

# FORUM

FOR MARXIST - LENINIST

STRUGGLE

PRICE 3d.

OCTOBER, 1965.

## Revisionism in Action: Soviet-U.S. Collaboration Over Kashmir War

Because the post-Kruschev revisionists in Russia are more cunning in their concealment of their capitulation to U.S. imperialism it is not always easy to discover the full extent of their treachery. On one issue, however, they have been quite unashamed about their real intentions: their support for the Indian ruling class which has made hostility to China one of the keystones of its foreign and domestic policies. Among the many acts of betrayal of Marxism by the Kruschev clique one of the most serious was the policy adopted over the Sino-Indian border dispute in 1962. Far from supporting a fraternal socialist country the Soviet Union adopted an attitude of neutrality not distinguishing between the aggressor and the victim of aggression. Even more dastardly was the stopping up of military aid to the very country which was and has continued to be a pawn of U.S. imperialism. Soviet military aid to India - contrary to revisionist denial (of Gollan's answer at a meeting in St. Pancras Town Hall, November, 1964 to celebrate the anniversary of the Russian Revolution) - did not stop during the war and has been considerably expanded since, although the Indian Government can scarcely be called an independent entity tied as it is to U.S. capital and a substantial amount of British investment. But the fact that India is becoming more heavily chained to U.S. imperialism does not seem to deter the Soviet Union from lavishing praise on it.

Whereas the Government of India has been pursuing a deliberate policy of hostility and military adventurism directed against the southern boundaries of China - a policy that has been rewarded handsomely by the receipt of massive quantities of U.S. credit because it helps U.S. global strategy in overthrowing communism - the Soviet Union finds the Indian Government to be truly non-aligned and following peaceful co-existence! The Government of India, forgetting its earlier efforts to promote Afro-Asian liberation now supports the imperialist conspiracy of "Malaysia" and joins Tito in promoting Johnson's phoney negotiations on Vietnam. It does not dare oppose the entry into the Bay of Bengal of the U.S. Seventh Fleet and permits diverse organs of U.S. counter-revolution to spread their tentacles in India.

More recently, the Government of India, has used force against another of its neighbours - Pakistan. While it is perfectly true that the very division of the country in 1947 was an imperialist device accepted by the Indian and Pakistani ruling class the real interests of the peoples of both Pakistan and India require that they live in peace and friendship. However, from the outset a very useful bone of contention and diversion was found in the disputed territory of Kashmir. The people of Kashmir have never been given the opportunity to decide their own future. Instead of supporting the just demand of the Kashmiris for self determination the Indian Government has gradually assumed sovereignty over Kashmir complete integration being effected in December 1964. At the same time the undisputed leader of Kashmir - Sheikh Abdullah - has been kept in prison by the Government of India since 1953. A brief period of freedom was ended earlier this year when Abdullah's determination to fight for the right of his people to decide their own future was made quite evident and once again he is kept under detention by the Indian authorities. Pakistan, on the other hand, has disputed India's right to the territory from the outset and given every encouragement to the Kashmiri liberation struggle. It would seem obvious that this is a disputed area



where neither Pakistan nor India has any right to determine the future of the people of Kashmir. In such a situation socialist countries cannot identify themselves with the claims of rival contenders but should stand by the principle of self-determination of the people of Kashmir which is exactly what the Chinese have done. Not so the Soviet Union. As part of their policy of alliance with the India ruling class they have reiterated their complete agreement with Indian chauvinism which denies the Kashmiris to hold a plebiscite to determine their own future

Because the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union has given its unqualified support to India over its absorption of Kashmir it has over the most recent fighting between India and Pakistan - an undeclared war extended by the Indian ruling class into the very territory of Pakistan - quite nakedly come down on the side of the imperialists - especially U.S. imperialism. This latest phase in Indo-Pakistan relations over Kashmir is the direct result of U.S. imperialist design not only to obtain control over Kashmir but over the entire sub-continent. A more immediate aim is to overthrow the present government of Pakistan. Revelations in the British Press (Daily Telegraph, Time and Tide) have indicated C.I.A. intrigue to get rid of President Ayub Khan and replace him by someone more amenable to American dictation. In other words when the liberation struggle in Kashmir assumed a more militant tempo in July of this year and Kashmiri liberation fighters (not Pakistanis) crossed over into Indian-held Kashmir not only did the Indian ruling class try to suppress them with the utmost ferocity but decided, on August 5, to extend the area of fighting. By the beginning of September, because it was sure of both U.S. and Russian backing, the Indian Government had ordered its armed forces to cross the international frontier dividing West Pakistan and India and attack Lahore and other towns in Pakistan.

