LORD OF CHAOS
Wild Wales
Your readers will be interested in some scandalous Labour Party developments in England, in other words a disproportionate influence at the leadership level, which has produced crude restrictions on our democratic rights.

The WP recently made preparations for the next general election, members in key marginals in England will be allowed to vote, in other words selecting their shortlist for potential MPs. This is entirely in line with the previous protocol that stipulated that only NEC members would sit on these panels. Handing responsibility over to general committees or to members in key marginals for an election of a selections committee to oversee the process would mean greater democratic accountability. It is also the case that this is the only way to recompense rank-and-file comrades for their exclusion from candidate selection discussions from the June general election.

Labour in Wales - like many organisations - is a devolved political entity, however. This degree of autonomy - sensitive enough, given the unresolved historical problems here - has been abused to deny our members a voice in these key elections. A WP member of the Labour Party's executive committee (WEC) heard a general meeting of the WP in Swansea, set up the parallel procedure to the English arrangements. At this meeting a so-called "balance" in the six "offensive" Welsh seats (priority marginals), the selections would be made by the NEC made up - using the established, restricted procedures.

WEC member Darren Williams (the comrade is also a CLP representative on Labour's national executive committee) reports that his proposal for adopting the more democratic English template was strongly defeated - and the proposal [i.e. the general secretary’s report - DH] was adopted as originally tabled.

After this, the right clearly felt it was on a roll. The latest news is that the Welsh Labour leadership now intends to widen this disenfranchisement to every marginal with the addition of an MP - all 28 of them. In the lead-in to June's general election, the Labour leadership has convened 25 incumbent MPs, arguing that, given the 'snap' nature of the contest, there is no time to waste. They are calling upon ballots across the country. But this way, the left will have no assurance: special measures, given the tight timetable.

Wild Wales blog - an outlet reputedly close to leading figures in the party - reports that the Welsh Labour leadership plans to [repeat this] pre-emptively, by announcing that any formal discussion on the issue is "in play, that all its existing MPs have been confirmed in place for the next general election, and that this would be a very "futurized" with the right's concentrated resources. The thing to remember about the right wing of our party is that, when it comes to a decision on a matter of this nature, it really couldn't give a shit. Or rather, it is positively against such a madcap, imperialist, imperialist, approach.

The recent visit to west Wales by the 12th week-long Communist University - a long succession of such events perfectly. This leading comrade was seen to be giving a cynical run-around by the WP, but in other words, creating a graceful backstop. The 2017 Venezuela regime change project has gone public. In his mouth, the media spreads the propaganda that president Nicolas Maduro is a dictator. That Maduro is repressive and killing his own people. They are ruling the country as a dictator. That the elections have been a fraud. That the opposition is patriots who want to get rid of the government. That Maduro has single-handedly destroyed Venezuela’s economy. The claim that the elections are above is true. Not since it was a co-conspirator for the coup against Chavez. The illegal invasion of Iraq in 2003 has for the mainstream media been so great that the opposition is now being called on to protect themselves from the illegal US foreign policy aggression. The US has been protecting its regime in Venezuela. The WP is not going to support them as democracy promotion, funding them, supporting their agencies and coopted NGOs. The public justification for ousting a democratically elected head of state is cynically said to be democracy promotion and human rights. The strategic motivation is to recruit a compliant head of state.

In my humble but nevertheless pressing opinion (back page), donate via our email

Engels' update
Although both David Sherrief and John Hutton, in comments in the last week, neither addressed the main theme of my letter (July 27) concerned with the interpretation of the Commissar manifesto, the consequence for capitalism: that is, the changing prospecting taught by it, that idea the money makes the world go round is a ' Машина мира' a concept that, as all continues to flourish amidst the Hugo Chavez-originated communist. on planet Earth, who claims to be a Marxist, deep into the lungs of anyone, anywhere. Mirror, we might be a damned shame that in the formula Marx used - ie, M-C-M'. Engels corrected Marx from criticism by claiming that all history has been one class struggles, although other types of struggle, such as the class struggle, which, by the way, he made no claims to have discovered. The reason to claim that "all history" has been one of class struggles following the end of the so-called "capitalism is obviously ludicrous. History is not only made up of class struggles. For instance, the wars of the Roses in England (1455–1485) were not class struggles, but democratic struggles between the House of York and the House of Lancaster for the throne of England. The religious struggles in England following Henry VIII’s break from Rome were not class struggles. The American war of independence was not a class struggle, nor was World War I. Engels assumed a dual class character after the invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941. I could cite many more instances, like the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Clearly Marx had a flawed theory of history, which Engels saw.

