

RED FRONT

FOR WORKING CLASS POWER
FOR A SOCIALIST BRITAIN

ORGAN OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN



August/September 1970

Price: 1/-

THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT IS GROWING!

AN ESSENTIAL PRE-REQUISITE FOR THE ADVANCE OF THE WORLD WORKING CLASS ALONG THE HISTORIC ROAD OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IS THE REBUILDING OF MARXIST-LENINIST VANGUARD PARTIES OF THE WORKING CLASS IN EACH COUNTRY AND THEIR UNION INTO A MARXIST-LENINIST INTERNATIONAL.

Never before in the long and bloody history of capitalism has the overall social terrain, within which progress towards the world proletarian-socialist revolution must be secured, been characterised by such varied and contradictory features - some advantageous to the working class, others highly disadvantageous. Generally speaking, on both the national and international plane the advantageous factors lie almost wholly within the objective situation, while the disadvantageous factors lie almost solely within the sphere of the subjective preparedness of the proletarian class forces. It is, above all, the virtually complete liquidation of the international communist movement, once the revolutionary vanguard leadership of the world working class, as a result of the thoroughgoing and tactically diversified betrayal of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism perpetrated by the representatives of the various brands of modern revisionism, which is preventing these favourable objective conditions from yielding their fruit.

Nevertheless, the tremendous experience gained in the struggle against modern revisionism in all its forms over the past fifteen years and more is now beginning to bear fruit in a rapid development of Marxist-Leninist analysis and its application. As the Programmatic

Manifesto of the MLOB expresses it:

"The growth of modern revisionism represents the penetration of the international bourgeoisie and imperialism into the socialist nations and communist parties and brings with it class struggle on a heightened plane. It is for this reason that, in spite of the severe blow to the world forces of socialism and national liberation represented by the betrayal of the modern revisionists, the Great Debate with modern revisionism denotes not so much a retrogression in the objective situation and perspectives of the world proletarian-socialist revolution, but the preparation for new revolutionary advances. For this heightened struggle is acting as a great university to train and mobilise the proletarian forces, and denotes the beginning of the end of the long period of bourgeois ideological and political penetration into the ranks of the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard." (p.18).

Certainly, the difficulties standing in the path of construction of genuine revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class are very great and at this early inceptive stage the numerical strength of the Marxist-Leninist nuclei is necessarily small.

BUT IT IS AN IRREFUTABLE FACT THAT THIS PROCESS HAS BEGUN, AND NO POWER ON EARTH, NOT ALL THE SOPHISTICATED INSTRUMENTS OF FORCE AND DECEPTION AT THE COMMAND OF WORLD IMPERIALISM AND ITS HIRELINGS, CAN NOW HALT IT.

Continued overleaf...

One of the most significant of the advantageous objective factors at present operating in the world situation is the tendency for the relative shrinking of the imperialist world market and spheres of influence arising from the victorious onward march of national liberation struggles in the under-developed colonial-type sector of the world. This process is undermining the objective, economic basis for reformism and social-democracy - and ultimately for the various forms of revisionism also - within the working class movements of the developed imperialist countries and is developing relentlessly the tendency for the class struggle in these countries to intensify. These developments are leading, on the one hand, to the preparation of the ground for the final smashing of the influence of social-democracy and revisionism (the latter being merely social-democracy under a false "Marxist" label) and its replacement by the influence of revolutionary vanguard parties armed with scientific Marxist-Leninist theory. On the other hand, these events are leading to counter-measures on the part of the ruling monopoly capitalist classes aimed at hindering this process; these counter-measures include attempts to impose corporate state forms of intensified repression and open class dictatorship, and the fostering of revisionism in all its tactically diversified forms of right, "left" and "centre".

Another fundamental law of the capitalist system which is finding its fullest and most intense expression in the contemporary epoch is the law of uneven development of capitalism. It is the new mode of operation of this law which is now beginning to bring about the division of the capitalist world system into two great rival power groups, one headed by United States imperialism, the other based on the developing alliance of European imperialist powers, including the neo-imperialist Soviet Union. It is this division - the highest and most intense expression of inter-imperialist rivalries and contradictions yet to develop within the world capitalist system - which is daily and hourly preparing the ground for yet another imperialist world war for the re-division of the markets and investment spheres still open for imperialist exploitation.

These developments are bringing about a situation where the focal point of contradiction in the imperialist world system is moving from the colonial periphery to embrace the developed heartlands of imperialism, with their developed working class movements.