This flagrant violation of international law was received very quietly by the imperialist world. While protests were made by several Afro-Asian states that stronghold of American imperialism - the United Nations - did not open its mouth to condemn Indian aggression. On the contrary there was a tacit agreement



between the U.S.A. and Russia that under the guise of apparent neutrality they should help India. The American Government decided to stop military aid to both countries knowing full well that such a curb would help India which has a flourishing armaments industry since 1963 thanks to the help given by the imperialists and Russia. Indeed, both in the Indian and American Press it was declared quite openly that the embargo on military aid to both countries was in reality going to help India. (Free Press Journal, Bombay, Sept. 15; New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 20). The Soviet Union began to talk of a cease-fire and invited both India and Pakistan to have talks on Russian soil. Once again the Soviet Union, refused to distinguish between the aggressor and its victim. It might be supposed that Kosygin's invitation was prompted by a desire to take the matter out of the hands of the imperialists. On the contrary, it suited the U.S. that such a move should be made by a country not yet tarnished with the imperialist brush. "I am delighted that the Soviet Union has offered its good offices and I wish it every success in the endeavour" said Senator Mansfield. Similar commendation was expressed for the Soviet "initiative" by Secretary of State Rusk and Under-Secretary of State Ball. (Pres. and N.B.C. interviews on Sept. 13).

The U.N. has been exposed as a tool of U.S. imperialism since its dirty war in Korea and more recently through the activities in the Congo. There was a time when the Soviet Union led the world in condemning U.N. action and exposing imperialist machinations in various U.N. actions. But now the capitulation to U.S. imperialism proceeds in every sphere of Russian policy including its acceptance of U.N. as a vehicle to solve international problems. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Soviet Union in complete accord with the U.S.A. in the U.N. over the decision to fall for an immediate "cease-fire" in the fighting between India and Pakistan. While the U.N. had kept silent about Indian aggression against Pakistan despite a multitude of U.N. observers and 'peace-keeping' troops that have been posted in Kashmir since 1948 it lost no time to issue an ultimatum ostensibly to both parties to have an immediate cease-fire.



What was left unsaid in both speeches of the American and Russian representatives - Goldberg and Fedorenko - was that a cease-fire with Indian troops right in the heart of Pakistan would be of military advantage to India. What was even more significant is that in the debate nothing was said about the future of Kashmir although this is a dispute that has been unresolved by the U.N. since 1948 when the decision for a plebiscite was first mooted. One cannot quarrel with the New York Times when it described Russia's stand of complete support for India over Kashmir as one "that at the moment parallels that of the United States"; or its conclusion that "Moscow's support for India on this issue apparently is closely linked to a policy of containing Communist China in Asia". (October 1).

That is the heart of the matter. Revisionism in the Soviet Union is directed against China and towards the U.S.A. Concurrent with the India-Pakistan clash was a renewed flare-up between India and China over intrusions by India into Chinese territory on the other side of Sikkim. For the first time the Indian Government admitted, albeit in an oblique way, that it had built military installations on the Chinese side of the border. The Sino-Indian dispute once again revealed the true alignment of the Soviet Union. For all its prating about the need for socialist unity because of the terrible situation in South-East Asia the revisionists do not want to strengthen the socialist camp in the face of U.S. imperialism. At a time when it has become quite evident that India is being armed to oppose China and after the latest Chinese notes have indicated the kinds of incursions and intrusions into Chinese territory being undertaken by the Indian rulers the Soviet Union refuses to support her fraternal neighbour. Instead the treatment of the Chinese notes in the Soviet Press has been so biased that little is given of the detailed charges made by China against India while the Indian Prime Minister's rebuttals and allegations are given ample coverage. Pravda, for example, (Sept. 23) speaks of "anxiety" about the transfer and concentration of Chinese troops within its own borders without a word about the anxiety it should feel about the subservience of the Indian government to American war plans



against China. Because China has supported Pakistan in the face of Indian aggression the Soviet Union has made innumerable criticisms (though not daring to name China) about "third parties" which are deliberately trying "to fan the flames of war." It is incredible that the country which should be the leader of the socialist world should find itself allied to a puppet of the U.S.A. whose main task is to attack China.