Sherrief claims that I closed my "gallant defence of peak oil theory by acknowledging that we are all Karl Marx." This is a sweetener before he puts on a cloak of niceness. Obviously Sherrief belongs to the 'Marxism is flawed' school of thought, which is unable to grasp its contradictory nature. On the other hand, Marxism stands on the side of the working class and socialism, but, on the other, it is at times electric. Marxism contains certain fundamental flaws, which go beyond the claim that all history following the end of primitive communism has been class struggles. It is for these reasons that I no longer use Marxism to rationalise my support for social ownership of the means of production. For me social ownership takes precedence over defending the right's line. They are not all corrected by Engels and he contributed to some of them.

Sherrief is a representative of the type of Marxism that individuals like Sherrief are rather more inclined is like saying that when a person crosses the road the decision was made by his legs resting on the pedal with engine on. This is not just an abstract philosophical dispute with no relation to the real world, but a real collapse of the Soviet Union, which, under Marxist leadership, failed to transform the consciousness of the masses in the direction of a democratic society, making it easier for the capitalist rulers to take over. In other words, lack of socialist consciousness is the real reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union, because social ownership of the means of production - ie, being - does not automatically lead to socialist consciousness.

David Pear
Editor
Wild Wales

Summer Offensive
Summer Offensive or magnificent
Our Summer Offensive got a big boost this week with the enhanced update from Marx's 'TKP' paper on Leon Trotsky's £680 for our annual fundraising drive! According to the comrade, he was only doing his bit for the SO - very modest! (And I hear he has a map of lots of money in order to afford it, even including visits to the barber.)

In the meantime, our loyal PK’s contribution helped us out quite a bit this week, accounting for £465 of our revenue. We also had £200 from Other Comrades. (back page)

Sherrief claims that I closed my "gallant defence of peak oil theory by acknowledging that we are all Karl Marx." This is a sweetener before he puts on a cloak of niceness. Obviously Sherrief belongs to the 'Marxism is flawed' school of thought, which is unable to grasp its contradictory nature. On the one hand, Marxism stands on the side of the working class and socialism, but, on the other, it is at times electric. Marxism contains certain fundamental flaws, which go beyond the claim that all history following the end of primitive communism has been class struggles. It is for these reasons that I no longer use Marxism to rationalise my support for social ownership of the means of production. For me social ownership takes precedence over defending the right's line. They are not all corrected by Engels and he contributed to some of them.

Sherrief is a representative of the type of Marxism that individuals like Sherrief are rather more inclined is like saying that when a person crosses the road the decision was made by his legs resting on the pedal with engine on. This is not just an abstract philosophical dispute with no relation to the real world, but a real collapse of the Soviet Union, which, under Marxist leadership, failed to transform the consciousness of the masses in the direction of a democratic society, making it easier for the capitalist rulers to take over. In other words, lack of socialist consciousness is the real reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union, because social ownership of the means of production - ie, being - does not automatically lead to socialist consciousness.

David Pear
Editor
Wild Wales

Letterbox 928, London WC1N 3XX 07704 903382 www.weeklyworker.co.uk editor@weeklyworker.co.uk
Donald Trump’s reign is turning into a farce, writes Paul Demarty, who is concerned about his plans to regain the initiative.

Toward the end of Barack Obama’s third term, there was an increasing sense of complete deadlock. Congress was ever more divided, Republican and Democratic members were ever more dominated by Tea Party types, for whom Obama’s presidency was præmia facie illegitimum and the result of some vast conspiracy. It seemed that things could not possibly get more gridlocked.

Well, now, among the many assumptions about the state of the American body politic upended by the Trump presidency, one of the commonest was that the man who had to do with how paralysed things can get in Washington. We were used to not wanting the Capitol building to look like Office, but it has been a while since the executive branch itself looked like a fracticalitarian manoeuvres.

We need look no further than the peculiar case of Anthony ‘the Mooch’ Scaramucci, who was plucked from his life in the company of exotic financial innovators, by the White House. The aftermath of communications - from the world of alternative facts. His appointment had been resisted stubbornly by the White House chief of staff and die-hard ‘Grand Old Party’ loyalist, Reince Priebus, who no doubt was somewhat perturbed by Scaramucci’s habit of running his mouth (in the interests of communications) with the support he had been given in 2016 for his help in naming his mouth off at the wrong times.

The Mooch’s arrival heralded the departure of Priebus’s creature, Sean Spicer, the modern American master of the barefaced lie; thus began what sometimes seemed like a 10-day-long Saturday night live sketch. Scaramucci, having begun (as they all do) with a promise to do things differently, in a way that didn’t seem to set well with Priebus, as the latter’s fears about leaks are confirmed, one by one. Scaramucci were confirmed, one by one.

...From Priebus, as the latter’s fears about surmise that he got very little support and a half in PR that he decided to switch White House staff - so bored by his day for himself busy hunting for leaks from himself.

He can fire advisor for a big pay day. At the centre of it all is a very funny sort of Bonapartism we are witnessing the reign of the man-child.

Workshop, Friends Meeting House, 31 Red Lion Square, London WC1. No to Trump’s inflammatory behaviour towards North Korea.

Organised by Stop the arms fair: www.stopthearmsfair.org/events/leeds-stop-arms-fair-workshop.

