



# CONQUER THE WORLD

The International Proletariat Must and Will

Voice of The Supporters of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement (RIM) in Britain.

Issue No 3 - June/July 1988.

## Tear Down British Imperialism In Northern Ireland 14



Republicans attacking SAS soldiers.

## Palestine Unbreakable Spirit of Intefadeh 2

**Afghanistan:  
From Occupation  
to Civil War**

20

**Against Economism**

24



## PALESTINE

# Unbreakable Spirit of *Intefadeh*

Each morning before dawn, youth have poured into the streets to build barricades out of garbage bins and boulders and whatever else they could find. Mounds of burning tyres have sent thick, oily smoke up into the sky. The barricades enforced a general strike against the Israeli occupiers - shops were shuttered, and tens of thousands of Palestinian workers who provide cheap labour every day across the border in Israel refused to work.

Later, as Israeli "security forces" moved in to disperse, beat, and kill, running battles raged in the dirt streets of the eight refugee camps of the Gaza. Palestinian youths wrapped their faces in black-and-white kaffiyehs and fought the enemy troops with stones, pipes, bottles and occasional molotov cocktails.

The Gaza strip showed all the signs of an open fire zone: pockmarked buildings, scorched streets, walls covered with slogans denouncing the oppressor. And hospitals filled with bullet-ridden bodies, often shot in the back - proof of Israeli atrocities.

For the last few years, reactionary vultures of all kinds have cackled over "the corpse of the Palestinian movement." Now suddenly, all their lies are scattered. The rebels of Gaza stood up and revealed themselves - young, fearless, irrepressible. Sparks flew from Gaza to the West Bank and ignited fresh resistance among Palestinians living there under Israel's Zionist boot.

"The Iron Fist" - that is how the Israeli rulers themselves described their own policy toward Palestinians. At every occasion they bragged about their willingness to use any means to terrorize the two million Palestinian Arabs living under direct Israeli rule. There is open incitement for more Palestinian blood. When the defence minister argued before the Israeli parliament that the army was using all available means to put down the unrest, a member of the ruling Likud Party rose to disagree and called for the deliberate doubling of the Palestinian death toll in the occupied zones. And yet with typical doublethink, they also insisted that nothing unusual was going on...just the usual "terrorist actions" of a few troublemakers and "juvenile delinquents". One meeting of the Israeli cabinet passed a resolution that said, "there isn't a civil rebellion in the territories."

Yet for all their absurdity, their brutality and bravado - the Israeli occupiers have, quite simply, failed to suppress this righteous uprising.

After months of street fighting, strikes, and protests, it is only becoming more difficult to catalogue all the separate events that make up this rebellion. It blankets the whole ancient land of Palestine: from the River Jordan to the edges of Sinai's desert, throughout the impoverished towns and refugee camps of the Gaza Strip, in the crowded farm villages of the West Bank, in the Arab districts of East Jerusalem. The banned Palestinian flag is flown defiantly again and again. Gatherings quickly turn into demonstrations; demonstrations quickly erupt into confrontations. Rebellion has also broken out among the people whom the Western press calls "Israeli Arabs" - those Palestinians who live within the so-called "Green Line" - shocking the Israeli government and its international backers.

### THE STOMPING OF ISRAELI BOOTS

To understand the ferocity, anger and self-sacrifice that this continuing struggle demands of the Palestinians, it is necessary to get a picture of the extreme force being applied by Israel. The heavily armed combat troops have licence to kill. The Israeli military is applying sweeping counterinsurgency measures against all Palestinian political forces and unleashing calculated as well as random terror against the entire Arab population.

Almost every day brings new reports of killings by Israeli troops. The Palestinian Liberation Organisation claims the dead now number more than 200; they cite Israeli left-wing newspaper accounts that the Israeli army has buried Palestinians in secret mass graves to hide the actual number of people the troops have actually murdered.

The Israeli military still cynically insists that its troops only shoot in "self-defence". However, the shooting has only gone one way. Just one Israeli soldier has been killed. This is not self-defence - it is deliberate state terror against civilians. One documented example of the Israeli committing acts of random murder is the killing of Haniya Suleiman Zarawneh, a 25-year-old mother of five from the camp of Al Ram, five miles north of Jerusalem. She was killed on January 3rd as she washed clothes outside her home. A relative



# GAZA ERUPTS

said an Israeli soldier pursued a young demonstrator into her building, shot open the lock to her apartment, and ran through her house out onto a patio. There he caught the boy in front of Haniya. "Haniya told him to please leave the boy alone," the witness says. The soldier then shot Haniya in the chest from a distance of two to three yards. Israeli army officials claim that this incident is an exception, saying that the officer "lost his head".

Mass arrests and Kangaroo court "military trials" continue. The Israeli secret police and troops have arrested more than 4,000 Palestinians. Israel claims the right to detain Palestinians for six months without trials or even specific charges.

The Israeli government had justified the mass arrests by saying they would "restore order" by rounding up the "few instigators." There can be little doubt that these arrests have been a savage blow to the struggle of Palestinians. Hundreds of political activists have been locked up, hundreds from the masses have been terrorized and beaten in detention. And yet, so great is the power of this uprising that even such massive arrests have apparently completely failed as a means of "restoring order" — the arrests have simply become a new focus of protests and stone-throwing.

According to Mazen Quepty, a Palestinian lawyer in Jerusalem, two 17-year-old youths were seized by Israelis in the West Bank town of Hebron during the night of December 19th. They were taken to Faraa prison north of Nablus where, their lawyer said, they were tortured by Israelis wielding electroshock equipment until they gave confessions. An Israeli army spokeswoman denied that electroshock was used. But the youths remain in detention and could not be reached by journalists. This same week Amnesty International released its report on child torture which lists Israel together with South Africa among countries known to torture children.

Despite their own denials that they face the resistance of an entire population, the Israelis utilized another special punishment: "town arrest".

In Nuseirat camp in Gaza, after shooting into the crowd with sniper rifles, the Israeli military clamped a complete curfew on the entire population of 30,000. No Palestinians there are allowed to leave their homes, fullstop. This was enforced by massive occupation of the village by Israeli troops.

Close to 100,000 Palestinians in at least six refugee camps in Gaza were put under such town-wide house arrest at various times, sometimes for days

PALESTINE

# Unbreakable Spirit of Intefadeh

*There is an Arabic word that should be part of the vocabulary of the world's oppressed: intefadeh, as the Palestinians proudly call their uprising.*

Continued from page 5.

## Uprising!



Amari refugee center, West Bank.



Nablus, West Bank.

at a stretch. In other cases troops have completely sealed off refugee districts by controlling all traffic in and out — a tactic designed to terrify people who remember the 1982 massacres of Palestinians at Sabra and Shatila refugee camps south of Beirut in Lebanon. In the Jabalya and Bureij camps, all males between the ages of fourteen and sixty were taken into custody at a military camp.

Meanwhile, this "Iron Fist" also chose to strike by air. Israeli warplanes bombed Palestinian camps in Lebanon, killing dozens of people — mostly civilians, including children. It was supposedly in response to a single Palestinian guerrilla who penetrated Israeli territory on a hang glider and attacked some soldiers. The air raid continues Israel's Nazi-like policy of massive retaliation against civilian villages for each single death on its side.

And still, the resistance rages without an end in sight!

### SHULTZ VS THE SHEBAB.

George Shultz, the U.S. Secretary of State, landed in Israel with a sinister plan. His mission is to piece together a new reactionary setup for the United States and Israel in the region.

The first step of his plan would be for Israel to stage local elections among Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The newly elected officials would be given no real power but would be expected to act as collaborators with Israeli occupation and as Palestinian "representatives" in a U.S.-sponsored international conference.

That conference would put a rubber stamp on an "interim arrangement" forced on the Palestinian people. In other words, some form of meaningless "self-rule" would be

approved — it would have nothing to do with real national liberation and an independent Palestinian state. Palestinians and Arab heads of state participating in such a conference would be required to agree to renounce and suppress revolutionary struggle against the Zionist settler state and accept its "right to exist".

In short, Shultz's plan is aimed at crushing Palestinian resistance and building a new arrangement in the region to protect the reactionary interests of Israel and its U.S. godfathers.

But even before Shultz landed in Israel, the shebab — the Palestinian youth — declared loud and clear that they reject his imperialist "initiative". Heated street battles raged in many towns and refugee camps, as Palestinian youth showed the world their determination to free themselves from chains of Zionist domination and clashed with Israeli troops. Israel responded with bullets and beatings. There were new arrests, injuries, murders, and other outrages — including a second incident of Israeli troops trying to bury Palestinians alive.

According to reports in the press, Yasser Arafat and the "external" leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization at first agreed to allow several "prominent" Palestinian notables to meet with Shultz but then were forced to eat their words. A Palestinian writer quoted by the New York Times said, "But the shebab, the street, said no, and the outside leadership had to back down. The shebab are more radical than the outside and right now they are more powerful".

This was a set back to U.S. plans — Shultz had said the participation of "moderate" Palestinians was "essential" to his scheme.

Shultz faced other problems. Even the closest allies of the U.S. in the region were skittish of endorsing a major geopolitical gamble at this point. Jordan's

King Hussein even went to London to have dental surgery during the Shultz trip. It seems he preferred a root canal than risk being seen as openly collaborating with the U.S. and Israel at this point. And like fighting dogs on the same leash, the Zionist rulers remained so badly split over strategies that Shultz had to shuttle back and forth between separate meetings with leaders of the ruling parties.

The uprising — intefadeh in Arabic — has rekindled hopes of liberating all of Palestine. There is broad discussion among Palestinians once again of establishing a truly liberated and independent Palestinian state that embraces the whole territory of their homeland. The uprising also brings to the forefront urgent and important political questions on the road to such liberation. Only revolutionary armed struggle, based on the broad masses of people and aimed at the overthrow of the Zionist settler state, can lead to an independent, democratic Palestinian state. History has shown repeatedly that the leadership of a revolutionary communist party is key to waging and winning such a war of liberation.

While there are reports of debates over strategy within the Palestinian leadership, it seems they focus on how best to use the uprising in order to force better terms from the U.S., Israel, and other powers. However militantly that course might be followed, in the end it leads right back to those like George Shultz and schemes like the one he is now promoting. The simple fact is that relying on the U.S. (or any other imperialists, including the Soviets) will never lead to liberation of the Palestinian people.

But the many difficulties Shultz and his plan face point to major problems for the U.S. empire. And the defiant shebab and their intefadeh which greeted Shultz show the real potential for starting and waging a powerful people's war. ■

---

# Revisionists On The Palestinian Revolution!

"Recognition of the state of Israel..is a necessary element in establishing peace..in the region".Gorbachev (Pravda,10th April 88)

"Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied since 1967"Only through,"a negotiated agreement between all parties concerned [including the Zionist state] under the joint chairmanship of the US and USSR."

CP of "Great" Britain (Pamphlet on Palestine, June 87).

"Liberate the Arab territories occupied since 1967..establishment of an independent Palestinian Arab state in the West Bank, including Arab Jerusalem and the Gaza strip". CP of Palestine, same pamphlet.

## Revisionists On The Palestinian Revolution!

CPGB says: "Since the foundation of the state of Israel, Palestinian communists have had excellent relations with the 'Israeli Communist Party'."

The 'Communist Party of Israel' has the following to say with regard to the Palestinian revolution. "Arab residents in Israel are only historically part of the Palestinian people, but today they are resident and the nationality of this country (i.e. Israeli) and they have no country other than that (Israel)". (From 6th June Statement-1980)

The above statement clearly says that today Palestinians can not have a country and that their only country is Israel. In the language of the oppressed this clearly means that Palestinians must drop the dream of liberating Palestine from its illegal Zionist occupiers! This statement can only mean that you (Palestinians) are today Israelis, and by that the CP of Israel means a defender and upholder of Zionism.

The "Communist Party" of Israel - read the reactionary, revisionist party of Israel, by name, itself recognises that the Israelis are a NATION and, on that basis, their "right" to "self-determination". Israelis are NOT a nation (like the whites in South Africa), they are a settler-colonial state. They were brought there from different parts of the world, by imperialism in order to serve imperialism, they were not a nation in any of the countries that they came from. The Zionist state was set up by British imperialism (under the reactionary Labour government) on the blood and land of the Palestinian people (and NATION).

The following are some FACTS about the Communist Party of Israel:-

- Sections of the leadership of this party supported the Zionist state in its Six Day War against the Arabs.
- They supported the Rogers-Gromiko plan for a "small Palestinian state".
- They support the "negotiated peaceful political settlement" to disarm the Palestinian armed revolution.
- In their 25th Congress they upheld the security of all countries (including the illegal Israeli Zionist state) in the region.
- They want the Israeli army to evacuate only the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.
- It recognises the "self-determination for Palestinian people" in the region occupied since 1967, only if Palestinians recognise the existence and legitimacy of the Israeli Zionist state.