This article has not gone into the background of the two countries of India and Pakistan. These two, once formed the greatest colony in the British Empire. After a negotiated settlement which helped only the ruling classes of both countries and the imperialists they became, like so many former colonies, the victims of neo-colonialism. Because of the difference in the class composition of the ruling class in the two countries, the uneven development of the people's forces and the leadership of their communist movements the dialectics of struggle have not been uniform. On the contrary whereas in the past the Pakistani ruling class was completely tied to U.S. imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie tended to follow a more independent policy of non-alignment, since 1959 there has been a reversal in role. The needs of a stagnant economy have made Indian capitalism accept a subordinate position under U.S. imperialism seeking profits in a war-gearred economy. War whether with China or Pakistan is also a most useful diversion for a restive population groaning under rising prices, heavy taxes and food scarcity. The present Pakistan government, however, finds itself opposed to U.S. domination. The contradictions between it and U.S. imperialism have reached such a point as to forge links between Pakistan and the socialist world, especially China and thereby to invoke American anger which led, a few months back to the termination of economic aid. Although, nominally a member of imperialist alliances like SEATO, Pakistan's present policy is one of non-co-operation with the U.S.A. so that Ayub has been described as another De Gaulle. In neither India nor Pakistan is the popular movement sufficiently strong to develop a liberation struggle against neo-colonialism. However, on the question of the main enemy, there is not the slightest doubt



that Pakistan is trying to assert its independence while India is becoming increasingly enslaved by the U.S.A. through military and economic aid and the inevitable political control of neo-colonialism. That it is at this very precise moment that the Soviet Union should strengthen its ties with the reactionary Indian ruling class is one more proof - if that was still necessary - of the real significance of revisionism. The distortion of the concept of "peaceful coexistence" has produced an alliance with U.S. imperialism and its dependency - the Government of India against socialist China.

---

### SOLIDARITY ACTION ON VIETNAM

On the initiative of "Forum", a meeting was held between various antirevisionist groups in London with the aim of developing a solidarity movement with the people of Vietnam, over and above the work that is being done by the 'Peace in Vietnam' movement in Britain today.

It was recognized that the general line of the British Council for Peace in Vietnam, of the 130 local Committees for Peace in Vietnam and other bodies, does not make clear the essential nature of the Vietnam war - that it is a struggle for national liberation against U.S. imperialism and therefore deserves the unqualified support of working people all over the world, until the point is reached when the slogan 'U.S. GET OUT OF VIETNAM' becomes a historically accomplished fact. The BCVP, while doing a great deal of useful work in arousing public interest and disseminating knowledge of the facts, and while upholding the Geneva Agreements and increasingly pointing the finger of blame at the U.S., does not adequately explain that the U.S. and only the U.S. is breaking the Geneva Agreements. It does not explain that U.S. strategy in Vietnam is the inevitable strategy of imperialism in its attempt to subjugate the various intermediate countries as part of its grand design to prepare the ground for an attack on the socialist countries. The intrinsically warlike and predatory character of Washington is not made clear, nor that U.S. imperialism attempts to oppress and

exploit all other nations, and is therefore the common enemy of all peoples of the world.

By blurring certain key issues in this way, the B.C.P.V. tends to appeal by pacifist reasoning and gives rein to those who call for 'peace at any price.' This is shown by the fact that the B.C.P.V. has so far failed to come out with a clear denunciation of any sort of negotiations while U.S. troops are still on Vietnamese soil. It is not surprising therefore that the sections mainly attracted to the B.C.P.V. and its work, are those sections of the people who are imbued with petty-bourgeois, humanitarian ideas. The building of a really broad anti-imperialist movement, with the industrial working class playing a leading role, will only be possible on the basis of class explanations and arguments. The tactical approach and method of presentation have to be carefully worked out, with particular attention being paid to the reactionary role of the British Government. In this respect the B.C.P.V. is working on the right lines.