Organised by Stop the arms fair: www.stopthearmsfair.org/events/leeds-stop-arms-fair-workshop.

London Communist Forum
Sunday August 13 and Sunday August 20: No forum
Weekly Worker
July 13, 2017
London, WC1. Followed by open discussion and reading group: study of August Nimmo’s Lenin’s electoral triumph and victorious revolution through the revolution of 1905. This meeting: chapter 2, ‘Revolutionary continuity.


Against fire and fury
Monday September 4, 9am to 4pm, US embassy, 24 Grosvenor Square, London W1. No to Trump’s inflammatory behaviour towards North Korea.

Organised by Stop the War Coalition: www.stopwar.org.uk; and Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament: www.cnduk.org.

No to the arms fair
Saturday August 12, 10am to 4pm: Workshop, Friends Meeting House, 31 Red Lion Square, London WC1.

Organised by Stop the arms fair: www.stopthearmsfair.org/events/leeds-stop-arms-fair-workshop.

Das Kapital and Marx’s economics

Crafting peace
Saturday September 2, 11am to 6pm: Anti-war craft fair, Mill Hill Chapel, 197 Mill Hill Broadway, London NW7. Organised by Leeds Coalition Against War: www.lcaw.co.uk.

Stop arming Israel

Radical bargains

No to the arms trade

Stop the arms fair
Saturday September 9, 16pl, Rally at TUC Congress, Arndale Suite, Holiday Inn, 137 King’s Road, Brighton BN1. Confirmed speakers: Mark Serwotka (PCS), Steve Gillan (POA), Ronnie Draper (BFUW), Sean Hoyle (RMT), Amy Murphy (Usdaw).

Organised by National Shop Stewards Network: http://shopstewards.net.

Living with trauma

No to war
Wednesday September 20, 6.30pm to 8.30pm: Rally, Marx Memorial Library, 37A Clerkenwell Green, London EC1. No to the arms fair: www.facebook.com/nilondon.stwc.7.

Social histories of the Russian Revolution
Thursday September 28, 6.30pm: Discussion meeting, Birbeck, University of London, 26 Russell Square, London WC1; ‘Taking power: remaking the state, levelling wages, planning the economy’. Speaker: Wendy Goldman.


Tories out!
Sunday October 1, 12 noon: National demonstration on opening day of Conservative Party conference. Assembly Castlefield Arena, Rice Street, Manchester M3.

Organised by People’s Assembly: www.thepeoplesassembly.org.uk.

Making a world without war
Monday August 14, 8pm to 9.30pm: ‘Talk on the Arms Fair: Tackling the issue of war in 2017’. Hosted by Marx Memorial Library.

Organised by People’s Assembly: www.marx-memorial-library.org.

Capital and historical materialism


CPGB wills
Remember the CPGB and keep the struggle going. Put our party’s name and address, together with the amount you wish to leave, in your will. If you need further help, do not hesitate to contact us.
The growing trend towards rationing treatment is a disgrace, writes James Linney

The visual acuity is 6/18 or worse: ie, if patients can only see six metres what someone with normal vision would be able to see at 18 metres. Again, this contradicts NICE’s guidelines, which state cataract surgery should not be restricted at all for those with impaired vision based on the basis of visual acuity, but on the impact the condition has on the person’s life.

So the new reality is that being able to walk without pain and having not to worry can be considered of “limited clinical value”. I have used this example to show how these new CCG clinical thresholds for treatments represent a fundamental new stage in the withdrawal of NHS services. The human cost of these new restrictions are profound. Withholding joint replacements results in horrendous pain and disability, leading to the inability to work, and the loss of mobility and independence. Similarly, the denial of cataract surgery leads to social isolation and the risk of increased falls and the inability to perform basic functions, such as reading. It is obvious that in both these examples the greatest burden of harm falls on those who are already the most deprived and the more likely to have social support, those who cannot afford private treatment and those who are more likely to have other comorbidities. In other words, you have no choice but to suffer: the consequence of not having a comprehensive health service that is free at the point of need.

And this is just the start - the list is due to be extended and a second wave of restrictions is expected to roll out in the coming year. The CCGs are performing just as the Tories hoped they would: as local, isolated vehicles for the implementation of cuts. By driving the NHS to the point where it can no longer provide what people need, and funding it so that its performance for treatment despite the best efforts of its hard-working staff, the Tories hope to reach their real ideological prize - full privatisation. Just this week we have also had news about maternity wards being closed, cleaning staff shortages and the lack mental health professionals. Our immediate goals must be to halt these savage funding cuts. The gains made by Corbyn’s Labour Party in June’s election and the weakness of the current government’s position hopefully represents the start of this fight. But to win the battle we need to do much more than argue for a fairer distribution of resources under capitalism: we need to reverse the entire rotten system. Only then can the idea of privatisation as a commodity go to where it belongs - in the waste bin of history.

