African States and poses naturally a new theoretical question of the social characterisation of this bureaucracy and of these States.

"ASIATIC MODE OF PRODUCTION"

On the purely theoretical plane, these States have curiously certain curious analogies with a question which is already an old one, with what Marx called the "Asiatic mode of production" and which is again being discussed in certain Marxist circles.

The "Asiatic mode of production" corresponds, schematically, to these primitive societies composed of a assembly of village communities run by a functional bureaucracy, itself commanded by a despotic King, the supreme incarnation of collective property.

The State bureaucracy in this case is both the regulator and guarantee of the collective economy and at the same time the force which in the long run undermines this economy.

This economy in effect either evolves towards slavery, or directly towards feudalism. In both cases, the privileged social layer, the bureaucracy, which has emerged from the primitive classless communal society, becomes a genuine ruling class in a veritable class regime.

The "Asiatic mode of production" is marked by the role of the functional bureaucracy in the framework of a primitive communal society, during the latter's passage to a class society.

We are now seeing the phenomenon of certain colonial societies achieving independence with weak economic and social development, and the rise of the formation of a bureaucracy managing a more and more substantial State sector of the economy.

Theoretically, such a development has the possibility of an evolution either towards a genuine Workers State or towards a frankly neocolonialist State. The question is whether the State bureaucracy in these cases is a social layer or a class. What also is the definitive class character of these transitional regimes? These questions will be only clearly settled in practice by the possibility or not of the measures stemming the development and omnipotence of the bureauc-

eracy and to structure their own power of democratic management of the Economy, State and Society.

From these questions arise the extreme importance of the experience of Self-Management in Algeria, of the new developments of Self-Management in Yugoslavia and of the discussions occurring now also in the USSR, Czechoslovakia and other Workers States on the method of managing the nationalised economy.

It is necessary, moreover, to also note the renewed interest among certain vanguard elements of the European workers movement in problems of "Workers Control" and of workers management, even in connection with efforts to extend the domain of the Socialist economy in capitalist countries in order to oppose to capitalist preponderation, propaganda and the democratic socialist planning of the economy.

The struggle undertaken from this viewpoint by certain circles of the Labour Left in England to have the State socially placed under the control and even management of "Workers Committees" has much wider importance than for Britain alone. (1)

SELF-MANAGEMENT GAINING GROUND

Self-Management can be said to be, in a general way, once more gaining ground in the international workers movement and can become a renovating idea for this movement and for socialism.

The need to democratise the management of the economy

and its planning, as well as the management of the State and Society, is being universally felt. But, as well as the resistance of the capitalists and bureaucrats to these objectives, while both recognise the need to associate the producers more closely to the running of production, account must also be taken of opposition from bureaucratic and conservative tendencies inside the international workers movement itself.

The latter see Self-Management as a danger, which threatens to question the necessary planning of the nationalised economy, and as a uncontrollably strengthening of capitalist tendencies which exist for a whole period in the transitional economy.

The centralist and "Stalinist" tradition is certainly strongly rooted in the communist movement and the economy managed in this tradition is generally considered as the "classical model" for a Workers State. But anyone who has understood how much this method of management has led fatally, above all in under-developed countries to the irresistible development of a managerial and controlling bureaucracy in the statified economy, can only conclude that it is absolutely necessary to rethink the questions of the management and planning of the transitional economy with a new perspective.

We propose to do that in this study, by making more explicit and by deepening the ideas on this question contained in the Theses on the African and Algerian Revolution published in the last issue of UNDER THE BANNER OF SOCIALISM.

H. SELF-MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING

There can be no doubt that, theoretically, Self-Management is the best system for increasing labour productivity at the level of the "basic economic unit", of the factory or farm. For this system gives the best combination of the two essential stimulants for such a result: the moral and material interesting of the direct producers in production. By applying Self-Management integrally at the level of the basic economic unit, by really giving its management to the collective of its workers, and by having them really take part in the profits resulting from the increase in productivity, the optimum conditions for the increase in productivity and for the best running of the enterprise are created.

Certainly, even in this case, Self-Management supposes a collective of conscious, self-disciplined workers who voluntarily accept to follow the directions in the execution of the work of those they have freely chosen: that of a Director assisted by a Management Committee and Workers Council (the Yugoslav system) or of a President of a Management Committee, Management Committee and Workers Council, assisted by a Director and other technical cadres (Algerian system). The unity of technical and administrative direction still appears to be a principle which any work-group has to obey.