Conscious of these weaknesses in the existing movement, the comrades got together to discuss ways and means of appealing directly to industrial workers by explaining that British and Vietnamese working people suffer at the hands of the same oppressor - U.S. imperialism. As a result of considerable discussion a leaflet was got out (reproduced at the end of this article), and distributed outside Ford's works at Dagenham, in the name of the "Hands off Vietnam Committee". While the leaflet contains faults and weaknesses which we now recognize, it is felt that at least a start has been made in more representative collective work. Some 30 comrades have been involved, 20 of them actually engaging in the distribution. The comrades felt cheered by a generally favourable response from Ford's workers, and further work is being planned to test out the initial response and to build on it. This will be reported in subsequent issues of Forum.

This initiative does not in any sense mean that anti-revisionists stand in opposition to the B.C.P.V. Many of them actively support both it and the local committees, and struggle for a correct line within these organisations. The 'Hands off



Vietnam Committee' is attempting in a limited way to do the job which at present goes by default because of the revisionist nature of the C.P.G.B. It is only when principled Marxist-Leninist analysis appears alongside the various other social-democratic, pacifist versions of the struggle that the people at large will begin to see the thing clearly.

In the months ahead there is no more urgent task for communists than to broaden and deepen the Vietnam campaign. Up to now the surface has barely been scratched. To end with just one example of untapped potentiality, there are many young people in the working class movement who are ready at this very moment to respond to a much more militant lead. It is up to anti-revisionists to seize this chance and to direct these energies.

#### V I E T N A M -

#### THE UNITED STATES ARE THE AGGRESSORS

United States and its agent, General Ky in Saigon, are brutally oppressing the working people in South Vietnam. Witness the public and official murder of the twenty-four-year-old electrician Van Troy on 15th October, 1964, which is one infamous example among countless others.

On May Day, 1964, 12,000 taxi-drivers in Saigon-Cholon demonstrated against the U.S. murder of three drivers. The strike movement spread to the plantation workers in Bienhoa Province, to Saigon dockers who paralysed 11 U.S. ships transporting military vehicles, to cement, chalk and brick factories, to the U.S. Vimitex textile mill.

On 18th August strikes and meetings were prohibited by decree, and repression was stepped up. Despite this a general strike was called and 200,000 demonstrated in the streets (21st and 22nd September).



The workers are conscious of the necessity to show their strength when their organisations are threatened by forces of fascism. The U.S. and their stooges are using the same methods as the Nazis used in pre-war Germany, namely to attack the working class organisations. But the lesson has been learnt and in 1965 the struggle by peasants and workers has been successfully carried out, in support of the National Liberation Front Army, and has seriously dislocated the U.S. war effort.

Ford workers have a direct interest in this struggle. The U.S. makes an estimated £280 profit after tax out of every Ford employee each year, and this money helps to fill the coffers of U.S. big business, who are the most solid supporters of Washington's wars of oppression - whether in Vietnam, Laos or the Dominican Republic. A substantial part of every £280 goes straight to the U.S. Treasury to pay for the napalm bombs, toxic gases, aircraft, etc., used in the Vietnam war.

Workers of Ford's, Dagenham, and workers at the Caltex Oil Co., Saigon, have a common exploiter - U.S. big business. At Ford's it is a question of speed up and sackings but at Caltex, Saigon, it is imprisonment and sometimes even murder.

The Vietnamese people want peace, so that they can reconstruct their agriculture and industries, and end the mass unemployment and malnutrition in the south.

THERE CAN BE NO TALK OF PEACE NEGOTIATIONS  
WHILE THE U.S. AGGRESSORS ARE IN VIETNAM  
TO IMPLEMENT THE 1954 GENEVA AGREEMENTS THE  
U.S. MUST GET OUT OF VIETNAM AND TAKE THEIR  
WAR MACHINE WITH THEM

H A N D S   O F F   V I E T N A M !



BOOK REVIEW

Wilfred Burchett: Vietnam: Inside story of the guerilla war. 253 pp, illustrated with photographs. International Publishers, New York, 1965. \$ 4.95.

This book is brilliant reportage on the war in Vietnam. Burchett travelled widely in the liberated areas of South Vietnam, reporting on all he heard and saw. It is a pity the book is so expensive, but it is to be hoped that a cheap paper-back edition will be printed before long. Meanwhile comrades are urged to get their local library to buy a copy. It may be a surprise to some, but it is a fact that reading this book is like a tonic for anyone inclined to feel despondent about the situation at times. After reading it, you realise why the Liberation Front are going to win.

