

ply out of fear of a Tory government. But because without union support, the Callaghan government would be forced to resign, leaving the way clear for the destruction of the Labour Party as a viable working-class party in Britain.

Little attempt is being made to hide efforts to split the Labour Party into two opposing factions, neither of which would pretend to represent Britain's large trade-union movement, which in contrast to the U.S., has practically 80 percent of all workers within it. The right-wing social democratic faction, led by Healey and European Commissioner Roy Jenkins, would be free to align with the Liberal Party and factions of the Tory party under a strict monetarist economic program which would leave Britain a deindustrialized wasteland. The other, a "neo-Marxist" faction based on grassroots constituency parties, would form a zero-growth, "left" alternative.

The trade unions' support for the Callaghan government, therefore, signaled their intent to keep the Labour Party firmly committed to a proindustrial growth strategy. Successive interventions by trade-union representatives at the party conference registered their commitment to growth by blocking constituency party resolutions demanding a ban on nuclear power development. Electricians Union leader Frank Chapple warned of cold, starvation, and world war without nuclear power, while Miners' union general secretary Joe Gormley predicted "a return to the Stone Age" if the zero-growth proponents were successful.

Healey Under Fire

Preliminary attempts to weed out the monetarist faction of the party were made by Transport Workers Union general secretary Jack Jones, who launched a bitter attack on the corruption within the Labour Party — corruption which directly involves former Prime

Minister Harold Wilson and his Jewish financial friends in the City of London. Following the suicide of ex-Second International Treasurer Sir Eric Miller (knighted by Wilson), evidence concerning Miller's connections and shady transactions with several of Wilson's top aides, including Chancellor Healey, has become public knowledge. When asked if he was implicating Healey in his attacks on ministerial conduct, Jones only replied "draw your own conclusions," but proceeded to charge that the government's lack of credibility with traditional Labour voters could be directly linked to its hypocrisy. He called on the Labour party to "come out as a clean party, a party of principle... above suspicion."

Jones' attack on Healey is just an extension of general discontent over the way the Chancellor has deliberately driven a wedge between the unions and industry over wage policy. Healey announced in his August budget that any company which contravened the government's "suggested" pay increase of 10 percent would immediately face withdrawal of all governmental aid, export credits, or investment assistance. While several smaller companies have already been hit by Healey's sanctions, the largest, and most recent industrial rebel is Ford Motors of Great Britain, whose announcement only last weekend that it would provide 7,500 jobs in a new engine plant in South Wales was greeted by the government as "a major boost for our industrial strategy."

While the government's position against Ford is still undecided, major trade-union support has already been mobilized for the companies caught in Healey's de-industrialization squeeze. Moss Evans, general secretary-elect of the Transport workers, denounced the Healey strategy as "blackmail", charging that it "smacks of the corporate state" and might destroy the government's hopes for collaboration with the unions on the industrial strategy.

Union Of The Left Break Means PCF Must Renew Program

The following policy statement from the European Labor Party (ELP) on the current programmatic debate threatening to fracture the Union of the Left, the French Communist Party's electoral alliance with the Socialist Party of François Mitterrand, was released in the Oct. 4 issue of the ELP's bi-monthly publication Nouvelle Solidarité:

The break in France's Union of the Left and the new forward motion taken by Franco-Soviet cooperation are creating an entirely new political configuration in France. In view of this historically decisive situation, the French Communist Party (PCF) and its allied trade union, the CGT, can only respond by becoming a center of prodevelopment programmatic initiatives to which other forces will have to define themselves, or else disappear as representative institutions of the working class. There is no other choice for them now.

This immediately raises the question of the Common Program of the Left. Officially, it is in the name of the

letter of this program that the PCF broke with the Socialist Party (SP), by demanding, against SP leader Mitterrand's will, the nationalization of all the subsidiaries of the nine industrial groups that are listed in the text of the 1972 accord between the two parties.

Reality, as militant Communists well know, is quite different. In effect, it was not a certified public accountants' dispute over the number of nationalizations which provoked the split, but a surge of morality which spread from the rank-and-file up to the leadership of the party.

This surge was made possible by the intervention of the Soviet Union, which unequivocally condemned any complicity with the "decentralization," zero-growth, Atlanticist policies defended by François Mitterrand in the name of the City of London, rightly counterposing to him the positive elements offered by the governmental majority, generally close to Prime Minister Raymond Barre on the one hand, and the Gaullist movement on the other.