Some raise this argument as an example of the duality of power which exists in the Algerian system, where the daily direction of a self-managed enterprise is shared between the Director, the latter acting, according to the Decree of the 28 March 1963, under the authority of the President.

But all these real difficulties become secondary and are even eclipsed when we have a collective of conscious workers who have democratically elaborated and adopted internal regulations for the enterprise which fits in with the specific and exact role of each in the running of the enterprise.

It is necessary then to apply strict discipline whose dispositions have been democratically elaborated and adopted, including those on possible sanctions to be taken against the breaking of this discipline.

It is on the other hand true that Self-Management demands a combination of the productive work of the workers in an

enterprise with intensive work in technological, political and general training so that the workers may intensify their professional qualifications, and progressively raise their understanding of the economic, social, political and national context in which their enterprise operates.

For, must not Self-Management, which in effect seeks to abolish the proletarian wage condition of the worker through his direct moral and material interesting in production, also seek to abolish his proletarian condition (from a cultural point-of-view which in reality determines the rest of his proletarian condition)?

A multi-form cultural effort would have to be combined in a Workers State based on Self-Management, in a permanent way with the daily productive effort, by the obligatory attendance of workers in schools, with workshops, laboratories, or experimental farms attached to each enterprise or group of enterprises or Commune.

Self-Management as a managerial system of the Economy, State and the whole of social life, widely bypasses the framework of management of basic economic units by the workers left to themselves, which is at the cultural level characteristic of the proletarian condition under capitalism.

For if that was done it would only be easy to demonstrate the multiple real weaknesses of the workers, and starting from that to theorise the role of the technocratic and administrative bureaucracy, managing the Economy, the State and Society itself in the place of the masses.

Self-Management's success — as we have continually repeated — supposes the real aid of the State, Party and Trade Unions, to the workers, to the class they claim to represent, so that the working class may be able to pass through their apprenticeship in social management in the best possible conditions.

AID TO SELF-MANAGEMENT

The organisation of this aid to Self-Management must become the raison d'être of the State, of the Party, and of the trade unions in a really socialist regime. Certain will argue that such a combination of Self-Management comes in the direct moral and material interesting of the workers in management with the abolition of their cultural backwardness

chronologically, politically and in general) through free polytechnic education, included as part of their working day week, is only economically possible at an advanced stage of a transitional period in which there is a nationalised planned economy, centrally administered by the State bureaucracy and technicians.

It is extremely possible however, that a strict national planning of the unproductive expenses incurred from a bureaucracy of functionaries in a centralised State, acting as controller and manager of the whole of social life, as well as for bureaucratic planning, and a plethoric police army, exceeds by a long way the expenses demanded by cultural investment to the profit of the working masses. The relatively rapid yield from such investment is beyond doubt.

Such a conception of Self-Management, however, of course is in question the general conception of Planning, and the "economic model" to be applied in a regime which does this choice. Some see Self-Management in relation to Planning as being open to criticism and inoperative.

How, they ask, can the liberty inherent in Self-Management be combined with the imperative character of centralised planning? How can the "egoism" of each enterprise, the "localist" and "regionalist" spirit, and harmful results of competition among different economic units, or even different Communes, so be combined with centralised planning?

These criticisms are nourished by the tenacity of the myth bureaucratic planning which appears to dominate the economic facts which planning has to struggle against in a transitional period.

Planning, moreover, is not a goal in itself, to be carried out in no matter what conditions and in no matter what economic and social price.

Planning in a socialist regime seeks to aid the most rapid and harmonious economic and social development possible, and to orientate it towards the strengthening of the socialist tendencies of the economy and the whole of society.

Planning is only "ideal" where there is a society with very high level of productive forces, a high cultural level and with a completely nationalised economy.

In such a situation all those problems arising from the survival of the money and market economy, of sectors of the economy which are still not "socialised", of the inequality of technical equipment among enterprises, of the cultural backwardness of the workers, etc. no more exist. But in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism we have to take account of these economic technical and moral realities which are essentially different from those under socialism, and which give rise to a planning which is necessarily fitted in with these realities.

The question is, by starting from those realities, of finding the best results able to give the most rapid and launched economic and social development possible in the general direction of socialism.