The book is packed with interesting incident, but two points especially come to mind. The first is about the origins of the war. The comrades told Burchett about the situation between 1954 and 1960, when the Liberation Front was formed. The massacres of defenceless villagers, after the Vietminh had gone north, were almost unbelievable in their savagery. But this violence vastly decreased after resistance began. Life became better. This may seem paradoxical, but when you read this book you realise why. Resistance began with some remote tribes; they had had enough. When they resisted, the fascists began leaving them alone. So more peasants followed their example. Eventually the political leadership came to see that armed resistance was the only way.

The other point that comes out very clearly from the book is the great political work done by the guerillas. As a result there is a kind of 'unofficial truce' in large areas of the country. The guerillas even allet land in the land reform to soldiers of the Saigon Government Army and then tell them about it.

In conclusion, it should be stressed that this book is not only an absorbing story but there are very significant political



lessons which can be drawn from it.

---

### GUNS AND/OR BUTTER

Revisionism seeks to substitute class collaboration for class struggle within capitalist countries and peaceful coexistence for opposition to imperialist aggression internationally.

One of the most common forms of this revisionist aim is a plea to the ruling class to cut down arms expenditure and to use the money saved to raise the standard of living of the people. The Daily Worker, ever since the Labour Government came to power, has been full of complaints that, like the Tories, the Labourites have maintained overseas bases and a high level of arms expenditure. If only the Government would drastically reduce the arms bill, money could be spent instead on education, housing, health, etc. and Britain could implement socialist measures - without any fundamental social change.

This is precisely the same perspective put forward by the Soviet leadership at various international conferences such as Moshi. If only the U.S. would curtail its enormous arms expenditure, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. could co-operate in making the money saved on weapons available for aid to the underdeveloped countries.

The implication of this approach, both on the national and international front, is that capitalist governments arbitrarily choose to produce arms instead of butter. All we have to do to achieve peace and plenty is to persuade them that they ought to be using public expenditure for socially constructive rather than destructive ends. We must persuade capitalists that profits from butter are just as good as profits from guns, and butter is more useful to the community at large.

This whole approach shows a profoundly ignorant or wilfully perverse attitude to the question of how capitalism really works. It is no accident that from the time

economists like Keynes began indicating that capitalism might be able to avoid the kind of crisis which occurred in the 'Thirties by a high level of public investment, this investment has primarily taken the form of expenditure on arms. When the Labour Government as the agent of British capitalism is faced with a balance of payments crisis, any understanding of capitalism would lead one to expect that it would be education, housing, the health services etc. which would be cut back and not the cost of overseas bases and arms.

Armaments expenditure is absolutely necessary for capitalism's survival for the following reasons:

(1) Unlike an increase in the production of consumer's goods, arms do not have to be purchased by the public for capitalists to realise their profits. This avoids the problem of production outrunning the purchasing power of the people. Even if arms are not used up in war, obsolescence ensures that they have to be replaced on an ever-increasing scale.

(2) Public expenditure on arms is the best possible way of taking money out of the pockets of the people by taxation and transferring it to the armaments manufacturers. Moreover all capitalist enterprises are given a boost by this operation since a high level of arms production acts like a shot in the arm to industry in general.

(3) Most important of all, while public investment in education, housing etc. helps business, its products are not so directly relevant to the needs of capitalism as the production of arms. In the imperialist phase of capitalism, not only does arms production solve various internal economic problems, it also provides the means for subjugating or keeping in suppression the overseas proletariat in the colonial or neo-colonial countries whose exploitation is essential.

More could be said on all this; but it is obvious that asking the ruling class in capitalist countries to produce socially useful goods instead of armaments is like asking them to cut their own throats.



As an example, the U.S. aggressive war against the people of Vietnam must be seen not simply as an attempt to ensure the continued exploitation of S.E. Asia and to dissuade other exploited peoples in Africa and Latin America from trying to overthrow U.S. economic domination. It is also a necessary element in the U.S. domestic economy - as is proved by the fact that the New York stock exchange booms with each piece of evidence that the war in Vietnam will be prosecuted with increased force.

Moreover, the fact that the war in Vietnam keeps the U.S. economy buoyant is recognised by the reactionary trade union leadership in the U.S. which supports Johnson's aggressive policies up to the hilt.

This same economic analysis applies with equal force to the British Labour Government's war in "Malaysia" and what is rapidly developing into a more extensive war in South Arabia.