The mighty uprisings of the Palestinian

people is rocking the whole Middle East and indeed the whole world. The oppressed people of the world are watching Palestine - day and night - with eyes open and heads high; and so are all the oppressors of this imperialist world, also with their eyes open but with their heads down. Palestine and the question of the Palestinian revolution has become a dividing line question. As the struggle of the Palestinian people deepens, the clear the dividing line becomes: Are you for the liberation of Palestine on the ruins and elimination of the illegal Israeli settler-colonial Zionist state or NOT?! Of course the revolutionary communists believe there is the question of the alternative to the Zionist state (The People's Democratic Republic of Palestine) and how to achieve it (Through the only solution - People's War based on the teachings of chairman Mao Tsetung). Revisionists, because they want to preserve the State of Israel, reduce the question of revolution to the "withdrawal" of the Israeli army from just the small area of lands occupied since 1967, and not the whole of Palestine, and then only through a "negotiated, peaceful settlement," under the joint chairmanship of the USA and USSR. You can imagine the kind of "liberation" which might be the outcome of such "negotiations". (It is worth remembering again here that both the USA and USSR, for different reasons, are committed to preserving the Zionist state of Israel. The state of Israel was planned, set up, financed, armed to the teeth and dictated to and supported in its every move right up until the present and it will in the future - that is right up until the time that the Palestinian revolution puts an end to it - by the Western bloc as a whole and now mainly by the USA. According to Gorbachev as well - that is Soviet social imperialism - they are also committed to preserving the Zionist State of Israel. Therefore, by promoting and "fighting" for such an ideal, they both are promoting Zionism and actively opposing FREEDOM FROM ALL ZIONIST PALESTINE!). Such prescriptions are always available in the drug stores of revisionists. The revisionists in Britain have similar dreams for their "patient" - the Irish revolution. If these prescribed drugs are taken by the victims, they will only benefit the victimiser.

The pamphlet by the "Communist Party of Great Britain" (read the revisionist lackies of Soviet social imperialism in Britain) on Palestine (June '87) should be thoroughly studied, and used to expose these revisionists. All the above "remedies" are prescribed by the "CPGB", under the direct guidelines of the KGB and indeed Soviet social imperialism,

and it is the duty of all lackies such as the "CPGB", the "CP of Palestine" and the "CP of Israel" to carry out their task.

The righteous rebellion of the Palestinian has forced all the imperialist powers from Washington to Moscow, from the reactionary Arab states to the Islamic Republic regime in Iran, to throw themselves on the scene to save the Palestinians FROM MAKING REVOLUTION, because this is a struggle, that if it deepens, with a conscious revolutionary vanguard, armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought at its head, can topple the imperialist powers and their puppets in the whole region. That's why the imperialists, including Soviet social imperialism, can not bear it. They can clearly see the potential of this struggle and try to gain maximum leverage in the organisations involved and use them and their support in the movement for their imperialist interests in their contention against the rival bloc. That is why Gorbachev, in his meeting with Arafat, said that vast international support is the guarantee of solving the Palestinians' major problem. ( Pravda, 10th April, 1988).

In the language of the proletariat, this means, that if the Palestinians want to make revolution they must have the "guarantee" of backing from the Soviet union and its allies and lackies, because without this support, nothing can be done. This clearly means, subjugation of the Palestinian revolution to the imperialist interests of the Soviet Union in the region in its contention with the western bloc. Their "support" for the Palestinian struggle, as Lenin put it, is like a rope over the neck of a person being hanged.

On the "Communist-read revisionist-Party of Israel" one point must be clarified here, that those who portray such forces as allies of the Palestinian people, are in reality themselves (and their allies) enemies of the Palestinian revolution. Palestinian people recognise no strata or class in Israeli society as their allies. Because these strata and classes have been brought there from different parts of the world with the aim of occupying Palestinian land and they are part of an army (social-military) of occupiers. Israel is an army base of U.S. imperialism in the region. In the decades of bloody struggle between the Palestinians and the Israeli state, in order to smash or preserve it respectively, one side is just and the other unjust. Choosing the position between just and unjust, or rather between the one which has the right to exist and the one which has not - is the DIVIDING LINE between the allies of the Palestinian revolution and

its enemies. Those who live in Israel and want to ally with the Palestinian revolution must join the uprisings of Palestine in order to smash the Zionist state and help to liberate occupied Palestine.

On the social imperialist front, from top to bottom, they are trying hard to deceive the Palestinian people and "lead" them to defeat. At this time more than ever, when armed struggle to smash the imperialist-created Zionist state is gaining popular support, these reactionaries are talking about " a negotiated agreement between all parties concerned (including the Zionist state) under the joint chairmanship of the USA and USSR." (CPGB on Palestine -June 1987 )

Such plans are intended to cut the throat of the Palestinian revolution. They remind us of the capitulationist Rogers-Gromiko plan in 1974, at the height of the armed struggle of the Palestinian people, against the Zionist occupiers, the Lebanese reactionaries and other reactionaries in the region. These plans were (and still are ) designed to evaporate the revolutionary goals of the Palestinian people. In the '70's, the Soviet Union allowed 60,000 Jews to go to Israel and these Jews were deployed in the Zionist army and settled in the occupied areas. In recent years there have been mutual agreements between the Soviet Union and the Israeli state regarding the migration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel.

But the Soviet Union, like its rival western bloc, can not ignore the objective reality of the struggle of the Palestinian people. They are trying to use this struggle as a "pressure lever" for more influence in the region.

For the oppressed and exploited, who are forced to live under this imperialist or social imperialist system, once again there is an important lesson to be learnt. They are openly advocating that the Palestinians must recognise their oppressors and that this is the only way to "liberation"- read subjugation! Those who want to do whatever possible to destroy the Zionist state in order to liberate Palestine, must also settle the account with reactionary forces such as the "CPGB" because they stand alongside the oppressors.

A "peaceful" and "negotiated" settlement under the chairmanship of the world's biggest gangsters, the USA and the USSR, are deliberate and conscious attempts to defeat the Palestinian revolution. Even those who limit Palestine to areas occupied since 1967 are on the same road, as this road also recognises the state of Israel.

# Resistance At Stamford Hill

Stamford Hill estate was the scene of a mass eviction by the state of over 200 flats, lived in mainly by young people. They stood up to a massive offensive which rose to its high in the form of a mass eviction, the zenith of a year long "legal" struggle. The determination of the state to remove these otherwise homeless people was clear by the massive "official" military backing of the police "special riot squad".

The cost of the eviction was on no less an unprecedented scale. Before the day of the eviction the state spent £500,000 plus in the vain attempt to remove these youth. In the face of such determination and preparation on the part of the state the squatters reply was in a defiant rebel mood. On the eve of the eviction, early morning 7th March 88, the "peace of the morning" was broken by the building of barricades in the entrances to the estate. Followed by the burning of a car, stolen for the purpose, in the main front entrance to the estate.

For the period of the siege that followed police were drafted in from all over London. Fifty riot vans were kept on standby, surveillance police and helicopters were a frequent reminder of their "concern" for the situation. One hundred bailiffs were enlisted to give the whole operation an "official" character and kept on standby whilst the siege went on.

The housing allocation system is not a "social service" to the masses of people. It is a means of controlling and restructuring the inner cities to the needs of the state. And the objective of the eviction was for the state to regain under its control these 200 plus flats. This statement is supported by the fact that in London local councils have all the housing they need to house the homeless and those forced to live in bed and breakfast accommodation. It is also a fact that local councils spend more money in keeping the homeless and badly housed out of empty properties than it does in housing them. This housing allocation system is a means by which the state can and does control the living conditions of millions, consequently controlling their future movement and settlement.

## Battening down the hatches on the home front;

London is the centre of capital for British imperialism. It is its heart and brain. From here decisions are made, actions taken which will cause and extend misery to millions

all around the world.

Preparations for war are the order of the day of all imperialists in "these times". Consolidation of the "home front" is an important part of these preparations. The imperialists cannot carry forward its plans for war without "tightening the screws" at home. The imperialists do not get it all their own way, such measures

gives rise to counter measures by the masses.

Sections of "British society" such as oppressed nationalities, women and minority groups all pose a threat to "respectable living". Such groups are under greater repression by imperialism. This repression will not lessen with time but be increased as part of an overall clamp down internally in preparing for world war and as a safeguard to revolutionary upheavals. These people will not rally around the national flag, they have been given no stake in this system or choose to have no stake in it. These forces will play a major role in tearing down this imperialist system, precisely because they have nothing to lose and a world to gain.

British imperialism does not relish the idea that such forces are so close to the centre of British capital. The state realises it cannot rely on these forces when the "shit hits the fan". The state also realises such forces should not be, in any concentration, too close to its heart, as it may cause a heart attack. The state has the conscious policy of "divide and rule" in these communities.

At the same time the state does not have it all its own way when it acts on its policy. Open offensives against sections of society are delicate operations, which can blow up in the faces of these reactionaries, turning a state offensive into a state defensive. The Stamford Hill resistance was one such inner city rebellion. With all the potential of escalating in the face of such offensive measures. Rebel youth from all over London and further afield were drawn to the barricades. Unfortunately the resistance fell far short of its potential. The dominant leadership did not have the correct outlook to advance in the face of the reactionary state. This leadership had a reformist outlook and as a result could not unleash the potential of the 300 plus resisters gathered there plus the many other forces that passed in and out frequently during the siege. Only by unleashing the vast potential of these masses for change could the struggle advance.

## War stories

Over the period of the siege, Stamford Hill was a magnet to the rebel youth of London and caught the imagination of many others all over the country. →





SQUATTERS AT STAMFORD HILL ESTATE

The morning of the first day, behind the burnt out car, standing on top of an upturned council skip, was a group of young black rebel youth looking out over the burnt out car into the street where police and reporters stood. The posture of these rebels was that of calm defiance. Looking at nothing in particular whilst every now and again passing comments to each other. They were getting the feel for a liberated area.

Later that morning a group of four black rebels gathered at one of the barricades, as they passed they wished us luck, our reply was we asked them to join us. This set a heated debate into motion. One black youth argued with the others that this struggle was their struggle. A while later they passed the barricade into the street and said to us, "see you later, we're going to get some bodies".

On the last evening of the siege, 8th March 88, a group of young white rebel youth, who lived on the estate, stood around quite at home in their new surroundings. When asked they said they supported the resistance as did their parents. When asked what they thought of the resistance they replied calmly, "its ok", no doubt these rebel youth have far greater aspirations than the leadership of this struggle.

Later that evening a black youth in his late twenties, standing near to one of the camp fires, said he had heard of the resistance on the TV then came straight down to see what was going on. He said he had only recently been released from prison. Having spent four years inside for attempting to torch two policemen in one of the London riots. When we asked which prison he was at he replied, "all of them". He said he was moved continually for attempting to organise the prisoners to stand up for themselves.

Eight local youths gathered at the fence near to where a group of resisters were sitting around the camp fire. These local youth had come to see what was going on, they had come to hear what we had to say. They had come to ask questions and get answers, which were not always forthcoming. These youth remained with us, leaning over the fence, for four plus hours.

It was as if the building of the barricades united us all in the face of our enemy British imperialism. The police patrolling the area found this situation unsettling it was clear to them that our differences were minor compared to our hatred for them.

Continued on page 10.

## Resistance At Stamford Hill

Continued from page 9.

### Shortcomings of the dominant leadership.

This leadership could not grasp the nature of the offensive they faced, they could not grasp that it was a direct expression of central government policy, that it was part and parcel of British imperialist "battening down the hatches on the homefront policy."

The link was not made between the actions of local government, both left and right, and central government policy. That local government is the arm of central government. The leadership had the outlook that both had an independent role in relation to the other. Rather than both being one and the same thing. This shortcoming is clear in one of their slogans, a rewrite of a local council slogan, it reads...

"Hackney Council working for themselves"...  
The original local council slogan reads....  
"Hackney Council working with the people"..  
It should have read...

"Hackney council working for the state"....

The dominant leadership portrayed the state offensive as a personal attack by local government, masking the principle role of central government as spearhead. An action which was one part of an overall plan of battening down the hatches on the home front in preparation for war.

The political character of this struggle was coloured by the refusal and resistance to the state clampdown and repression by the squatters and their supporters.

The struggle was built along the lines of "the rights to housing"; this demand became completely subordinated to the principle character of the struggle, irrespective of the will of the leadership, which was for the struggle to remain in the realm of "rights to housing" and to have a non-political character.

The objective conditions faced at Stamford Hill forced the situation far beyond the wishes of the leadership. This heightening led the resistance into direct confrontation with the state as a whole. The barricades became a drawn line of the antagonism between the states policy of clamp down and those forces who refused that clamp down and stood in its way. The present leadership was not and could not have become organizationally and politically prepared for the clear and heightened confrontation. A radical line was advancing and coming from behind. It was coming from the rebel youth outside of the leadership, a line that was challenging the existing reformist leadership and influencing a few of the individuals within its ranks. This radical line was rising to face the developing

situation head on, unfortunately it was defeated by various saboteur tactics of the reformists.