ACKNOWLEDGING REVISION"

The inconveniences of centralised, bureaucratic, and imperative planning based upon a statified economy, have become so urgent in all the Workers States that the bureaucracy itself is obliged to carry out an "acknowledging revision" of the economic model" taking account of economic realities which have been neglected for a long time, as well as the decisive importance of the human factor.

Results can be obtained for a whole period when planning for an extensive economy, which does not take account of the cost and quality of production, of the profitability of investment, or of consumers needs. It is that occurs to the detriment of the balanced evolution of the economy, and of the well-being of the workers.

It is not however a question of building any sort of economy and society, but of a regime which places itself

right from the beginning in conditions which will assure it progressively genuine economic and social supremacy over the most advanced capitalist society.

By artificially isolating a given regime through the bureaucratic and centralised planning of its economy, from the world market, the illusion of building socialism is created, without daring to confront the cost and quality of production under the Plan with that of capitalist production.

But in the long run, such an experience becomes untenable, placing the very existence of the social regime in permanent danger.

Care should be taken then right from the beginning to plan in such a way as to approach as near as possible to cost and quality on the world market, which is in constant and rapid evolution.

That is only possible on the basis of Self-Management which essentially modifies the methodology, the elaboration, application and goals of bureaucratic and centralised planning based on a statified economy.

Planning under Self-Management is elaborated beginning from the existence at the base of relationships of production characterised by self-managed economic units in the framework of a self-managed Commune.

Each unit at the base freely elaborates its own plan, taking account of information supplied by the Central National Plan on the market, supplies of primary material, possibilities of credit and investment, prices, etc.

Each Commune elaborates its own social Plan (economic and general) taking account of the plans of economic units in its territory and general information supplied by the Central National Plan.

Each economic Region in turn elaborates its social plan taking account of the plans of the Communes and of the Central Plan.

ELABORATION OF CENTRAL PLAN

The Central Plan, in turn, is elaborated on the basis of the plans supplied by the economic units, Communes, and Regions, which have already taken its directives into account. Thus the Central Plan emerges as the result of the collective elaboration of all the economic and social cells at the base, which in turn act in the general framework of the information, means, and orientation given to them by the Central Plan.

A double process therefore exists — supple and dynamic between the base and the summit and vice-versa — for the elaboration and application of the Central Plan and plans of the Region, Commune and of each enterprise.

The Central Plan has important economic means to orientate the whole of economic activity towards the desired goals, to correct inequalities and disproporitions which arise, here or there, and any excess or faults arising from the liberty left to the economic cells at the base in the Communes and even in the Regions.

The Central Plan through taxes, prices and investments, fixes the framework of general economic activity and regulates it in the sense described above.

The Central Plan has to act, by making investments for infrastructure work in the national interest, as well as to create a new economic units and services in the national interest.

The Central Plan also directs national policy on taxes, credit, certain prices and currency rates, in the framework of which the basic units, the Communes and Regions will have to act.

Thus the economic liberty to the units at the base is tempered by the Central Plan attributions and means, which orientate economic activity, according to the broad lines fixed by the Plan.

It will be said that this conception considerably reduces the principle of Self-Management — the enormous difference however — between the above conception of the Plan and that of the bureaucratic centralist Plan, consists in: the liberty of the basic economic units on questions of the volume

Now available from: A. McLean, P.O. Box 13, Balmain, N.S.W. 2041.

Michel Pablo

10 cents

report on the PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION

SELF-MANAGEMENT, SOCIALISM and PLANNING (continued)

and quality of production, of prices, of self-investment, of commercialisation, remains very great: it sees the Plan imposing its general views on the local, Colonial and Regional economic units, not through administrative constraint, but by economic means, and these economic means wither away in part to the profit of Self-Management to the degree that the system is „running in“, is consolidating and is developing.

Thus, in Yugoslavia for example, following the recent YLC Congress, a profound reform of the whole policy of investment, installation and credits is proposed in favour of the considerable brokering of the resources left at the free disposition of each work-collective, for the latter to use them for self-investment in enterprises, or for the more substantial improvement of the workers' living standards. To find the correct balance — which can moreover only be a dynamic one — between centralist interventions and the tendency at the base to extreme decentralisation, is the goal of Planning under Self-Management.

The eulogists of schemas of Planning which work exactly „like clockwork“ will not be satisfied with a dynamic conception of Planning which seeks to find a balance by a perpetual effort to harmonise the different factors which determine economic life in the transitional period: the autonomous forms of relationships of production at the base (Self-Management of social property), and autonomous forms of the market and money economy which continue to exist for a long period.