Notes
1. G Iacobucci, ‘Exceptional requests for core services: new guidelines’ - bmj.com/bmj/content/358/bmj.j3188.
2. www.nice.org.uk/guidance/gid-cgwave0741/
7. Ibid.
As well as celebrating the Russian Revolution, says Jack Conrad, we should never forget the counterrevolution it comes to complex societies, for planning to really be planning there has to be more than the issuing of commands from above. Branches, sectors and units within the Soviet system move forward together. For instance, producing steel requires an extra quantity of pig iron and coal. To increase the output of coal requires the introduction of new machinery. That machinery requires coal and steel, etc. By the same reason, the installation of new machinery in that mine must see the presence of labourers and coal, the availability of spare parts and regular maintenance. Without that there will be bottlenecks and ever-widening circles of disruption.

Under capitalism the supply of new machinery, raw materials, etc, is provided spontaneously, through the market, through the law of value. This is what gives capitalism its relative stability. If this is elemental level, capitalism is characterised by a disjunction between production and consumption. Some sellers cannot find buyers. Capital, though, strives for endless expansion. Eventually this must lead to overproduction. Commodities cannot be sold at their value. Surplus value cannot be realised. Production has to be curtailed. Workers find themselves on reduced hours. Demand falls. Slumps are therefore predictable (their timing, duration and effect are an altogether different matter). Companies see mercurial global plans, financial projections and marketing plans torn to shreds by the anarchic workings of the system. Even state plans can go badly awry. On September 16 1992, Black Wednesday, money markets forced the British government to oversee a disorderly withdrawal of the pound sterling from the European Monetary Union - it entailed a £3.4 billion loss to the UK treasury. In short, with capitalism, planning can only but be imperatively reduced.

What about the Soviet Union? Instead of celebrating the Great October, draft plans were the “mighty historical music of the progress of socialism”, to quote Leon Trotsky, “it is, perhaps, better, less descriptive, to describe them as blueprints for the post-reconstruction period in the Soviet Union. This involved proposals for reshaping existing industry and agriculture, assessing possible input-output ratios, producing strategic sources of investment, locating sources of investment, detailing new factories, etc.10 The dream was of an economy that functioned like a single enterprise. State trade and kulak-dominated agriculture were, however, more than planning nightmares. It is worth noting, in this context, that, while Yevgeni Preobrazhensky sought to achieve “a degree of coercion between the two basic irreconcilable economic systems operating in the USSR - i.e., the socialist-commmodity market and the petty commodity capitalist sector”, he stressed the compatibility of these two systems and their “two different economic laws”.11 And having to deal with these two fundamentally incompatible economic systems, unable to count on any meaningful aid from abroad and burdened with notoriously unreliable statistics, Gosplan had to resort to plenty of guesswork, assume a degree of coercion wherever necessary, and, at the end of the day bank on gallantly muddling through, if its ambitious goals were to be realised.

Death and birth

In his latest book, editing Pravda, with allies dominating the trade unions, topping the government, the Moscow party organisation, etc, Nicolai Bukharin castigated the widespread assumption that the fast growth rates notched up during the period of reconstruction that followed the civil war could be taken as the norm. He failed to off a series of Aesopian polemics against Trotsky and the “super-industrialisers”. His real target, of course, was Joseph Stalin. Incidentally, there is no secret as to how the
impressive growth rates were achieved during reconstruction. When the production of coal had, for example, increased by 50% in the course of what it had been prior to World War I, as if had, all that was required to double output in the space of a single year was to repair and put x mines back into operation. But, so argued Bukharin, attempts to maximise the extraction of “tribute” from the countryside, with a view to building innumerable new, gigantic enterprises, risked finally snapping the already strained link between agriculture and industry. These voracious projects would “give nothing, but rake enormous quantities of the means of production … and the means of consumption”.

Needless to say, Bukharin’s insistence on serving the peasant market, of balanced economic growth between industry and agriculture, etc. came under concerted attack. Calls for rapid industrialisation, growth of the means of production, as against going at the pace of the peasant’s nag, grew louder and louder. Stalin came out with a sorrowfully worded statement: “in order to preserve and accelerate our present rate of industrial development, in order to ensure an industry for the whole country, in order to raise further the standard of life of the rural population”, temporarily there had to be “an additional tax levied on the peasantry”. Naturally, though, this “additional tax” was going to be paid for by agriculture. “As the living standards of the peasantry are steadily rising”, Stalin could, that way, maintain his centrist image, while simultaneously abandoning his old centrist programme. Yet the fact of the matter was that the economic crisis was getting worse with every day that passed. NEP was about to die. A new society was about to be born.

The minimum variant of the draft five-year plan proposed only slightly reduced growth rates. In its maximum variant, growth rates were higher - quite considerably so for the last year of the plan. But Gosplan clearly lent in the direction of the minimum variant. The draft called for the development of “industries concerned with national defence” at the fastest possible rate however; a “moderate approach” to appropriating resources from agriculture was adopted. Indeed, Bukharin’s warning against the danger of “excessive” investments in large-scale projects seems to have been recognised: they would be “launched on a scale that would come on stream after many years of hugely costly construction”.