Therefore the revisionist plea for butter instead of guns is ridiculous. It's the ever-increasing production of guns in capitalist countries that makes capitalist butter possible. It's useless asking capitalism to commit suicide by becoming peaceful and giving up its weapons. It has to be forcibly disarmed.

This is the task national liberation movements have so courageously undertaken. This is the task the proletariat in the West has to put on its agenda.

#### IMPERIALISM AND THE PARLIAMENTARY ROAD

The July Supplement on The British Road to Socialism contained much useful analysis and many sharp and pointed exposures. It should do much to remove the blinkers from many comrades' eyes and help to develop the process of serious criticism of the unbroken twenty years of ineptitude and failure which is the history of the Communist Party since 1945.

An extremely important omission, however, was very obvious in this Supplement. Nowhere did an exposure of the revisionist line on imperialism appear.

When the 1951 edition of The British Road to Socialism first came out it contained the following statement on imperialism:

"Only by this means (the ending of colonial wars and military repression) can Britain be assured of the vital food and raw materials necessary for her economic life, obtaining them in equal exchange for the products of British industry, needed by those countries for their own economic development.

This would provide the basis for a new, close, fraternal association of the British people and the liberated peoples of the Empire." (p.12)

It is also stated that the enemies of communism asserted that the Communist Party wanted to destroy the Empire, and declared that this "is a lie because it is ... the Tories and Labour leaders who are doing this." (p.11). "The Communist Party," this document affirmed "would put an end to the present abnormal relations of colonial war and repression between the British people and the peoples of the Empire." (p.11). It would aim to "transform the existing unequal imperialist Empire (!) into a strong, free, equal association of peoples." (p.15) (writer's emphases).

In 1957 in the heat of the Hungarian crisis, a so-called "minority" criticism of some of these ideas was put up at the emergency Congress and "accepted". The result was a slight blurring of the outlines by talking of "voluntary fraternal relations" instead of "fraternal association", thereby, in fact, bringing the Party "up to date" by lining up with the neo-colonialists. The essential idea of the necessary continuation of a "special (i.e. imperialist) relation" between a socialist Britain and ex-colonies, remained the same, and the Party leaders, with their usual contempt for the "stupid" masses, made no bones about the question in the literature designed for popular distribution. In the widely circulated pamphlet



A World of Difference (1960) a simple imperialist balance-sheet was included showing how it was "good business" to "give" the colonies their freedom since they had the raw materials we "needed" and we had the manufactured products they "needed".

Why is it so important for anti-revisionists to attack this particular aspect of The British Road to Socialism?

We all know that Britain is an imperialist country. But what does this mean concretely? When we stop to think it is very clear that no aspect whatsoever of the life of this country is free of imperialist influence. The vast industrial complex is the product of early British leadership in imperialist rivalry. Our native natural resources could certainly never have produced it. The pattern of industry is a product of imperialism - cotton, ship-building, engineering, rubber, oil, vehicles, chemicals, etc. The ratio of industry to agriculture, with the latter quite incapable of supporting the country's needs, is a product of imperialism, making the population dependent on imported foodstuffs. The ratio, also, of industrial to non-industrial workers in Britain today is a product of imperialism. The vast number of white-collar workers, appearing especially since World War Two, is the direct result of the increasing concentration of monopoly and finance capital, extending its tentacles into every corner of the globe.

These and many other facts constitute the material basis of the whole of life of the working class and masses in Britain. They have done so for many generations. We cannot be Marxists if we do not recognise that this material basis is the foundation on which the corruptive ideological influences in the working class, originating with the ruling class, have been built.

This is not only a matter of chauvinism and indoctrination on the lines of "the empire on which the sun never sets", although such brain-washing, especially on the very young, is extremely important. Nor is it only a matter of bourgeois concepts of "freedom" and "democracy" and conceited patronising comparisons between superior Britons and inferior "natives" who need our "guidance" to better things.



Let us recall that after years of bitter and violent resistance a century ago, to factory legislation of various sorts, the bourgeoisie suddenly turned round and accepted it at a time when the working class movement was at a low ebb. Let us recall that the first occasion on which workers were allowed to vote was at the instigation of a reactionary imperialist Tory prime minister (Disraeli 1867). Let us recall that Churchill and Lloyd George, two of the most vicious imperialists of the twentieth century, were loudest in 1906 in support of "social reform".