In the early stages a radical line, in the field of battle, dominated. After the defeat the reformists were doing everything possible to cool the situation down and more and more moving towards negotiation with the local council, which in the end they did.

### Conclusions drawn from the struggle

One lesson is clear, there is a necessity for the leadership to grasp an all-round picture of the situation they are in. The leadership must prepare itself so as to contend with any developing antagonism with our reactionary enemy, British imperialism. A leadership that does not link up with the radical and advanced youth with their "nothing to lose" sentiments has no right to call itself leadership let alone guide them into battle and future victory. We must prepare ourselves for confrontation with the state, take control out of the hands of the reformist leadership and pose a real threat to this imperialist oppressor.

### To the rebel youth

Revolution has never been made without the rebel sentiments of the youth. Stamford Hill has shown us clearly that rebel sentiments in themselves are not enough to advance all the way to revolution. Such feelings, such burning desires to tear down this shit must work in partnership with, be guided by our revolutionary science. With it we can conquer the world, without it we shall not win through. We shall lose sight of the correct path, the only path to our goal, communism. Armed with Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse Tung thought we shall be guided along this correct path. Armed to smash the enemy imperialism, making certain it does not rise from the ashes again. Armed to build our society where exploitation and oppression are crimes in the eyes and practices of our class, the proletarian class. Our revolutionary science is the fruit of our uprisings and revolutions and the seeds of our future. Each and every conflict we, the oppressed, have with our oppressor has the potential to advance our struggle for freedom. Each rebellion must be developed to its limitations so as to speed forward the end to our enslavement. A complete grasp of the advances made and the shortcomings must be made clear to us all. Who are our friends and who our enemies is crucial in this advancing. It is a crime to the oppressed all over the world if we do not

Continued on page 13

# The British War Machine

## THE BRITISH WAR MACHINE.

In the world political arena British Imperialism is jostling for a favourable position for itself, alongside and in competition with the interests of her western bloc. Let there be no illusion, British imperialism has a lot at stake in the "redivision of the world". It is playing, therefore, high stakes and a major role in the strategy of "preparations for war". With its own interests at the forefront of its decision making with the clear intention of not only holding onto its present pieces of world plunder but of increasing them.

No imperialist wants to go to war if the situation is not "favourable" to them, this is a major contention between them. Neither saying "no to world war" as it is an inevitable and necessary process of competing capital. On the other hand, they do say "no to world war", if it does not or will not serve their interests at a particular time.

However there are times when necessity throws them into the war arena, with the least preparation, rather than face a military defeat. This is not the case for "these times" as all imperialists, of both blocs, have done, are doing their war preparations, fully conscious of the blood letting period ahead (necessitated by the laws of capital), so as to facilitate their temporary survival.

The "redivision of the world" during and after world war II, no longer corresponds to the needs of the various imperialists to "peacefully" extend and expand their profit empires. A redivision of the international economic and political (as well as military) relations are the order of the day. All the major contradictions of the world imperialist system are rapidly accentuating. As the RIM declaration says:

It is in this context that the statement by Mao Tsetung, "Either revolution will prevent war, or war will give rise to revolution" rings out all the more clearly and takes on urgent importance. The very logic of the imperialist system and the revolutionary struggles is preparing a new situation. The contradiction between the rival bands of imperialists, between the imperialists and the oppressed nations, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the imperialist countries, are likely in the coming period to express themselves by the force of arms on an unprecedented scale. As



Thatcher displays preparedness.

Stalin said in regard to the First World War:

"The significance of the imperialist war which broke out ten years ago lies, among other things, in the fact that it gathered all these contradictions into a single knot and threw them on to the scales, thereby accelerating and facilitating the revolutionary battles of the proletariat."

The choice is not between "war" and "peace" but between "imperialist war" or "revolutionary war". Only revolutionary war led by the Proletariat and its vanguard party can "lay the foundations" for world peace.

## THE DISARMAMENT MIRAGE: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE IMPERIALISTS "PREPARATIONS FOR WAR" COIN.

The deadly logic of the respective blocs of imperialists is: "We want peace but the other side doesn't, so to prevent war we must prepare for war".

The historical role of "disarmament" has always been to show the masses "on their side" that their imperialist master wants peace. This is the practice of both blocs of imperialists. The object is to make public opinion favourable to themselves at the expense of their rivals. Whilst at the same time masking the fact that both sides continue to prepare for a military confrontation. The only role "disarmament" politics play is to disarm the masses against preparing ideologically, organisationally and politically as well as militarily against their deadly enemy: imperialism. Disarmament politics serves only the ruling classes, the bourgeois class, as it is designed to lull the masses into a false sense of security, therefore political inactivity. →

## The British War Machine

A statement by the bourgeois imperialist Thatcher, in the context of the NATO summit, exposes clearly the "concern" she has for the united front of the Western imperialists against the Eastern bloc imperialists. Thus the Sunday Times reports on 21st February 1988.

"Thatcher conceded that the Soviet Union was succeeding in producing 'an image of reasonableness, of desire to reduce tensions, of willingness to rid the world of nuclear weapons'. All this was having 'a telling effect on opinion in the west'."

The purpose of Gorbachev's "image of reasonableness" and "desire to reduce tensions" is to win some sections of the masses, as well as some of the bourgeoisie, into its support camp. And it is this that the British imperialists express "concern" about. Thatcher goes on to say:

"The Russian bear was easier to deal with when it looked more like a bear than it does now"

"The nicer the Russians get, the more dangerous they are".

During these times of war preparations the imperialists increase their activity of offering "peace agreements" while at the same time preparing for war. There is a bloody logic to Thatcher's statement, "The nicer they are the more dangerous they become". Why? Because the soft words of the imperialists are designed to lull the masses into a false sense of security. So when the imperialists go to war they hope that the masses will be least expecting it, least prepared, and will be slow to respond. For British imperialism this means that she may find it difficult to mobilise the masses around its national flag, against the rival imperialist enemy. The imperialists may not have it as they plan it, what they prepare for and plan for does not necessarily mean they will achieve it. The proletarians too have their plans and ideas if a war breaks out, that is if a revolutionary war doesn't put a stop to the imperialist blood-letting first. The imperialist war can be made to turn into its opposite, a revolutionary war against the imperialists themselves. And it is to a revolutionary war we should turn our energies, we must prepare for this day on every front. The same article from the Sunday Times goes on, quoting from Thatcher:

"....Eastern Europe. Its communist countries had a 'potentially explosive mixture' of political dissent and economic instability which must be of great concern to the Soviet leadership, she thought.

"But she warned that 'if an explosion comes (in Eastern Europe), I have no doubt that the Soviet Union would intervene directly and militarily to suppress it'."

Thatcher has every confidence that the Soviet mask of "reasonableness" and "a desire to reduce tensions" will fall away, exposing their true imperialist colours of the east to the western masses. For the sake of public opinion in the west, Thatcher hopes it is soon. As the "cold war bear" was a more favourable image for western interests than the new "eagle clawed dove".

Each imperialist bloc makes political mileage out of the "fuck-ups" of their rivals, by relaying the bloody practices to their own masses thus creating public opinion for themselves and against their rivals.

Explosive mixtures of "political dissent" and "economic instability" are deadly infections in the bodies of the imperialist beast. What is deadly and infectious to the imperialists is the chance of life and freedom to the proletariat.

World war stretches their resources to its limit, maximum effort is needed from the imperialist system during such times because everything is on the line for them. They concentrate their war machine in key and vital areas of the world, far from their home base. During these times weak links in their system can have devastating effects if broken, hair line cracks become gaping fissures. The effects of city uprisings have a magnified effect in contrast with similar uprisings in "peace" time. For the imperialists to lose a battle in a foreign land, during these times, is a setback but for the imperialist to lose their home base is death itself.

### BRITISH IMPERIALISM CALLS TO ITS GANGSTER ALLIES TO "BEAR THEIR FAIR SHARE".

Continued from the Sunday Times article:

"Continued U.S. commitment to Europe would depend on how far Europe was willing to bear its fair share. That would need more than being present in the Persian Gulf. Britain, she noted, had troops in garrisons, giving training and on loan, in more than 30 countries around the world".

We in Britain lie at the heart and brain of a bloody imperialist beast. The above statement is from a so called "civilized country". An imperialist nation that brags to its own, and the world, of its interests in plundering the world. Holding up as a jewel in its bloody crown the miserable human booty of its past and present plundering. Killing, and threatening to kill those who stand up against it, such as the case with the Irish freedom fighters, openly murdered on the streets of Gibraltar. While on the otherside of the world the bloody British jostle with the

## Resistance At Stamford Hill

Continued from page 10.

take these opportunities as our responsibility to our class. And to those forces who stand in the way of our advance we say "don't do the crime if you can't do the time" because those who stand in the way of our advance will pay for the crime!

The supporters of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement salute the rebel youth at Stamford Hill who dared to spit in the face of our enemy, British imperialism. We salute all such people with the "nothing to lose" attitude. Making revolution is no tea party. Revolution is not arrived at it is made. It is not made with selfish ideas but with a class conscious outlook. We say to all rebel youth join our ranks and struggle to build our party and organisation. Prepare for the time when we take our freedom into our hands out of our oppressors, imperialism. A freedom not based on individualism but on class freedom, as a class we can be truly free as individuals.

VICTORY TO THE REBEL YOUTH ON THE ROAD TO REVOLUTION AND LET THE OLD AND FEEBLE MINDED NOT BE TOO FAR BEHIND! ■

## Revisionists On The Palestinian Revolution!

Continued from page 7

The mighty uprising of the Palestinian people, the rebel youth, women, proletarians, and all the oppressed people, are on the road to liberate themselves. The winter uprisings of the stones must pave the way for people's war for the liberation of Palestine. The only road to liberation and emancipation. ■

## The British War Machine

contender imperialists for a piece of the plunder in the Persian Gulf, where the gangster logic of all the imperialists is law.

All imperialists are today preparing for war while, at the same time, all hold up a thin veil of "peace" to the worlds masses — absolute hypocrisy. Let us not be lulled into a false sense of security, into inactivity, by the sweet songs of these groaning imperialist monsters.

We must expose the real activities and real interests behind the US and USSR "peace" initiatives. We must expose them and those who hold them up as authentic. We must expose the "disarmament talks" as the other side of the "preparations for war" coin. (For more on this read: "Dinosaurs in the Rain" Conquer the World issue # 2)

In direct antagonism with the bourgeoisie and their lackies, are our interests, that of the revolutionary proletariat, which do not lie in the continued existence of capital, but in wiping them and it off the face of the earth, nothing short of this. This means the complete elimination of all forms of oppression and exploitation and finally the emancipation of all humanity — communism. Let us too prepare ourselves for war, revolutionary war. Let us arm ourselves with both proletarian ideology and the gun. World war can only be opposed with revolution, not by peace. Let us learn who are our friends and who are our enemies, imperialism is our all time absolute enemy.

RED, WHITE AND BLUE WE SHIT ON YOU!

DEATH TO BRITISH IMPERIALISM! ■

**To contact**

**Conquer The World**

**Write to:**

**BM Conquer The World**

**London WC1N 3XX**

***Stop the Reign of Terror Against the Gaza Strip and the West Bank Now!***

***Victory to the Struggle of the Palestinian People!***

***Palestinian Youth — Fierce, Confident, and Bold!***

***Fan the Flames of the Uprising in the Israeli Bantustan!***

***Down with the Reactionary Israeli Settler State and Its U.S. Masters!***

## Tear Down British Imperialism In Northern Ireland



The funeral ceremony of three IRA members murdered in Gibraltar

The development of events in Northern Ireland shows an upsurge in the mood and struggle of the masses. This new round of developments toward revolution in Ireland occurs in the context of an overall crisis in the imperialist system. The Irish struggle and especially the bright prospects for revolution coming out of the new round of developments cannot be understood except in the context of the world situation.

The British "empire" is in a world of trouble as it rots and decays in the midst of a crisis that is gripping the whole imperialist system. In Northern Ireland, the British ruling class is staring big contradictions in the face. They are both political and military in nature and involve the stability of the entire region as a crucial step in their preparations for world war. Indeed, the entire Western war bloc, headed by the U.S., as well as the soviet war bloc, is warily eyeing the developments in the so-called "British Isles". They are faced with an urgent and growing necessity to attempt to "reduce tensions" in Northern Ireland and achieve a strategic consensus with the Republic of Ireland, the zenith of which being the Republic's entry into the NATO alliance

as a crucial base area on Britain's west flank. The British imperialists and their lackeys in the Republic are acting to unleash a spate of political manoeuvres, hoping to make the most advances possible and to do it soon. A central feature of the success of this plan is the dressing up of the regime in Northern Ireland: a regime so badly exposed and battered that the British had taken over ruling the north directly. The imperialists see the key as "power sharing", reflected in the Hillsborough Agreement, whereby bourgeois political forces in the Catholic community (namely the Social Democratic Labour Party) would be allowed certain slots in the government in exchange for keeping the masses of Irish people on a tight leash with incessant raps about the "great progress" the oppressed Irish masses are making under such a "fine" deal. The Hillsborough agreement plan has nothing to do with altering the SITUATION OF British occupation and domination, in league with the Protestant rulers, in Northern Ireland. It has everything to do with tightening up and "stabilising" the region in readiness to defend the "empire" in preparation for

world war.