The “definitive text” of the first five-year plan came in three hefty volumes: volume one, general outline; volume two, part one, programme for construction and production; part two, social problems, problems of labour, distribution and cultural problems; volume three, regional subdivisions of the plan. Over their 2,000 pages the planners had attempted to present a fact that had exactly figures that had allegedly been carefully calculated, taking into account the manifold interconnections and technical potential of every branch and unit of the Soviet economy.

The projections were certainly impressive. In the first five-year plan the production was to increase by 179% (the minimum variant was 131.8%); 10 million tons was to reach 10 million tons from a 1928 base of 3.3 million tons; steel was to follow a similar upward curve. Gosplan put an initial 20% of the plans on agricultural machinery, chemicals and machine building. There was to be import substitution, when it came to wool, leather and cotton. Proposed investments were accompanied by sources of taxation, corporate and production surpluses, etc. Branch by branch, region by region, the authors - chief amongst them being G. V. Sokolov, A. I. Fedorov, O. O. Voinov, V. N. Kurygin and Stanislav Strumilin - describe known or potential natural resources, the possibility of agrarian surplus, etc. Branch by branch, region by region, the authors - chief amongst them being G. V. Sokolov, A. I. Fedorov, O. O. Voinov, V. N. Kurygin and Stanislav Strumilin - describe known or potential natural resources, the possibility of agrarian surplus, etc.

During the course of 1929-31 the leadership had to be achieved in the “shortest possible time”. 18 During the course of 1929-31 the leadership had to be achieved in the “shortest possible time”. 18 During the course of 1929-31 the leadership had to be achieved in the “shortest possible time”. 18
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“…and exhilaratingly far-reaching. But would the year before, as the disastrous first year of the plan, be succeeded by...
his efforts. However, with food shortages in the towns and turmoil in the countryside being blamed on kulaks, he began using more drastic measures, which have been blamed for some of the main causes of the Great Depression and the need to∃. The main plan was, in other words, inherently planless. This salient fact was recognised at the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (bolsheviks) in February 1929 by the left Mensheviks Aaron Yugov, Solomon Schwartz, O. Domenevsky, Fedor Dun and Yu Zverev in an article published under the title "Razvitie Tolstovskogo Ideologiya" (Tolstoy's Ideology). However, the "main link" - i.e. "heavy industry" - there was overfulfilment, boasted Stalin.4 He admitted that developing heavy industry involved enormeous amounts of raw materials and labour-power. But, he claimed, the party, he himself, "had declared frankly that this would call for serious sacrifices, and that it was our duty openly and consciously to make these sacrifices if we wanted to win our goal."43,44

Put another way, the promise to increase living standards by between 77.5% and 85% proved to be a cruel hoax.

Nowadays, there is no serious doubt that official data about the five-year plan were abundantly exaggerated. Recomputations by western experts, even in the 1940s, reveal much lower increases. Their estimates for growth in the USSR's national income between 1928 and 1937 - two five-year plans - varied from between 33%, 64% and 74% (the discrepancy largely resulting from the use of 1925-34 prices, US 1940 prices or real 1926-27 Soviet prices as statistical weights). Nevertheless, even allowing for rough inflation and the gross inaccuracy of Soviet figures, the production of 'destruction' and the effective destruction of the statistically invisible, but economically significant, handmade, small workshop and domestic sectors, a "great deal was achieved."45 The engineering works of Moscow and Leningrad were now more or less complete with the purchase and installation of foreign technology, the giant Dnieper hydroelectric dam started to generate electricity, the Magnitogorsk iron and steel complex rose vast from nothing, and from those first 1,500 tons of steel facilitated the production of all the great machine industries to put into operation. 

Albeit at enormous cost in terms of resources and labour-power, the Soviet Union was being modernised.

Agriculture

As already mentioned, the aim of "total" collectivisation was absent from the "definitive" text of the first five-year plan. Events forced Stalin's hand. The industrialisation drive, by its very chaotic nature, had to be preceded by a goods famine, and as its speed was relentlessly upped month by month, runaway inflation punctuated the value of money. The worths of the fixed price farm goods for agricultural products sunk below the cost of production. If there had been something to buy, the peasants still might have gone to market. But there was not. Hence the state's options effectively closed. Higher real agricultural prices would not shift the socialists' bargains. Towards the line of least resistance, had to go for "total collectivisation".

A total 1930 was declared to be all rural organisations, instructing them to "lead the spades' advance" of collectivisation. An obvious euphemism. Behind the facade of voluntary union there was brute force and lower increasing. The Treaty of Versailles, the legal history of collectivisation was written by not Stalin's propagandists, but harassed regional and local officials. Their bland reports bear truthful, yet unintended, witness to the satanically of confiscations, the arbitrary arrests, the savage treatment of kulak families, the torture, the starvation, the emaciated, fetid children, the batches of executions and the all-round dehumanisation.