If we recall these and many other similar developments in the last hundred years of British imperialism, it is clear that the tactics of the ruling class in Britain have been to develop to the highest possible level illusions of "partnership" between the ruling class and the working class in the business of exploiting and plundering the rest of the world.

Marx and Engels understood this process very well indeed as anyone who cares to re-read Engels' later Preface to The Communist Manifesto will see. Parliamentarism is the highest and most deceptive form this illusion of "partnership" has taken because it is the "legal" recognition by the bourgeoisie of the docility of the working class. Such docility is directly proportional to the degree of material corruption, revealed in a multitude of different ways, that the imperialists engender among the masses generally in an imperialist country. Thus, despite the development of the Left in Germany before 1933, the German working class almost wholly accepted nazism in its period of triumph in 1940-41. Thus, today, the U.S. working class with few exceptions, is slow to support either the negro struggle or the mounting opposition coming from other quarters in the U.S. to the war in Vietnam. In Britain at the present time television and bingo are still serious challenges even to trade union Branch attendance, let alone political action against imperialism.

It is no accident that, as British imperialism has developed and expanded, so the "admission" of the working class into parliamentary politics has progressed. In fact, relationship



especially between the growth of the parliamentary state and the growth of monopoly capitalism and imperialism is central to the whole system of ideological corruption which the ruling class has pursued among the working class in the era of imperialism.

It is for this reason that it is quite inadequate to expose only the fallacies and stupidities of the B.R.S. with respect to the state inside Britain, and in comparison with class struggle experience all over the world. If this is done, the B.R.S. will appear, as the Supplement described it, as no more than a "foolish" document. It is not a foolish document but a vicious and evil document pursuing two principal false lines which are inseparable from each other. The parliamentary road to workers' power via a general election is, in fact conditional on the retention of the whole imperialist basis of life in Britain, because parliamentarism, which is accepted lock stock and barrel by the revisionists, is itself an exorescence of imperialism.

No one will find gentlemanly elections in progress in any crown colonies today. Nor will they find them where British or U.S. or any other imperialist control is still dominant behind the facade of "independence". The rooms which strew the revisionists' parliamentary path to power have been watered by the sweat and tears of the oppressed masses of the world. Their thorns not their petals are most significant to the exploited millions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Nor is this treachery on imperialism merely a matter of revisionist "theory". The revisionists have a long record of betrayal in practice of the national liberation struggle. Let us remember that, at the 1947 Congress, the Party Resolution actually called on the then Labour Government to recruit colonial officers "more democratically". Let us remember that in 1948-9, when the Malayan resistance to imperialist brutality was at its height, the revisionists virtually withdrew their support from our Malayan Comrades on the grounds that armed struggle against the "might" of British imperialism was hopeless at that stage. In recent years those in the Party who have worked closely with colonial Comrades in Britain, know only too well how the revisionists have persistently attempted to divert



such Comrades away from genuine mass struggle in their own countries, adopting the false capitulationist line that the main feature of the national liberation struggle is its bourgeois leadership. Woddis is the latest exponent of this line.

This last piece of treachery is the most insidious. On one hand, it peddles a distorted version of the correct line of united anti-imperialist struggle. This line stresses the principle of "unite with and struggle against" (i.e. unite all possible classes in the struggle against imperialism whilst striving to achieve and maintain proletarian leadership). This line has had its most striking successes in the Chinese revolution and the struggle against U.S. aggression in South Vietnam. On the other hand, the false line of the revisionists on the national liberation struggle is, in reality, an attempt to create conditions which are favourable for the false lines of the B.R.S.

If national liberation struggles result in Peoples' Democracies, with the workers and peasants in the leadership in alliance with the national bourgeoisie and other elements, any form of "fraternal association" is utterly doomed. On the contrary, if national bourgeois leaderships completely control these struggles the fabric of imperialism is not destroyed but instead colonialism becomes neo-colonialism.

It can therefore be said unqualifiedly that both the theory and the practice of the line of the B.R.S. on imperialism in the past fifteen years has actively encouraged and supported neo-colonialism. Without such encouragement the confused situation in the left in, for example, Nigeria at the moment, would not exist, at least in its present form.