It was thus in Western Europe and North America that the struggle against revisionism in all its forms has developed to the level where the nuclei of genuine Marxist-Leninist Parties have first been established.

It was in the United States of America, the

principal bastion of world imperialism, where class contradictions have already reached a high level of intensity, that the first measures outside Britain were taken to establish a genuine Marxist-Leninist vanguard organisation. Here, at the beginning of 1969, a section of the former "Communist Party of the United States of America (Marxist-Leninist)" repudiated the maoist "left" revisionism with which that organisation was infected, and broke away to set up, under the name of **THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT**, the nucleus of a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party.

During the last few months the American Marxist-Leninists organised in **THE AMERICAN COMMUNIST MOVEMENT** have taken further steps to consolidate and strengthen their ranks on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. After an intense political struggle, the A.C.M. has cleansed itself of certain elements who were striving to divert it in a "left" revisionist direction and has reorganised itself as **THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**. It will be publishing a newspaper entitled **WORKERS' POWER** and a theoretical journal entitled "**PROLETARIAT**".

In Canada, the brand of "centrist" revisionism propagated by the "Communist Party of Belgium" had gained a measure of support among the rising forces of the advanced working class and working youth, partly as a result of linguistic affinity, partly as a result of the correct stand taken by the "CPB" against both Soviet right revisionism and maoist "left" revisionism in the months prior to the summer of 1969. Individual Marxist-Leninists in Canada waged a persistent and principled struggle to expose this "centrist" revisionist trend, and in August 1970 this struggle resulted in the formation of a genuine Marxist-Leninist vanguard organisation, **THE STALINIST NUCLEUS**.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN AND ITS JOURNAL "RED FRONT" SEND WARMEST FRATERNAL GREETINGS TO OUR AMERICAN AND CANADIAN COMRADES AND WELCOME THEM INTO THE SMALL BUT GROWING RANKS OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT. WE HOPE TO PUBLISH PROGRAMMATIC DOCUMENTS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CANADIAN STALINIST NUCLEUS IN THE NEXT ISSUE OF "RED FRONT".

HOWEVER ARDUOUS AND COMPLEX THE STRUGGLE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MARXIST-LENINIST VANGUARD PARTIES OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE VARIOUS COUNTRIES MAY BE, HOWEVER PROTRACTED AND TACTICALLY DIVERSIFIED

Continued on back page....

"THE PERMISSIVE SOCIETY"

IN RECENT YEARS THERE HAS BEEN AN INCREASING TENDENCY IN THE PRESS AND ON TELEVISION TO DESCRIBE CONTEMPORARY CAPITALIST SOCIETY IN BRITAIN - AND NOT ONLY IN BRITAIN - BY THE NAME OF "THE PERMISSIVE SOCIETY".

Of course, those who try to exert their democratic right to demonstrate before the United States Embassy in Grosvenor Square quickly discover - if, indeed, they ever had any illusions on the subject - that the new "permissiveness" does not extend to political activity which the ruling class of monopoly capitalists considers a threat to its interests.

THE NEW "PERMISSIVENESS" RELATES TO THE FIELD OF WHAT IS CALLED MORALITY.

The "New Morality"

There are, of course, no absolute standards of morality, of "right" and "wrong", valid for all times and all places. The "code of morality" endorsed as orthodox by the ruling class in any class-divided society represents the conception of "right" and "wrong" which meets the needs of that particular ruling class at a particular time. Thus, orthodox feudal morality, which was the morality of a landed aristocracy, taught that usury, the lending of money at interest, was "wrong"; when the capitalist class seized power from the feudal aristocracy, this "moral law" was swept overboard.

The new "code of morality" of "the permissive society" differs from that of Victorian Britain because the needs of the ruling class today, when British capitalism is in a state of acute decay, are somewhat different from those needs in Victorian times, when British capitalism was still capable of developing the productive forces at a not inconsiderable rate.

The pattern of the new "code of morality" is discernible particularly in the field of what may broadly be termed sexual behaviour.

For some considerable time the artistic hacks who have sold their souls to the capitalist class have been campaigning in the name of "freedom of art" against the "repressiveness" of censorship, and, "in response to their call" the state has kindly reduced censorship of the arts and in some fields (such as the theatre) abolished it altogether. As a result of this "permissiveness" in the field of the "arts", the contemporary novel has largely dispensed with asterisks to describe the sexual exploits of its anti-heroes; nude models simper from the posters beside every Underground escalator to boost products as varied as shoes and sports cars; in an effort to provide titilla-

tion to make up for its lack of content, the theatre has begun to feature nudity on a considerable scale, and television has not been slow to follow its example; a film script for the commercial cinema is today thought hardly worthy of serious consideration unless it includes the naturalistic presentation of sexual intercourse in one form or another; pornographic magazines are displayed conspicuously for sale on almost every bookstall; and in the larger towns cinema "clubs" specialising in pornographic films have become almost as widespread as sleazy strip-tease shows.