Contrary to Mitterrand, these forces have taken a stand against NATO activities on several precise points: the development of energy, national defense, the role of the Palestinian Liberation Organization in a Middle East peace, and the struggle against terrorism. Industrial growth founded on the expansion of the nuclear industry sector, which the Gaullist party (RPR) defends, is the motor force of this policy.

The side that is hidden — at least from the public at large — in this new situation, is the growing influence of the themes developed by the European Labor Party (ELP) which notably contributed to launching the fight against the “environmentalist” operation.

However, there is a danger if, as a basis for its polemic with the Socialists, the PCF invokes the letter — and not the spirit — of the Common Program. The Maginot Line which Communist General Secretary Georges Marchais is using as a rampart — “we will yield to no pressure, either from the outside or from within,... we will not budge an inch” — cannot hold up any better than any other defense of the same nature. Were such an attitude to continue, at best it would bring about political paralysis, at worst it would lead to a new, purely electoral, compromise with the Socialists. In either case, it would purely and simply be a betrayal of working class interests.

As any good Resistance fighter from World War II will tell you, an effective defense can only be based on a strategy of the offensive. In order to elaborate this strategy, the PCF must take the real reasons for its break with the Socialists (as opposed to those reasons publicly evoked by Marchais) and forge them into a weapon for war.

The “Common Program”

The Common Program is a useful reference point. In its general conception it is not really a “program,” but a gross catalogue of needs inspired by the most backward Fabian redistributionism, as particularly the first section of the “program” shows. This fruit of backroom compromise reflects the image of a world governed by an unchangeable system of fixed laws converging towards a predetermined point. This is the dead world of little shopkeepers, of finite technological resources. To accept it is to inevitably be led to a 19th century Malthusian view, when redistribution reaches its “physical” limits, and reaches the point of eliminating the “useless eaters.”

However, the Common Program also contains the pale reflection of a diametrically opposed conception, as the Preface signed by Marchais explains in the following manner:

The resolution of the new problems raised by the development of the productive forces, the satisfaction of needs which this development engenders, require a profound transformation of the economic and political structures of the country... Others are trying to bring back that old reaction-

ary theory which is Malthusianism, and propose to deny the progress of knowledge, the increasing of social wealth and the expansion of humanity.

This is in fact the worldview which motivated the break with Mitterrand, the worldview that in part inspired the second part of the program, that defined the parameters of a “dynamic and efficient industrial society” as implying “a considerable development of research” and “an appropriate credit policy.” What we are proposing to the PCF and the CGT is that they put this worldview in the command center of their policies.

A concoction of Fabianism and progrowth policy only produces, in the final analysis, obscurity. In that kind of intellectual algebra, minus times plus can only add up to a minus. No matter how resourceful the author, a little or even a lot of growth cannot be introduced through the back door into a whole whose logic is foreign to it.

On the contrary, it is only by basing itself on a *global* conception of the universe in expansion, a universe not seen from the standpoint of an enumeration of existing resources — which the senses perceive — but from the standpoint of the revolutionary technological forms necessary for the formation of social surplus permitting the maintenance of existing capacities and the creation of the new forces necessary for the survival of the human race that the Communist Party will rapidly be able to become a center of programmatic initiatives guiding the development of the French Republic.

To deliberately assume this creative role implies more precisely an epistemological revolution. To use the example of the Common Program again, it would first require breaking with the imbecilic addition of specific “measures” and wholly rebuilding it according to a programmatic content changing its entire geometry. The parameters of “international cooperation” — a new international monetary system breaking with the dollar and a corresponding international credit mechanism for development — is the foundation for the construction of a planned national economy in which institutions and services can be defined, and not the reverse.

The present international crisis can only be resolved within the framework of a new world economic order; thus the French Communist Party, which has an international vocation, must establish the outline of its program keeping in mind the contribution that the French Republic can make to this order. From this standpoint, it must be said, Gaullism has a relatively more advanced view of the world than the “socialism with French colors” in whose name Marchais does not hesitate to cite the fascist leader of the Action Française, Charles Maurras. It is up to the PCF to take up the challenge. Scientific creation and national education are the pillars on which it must build. This, in the final analysis, requires the *political* promotion of a whole French scientific élite which, having a *universal* vocation, represents the best of France’s national culture, contrary to the existentialist “literary” culture which pollutes, among others, the PCF itself and its youth organizations in particular.