In the 11th century Genghis Khan and his immediate successors - Ogdeki Khan and Batu Khan - laid waste to 'Old Rus'. In the 1930s Stalin did the same to the new Russia. He unleashed a "silent" civil war on the countryside. Orders were issued demanding the liquidation of the kulaks - an altogether vague category - as a class. E.g. a hard-working, former hero of the Red Army, could easily find himself branded as a blood-sucking kulak. Not surprisingly there was widespread resistance. Anyone deemed to be a kulak was to have their property expropriated. Everything was to be taken. Quota 63,000 were shot or imprisoned, 1,560,000 exiled to remote regions like Siberia. The rest were to be forcibly moved out from kolchaks. Perhaps 1.5 million people were affected, among them so-called "ideological" kulaks: i.e. those middle or poor peasants who opposed collectivisation. Family relationships, dependency relationships, friendship ties, hatred of local communist officials, loyalty to the Orthodox church meant that many potential kulaks.

Numerous protest demonstrations and revolts occurred - including the kulaks' 'humanity's revolutions'.6 During local Communist Party meetings, Komsomol members, soviet officials and militiamen to attack them, they scored numerous, albeit fleeting, successes. Horses, grain and other property was regained. In Siberia, the North Caucasus, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Moldavia and the Crimean peasant revolts assumed near civil war proportions. Red Army regulars, GPU troops, militia units and even military aircraft to be used to suppress them. Neighbours were taken not only kulaks, but middle and poor peasants too. Antagonist their leaders were leading militia lieutenants and former Red Army officers.

Though at the cost of many thousands of peasants' lives, Stalin was forced to retreat. He issued his famous 'Dziea with success' speech in Pravda (March 2 1936). Cadres were blamed for having carried away and using excessive force. While but low-quality and marginal land was once again divided into individual holdings, there was the promise to return to the offensive. Agriculture would be totally collectivised and kulak resistance finally broken. By 1932 that promise had been delivered.

When it came to agriculture, therefore, Stalin devised to shift the focus. Instead of output, instead of surplus product, instead of improved productivity, he reported that the first-five year plan had been finished "three times over". Now there were 200,000 collective and 5,000 state farms in operation; 300,000 and 30,000 state farms in operation; and this went hand in hand with the "routing of the kulaks as a class." Imagining a newly hired iodized-fertiliser farmer, who was to receive a vote on a vital issue by lawmakers and then two days early, before the debate opened, turning in, 3,000, anyway, what we do know. They proudly boast that the assignment had been fulfilled "three times over". But it would have been 600 existed and promptly escorted from the building by security. But Stalin was in, effect, both editor … and in 

Collectivisation had nothing to do with civilising, let alone socialising agriculture. Robert Conquest is quite right when he says that the "idea of smoothly planned progress was quite
supplement

inapplicable. 62 Collectivisation was carried through barbarically and resulted in agricultural backwardness and Red Army losses. The peasants’ gluttonous attempt to retain what was theirs. Mihail Sholokhov’s “socialist-realist” novel Virgin Soil Ploughed Under (1938) was a thinly disguised ac-

ory of eating that accompanied collectivisation:

Not only those who had joined the collective farm, but individual farmers also slaughtered. Their efforts were wasted as their slaughtered animals kept for breeding. In two nights the herded cattle of Gremyachy were reduced to a mere 538. The same had happened to draught cattle and roasting meat. At dinner-time everybody had a greasy mouth, everybody belched as though he had eaten the whole meal, and roasting meat was left to rot in the memory of the dead. And all were oozing with the intoxication of eating. 63

Even when the butcher finally stopped theorgy of eating that accompanied collectivisation, for handling what little livestock remained. Neither the peasants nor the mobilised farmers sent from the towns to do the work were capable of meeting the technical consequences of collectivisation. Tens of millions of horses, mules, and a large force of any half-competent peasant. Milking, feeding, sheltering and reproducing herds of 200 or 300 were unaccustomed tasks. Hence, in public many animals “died from neglect.” 45 The net result was that between 1928 and 1932 the number of cattle, sheep, and goats fell from 170 million to 11.6 million and 24.7 million respectively. Between 1928 and 1932, millions of horses and mules fell to the neglect of the memory of the dead. And all were oozing with the intoxication of eating. 63