Those other well-paid servants of the capitalist class, the "sociologists", have at the same time been persuaded to crawl out from under their red bricks to say, in their most erudite Freudian pseudo-psychological jargon, how "healthy" this pornography is in that, as a result of this commercial exploitation and degradation of sex, people's "repressions" are being broken down. These "sociologists" proceed to tell us that permanent relationships between the sexes based on affection and fidelity as well as physical attraction constitute an "outdated" and "repressive" social institution which, in the cause of "progress" and "the freedom of the individual" needs to be replaced by a system of temporary relationships lasting only until one or other partner feels the desire for sexual novelty. And the state, the state of the monopoly capitalists - ever ready to respond to calls for "progress" from its hired "sociologists" - obligingly makes available easier divorces and easier abortions, while the pharmaceutical trusts rush to provide new contraceptive drugs whose long-term effects remain, as with thalidomide, to be discovered in use.

The programme for "the permissive society" evolved by the hired intellectual servants of Big Business aims at degrading human sexual behaviour not merely to the level of lower species, not merely to a level devoid of human emotion and feeling but below this level - to that of a "sporting" activity undertaken merely "for kicks" like a ride on the roller-coaster at the Festival Gardens. Those who feel little desire to perform, standing on their head,

cunnilingus with two mares on the stage of the Round House are made to feel that they must be somehow "abnormal" and in need of psychiatric attention!

To the extent that young people accept the "code of morality" of "the permissive society" - and it is directed particularly at the youth - it reduces sex to a stimulating "diversion" - a diversion aimed at diverting them from thoughts and activity dangerous to the ruling class.

It must be realised that a principal aim of the "new morality" of "the permissive society" is to corrupt the ideals of youth, ideals which are an ever-present threat to the ruling class of a degenerate society.

THE NEW OPIATES

For long centuries religion constituted the principal "opium of the people", the effect of which was to persuade the "believing" exploited that if they tolerated their exploitation on earth - for "Blessed are the poor in spirit!" - they would be rewarded with eternal bliss in an imaginary world to come. Today such superstitions have largely lost their hold on British youth and the ruling class has need of new opiates to take their place.

One such drug is the perversion of music known colloquially as "pop". Requiring a minimum of technical skill to perform, this ubiquitous, commercialised noise is usually performed continuously in its "temples" where youth congregate, with a maximum of electronic amplification that seeks to hide its emptiness of content by sheer, deafening volume. While music, like the other arts, serves to deepen man's consciousness of the world and of his fellow men, to inspire him to high ideals and noble deeds, this cacophony - to which some radio networks are devoted exclusively for eighteen hours a day - is designed, not merely to make large profits for its capitalist backers and agents - but to drug the senses of its adherents and induce in their minds a premature senility.

The untalented, characterless "artistes" of the "pop" world are, not unnaturally, delighted if, as a result of some novel gimmick in their hairstyle, they are chosen by the capitalist mass media to be elevated to "star" status, to receive for a brief period a high income and, instead of the disgust and revulsion which would be appropriate, the hysterical adulation of their young, misguided "fans".

These "stars" of the sordid world of "pop" serve also to provide a widely publicised link between the cultural drug of "pop" music and the more potent pharmaceutical narcotics, such as cannabis, which in "the permissive society" are readily available to young people who find degraded sex and "pop" inadequate to satisfy their escapist desires.

An interesting recent development in the field of opiates is the attempt to stimulate the interest of young people in various brands of Eastern religious mysticism, by means of which - aided by "pop" and cannabis where necessary - the "spirit" may escape

from unpleasant reality to some "higher plane". The spectacle of young people leaving a Chelsea discotheque to join a chanting procession for Krishna may have its amusing side, but it vividly reflects the attempts of the ruling class to find novel (novel for Chelsea!) and fashionable opiates to take the place of discredited Christianity.