The failure of the Hillsborough Agreement was written within itself! The problem in Northern Ireland is not "power sharing" but the domination of that country. The masses are in no mood for compromise and the British now are having difficulties finding anyone with influence among the masses who is part of the Republican movement to tow their line of capitulation. The Hillsborough agreement not only failed to achieve its aims but it gave rise to new conditions, making matters worse than before and forcing the protestants and lackeys of British imperialism in the south to accept this agreement against their will in order to stop matters getting out of control.

The British are deploying new tactics of late. Unleashing open terror, naked forms of oppression, on the Irish people in an attempt to force some into compromise. This new round of state terror should be viewed with this in mind.

After the failure by the British state to achieve its aims in Northern Ireland by "peaceful means" (i.e., agreements), attempting to isolate the republican movement from the Irish people, it has continued to brutally oppress the Irish in a series of atrocities. British imperialism has increasingly resorted to the use of violence to try and physically wipe out any progressive or revolutionary people, who are fighting for the freedom of Irish people from national oppression, through the use of a shoot-to-kill policy.

The new round of development started with two matters concerning Northern Ireland. One was the investigation of the shooting-to-kill policy, concerning the RUC and British army, and the other was related to the republican movement, with the retrial of the Birmingham Six. "Criminal charges were not brought against the RUC officers who were involved, on the grounds of "reasons of national security" which means, the troops and state forces can go on murdering Irish people and should not worry about the consequences because British imperialism will do everything to protect them. As long as you kill for the "empire" you are all right.

This was a green light for the security forces to unleash open terror on the republican movement. At the same time the Court of Appeal rejected the appeal of six Irish men who had no involvement in the Birmingham pub bombings. There was a message in this action to the Republicans from the British state, that was, it was not the point whether you had taken part in the action against the state, as long as you are a supporter of the Republican movement you

are a target. So it is better if, for your own sake, you distance yourself from it. Otherwise, they say, be prepared to suffer the terrorism of British justice, which includes grenades thrown into a crowd at the funeral ceremony. It is no coincidence that both incidents came within a week of each other. It was part and parcel of the new British strategy in Ireland. This policy surfaced again a month later (21 Feb) when Aiden McAespie was shot dead at a British border check point, he was a supporter of the IRA.

On the 23 Feb private Ian Thain, a British soldier sentenced to life imprisonment in 1984 for murdering an Irish civilian in Belfast was released after serving only three years, finding himself back on duty with his regiment. The events surrounding the release of this soldier go to prove again the new British policy in Ireland.

THE GILBRALTAR MURDERS.

On the 6th March 1988, Mairead Farrell, Daniel McCann and Sean Savage, three IRA members, were shot dead in Gilbralter by the SAS. Here is a description of events surrounding the killings in Gilbralter by the "Times" newspaper on Tuesday 8th March '88. Quote.. "Shortly before 1pm on Sunday 6th March 1988, an IRA member drove a white Renault car into Gilbraltar and parked it in the area where fifty members of the Royal Anglian Regiment, which had recently served in Northern Ireland, would that day be performing the Guard Mounting Ceremony. Shortly before 3pm two other IRA members crossed into Gilbralter on foot and joined their comrade in the town. At about 3.30pm, the three started walking back towards the border.

They were challenged, made movements and were shot dead. They were found to be unarmed, and a bomb disposal team established that there was no bomb in the car"...

The British imperialists and their lackeys, in collusion with the Spanish government claim to have kept the three IRA members under surveillance from the moment they left Belfast, across Europe to when they arrived in Gilbraltar, all along with the intention of murdering them. A whole series of statements made by the British government after the Gilbraltar murders exposes their action. On March 7th, Monday, Gilbraltar radio broadcast an eye-witness account of the killings exposing the fact that the IRA members were unarmed and put up no resistance when they were challenged by the SAS.

On Thursday 28th April, Thames television screened a programme called "Death on the

rock", which included an interview with Carmen Proetta, a legal translator and witness to the murders. She said that the IRA members put their hands up in surrender and that "there was no interchange of words, just shots", contradicting the foreign secretary's statement that the IRA members were challenged before they were shot. Another anonymous eye-witness said he saw one of the IRA members lying on his back "the man standing over this man had his foot on the man's chest. The SAS gunman pointed his gun deliberately at the man lying on the floor and fired three times at point blank range. I was horrified by what I saw"

These eye-witness accounts expose how the British state tries to terrorise people by propaganda in the media into thinking that they should not fight against the crimes committed by British imperialism because they will be brutally punished.

The editor of the 'Times' newspaper summed up the British state's policy towards anybody who dares to fight against the horrors inflicted upon the world by British imperialism when he stated in the 'Times' on the 8th March 1988:

'The killing of the IRA "terrorists" in Gibraltar drives home the lesson which all those tempted to follow in their doomed footsteps must be taught, there is no let-up, ever, anywhere.'

By this logic the British state can murder anyone in the interests of British imperialism.

Whitehall had decided well in advance to shoot these people dead, long before they had even entered Gibraltar, all they were waiting for was an excuse which could justify their action in the eyes of people who are outraged by what Britain is doing in Northern Ireland. All this bullshit about "saving lives" and the security force being in danger was nothing but plain lies, because the IRA members were not armed and no explosive was found in the car. Many people ask: why weren't they arrested? The answer is that in desperate times reactionaries do desperate things. They have to find a solution in Northern Ireland, and for that they will do anything, including committing crimes on a massive scale against the people.

#### THE CEMETERY KILLINGS

On Wednesday 16th March 1988, at the funeral in Milltown cemetery, Belfast, of Mairead Farrell, Daniel McCann and Sean Savage, the three IRA members murdered by the British SAS in Gibraltar, five thousand Irish people came under loyalist

gun and grenade attacks as the bodies were lowered into the Republican plot in Milltown, leaving fifty people injured and Thomas McEarlean, John Murray and Kevin Brady (IRA member) dead.

The man who carried out the attack was an East Belfast protestant who wanted to become a member of the Ulster Defence Association. The attacker threw several grenades and fired a number of shots at will from an automatic pistol as he retreated through the graveyard, trying to make his escape across fields behind the cemetery, but his weapons failed to deter the large crowd of youths which pursued him, showing the fearless defiance people struggling for Irish national freedom have in fighting the British state. The attacker was finally cornered and severely beaten up before the police caught up and intervened.

This loyalist attacker was backed by the Royal Ulster Constabulary, who planned to escape with the attacker in a van parked at the edge of the cemetery, but this plan failed, leaving the British state and their supporters exposed.

Riots erupted in republican areas of West Belfast on Monday 7th March, in protest at the shootings in Gibraltar. Vehicles, including buses, were hijacked and set on fire, creating a blazing inferno of defiance against the British state in the Springfield, Falls Road and Whiterock districts of West Belfast, giving "a taste of things to come" to the police and troops who used plastic bullets to disperse the riots.

The killing of the republicans was a cowardly act in which the bloody hands of the RUC and the bloodsucking capitalist class and the system they represent, the law of oppression and the order of exploitation they enforce, are clearly implicated and for which they are accountable, adding just another crime to the endless list of their crimes. And it is all the more cowardly and despicable because the RUC and the authorities have tried to camouflage their treachery, pretending they have no connection with the thug whose hands actually wielded the weapon that cut three republicans down, by keeping a supposedly low profile in this unprecedented incident. It would be interesting to know how he picked an IRA member to shoot among all the crowd which was present. But the facts already known show that the attack on the cemetery was not only a part, and an escalation, of the many vicious attacks on the republicans, and their supporters, but was a premeditated, calculated assault in which an IRA member was singled out from the first, consciously and deliberately targeted for murder. In particular, it was with the aim



of stopping the gathering momentum for revolution in Northern Ireland. It is no accident that these murders were carried out only a week after the shooting in Gibraltar. But this only shows that the rulers of this country and their assassins in and out of uniform, are not only cowardly but desperate, desperate to prevent the awakening sections of the masses from storming the heavens.

In fact this only shows more clearly that it is the imperialists and reactionaries who fear the people especially the thousands who are preparing to step onto the historical stage and the millions and millions of others who are beginning to raise their heads. And if these desperate criminals thought or hoped, that by carrying out such a cold blooded murder they would cause the revolutionaries to lay down the banner of revolution and retreat, to run in fear from the arduous task of making revolution, and if they thought that they would intimidate those who have already stepped forward to join this historic struggle and scare away those on the verge of doing so, they will find out that the exposure of their bloody hand in this action will have just the opposite effect. It will deepen a hundred fold the determination of those already involved to carry forward the fight for which Irish freedom fighters give their lives, and will inspire hundreds, indeed thousands more to step forward and become part of that same great battle, for proof we don't have to go far, a week later all this became a reality. THEY DIDN'T GET AWAY WITH IT: "WHEN THE SHIT HIT THE FAN"!

On Saturday 19th March 1988, two British soldiers were executed by IRA supporters at the funeral ceremony of the Kevin Brady, one of the IRA men killed by the Loyalist attack at Belfast's Milltown cemetery. The IRA, admitting responsibility for the executions of the British soldiers by the Belfast Brigade, stated the two men had been identified as members of the SAS by equipment and documentation before being shot.

Gerry Adams, President of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the Provisional IRA, said the presence of the British soldiers at the funeral: "bore all the hallmarks of an official British Army under-cover dirty tricks operation".

When challenged by Republican funeral stewards the British soldiers, in civilian clothes, refused to identify themselves and tried to drive away. Witnesses said that the silver-grey car appeared to be about to ram the funeral hearse.

A group of people engulfed the car and smashed the wind-screen with a wheel brace. Another man punched a hole through the

front passenger window with his fist. Moments later there was a pistol shot as one of the British soldiers tried to shoot people in the crowd then the SAS soldiers were dragged from the car, stripped to their underpants and beaten with concrete posts before being executed with gunshots. A catholic priest tried to save the life of one of the British soldiers by giving him "the kiss of life" but was pushed aside by a masked IRA gunman who pumped a final, fatal bullet into the soldier's head, correctly showing the armed violence needed to overthrow the brutal repression of the British state, and smashing the idea of non-violence and compassion to living beings.

Witnesses to the execution of the two British soldiers on the streets of West Belfast showed no remorse, having themselves experienced the long history of the savage nature of the British state's repression of Irish people.

Police and soldiers saturated the area in Belfast shortly after the executions and forced all shops to close. Local people did not like this, but were satisfied that the two British soldiers had got what they deserved, British soldiers who they clearly believed to be undercover agents.

The execution of British Soldiers in Belfast and more recently the events in Holland and other bold actions send shock waves all across the country, indeed even to many other parts of the world, driving the ruling class of this country and their allies and bootlickers into a frenzy, and sending a chill of fear up their spineless backs, while shooting a bolt of joy through the hearts of thousands and millions among the masses who heard of it.

BRITISH IMPERIALISM IS DOOMED!  
LET'S FINISH IT OFF!

The British and the imperialists generally have great cause for worry. Imperialism's hold on Ireland is being threatened and big changes on a world scale are up ahead. All the various lies and slanders on the part of these imperialist rulers directed against the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat and masses of people around the world, be they in the form of calling them "criminal acts of international terrorists" or "centuries old religious conflicts", etc., are nothing more than the desperate screams of a beast doomed to extinction. But revolutions are consciously made. Those dispossessed, oppressed and exploited in the belly of the beast, including Irish people here, who have no stake in this blood sucking system must unite under the glorious banner of Marxism, Leninism, Mao Tsetung thought to accomplish the historical mission of the international proletariat. ■

# MAY FIRST, 1988

## Statement by the Committee of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement

This May 1st comes with springtime in Palestine, and what could be more welcome to those everywhere who know what it is to suffer scorn and be beaten down, those who long to dig existing society's grave?

The Western criminal powers, great and small, had unleashed their Zionist dogs to carry out mass murder on the ground and from the air while prohibiting the Palestinians even to whisper. The Soviets, while occasionally posing as friends of the Palestinians, had offered to guarantee the existence of the Zionist state in return for more Soviet influence. Yet Palestinian youth raised under the Israeli whip, along with their elders, stormed forward stones in hand and threw the whole rotten scene into an uproar heard around the world.

This uprising, coming where it was most forbidden, is appearing in the midst of gathering storms in many countries, and nowhere where the masses have risen up in the last few years — South Africa, Haiti, Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland to name just a few places — have the reactionaries and the imperialists been able to impose their terrible "tranquility" despite all their deadly efforts and slaughter and despite their tricks and demagogic manoeuvres which have brought those they have fooled to disaster.

Two things stand out in this situation. The first is that, as Palestine once again proves, revolution cannot be forever suppressed or wiped out. If it fails, it will break out again and again until those with nothing to lose finally rid the world of exploitation, oppression and inequality. The second is that without a genuine revolutionary vanguard party, based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought, even the most powerful uprisings cannot become a raging people's war to overthrow the enemy, and above all cannot move towards real emancipation.