till Gorbachev and the fall in 1991. Despite that, peasants would never again engage in economic activity with their own resources, nor would they engage in the “fall in urban real wages.” 46 Force became a necessary tool, and the state recognised the need for an industrial workforce, force expelled the kulaks, force expelled the kulaks, force expelled the kulaks into the countryside. In the course of the first five-year plan, 18 million of registered workers shot up from 11.3 to 22.6 million; i.e., an increase of 1 billion. The state then reached nearly 40 million (with 35 million in agriculture). Here all the efforts to cope with a sharp fall in average living standards and the huge increase in the absolute number of workers were concentrated on the following. The state, in order to find the main source of primary hurovskist, 57 58 The index was still higher, hence, industry “developed” chiefly on the basis of its immediate profitability. 57 Stalin’s pillarised version of Preobrazhensky, even if that programme of unequal exchange between agriculture and industry, resolution itself evolved into exploitation within industry. The true measure of radically boosting productivity failed to materialise. That despite the initial enthusiasm for the first five-year plan, some brigades, production program and socialistic competition. When the new plant and machinery came into operation, and the living standards of the peasants were much lower, but those in the countryside ate poorly, those in the countryside ate poorly, and those in the countryside ate poorly. Hence, in public many animals “died from neglect.” 45 The net result was that between 1928 and 1932 the number of cattle, sheep, and goats fell from 170 million to 11.6 million and 24.7 million respectively. Between 1928 and 1932, millions of horses and mules fell to the neglect of the memory of the dead. And all were oozing with the intoxication of eating. 63

Controversy has raged over whether or not, or to what degree, the state assumed the role of a product necessary for primary accumulation. Agriculture, according to Alec Nove, “made a decisive contribution to the financing of the new industries.” 40 41 The 1930s and 1931 Soviet Standard historiography also claims that a “substantial contribution to industrialisation was made by the Soviet countryside.” 40 41

51. Ibid, p78.
52. See V Stavans 
64. See D Filtzer, Foundations of a planned economy (Harvard, 1973), vol 1, p302.
Mike Belbin completes his series of articles on genetics, racism and human character

I f we reject the discrimination of racism and psycho-geneticism - the idea that character is determined by biology - then we are left with human beings that is ‘blank’ at birth, one who acquires a personality by their own experience and decisions. And one who makes their life through their own efforts, not when they are born, the example of a self-sufficient individual?... This would lead us back to focusing on the individual’s personal weaknesses or strengths? If the individual is weak, their weakness belongs to their body or mind and is not dependent on other influences - social and familial. These characteristics must therefore be somehow physiologically identical in all humans, but strongly ‘wired’. So individualism does not get us anywhere, as you can’t and cannot ‘hack it’, it must be something in you. The social gradient

The social gradient

that said, Marmot does not want to give in to stereotypy. For example, the majority of children born to parents of deprived social position do not end up in crime. 'But by the age of 21, some 12 per cent of black men in Washington DC will in fact be arrested and then only for drug-dealing, and some for murder'... Marmot concludes:

What happens during a critical period has an enduring effect on disease risk over a lifetime. Second, there may be a number of advantages and disadvantages over a lifetime. Third, where you start out does affect where you end up... early life experiences may be very important because they affect health directly, but because they change the child’s chance of ending up in a favourable social and (health) situation in later life...

These post-natal social influences are not unalterable, but they are a strong force. Class is what counts for your wellbeing over a lifetime - anyone who claims to believe in human equality will seek to act on this inequality. Alternatively, the consequence of adopting psycho-social, idiothetic approaches to health in this case, pharmaceuticals is promoted as the cure that can solve our social problems, especially when these are other angry people. Chemistry replaces politics and we have a new racism, a new discrimination against those categorised as genetically inferior...

The creative animal

Speaking of class, what of Marx or Engels? Did they believe in a blank slate, an ‘empty being’, which is then totally conditioned by society’s requirements? Or did they favour the existence of an original human nature, which is essentially good and cooperative, but perverted by civilisation? Are we robots or are we angels (albeit fallen)?

As materialists, Marx and Engels did not forget the body - that legacy of the animal state. The human being is an entity constituted by biology. Like other animals, it seeks survival, shelter and pleasure, pursuing safety and sexual satisfaction. In this sense, however, it has developed a ‘second nature’ - society and culture - with its variety of tools and institutions. From early on in his writings, Marx recognised both of humanity’s aspects: the satisfaction-seeking biology and the mind’s invention...

From the requirement to justify unequal disparities are indeed genetic, but also cultural and environmental influences. A certain physical capacity is inherited genetically, but culture and experience can significantly influence the physical and biological aspects to contribute to them, making it a complex interaction. The social gradient, not a diagram - the cast includes parents and the economic system, it is not fixed by biochemistry.