It is clear, therefore, that Marxist-Leninists in Britain who do not recognise that the revisionist betrayal on imperialism is basic to all other distortions and perversions of Marxism that have emerged from King Street, should carefully re-assess their whole analysis. The two principle betrayals of the revisionists have been (1) the retention of imperialism as an integral part of a "socialist programme, and (2) the total submission to bourgeois parliamentarism and the vulgar limitation



of the perspective of political power to a general election. (2) is absolutely dependent on (1). Marxist-Leninists in Britain have the duty in future of reversing this line.

We have to show the working class and masses how Britain can live without imperialism, because whether they like it or not, this is the only possible future. We have to show in practice as well as theory how a Britain free of imperialism can be won.

But first and foremost we have to develop the maximum solidarity now with all national liberation struggles remembering that more and more behind British imperialism stands U.S. imperialism, the main enemy of all the peoples of the world. An integral part of this programme is a total and complete break with the imperialist-generated illusion of parliamentarism. We must embark on all forms of struggle to confront and defeat the imperialists, home-grown and U.S., whose whips and scourges will soon be scoring our backs as bitterly as they have scored the backs of the colonial masses for so long.

---

The following publications are available from "Forum"

A reply to James Klugman on Peaceful Coexistence	6d.
The National Liberation Movement Today (a reply to Dutt and others)	1s.
Statement on John Gollan	6d.
Revisionism and Imperialism	1s.
Classes in Modern Imperialist Britain	4s.
<u>International Marxist-Leninist Publications</u>	
Seven letters exchanged between the CC. of the CPC. & CPSU.	6d.
Why Khrushchov Fell	6d.
Letter of the CPC. in reply to CPSU letter of June 1964	6d.
Letter of the CPC. in reply to CPSU letter of July 1964	6d.
People of the World unite for the complete, thorough, total and resolute prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.	3s.6d.
Revolutionise our Youth - Hu Yao Pang	1s.
The Indonesian Revolution and the immediate tasks of the C.P.I. - D.N. Aidit	1s.
Dare, Dare and Dare again! - D.N. Aidit	9d.
Set afire the Bantong spirit! Ever forward, no retreat	1s.3d.
China and Albania - Friends in a common struggle	2s.
Joint statement of the CPC. and the CP of New Zealand	6d.
Speech at the Party school of the Kwangtung PC. of the CPC. - V.C. Wilcox.	6d.
Out to the people; on to the offensive against monopoly - V.G.W.	1s.



International Marxist-Leninist Publications (Contd.)

Kennedy and U.S. Imperialism - from Akahata	1s.
Who will win in S. Vietnam? - Nguyen Chi Thanh	6d.
Peace of Violence - Hoc Tap	6d.
Hold high the revolutionary banner of creative Marxism, lead our revolutionary cause to complete victory - Le Duan	1s.
Some questions concerning the international tasks of our Party	9d.
Thwart the manoeuvres to split the I.C.M. from Rodon Shinmoon	6d.
Marxist-Leninists, unite! Brussels Federal Committee	6d.
Declaration of Australian Marxist-Leninists	6d.
Declarations of Havana	1s.

## THE JOURNAL EXISTS:

- (1) to open a forum for all views and experiences of comrades inside and outside the Party, long denied expression by the revisionist leadership;
- (2) to help carry out the work of exposing revisionist errors in the class struggle in Britain, and develop inner-Party struggle, thereby assisting in the international struggle against revisionism;
- (3) to carry this out without dictating a 'line', and in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist principle of gathering the revolutionary forces - a task never carried out by the revisionist leadership;
- (4) to exclude all Trotskyist views as disruptive of this hard task;
- (5) to preserve anonymity (a) to protect comrades in the Party from attack by the revisionists (b) to avoid the suggestion of leadership by any contributor, or contributors who are able to name themselves since at this early stage of the struggle complete equality of exchange and mutual criticism are necessary.

THIS IS YOUR JOURNAL - USE IT.

---



PLEASE TAKE OUT A SUBSCRIPTION NOW

Rates 6/- a year post free, payable by P.O. (blank) or cash to Forum, 41 Atholl Mansions, South Lambeth Road, London, S.W.8.

Also contributions and correspondence.

.....

PLEASE TEAR OFF AND SEND TO ABOVE ADDRESS.

I enclose £      s.      d.      as subscription/donation to FORUM, for.....months/year.

NAME.....

ADDRESS .....

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....



Optional