The imperialists and their flunkies have never spared a drop of the blood of the oppressed and exploited. Furthermore, the jockeying for position between East and West so that one can finally subdue the other is growing more and more dangerous, despite the "disarmament" agreements whose crescendo is only matched by the crescendoing increase in all kinds of monstrous weapons. Their rivalry will come to world war unless revolution stops them. But the uprising in Palestine shows how things can spring out of their control. The question in our time is not will there be wars, but will the proletarians and oppressed masses find the leadership to seize the cascading possibilities, to lead them through revolutionary wars to victories which alone can prevent world war, to advance towards putting an end once and for all to all classes and oppression and all the reactionary institutions and ideas that go with them.

Since May 1st was first proclaimed an international revolutionary holiday 99 years ago, the international communist movement has won great victories and undergone grave setbacks, including the reversal of the revolution led by Mao in China. In too many countries on May 1st now old and new-style pro-slavery politicians bellow to drown out the groaning of the slaves and rattle their tinsel tanks and reactionary rockets. But although old and new-style exploiters have done everything possible to impose their will with their immense military might, they have not and can not resolve the contradictions which generate rebellion against them.

The vast hundreds of millions of would-be gravediggers of this system, those long told they were born to labour to enrich others, must be organised into battalions and be set to work. Who will assume this responsibility? Who, in today's world, is arousing their fury against all exploitation, oppression and inequality, and who, with this aim, is "beginning revolutionary warfare where that is possible, stepping up preparations where the conditions for such warfare are not yet ripe," as said in the *Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement*? Not the revisionists who sneer at our banners of Marx, Lenin and Mao, who preach reconciliation with oppression because they aim to continue it or become new oppressors, and who even when they do resort to arms do so in a way that reeks of those aims.

Since 1984 the world's Maoist forces have been reassembling in the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement. Today in Peru, the Communist Party of Peru, a participating party in the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, is leading a people's war, rocking the government and all of arrogant society, alarming reactionary regimes and imperialist masters in many parts of the world and serving as a beacon to class brothers and sisters everywhere.

Who can lead the world's masses in thoroughgoing revolution — who can rise to this occasion? Only the revolutionary communists. That is why their contingents must be strengthened, why new proletarian parties must be formed in countries where they are sorely needed, and why this Revolutionary Internationalist Movement must be supported and built. No one else can lead the masses in doing what it will take. No matter what tricks and phony shortcuts and fraudulent hopes capitulationists and reactionaries may offer the masses and no matter what the twists and turns, the exploited and oppressed of this world will not be satisfied with less than complete emancipation.

**Let the "Uprising of Stones" Pave the Way for People's War for the Liberation of Palestine!**

**Support the People's War in Peru!**

**Break the Chains! Unleash the Fury of Women as a Mighty Force for Revolution!**

**Long Live Proletarian Internationalism! Strengthen the Ranks of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement!**

**Prevent World War, Step Up the Struggle for Revolution Throughout the World!**



## **A Report On May Day Activities In London**

May 1st is a vital day for the international proletariat, for all those who struggle to bring down a system that is rotten to the core, a system that is based on plunder, murder and inequality. It is a day when the proletariat reiterate that the essential and necessary path to change is through internationalism and a day upon which we look to the future communist society where oppression, exploitation and inequality will be things of the past, where one's life is not limited by one's race, class or sex. It is a day when we

remember the proletarian struggles of the past and plan for those of the future. R.I.M. supporters call on all ranks of the proletariat and the oppressed of all nationalities to organize together on a world scale to overthrow the imperialist system. The importance of May 1st is to be ideologically aware of the issues behind it and to use it to organize against the system.

R.I.M. supporters gathered outside Brixton library to celebrate International

Continued on page 31

## **Afghanistan: From Occupation to Civil War**



Islamabad, Pakistan — Afghan refugees burn effigy of Gorbachev.

**"Since World War II, every other major power has lost a war: the British lost east of Suez, the French lost in Algeria, the United States lost in Vietnam. Until now it hadn't happened to us, but now we will be like everyone else."**

**— A Soviet official on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, April 1988.**

After almost eight years of occupation, Soviet troops began withdrawing out of Afghanistan on May 15. It was on December 25, 1979 that the Soviet military first marched south across the border to back up the reactionary pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan. With 115,000 troops and massive amounts of modern weaponry, the Soviet rulers expected to crush the Afghan resistance — quickly and ruthlessly. But despite all the bloodshed and destruction that they caused, the Soviets and their Afghan allies could only manage to control a fifth of the country. In Mikhail Gorbachev's

words, Afghanistan became a "bleeding wound."

This is a sharp and major defeat for the Soviet social-imperialists at the hands of the just struggle of the Afghan people. But everyone knows that the agreement on the withdrawal of the troops, signed by the pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan and the pro-U.S. government in neighboring Pakistan (and "guaranteed" by the Soviet Union and the U.S.), will not bring peace to Afghanistan. The occupation is going to give way to civil war between the pro-Soviet government and opposition forces, and the gangster contention between the Soviet Union and the U.S. still rages fiercely, although in a different form. The situation in Afghanistan is very much up for grabs, including the possibility of openings for the advance of revolutionary forces.

\*\*\*\*

The agreement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops was signed in Geneva, Switzerland in April of this year. According to this agreement, half the Soviet troops are to be out within three months and the rest by next February.

One Soviet general recently insisted, "Soviet troops are going back home after fulfilling their international obligations.

The withdrawal is not a defeat. I think you can understand the difference between a retreat and the fulfillment of the Geneva accords." No amount of such doublespeak can disguise the fact that the Soviet imperialists, who only a few years ago were boasting that their gains around the world were "irreversible," have suffered a serious setback in Afghanistan. The troop withdrawal does not mean in any way that the Soviets have given up their claim on Afghanistan or their plans elsewhere in the world. But the failure of the occupation could open up deep cracks throughout the bloc headed by the Soviet Union.

And the talk of "international obligations" that the Soviet officials and generals have used to justify the invasion and occupation cannot hide the fact that Afghanistan is a glaring example of the thoroughly reactionary nature of the Soviet revisionist rulers. The U.S. and other Western powers invade and plunder around the world in the name of "democracy"; the false socialists of today's Soviet Union do the same in the name of "internationalism."

When the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979, they said they were defending the Afghan "democratic revolution" and the "socialist camp" against "counterrevo-

lution" and "foreign imperialist intervention." But there was no democratic revolution to defend in Afghanistan. What the Soviets called a "revolution" was actually the April 1978 coup in which a handful of pro-Soviet revisionists seized power. This pro-Soviet regime quickly became the object of such popular hatred and was so threatened by widespread

Southwest Asia. The fall of the Shah's regime in Iran and U.S. difficulties in the region generally probably were big factors in Moscow's decision that the time was right for the move. Coming at the heels of a string of aggressive Soviet maneuvers in the Third World in the late '70s, the invasion was a declaration to the world by the Soviet rulers that they were a

**Neither the U.S. nor the Soviet gangsters have any right whatsoever to talk about independence and self-determination for oppressed people anywhere in the world. Only a new democratic revolution waged by the masses of Afghan people, with support from proletarian and oppressed people internationally, can really sweep away all reaction and imperialist domination from Afghanistan.**

revolt that the Soviets felt compelled to step in and prop it up.

The Soviets and their Afghan flunkies resorted to the time-honored tactics of all occupiers and oppressors when faced with a rebellious people: They unleashed reactionary terror against the Afghan population, wreaking enormous destruction throughout the country. No one knows how many died in Soviet campaigns of aerial and artillery bombardment and search-and-destroy missions — the Soviets won't say or haven't bothered to count. But the estimates run as high as a million out of a population of 15 million. Fully half of the Afghan population — over 7 million people — have been uprooted from their homes: 5.5 million Afghans were driven into exile in neighboring Iran and Pakistan, while another 2 million have become "internal refugees" inside Afghanistan. Of Afghanistan's 22,000 villages, 12,000 have been destroyed in the war and 5,000 significantly damaged.

But for all the death and destruction they brought down on Afghanistan, the Soviets were never able to crush the Afghan resistance and in the end could maintain only shaky control over about 20 percent of the country — mainly around Kabul, the capital, and other major cities — and very little control of the borders with Pakistan and Iran. A measure of how vulnerable the Soviets had become in Afghanistan is that they have had to make extremely careful plans to pull out their troops from the country in order to avoid suffering heavy casualties from attacks by resistance forces during the process.

#### A Complex Battlefield

The struggle in Afghanistan has been a very complex battlefield because it has concentrated some of the different but interrelated contradictions that shape today's world: on one hand the contradiction between imperialism (and social-imperialism) and oppressed nations, and on the other hand the contradiction among the various imperialist powers, especially between the two blocs headed up by the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

The 1979 Soviet invasion was not only an effort to save the regime in Kabul; it was also a major military and strategic thrust into the Middle East and

global power and had to be reckoned with as a powerful challenger to the U.S.

In response, the U.S. and its allies have been deeply involved in supporting, advising, and arming major elements in the Afghan resistance. U.S. covert military aid to these forces, which flows through Pakistan, has totaled over \$2 billion over the past eight years — one of the biggest operations ever mounted by the CIA. The aid has gone to a collection of religious authorities, feudal chieftains, and pro-U.S. compradors who now dominate the resistance forces. In carrying out this huge effort to control and use the struggle of the Afghan people as a club against their Soviet rivals, the U.S. has posed hypocritically as supporters of "independence and self-determination" for Afghanistan.

The social-imperialists and their apologists around the world point to the U.S. intrigues in Afghanistan as an excuse for Soviet actions in that country. But the crimes of one imperialism are no justification for supporting the crimes of another. Neither the U.S. nor the Soviet gangsters have any right whatsoever to talk about independence and self-determination for oppressed people anywhere in the world. Only a new-democratic revolution waged by the masses of Afghan people, with support from proletarian and oppressed people internationally, can really sweep away all reaction and imperialist domination from Afghanistan.

It is true that in many areas of Afghanistan years of fighting under the leadership of reactionary feudal and pro-Western forces have had a very damaging effect on the resistance. The domination of these forces has meant, for example, that a wrong military line of relying on heavy arms received from the West now prevails in the Afghan movement, and it has also opened the door to capitulation to Soviet social-imperialism. This situation points to the necessity for a party based on Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought which can clearly present the new-democratic road and fully mobilize the revolutionary initiative of the masses in a genuine war of national liberation. The urgency for such leadership is even sharper with the Soviet withdrawal and the opportunities that could open up.

#### An Agreement to Continue the Bloodshed

The parties to the Geneva accords on Afghanistan were and continue to be at such loggerheads that they could not agree to a cease-fire, a coalition government, or even a means for forming such a government. About the only thing that the U.S. and Soviet Union, the two "guarantors," saw eye-to-eye on was to agree openly in advance that each side can violate the terms of the accords forbidding foreign intervention.

One U.S. government official admitted, "At a time when we're signing an agreement, we are telling people we won't respect it." While claiming that the U.S. wants "a government which reflects the will of the Afghan people," U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz declared out of the other side of his mouth that "there is nothing in the agreement that restricts the U.S. in any way." "We have made clear to the Soviet leaders before signing that it is our right to provide military aid to the resistance," he said.

In fact, both sides sent a large flood of arms to their forces in Afghanistan just **The only thing that can be said with certainty is that the future of Afghanistan is by no means settled. Once the Soviet troops leave, everything will be up for grabs.**

before the signing of the treaty in order to put them in the strongest possible position for the withdrawal aftermath. And each side insists that they have a right to continue arming their allies as long as the other side arms their allies. The Soviet Union and the U.S. will continue their bloody contention in Afghanistan through their proxies in the civil war. In the language of imperialist diplomacy, this agreement to continue pouring death into Afghanistan is called "positive symmetry."

The U.S.-backed resistance has condemned the Geneva accords and vows to overthrow the current pro-Soviet government. U.S. officials predict that the Kabul government will only last a matter of months, perhaps weeks. Others speculate that the Kabul regime may be able to hold out in a few major cities for some time, thanks to Soviet weapons, an army and a security force of 40,000 men built by the Soviets, several thousand remaining Soviet advisors, and sharp divisions between the various organizations in the main resistance front. This might be the calculation of the Soviets as well. Other scenarios, such as the absence of any strong central government or the fragmentation of the country, are also possible. The fluid situation could provide openings for rapid advances by genuine Marxist-Leninist forces in Afghanistan.

The only thing that can be said with certainty is that the future of Afghanistan is by no means settled. Once the Soviet troops leave, everything will be up for grabs. ■

## **Pulling Back the Knights to Move the Game Plan**

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 was one of the key events — along with the Iranian revolution and the election of Ronald Reagan — of a period marked by a sharp intensification of U.S.-Soviet tensions and the rapid acceleration of each side's preparations for world war. Now, in the wake of the Geneva agreement on Afghanistan and the start of the Soviet troop withdrawal, some people say that a dangerous hotspot of East-West conflict is being resolved and that the pendulum of U.S.-Soviet relations may be swinging toward less hostility and more cooperation.