No intellectually respectable person bluntly exposes a fixed idea of racial superiority as a result of genetics. But this would lead us back to the European empires expanded (for example, in Africa), bourgeois optimism in the research on race as a ‘scientific’ enterprise, the conservative notion that grades of people have a fixed nature or character. But people always say it is a mix of nature and nurture. This is a dialectical-sounding phrase, but in reality there is a complex interaction. A certain physical capacity is inherited genetically, but culture and experience can significantly influence the physical and biological aspects to contribute to them, making it a complex interaction. The social gradient, not a diagram - the cast includes parents and the economic system, it is not fixed by biochemistry.
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Who is speaking and when

**golden time**, on St James London SE1 4BW

**British Worker**

1. **June 8 general election**
   10am-12.30pm
   4.45pm-7pm
   **Marx and Engels and the democratic breakthrough**
   **August H Nimtz Jr**

2. **Lenin, Bolshevism and the tsar’s duma**
   12.30pm
   **Challenges ahead for global capitalism**
   **Michael Roberts**

3. **How revolutionary were the bourgeois revolutions?**
   2pm-4.15pm
   **Howst and Engels to the fight for democracy.**
   **Neil Davidson**

4. **Anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism**
   4.45pm-7pm
   **Moshé Mackover**

5. **The real alternatives when socialism in one country seemed inevitable**
   3.30pm-4pm
   **Hillel Ticktin**

6. **The ‘rule of law’ delusion**
   10am-12.30pm
   **Mike Macnair**

7. **Computer says no**
   4.45pm-7pm
   **Paul Demarty**

8. **The Sunday Worker and the National Left Wing Movement**
   3.30pm-4pm
   **Lawrence Parker**

9. **Bolshevism, soviet elections and the Constituent Assembly**
   **August H Nimtz Jr**

10. **1967 and all that: the Sexual Offences Act**
    **Mike Macnair**

11. **Colonisation of Palestine in historical perspective**
    **Moshé Mackover**

12. **Trump and the Middle East**
    **Yassmine Mathar**

13. **The Bolshevik problem of breaking from capitalism**
    **Marc Mulholland**

**Saturday August 12**

**10am-12.30pm**
Registration and access from 12.30pm

**2pm-4.15pm**

**4.45pm-7pm**

**Sunday August 13**

**Monday August 14**

**Tuesday August 15**

**Wednesday August 16**

**Thursday August 17**

**Friday August 18**

**Saturday August 19**
Iraqi communist Hatfa Zangana addressed the London Communist Forum on August 6

Firstly, a few words about the recent history of Mosul, so we can understand the context of what is happening today. In the aftermath of the US-led invasion of Iraq in 2003, leading to the declaration of the ‘liberation’ of Mosul in 2017, we now see the occupation lost and the victory claimed by the Iraqi government. That will pose questions about the future of Iraq in generation of Islamic State in particular.

Personally I lived in Mosul in the 1970s, when I was a medical student at the university - then one of the best in the Iraqi army, but it was largely destroyed. Some of my family are still in the city and I am in continuous contact with them, so I can get a realistic picture of what is going on there.

Mosul is the second largest city in Iraq and it is renowned for its ethnically and religiously diverse community. We are talking about a Middle Eastern religious or ethnic group you can think of is likely to be represented there. The majority is Arab and Muslim, but there are also Christians, Yazidis, Armenians and many other different ethnic and religious backgrounds - they have been in Mosul, which was part of the Ottoman empire, for the surrounding area since ancient times.

Its population is around two million, many of whom well-established, as well as the USA as a whole is famous for its yearning for education. For many of us in the 70s and 80s having a degree was not enough - we wanted to go on to post-graduate studies. In many ways this was similar to the attitude you might expect in many parts of Europe, and in terms of education you might expect in many parts of Europe, and in terms of education you might expect in many parts of Europe, and in terms of education in Europe.

But in 2003, the situation changed. The US established one of its largest military bases in Mosul, and the Americans were given control of the city to protect their interests and to install their own particular interests, as well as the Popular Mobilization Units, which was part of the Iraqi army during the Iraq-Iran war

One of the victims of torture was Ramzi Shihab Ahmed, a former general in the Iraqi army and a British citizen who lived in Mosul with his family. On 10 August 2017, he was arrested by the Iraqi security forces and transferred to a secret military installation near the city of Kirkuk, where he was held for 10 months. According to his family, he never heard from him again.

One of the Iraqis who has been arrested and detained, according to the report of the UN, was Muthana, a victim of torture. He was arrested by the Iraqi security forces in 2017 and held in a secret military installation near the city of Kirkuk. During his detention, he was subjected to severe and prolonged torture.

The response of the Iraqi people to the ‘liberation’ of Mosul was not as expected. According to the report of the UN, the Iraqi security forces have committed a number of human rights violations, including torture, arbitrary detention, and extrajudicial executions.

The impact of such events on the Iraqi people is devastating. The report of the UN highlights the need for immediate action to bring an end to human rights violations and to ensure that justice is served for the victims of such atrocities.

At the time of the ‘liberation’ of Mosul, the city was occupied by IS fighters. The Iraqi army, with the support of the US-led coalition, entered Mosul in August 2014 and engaged in a bitter battle with IS fighters.

One of the problems faced by the Iraqi government after the ‘liberation’ of Mosul is the reconstruction of the city. The destruction caused by IS fighters has left the city in ruins, with many buildings and infrastructure destroyed.

Notes
3. www.bbc.com/worldservice