But only a concrete reality is „planned“ and not an „ideal“ economy which is arbitrarily declared to be „socialist“.

JANUARY 1965

"HOW WE RAN OUR SCHOOLS DURING THE MAY 1968 REVOLUTION" by Nicholas Baby, French High School student leader in Paris during the May 1968 Revolution in France. Baby describes how students and teachers occupied their schools and ran them on the basis of self-management. He details the experience at Henri V Lycee.. only 5 c. + 5c.postage from A.McLean, PO Box 13, Balmain NSW -2091 .Australia

Arab Revolutionaries Protest at Continued Algerian Repression

Al Hurria, the newspaper of the Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, recently published a statement denouncing the continued persecution of revolutionaries in Algeria - persecution in the shape of the continued detention under harsh conditions of Ben Bella, Zehouane and Harbi, as well as scores of revolutionary student leaders, of the forced dissolution of UGTA (the Algerian equivalent of the PSU) and of the arbitrary trial and execution or imprisonment of some 200 liberation army officers. The statement of protest concluded by pointing out that not only are these acts counter-revolutionary but, by preventing the participation of these revolutionary militants in the liberation struggles of the Arab masses, objectively constitute a service rendered to international imperialism, to Zionism and to the forces of Arab reaction. The statement was signed by representatives of some 15 revolutionary movements - among them the Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Persian Gulf, the Workers' Union of the Peoples' Republic of South Yemen, the Union of Yemeni Women, the Union of Yemeni Students, the Rev. Marxist Tendency of the P.L., the Nat. Union of Jordanian Students, etc.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

please send me the following publications :

NAME :

ADDRESS:

postcode :

A YEAR'S SUBSCRIPTION TO INTERNATIONAL
a revolutionary socialist magazine
published once every two months \$1 a year

REVOLUTION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA
by Denis Freney - an offset printed booklet
of 36 pages giving information on the situation
in Southern Africa and the struggle of the
guerrillas which is unobtainable elsewhere
ONLY 20 cents a copy

THE FIRST TEN YEARS OF THE
FOURTH INTERNATIONAL (1936-1946)
by MICHEL PABLO .. covers the vital
war years and the immediate post war years
analysis of which has not been readily available
Also an introduction by Denis Freney outlining
briefly the history of the Fourth International
in the period 1948-1960 with particular reference
to the FI in Australia .. 36 pages for 25 cents.

TOTAL CARRIED OVER PAGE

ALL SUBS TO:
A McLEAN
PO Box 13
Balmain -NSW
2041 Australia
(please make all
cheques etc payable
to A McLean)

TOTAL CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

- THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN AND OTHER ESSAYS by Michel Pablo besides the title essay, which is a unique contribution to the discussion on this question now taking place in Australia there are also essays on the crisis in the Catholic Church analysis of Freud dialectics in Plato ONLY A FEW COPIES LEFT ONLY 25 cents (offset printed)

- THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN by Michel Pablo a reprint of the above article alone to cover new demand With a new introduction. ONLY 10 cents

- SELF-MANAGEMENT IN EDUCATION -- "HOW WE RAN OUR SCHOOLS IN THE MAY 1968 REVOLUTION" by Nicholas BABY 13-year old leader of the French CALs (high schools action committees) presents a unique account of the events in French Lycées in May only 5 cents + 5c postage

- THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION by Michel Pablo Pablo reports on a recent visit to the Middle East where he lived with the Palestinian liberation guerrillas of the PDLFP a revolutionary socialist guerrilla movement in Palestine. A unique review of the present stage of the Arab Revolution. ONLY 10 cents.

- A YEAR'S SUB TO INTERNATIONAL plus all above publications for only ONE DOLLAR SEVENTY

***** I ENCLOSE THEREFORE THE SUM OF -----

INTERNATIONAL is a revolutionary socialist magazine authorised and printed by A McLean PO Box 13 BALMAIN - 2041 for the Australian Section of the Fourth International which is affiliated to the Revolutionary Marxist Agency of the Fourth International. A number of articles in each issue are reprinted from SOUS LE DRAPEAU DU SOCIALISME organ of the RMTFI and published in France by G. Maquis 10 cite Lesnier CLAMART -92