Such arguments are quickly shattered by the reality on the ground in Afghanistan. The *only* thing that the Soviet Union and the United States agreed on was that each side will continue to back up the forces under its control in Afghanistan with mountains of guns and bullets. Even before the first Soviet soldier began pulling out, the arms flow rose dramatically, and the Afghanistan powder keg continues to be very explosive.

When the broader context of strategic moves by the Soviet Union and the United States, in the region and globally, is considered, it becomes even clearer that the Soviet troop withdrawal is not a lead-in to an easing of East-West tensions and dangers of war. Gorbachev's solution to the "Afghan problem" is to cut the Soviet losses while defending what can be defended in Afghanistan, in order to better contend with the U.S. internationally. On the other side, the Reagan administration's moves in Afghanistan and the Geneva negotiations have been aimed at making the Soviets pay as high a political and military price as possible while putting the U.S. in the strongest possible position in Afghanistan and other points of contention with the Soviets.

The recent events in Afghanistan reflect the deepening crisis gripping both imperialist blocs and pushing them to sharper conflicts. This, not some new dawn of cooperative superpower relations, is what the developments in Afghanistan point to.

### **A Rising Discontent on the Home Front**

The invasion of 1979 was both a response to what the Soviet rulers saw as a dangerous threat in their "backyard" and an aggressive offensive thrust. The Soviet leadership feared that the largely Muslim resistance posed a grave threat to the pro-Soviet regime in Kabul, whose collapse could harm Soviet global credibility and stir nationalist passions among Muslims in southern regions of the Soviet Union itself. (According to some estimates, the Soviet Union's Muslim population could soon number some 40 percent of the total Soviet population.)

The Soviet invasion was also a strategic push southward that threatened Western interests in Southwest Asia and the Middle East at a time when the U.S. had

recently been defeated in Vietnam and faced a debacle in Iran. The Kremlin leadership was declaring to foes as well as allies that the Soviet Union was a world power on the rise.

On all counts the invasion and occupation turned into their opposite, and Afghanistan became a quicksand trap for the Soviets. The Soviets have been unable to suppress the Afghan resistance, while the Nagib regime in Kabul is shaky and besieged and will be fighting desperately for its life after the Soviet troops leave.

Unlike the U.S. during the Vietnam War era, the Soviet government has not faced a massive antiwar movement on the home front. But there have been reports that domestic discontent over the war has been growing. The war of aggression against a Muslim nation may have contributed to tensions among Soviet Muslims which erupted into rebellions in Soviet Azerbaijan and other areas in recent years. According to figures given by Moscow, 12,000 Soviet troops have been killed in Afghanistan, with another 20,000 wounded. Official rationalizations about "internationalist duty" are losing their effectiveness: When the audience at one recent public forum on Afghanistan was asked to submit questions, one person wrote, "Remember Vietnam." The 1 million Soviet veterans of Afghanistan have become something of a focal point of dissatisfaction and disillusion with the Soviet system. Within the military, demoralization has grown to a point where Soviet soldiers widely sell their weapons in exchange for drugs and vodka on the Afghan black market, and there have been several known cases of Soviet soldiers defecting to the Afghan resistance.

### **Glasnost and the "Bleeding Wound"**

In a system already pressed hard by crisis on all fronts, this growing discontent over Afghanistan posed a serious danger to the Soviet rulers. Gorbachev declared in a 1986 speech: "We are living at a crucial time. . . . There is not a moment to lose. Everything that we have planned must be done in time, for at issue are the might and prosperity of our country, the position of socialism in the international arena and the consolidation of peace throughout the world." This needs a little translation: by "socialism" Gorbachev means the bloc headed by Soviet social-imperialism, and by "consolidation of peace" he means achieving gains against the West. But Gorbachev's words clearly reflect the sense of gravity and urgency that underlie the Soviet leadership's program of *glasnost* (opening up) and *perestroika* (restructuring). Gorbachev's "reforms" to "accelerate social and economic development" are closely tied up with the gearing up of military development and counterrevolutionary suppression — in other words, with preparations for world war.

Although Gorbachev and those he rep-

resents see *glasnost* as absolutely necessary, these measures are also causing unpredictable repercussions and cracks in Soviet society as well as throughout the bloc: the recent uprisings by Polish workers are one example. In this situation, the "bleeding wound" of Afghanistan threatened to infect the whole *glasnost* program and ignite a dangerous "hot mix" of various currents of social discontent.

There is no doubt that the Soviet leadership would have preferred to crush the struggle of the Afghan people if possible. In fact, as soon as Gorbachev came into office in 1985, the Soviets launched a new offensive, including bombing raids on refugee camps in Pakistan, the mining of border roads, and increased use of Soviet commando units. But this offensive failed like the others, and the Soviets have been forced to try to "Afghanize" the conflict and rule more from the background. They are no doubt praying that their massive arms shipments to Kabul, along with divisions within the antigovernment forces and weariness among the Afghan people after years of war, will be enough to keep the Nagib regime floating above water.

### **Soviet Moves on the World Chessboard**

Gorbachev's *glasnost* and the withdrawal of combat troops from Afghanistan does not mean that the Soviet Union is now withdrawing into a shell. His "reforms" are not only a means to mobilize those people in his country who are bought off by the fruits of social-imperialist plunder; they are also meant to appeal to similar strata in the West. His sales pitch to such people: Friendship with the USSR (which is now making big advances in "democratization," thanks to *glasnost*) is the best way to ensure their privileged position. (This is often accompanied by thinly veiled threats of destruction by Soviet military might.) The social-imperialists are not turning inward but outward as they try to expand their options, consolidate what they have, and challenge the American empire in new areas.

As their war of aggression in Afghanistan dragged on, the Soviets suffered enormous political damage internationally. From the Western European peace movement to Third World liberation struggles, it became much harder for the Soviet Union to pose as a "defender of peace" and a "champion of the oppressed." The invasion and occupation generated fear and anger throughout the Muslim world and complicated Soviet efforts to expand its influence in the Middle East and take advantage of U.S. difficulties there. China raised the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan as one of the main preconditions for improved relations.

Now that they have been forced to end direct military presence in Afghanistan,

the Soviets want to make the best of this situation — or even turn the defeat into advantage in their global contention with the U.S. — by pointing to the withdrawal as proof of Soviet "flexibility" and "reasonableness." Some examples of the international offensive by Gorbachev & Co.:

- The Soviets recently have made aggressive efforts to build contacts with Middle East governments long considered pro-West, like Kuwait or Saudi Arabia and even Israel. While playing

total military manpower, along the border with China.

#### U.S. Countermoves

These challenges from Moscow have not gone unrecognized by the U.S. ruling class. Richard Nixon has written that "the Gorbachev era does not represent the end of the rivalry between the two superpowers. Rather, it represents the beginning of a dangerous, challenging new stage of the struggle. Under Gorbachev, the Soviet Union's foreign policy

#### The Doubled-Edged Sword in Afghanistan

The end of direct military occupation could bring the Soviet social-imperialists some relief from the difficulties created by their failed invasion. But not all the problems have been resolved, and the pullout itself could create new contradictions for Moscow. According to projections from some quarters, the life span of the Nagib regime after the Soviet troops leave is given in units of weeks or months. The establishment of a pro-West government in Kabul would pose grave dangers for the Soviets.



Downed Soviet helicopter

**The recent events in Afghanistan reflect the deepening crisis gripping both imperialist blocs and pushing them to sharper conflicts. This, not some new dawn of cooperative superpower relations, is what the developments in Afghanistan point to.**

both sides of the Iran-Iraq war (just like the West), the Soviet government has tried to push itself as the promoter of "peace" in the Persian Gulf, an area which the U.S. has marked off as "vital to its national security."

- In his book *Perestroika*, Gorbachev puts a lot of emphasis on Europe and writes: "If the world needs new relations, Europe needs them above all." He is not talking about proletarian revolution to overthrow the imperialist states but rather openings for more Soviet influence in Western Europe.

- In a 1986 speech at Vladivostok, the largest Soviet naval base on the Pacific coast, Gorbachev declared that "the Soviet Union is also an Asian and Pacific country." Since the U.S. claims the Pacific as an "American lake," everyone recognized Gorbachev's statement as a heads-on challenge to the U.S. in this region. Now that Moscow is withdrawing troops from Afghanistan, there is also speculation about better relations between the Soviet Union and China (especially if Vietnam, a Soviet ally, follows suit and ends its occupation of Kampuchea). Such a development would have far-reaching strategic and military implications. The Soviets now station 600,000 troops, about one-third of their

has been more skillful and subtle than ever. But it has been more aggressive, not less." (As a former chief executive of the American empire, Nixon should be an expert on imperialist aggression.)

In Afghanistan, the U.S. is trying to seize on the withdrawal to bolster its own position and weaken the Soviets — in the region as well as globally. After promising for two years that U.S. arms shipments to the Afghan mujahadeen would stop as soon as the Soviet troops withdrew, the Reagan administration now blatantly declares its intention to keep supplying the pro-West forces with plenty of weapons.

The U.S. rulers hope that the civil war in Afghanistan will lead to the fall of the Nagib government and the rise to power of a pro-West regime. Even if this does not happen (due to splits between various resistance groups and other factors), the U.S. will continue its attempts to use the conflict in Afghanistan as a knife pointed at the Soviet Union's underbelly. And in Washington, administration officials point to the Soviet troop withdrawal as proof that the policy of supporting pro-West "freedom fighters" gets results.

Even if the government manages to hang on for a longer period of time, the Soviets will continue to have a time bomb ticking in their own "backyard." It is possible that the Soviets might have to send the troops back in if things really turn unfavorable for their flunkies. Gorbachev has already declared, "If the intervention against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan continues, the Soviet Union will come to the defense of its neighbor."

The pullout also has a double-edged political impact for the Soviet leaders domestically and internationally. On the one hand it removes a major roadblock for Soviet moves around the world and a source of internal discontent. But no matter what kind of "spin" the officials and newspaper editors in Moscow try to give to the withdrawal, the fact remains that the aura of Soviet strength has been seriously punctured. This, in turn, could help spur dissension within the Soviet borders and various currents of opposition in Eastern Europe and damage the Soviet rulers' ability to gangster its way around the world.

While the U.S. rulers have been able to make important gains from Soviet troubles in Afghanistan, they also face some problems in the aftermath of the withdrawal. There have been rivalries

# Against Economism

'The workers have no need for socialists in their struggle to improve conditions, if that is their only struggle. In all countries there are workers who wage the struggle for the improvement of their conditions, but know nothing of socialism or are even hostile to it.'

( Lenin CW Vol.4 p.275 ).

What is to be done?, written by Lenin in 1901, is undoubtedly one of the great Marxist-Leninist works of all time - a classic whose value to the international proletariat has not diminished at all through the years. In brief, it is a thorough going polemic against a trend that had developed in the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party dubbed 'economism'. The polemic is valuable in its contribution to the character and nature of the party, the party press and the need to work amongst non-proletarian strata. The essence of 'What is to be done?' is that it draws out and thoroughly disseminates the difference between trade-union consciousness (which is, ultimately, bourgeois consciousness) and proletarian ideology; the need for the advanced proletariat concentrated in the party to organize the masses as a whole to take on revolution.

The basic theme of 'economism' was the worship of the spontaneous struggle, the generalizing of the existing level of consciousness, concentrated around the economic struggle. The fight for better conditions, higher wages, improved living standards etc. was made the starting point of the working class movement, leading to the downplay of any political struggle. As the economists put it; it was sometimes necessary to 'lend the economic struggle a political character', to win, as Lenin scathingly put it, 'palpable demands'. To the economists political ideology was of only secondary importance to the winning of 'palpable demands' - and yet without forwarding proletarian ideology from the beginning, it is inevitable that the working class movement will remain subordinate to bourgeois ideology. This is because, as Lenin examined, the economic struggle is based on reforming the sale of labour power to capital, something that is usually bargained through trade-unions. By itself 'trade-union politics, namely, the common striving of all workers to secure from the government measures for alleviating the distress characteristic of their position, but which do not abolish the subjection of labour to capital', (WITBD p.53), will lend itself to bourgeois consciousness. The economists also preached that the 'economic struggle is the most

This is a two part article in response to the recent strikes in this country. The first part examines the theoretical basis for economism, the second part deals with the recent strikes and the revisionist and Trotskyite positions towards these questions will be analysed.



"Smash Economism": A Character poster from the Cultural Revolution in China.

widely applicable means of drawing the masses into active political struggle'. What did Lenin think of this formulation;

'Is it true, that in general, the economic struggle "is the most widely applicable means" of drawing the masses into the political struggle? It is absolutely untrue!' (WITBD p.73).

It is worthwhile continuing the passage at some length;

'The very opposite is true. Of the sum total of the cases in which the workers suffer (either on their own account or on account of those closely connected with them) from tyranny, violence and lack of rights, undoubtedly only a small minority represent cases of police tyranny in the trade-union as such'. (Ibid.)

It is our duty, the duty of revolutionary communists, to imbue the masses with all-round class-consciousness of all class strata, the political and social, as well as economic oppression of women, oppressed nationalities, the role of British imperialism in Ireland and around the world etc. Indeed, are not these activities, just as, if not more, 'applicable' for drawing the masses into a revolutionary position;

'Hence, our task, the task of a communist, is to combat spontaneity, to divert the working class movement from this spontaneous, trade-unionist striving to



come under the wing of revolutionary communism.' (WITBD p.50).

So economism, which has been prevalent in the revolutionary movement for decades, and is as strong as ever, leads to concentrating one's forces in the economic struggle of the masses as the most fundamental sphere for organisation and revolutionary work, making trade-union activity the principle work for revolutionary communists, whether it be work inside or outside the unions with short or long term aims. Increasingly, this turns the revolutionary organisation into a structure to carry out this work, bureaucratising it and depriving it of revolutionary tension and militancy. Economism debases the content of the ties with the masses by lowering the activity of revolutionaries to that of trade-unionism. Naturally, economism goes hand in hand with a gradualist conception of revolutionary activity, expressed quite commonly in the position, first, economic struggle and organisation, after that political struggle and organisation, and after that finally, the revolutionary struggle'. In essence, this means that organisation remains in the sphere of economic struggle or trade-union politics, since the political struggle does not and cannot evolve from the economic struggle, except in some particular circumstances.

Such conceptions not only prevent effective and systematic exposures and political mobilizations around all aspects of imperialist politics and the role and activity of the different classes and parties which are their political expression, but also fail to take advantage of the political conjunctures that occur to develop the revolutionary political movement of the proletariat.

Because it conceives of the political struggle as evolving out of economic struggles, economism expresses itself in a deeply legalistic conception of class struggle. This means that the movements which have been placed or place themselves on the terrain of armed struggle are not critically examined in terms of their aspirations, their class basis and their strategy, but rather identified only according to the form of struggle they have undertaken, the armed struggle; they are reduced to that and rejected for that, which means, in fact, going over bag and baggage to the camp of bourgeois democracy.

The revolutionary political movement of the proletariat does not result from spontaneity nor much less from the development of the workers' day to day struggle. For us, the Supporters of RIM in Britain, our watchwords are 'Create Public Opinion....Seize Power'. We see that the decisive factor for the develop-

ment of such a movement is the existence of a party made up of the most advanced elements of the proletariat and able to carry out all-round revolutionary work among the ranks of that class. This must be based on the ability to develop the proletarian consciousness and organisation through political exposures and leading concrete political movements, and to carry out work in non-revolutionary periods so as to prepare itself and the proletarian masses to take advantage of these moments when the revolutionary seizure of power is the order of the day.

This does not mean we reject all participation in economic struggles; communists must not confuse economism with the necessary intervention in the economic struggle, both to guide the economic struggle to serve the interests of the most exploited sectors of the working class, and above all as one of the fields in which to develop political agitation. The Declaration of the Revolutionary Internationalist Movement, while polemicizing against economism and exposing its main features, also correctly argues:

'It is not possible to build the revolutionary movement and lead it to victory without paying attention to the battles for daily existence of the working class and masses of other strata. While the party must not direct its own or the masses attention mainly to such struggle nor foster the dissipation of its own and the masses forces and energies on them, neither can the party fail to do work in relation to them. Leading economic struggles is not the same thing as economism. The proletarian party should take these struggles, especially those with the potential to go beyond conventional bounds, seriously into account. This means conducting work in relation to these struggles in such a way as to facilitate the masses to revolutionary positions.'

In the imperialist citadels economism will express itself as 'imperialist economism'. Imperialist economism shares many of the central characteristics of the economism that Lenin argued against; a purist or workerist orientation; the belittling and complete negation of proletarian; the subordination of the revolutionary party to work in mass organisations. In essence, imperialist economism, sings the same old song of a 'kopek and a rouble,' except that in the imperialist countries the fight around and for improving living standards will become thoroughly eurocentric and chauvinist in outlook. That is, that over the decades

## Against Economism

Continued from page 25.



The fight for better living standards in the imperialist countries can only mean more misery for the people in the "Third World".

imperialism has become, and remains, the dominant force in the world today, shaping constantly evolving structures to meet its requirements in both oppressor and oppressed countries. The ability of the imperialists to extract super-profits from the extreme oppression of dominated (colonial or neo-colonial) countries have meant that they have been able to buy off certain sections of the working class and influence the broad strata of the working class overall. This is a point that Lenin brilliantly exposed and examined in 'Imperialism and the Split in Socialism.'

Statistics can tell a part of the story. Whether it is in terms of life expectancy, infant mortality, numbers of hospitals and doctors per capital, amount of food consumed, or any other statistical measure of the quality of life, there remains a huge gulf between the handful of imperialist countries and the great majority of countries and people in the world. For instance, one way of looking at the same phenomenon is this; the Gross National Product (GNP) in relation to every person in Britain is more than 35 times greater than in India; it is more than 25 times greater in France than in Senegal; more than 40 times greater in the U.S. than in Haiti; 9 times greater in West Germany than in Turkey, it is also 25 times greater in E.Germany than in

Mozambique, and almost 30 times greater in the Soviet Union than in Afghanistan.

Reflecting on these figures, can it really be said that revolutionaries in the imperialist countries should protect and preserve these tremendous and grotesque differences? Doesn't economism lend itself precisely to this task, of preserving imperialism, of encouraging chauvinism amongst workers in Britain and in the imperialist citadels. Superprofits as a whole has meant that the working class in this country has enjoyed a relative amount of privilege over the proletariat in oppressed countries, retaining a certain amount of economic and political stability, and leading to the creation of a labour aristocracy, a die-hard bedfellow of imperialism and its plunders. And it is this labour aristocracy that is the class base of the economists. In effect the economists want to use the working class only as a pressure force within the imperialist system, a bargaining force to improve living standards, to negate totally the proletariat as a class. The economists have always said to the capitalists, 'don't keep it all for yourself, give us some of what you get.' The necessary objective of revolutionary communists is to divide the working class between the bourgeoisified labour aristocracy who have sided with imperialism and

the real proletariat, those with nothing to lose, who have no stake in the system, who are willing to go all the way in making revolution. If we do not make this split in the working class our objective, we will, in effect be subordinating the revolutionary proletariat to the labour aristocracy, to some fairytale to the monolithic unity of the working class; a fairytale created by the economists. In short, the imperialist countries can be characterised as enjoying a certain amount of privilege and wealth, though political and economic oppression does exist, as does a class with nothing to lose but their chains, whilst the oppressed nations are the source of imperialist wealth and the privileges that the imperialists can afford to give the working class of the oppressor nation. It is central to the tasks of communists in the imperialist countries to struggle against the logic of participating in the fruits of imperialist plunder.

If we are asking, or tailing, workers who are, in most cases, bargaining for a greater share of the imperialist cake, then this will only lead up a blind alley of 'chauvinist economism;' it would be attempting to reform, and thus, identify the workers interests with imperialism (it can be said that the economists' outlook is inimicable to that of the imperialists), rather than raising the sights and the consciousness of the proletariat, to smash imperialism and create a socialist society on its ashes, looking forward to communism. As Bob Avakian put it in: Revolution, (Organ of the Central Committee of the RCP, USA)

'Let's face it, economism is bad enough in any form, and even where the masses are suffering desperately, where the economic struggle takes on a much more acute form and becomes the struggle of people for bread, for fuel and literally to survive and has much more potential to become a sharp struggle and become part of a revolutionary uprising or revolutionary movement among the masses and to contribute to that movement, even in those conditions, all the things that Lenin stressed about economism are true. But it's so much the worse when you're talking about it in an imperialist country with not only a powerful labour aristocracy, but broad, thoroughly bourgeoisified strata, where it would be stretching it to even describe a lot of the so-called economic struggles as struggle, and certainly stretching things to call it any kind of significant struggle.

In that context, to preach economism to the workers and to focus their attention on the narrow sphere of their relationship with their employer, or even frankly on the narrow sphere of their relationship with their own bourgeoisie, without focus-

## Against Economism

ing their attention on the world scale as a whole, is what I call "imperialist" or "chauvinist" economism. Such imperialist economism not only limits the movement to reformism but leads it into the service of counter-revolution, particularly the more so if it's a conscious policy. In fact, with regard to imperialist countries, if one takes the standpoint of the nation, especially in view of what was said earlier about lopsidedness and international production relations, it might be better to remain imperialist. But if one takes the stand of the proletariat - which can only mean the international proletariat - it would be better to make a socialist revolution and turn an imperialist country into a base area for the advance of world revolution and the advance to communism. The point is not to blame the workers, even the backward ones, who are spontaneously economist, but to blame the communists who tail behind this and who promote this in the name of the working class and socialism and communism.' (CTW p.39/40)

The argument of the imperialist economists today that economic struggle is still the basis, or, at least, important to revolutionary work because workers are still exploited in 'our country', however imperialist 'our country' is, will still run up into chauvinist economism. Not to see that the world is one system, that imperialism exploits globally, and to attempt to particularize a country's conditions and see that for the basis for internationalism, rather than assess the international situation and telescope it down to the conditions in this country, will mean taking a chauvinist and eurocentric viewpoint, and thus a pro-imperialist outlook. To propogate, as the imperialist economists do, that workers' interests lie in carving up, or taking a greater share in the imperialist profit, will do nothing but turn the workers against the international proletariat.

So we have, overall, a lopsidedness to the world. and being internationalists, we can see that there is a tremendous urgency for revolution by the masses, especially in this period where world war is looming. The economists don't see it like this, and they don't want to see what is happening around the world, to see basicly, that the exploited masses of the oppressed nations, have been held, literally, at gun point by the imperialists and their lackeys. Sizing up the situation it becomes clear that there is a great urgency for making revolution right here, in the imperialist heartlands, and revolutionary communists must make it their duty to make preparations for the inevitable armed struggle and the seizure of state power by the

# BRITISH IMPERIALISM

# "THE CRIME - TOGETHER - WE'LL SMASH IT."

## RIM - SUPPORTERS

On 9th March, 1988, Home Secretary Hurd launched an £11 million campaign with the declared aim of involving the "public" in crime prevention. The three year campaign began with a TV advert in which children are shown saying they want to grow up in a safer environment. There have been earlier campaigns of a similar nature but this one goes further in that it is not only concerned with burglary but is more far reaching.

The government is not spending £11 million to protect us against criminals. The government are the biggest criminals in the country. They exist to uphold a system of exploitation and oppression, robbery and rape, which from the point of view of the exploited and oppressed is criminal, and to protect a class of criminals - the imperialists. The main job of the legal and penal system is to keep down the exploited and the oppressed and to prevent them from overthrowing the imperialists and imperialist "legality". This is the main concern of the imperialist crackdown. The aim of this new government initiative is to try to mobilize people to support the forces of imperialist "law and order" i.e. to take a much more active role in supporting the state in upholding imperialism and all the horrors it stands for.

The government made it clear that they want to bring about more Neighbourhood Watch type schemes working closely with the police. These schemes are two-pronged, on the one hand - and this is the main aspect - they are intended to bind increasing numbers of people more closely and more actively to the police and to the state apparatus of oppression. On the other hand, they will encourage independent vigilante type behaviour - i.e. the most reactionary elements will feel encouraged (and the imperialists intend this although they will try to deny it) to use their initiative and be very vigilant in protecting themselves and their property; in other words they are being encouraged to feel that they have a mandate to persecute and terrorize people who "don't belong", e.g., oppressed nationalities, rebel youths, homosexuals, women, the unemployed, etc.

The slogan of the campaign is "CRIME - TOGETHER WE'LL CRACK IT" and Hurd launch-

ed the campaign with the statement that "we all have a part to play" and encouraged "active citizens" to "work together". The advertisement with all the children was purposely put together using both boys and girls, and black and white children, intending to promote the united, one nation idea among the people. The →



propaganda idea that we are all one big family, that we're all in one boat and that we have a common interest in trying to achieve a more secure future for these appealing little children. Of course this "all one family" stuff is a load of crap: British society consists in the main of two quite different and opposing classes — the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the capitalists are exploiting the proletarians of this country and workers and oppressed people all around the world, the bourgeoisie possesses because we are dispossessed, their position of power depends upon our lack of power. The propaganda is trying to suggest that surely we do all have something in common because only "criminals" could want to spoil the future for those lovely little kids! This is very hypocritical as it is the imperialist system which maintains and perpetuates all the divisions in society: between the different nationalities, between the sexes, between oppressor and oppressed, and indeed, between classes. They cannot end all the various divides in this society as their system reproduces these divisions and it can only survive if these divisions are maintained. Therefore, their attempts of uniting the "nation" — "Great" Britain — is followed by even more repressive and oppressive measures which give rise to even more divisions in society.

The next thought we are supposed to have is that anyone who cares about these kids ought to join in this great "team effort" and help the police. But who is it that's spoiling those kids' future, and indeed the future of human society on this planet as a whole? How come there are muggings and child abuse? Whose filthy rotten system generates muggings and child abuse and rape and murder by the minute? And all the other imposed imperialist horrors we have to face.

Although the latest campaign is supposed to appeal to the general public there have been sustained attempts this year to target particular young people in this way. In February it was announced that the government is encouraging the faster spread of youth or junior crime prevention panels to foster closer co-operation between in particular the police and schools. These youth crime prevention panels already exist in many parts of the country. In the Northfield district of Birmingham police have recruited children to "prevent crime" in a, so far, unique junior Neighbourhood Watch. Chief Inspector Sharp commented: "Children see things and go places adults do not. They will be watching out for crime and reporting back to adults or a local beat bobby.... We hope they will report vandals, graffiti writers and suspicious

characters loitering around cars or houses." In other words they want these kids as young snoopers to grass on people. They want to have "eyes everywhere" so that we are permanently under surveillance and we never feel safe. They are trying to buildup an all pervasive network of spies. They also understand the importance of attempting to brainwash these kids young into their camp, before these kids realise what is really going on in this world and take the revolutionary road.

The imperialists have no right to talk as if they serve the interests of these children or humanity. As today in the world, billions of people are forced to live under the worst kind of poverty in the "third world" countries with no social, economical, cultural or political rights; it is the degrading, exploitive and oppressive social relations of imperialism which up to now is responsible for two world wars and all the horrors that go with them — including the use of nuclear weapons in Japan by the leader of the so-called free world: U.S. imperialism. It is the imperialist system which is responsible for all the horrors committed in Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, North Korea etc., and for all the millions of people who were massacred. For example, in the "saturated bombings of Cambodia, in less than a week during the 1970's, nearly one million people were burnt to death. The imperialist born Apartheid system is responsible for raping, plundering, murdering, oppressing and exploiting our black brothers and sisters in Azania (South Africa), and again, it is the imperialist born Zionist state that is responsible for doing even greater evils than what goes on in Azania to our Palestinian brothers and sisters, and it is the imperialist system which is responsible for the famines in Africa where millions die every year. And what is even more horrifying than all the past horrors is their preparation for a third, nuclear, war, which simply has the potential of eliminating humankind from the face of this planet — if it is not prevented by revolution. Aren't these horrors enough to say that they have no right to talk about the future of these children or humanity? Isn't it the time to rise up and smash this blood soaked system? Isn't it the time to end all forms of oppression and exploitation and those relations that give rise to them? Our answer is yes to all these questions! And our imperialist rulers also know that their time is up and that it is the time of uprisings and rebellions. The signs are already here: Palestine, South Africa,

## BRITISH IMPERIALISM SMASH IT.

Peru, Philipines and not far off, Ireland. In the eyes of the oppressors, the most criminal elements are those who want to "steal" by force the most precious and valuable values: the right to rule!

Oppressed people know that without political power everything else is an illusion, and as Chairman Mao Tsetung so poetically and powerfully put it "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun". It is not accidental that the most advanced elements of the political rebellions of the 1980's in Britain are among what the bourgeoisie considers the most dangerous criminals; they are branded as "real" criminals, and the real essence of the imperialist crackdown on crime is to prevent these, so called, "real" criminals from "stealing" political power by force!

This campaign is part of the all out preparations for a nuclear third world war. Because for the imperialists a secure "home base" is key in its future engagements, showdowns and contentions, as part of the western bloc, against the Soviet bloc, its equally imperialist rival. Of course in the early stages of this campaign, the imperialists will try to divert it towards the victims of its own rule, such as drug users, squatters, unemployed people who occasionally try to radically transform the relations of distribution, however, we refuse to brand them as criminals etc. But by this scheme they are already planting the seeds of future plants.

They are already talking about reporting "graffiti writers". In February 1988 it was announced that the government is encouraging the faster spread of youth or junior crime prevention panels to foster closer co-operation between, in particular, the police and schools.

The government knows full well that youths are going to play a major role in the future revolutionary developments in this society — as they are already doing in the "hot spots" such as Palestine and South Africa. It is not accidental that the government is seeking the "faster spread" of these "prevention" — from revolutionary activity — panels. Because they have seen a glimpse of the role of youths in the recent rebellions: Broadwater farm, Handsworth, St Pauls, Moss Side, Toxteth, etc.

This is a warning for those who might think that the government campaign is intended to save them and/or their children from "criminals". This campaign is intended to train "good Germans" for the type of events and consequences which occurred before and during the second world war.

But above all, there is an important lesson

for us to learn and act upon. The reason for the state's initiation of this campaign in fact lies in its feared inability to be able to control society in future turmoils and upheavals. Thus it should not be surprising that the state will do its utmost to over-exaggerate the success of its campaign and through that try to create an atmosphere of terror and a police state through the "general public". The more they talk about its success, the more unsuccessful it has become.

The imperialist campaign of "crime — together we can crack it" must be turned to its opposite, against the state. Because the very existence of British imperialism is the biggest "crime" and "together we'll smash it". This seems to be a good slogan for graffiti writers! Doesn't it? ■

### Against Economism

Continued from page 27.

proletariat. But the economists do not see it like this either, they propogate that the proletariat in this country are not ready, that it is fine to sit back, tailing economic struggles, taking things step-by-step, gradually and legally and so forth, whilst this very economic system and the democratic institutions (including trade unions) is based on plunder and ruthless dictatorship internationally.

The economists argue that this is not South Africa or Palestine, the 'British' workers are not ready, thus the NHS, Social security etc. are relevant to the revolutionary struggle. Thus, further they argue, that the working class have fought for these standards and that these are their achievements; well it must be said, that if this is what the working class has achieved since it came into being, we must admit that the working class has much loftier aims than this. The international proletariat has many victories to be proud of; the achievement of building socialism in Russia and China under the leadership of Lenin, Stalin and Mao. It also has the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, which was not a Chinese phenomena, as revisionists and socialists would have us believe, but rather a victory for the proletariat of all countries. These victories belong to the international proletariat as a whole. It is not the duty of the working class to defend the so-called achievements based on living standards, but to make a revolution, to prepare for power. The first interest of the working class is siezing state power, nothing short of this will do. And in order to do this the revolutionary class must arm itself with Marxism-Leninism-Mao TseTung Thought and we must prepare the party and class to do that. Revolution doesn't happen, revolution is made. ■

## **Pulling Back the Knights to Move the Game Plan**

Continued from page 23

and infighting among the pro-West resistance forces from the beginning, and the new conditions in the Afghan battlefield could well make this fragmentation even worse. At the same time, the U.S. is worried that a Khomeini-type Islamic fundamentalism could come to dominate the scene and turn Afghanistan into another Iran — a wild card in the Middle Eastern deck.

Nor is it clear that the withdrawal will lead to more stability for the pro-West Zia

regime in Pakistan. The Zia government has been anxious to remove the very destabilizing Afghan refugee community from Pakistan, and this concern has been shared by the U.S. These refugees have long been treated as a political football kicked by both the U.S. and the Soviets. The withdrawal agreement calls for "voluntary repatriation" of the 5.5 million Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran. But some forces within the Afghan resistance have threatened to stir up trouble among the refugee community if their demands for continued Western support and establishment of an Islamic government are not met.

In short, the situation in Afghanistan and Southwest Asia remains very volatile

and unpredictable, and the Soviet Union and the U.S. each face some dangerous problems. This will not stop the two opposing imperialisms from committing more crimes; on the contrary, such difficulties and the sharp crisis shaking each bloc will drive them to new and dangerous levels of confrontation in the region and elsewhere in the world.

But the Soviet failure to "pacify" Afghanistan was also a stark display of the basic weakness of all imperialist powers, East or West. They are giants with feet of clay, possessing monstrous weapons of war and capable of slaughter on a massive scale, but in the final analysis they are unable to extinguish the flames of struggle of oppressed people. ■

## **A Report On May Day Activities In London**

Continued from page 19.

Proletarian Day with the people of Brixton. The turnout reflected R.I.M.s internationalist outlook, with comrades from every continent. R.I.M. supporters celebrated May 1st, taking the proletarian message to the streets and to the people, with proletarian culture, music, speeches, newspapers and an illegal march.

Music was played from the heart of the people, rebel music from Peter Tosh, Bob Marley and Linton Kwesi Johnson amongst others, music with one message - that the people will not take the shit dished up by this government and the whole rotten imperialist system any more. A guest singer sang movingly about political prisoners, rebellion and the F.B.I.

Displayed at the rally were red flags, the symbols of the proletariat and of communism, of freedom and the fight to get it; posters of the five great leaders of communism - Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao; banners proclaiming the fundamental issues of May 1st, of internationalism, of proletarian struggle. There were also two well stocked bookstalls.

Sisters and Brothers from the revolutionary ranks gave messages of support and solidarity with the struggle around the world against imperialism, asking the people to join in the fight to seize power and rebuild society from the foundations upwards.

The highlight of the celebrations was the illegal march through the centre of Brixton, during which slogans were continually shouted stressing the international and anti-imperialist nature of the battle ahead. Let's recall some of the slogans:-

'British imperialism hear us roar,

We won't take it any more.'

'Women's anger, women's power

Patriarchy's final hour.'

'Not the church, not the state

Proletariat will decide our fate.'

'Oppressed of the world, step to the fore,

Only revolution can stop world war.'

'Fan the flames of revolution from South Africa to Peru.'

The pigs in blue were soon on the scene, threatening the marchers with arrest because of the illegal nature of the march. When faced with the revolutionaries' determination, they failed to prevent it from continuing and they moved in and escorted it, trying to isolate it and to stop the voice of R.I.M. from reaching the people.

Earlier the same day in another part of Brixton some black revolutionaries were beaten up and arrested whilst distributing leaflets for a meeting calling for the release of the Tottenham Three. After the march R.I.M. supporters showed their solidarity with the black struggle, which is part of the overall fight against imperialism, by attending the meeting about the Tottenham Three and by joining the picket of the police station where the arrested were held and by chanting slogans continually. Within one hour more than 150 mainly black rebel youth and a number of anarchists had joined this illegal picket. This public exposure led to the political victory of the release of the detainees.

The message of May 1st, and indeed for every day until communism is achieved, is that revolution, not reform, is the only way forward, that we are proletarians, we are the oppressed, that is, we are internationalists who have no country. What we do have is a 'World to Win'. But we must do it quickly with urgency, before the contradictions of the imperialist system bring the world to the brink of destruction. There is only one way to stop world war three, there is only one way that people the world over can be emancipated from all forms of exploitation and oppression and that is by fighting, by joining together across the world, with a proletarian and internationalist consciousness to win public opinion, to form a Communist vanguard party, to end oppression once and for all, in other words, to 'Conquer The World'. ■

TO WIN 獲得的將是整個世界 МИР ВБИГРАТЬ UN

Read, subscribe,

distribute, support

UN MUNDO QUE GANAR KAZANI. АСАК DÜNYA विश्व विजय

MONDE A GAGNER जीतने के लिए सारा विश्व है A WORLD

**Perestroika**

"A drug-induced sleep in the land of milk and honey." This is about la dolce vita in Moscow, not Milan or Manhattan. Even more ironically, upscale book buyers in the West have made the Soviet General Secretary an international best-seller. What does Gorbachev think is wrong with the USSR and the world? What does he propose to do about it?

**Burkina Faso**

The most recent attempt to find an "independent path" to national liberation and even socialism without a revolutionary war of the masses, a proletarian party or Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. The coup was the bloody denouement of a play whose ending, like those of the Greek tragedies, was written into the form itself.

**Winds of October Still Blow**



THE PROLETARIAT HAS NOTHING TO LOSE BUT THEIR CHAINS, THEY HAVE A WORLD TO WIN...



1988/10

**The Gulf Fulcrum**

Fill Up the Gulf With the Crowns of Imperialists and Tyrants!	8
Imperialism Entangled in Gulf's Rising Waters	10
The Iran/Contra Crisis: Ragged Hole in "Resurgent America"	18
Soviet "Dove" Bares Its Claws in the Gulf	22

**Winds of October Still Blow**

Excerpts from Joseph Stalin, Mao Tsetung, John Reed, etc. on the October Revolution	40
10 Issues! But A World Still to Win	3
Burkina Faso: Why You Can't Make a Revolution Without the Masses	25
<b>South Asia</b>	
Opening Statement to the Second Regional RIM Conference in South Asia	35
Press Statement of the Central Reorganising Committee, Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) (CRC, CPI [M-L])	36
Excerpts from "The World Situation and Our Tasks by the CRC, CPI(ML)	37
Proletarian Party of Purba Bangla (PBSP) Holds Second National Congress	39
<b>Book Reviews</b>	
Indian Communists Criticise Armed Economism	57
Gorbachev: Soul of Capital Personified	64

TO WIN 1988/10

**A WORLD**

**THE GULF FULCRUM**

UNMOND جہانی برای فتح