THE "HIPPIES"

For those youth - especially petty bourgeois youth - who have become hopelessly disillusioned with capitalist society in decay, the bourgeois "sociologists" of "the permissive society" have evolved an "approved" pattern of behaviour harmless to the capitalist class, since it is designed to detach its adherents from any revolutionary movement. These young people are persuaded that the road of "social protest" involves, not participation in a socialist movement based on the working class, but "conscientious objection to society, 'dropping out'." They are persuaded that they should associate in a socially isolated, impotent, idle group - the "hippies" - which is, within the group, highly conformist and which, being easily distinguishable by its "uniform", may be useful to the ruling class as a scapegoat in a future fascist offensive.

LAYING THE GROUND FOR FASCISM

The "code of morality" of "the permissive society", with its false emphasis on "personal freedom", is appropriate for a decadent capitalist society in which the facade of "parliamentary democracy" is retained. But as the decay of capitalist society proceeds, "parliamentary democracy" becomes less and less a suitable political framework for the capitalist class to maintain its rule. The "code of morality" of "the permissive society" has in this respect a further valuable use to the ruling class: it helps to lay the ground for fascism.

The practice of hysterical adulation of "pop" stars that is built up by the mass media among masses of young people can be turned without undue difficulty into the hysterical adulation of a fascist leader. Already "uniformed" youth gangs have been persuaded to associate themselves openly with fascist ideology - the "skinheads" with the "sport" of "Paki-bashing" and, the "Hells' Angels" with the insignia of the nazi swastika, etc. The conversion of these gangs from aimless hooliganism into politically-orientated fascist, anti-working class thuggery is proceeding apace.

Even the fact that many of the features of "the permissive society" arouse the strong repugnance of broad sections of the working class and petty bourgeoisie can be turned, in the absence of a strongly based Marxist-Leninist party of the working class, to the use of fascism in

that it presents these features as the result, not of decadent capitalism, but of "democracy", and so can enlist the support of the more politically backward elements of these strata for "strong measures" to "clean up" the country. It is not accidental that the Greek colonels, after their fascist coup, proceeded forcibly to cut the hair of "hippies" in the streets of Athens and to present themselves as "cleaning up" the "permissive society". It is not accidental that of the revisionist leaders busy restoring capitalism in the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe, those who sought to establish this on the basis of "parliamentary democracy" (like the former Dubcek ultra-revisionist leadership in Czechoslovakia) encouraged the development of the features of "the permissive society", while those who (like the present Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership in the Soviet Union), are restoring capitalism on the basis of a strongly centralised fascist type of state machinery, present themselves as stern opponents of the features of "the permissive society".

CONCLUSION

The manifestations of social behaviour known collectively as "the permissive society" have not developed spontaneously. On the contrary, they have been brought into being coldly and deliberately as part of a calculated programme aimed at maintaining capitalist society - the stench of decay of which has become intolerable to masses of working people - by corrupting (in particular) the youth on a scale never before conceived in any decadent society of the past.

The tragic young human beings who have been reduced to vegetables by the "values" of "the permissive society" are but its more obvious sufferers, who must be classed with the murdered students of Kent University and the butchered children of My Lai as victims of an evil and corrupt society which must be destroyed.

IT IS THE HISTORIC TASK OF THE WORKING CLASS, LED BY ITS MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY, TO DESTROY THIS SOCIETY AND ALL THE FILTH AND ROTTENNESS THAT IS NOW INSEPARABLE FROM IT. AND IN BUILDING A NEW SOCIALIST SOCIETY TO TAKE ITS PLACE, THE WORKING CLASS WILL AT THE SAME TIME BUILD A NEW MORALITY BESIDE WHICH THAT OF THE CAPITALIST "PERMISSIVE SOCIETY" WILL BE REVEALED ALL THE MORE CLEARLY FOR THE SQUALID, VICIOUS, ANTI-HUMAN PERVERSION OF MORALITY WHICH IT IS.

MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN

Literature is on sale at:

COLLET'S BOOKSHOP
Charing Cross Road
London WC2

THE GENERAL ELECTION, 1970

WITH THE FULL CO-OPERATION OF THE LEADERS OF THE LABOUR PARTY, BIG BUSINESS IN BRITAIN HAS SUCCEEDED IN ITS AIM OF REPLACING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE LABOUR PARTY - ITS "RESERVE TEAM" OF POLITICIANS - BY ONE OF ITS OWN OPEN REPRESENTATIVES, BY ONE OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY.

The final voting figures, compared with those at the last General Election in 1966, are as follows:

	1970	1966
Conservative Party:	13.1 million (46.4%)	11.4 million (41.9%)
Labour Party:	12.1 million (43.0%)	13.0 million (47.9%)
Others:	3.0 million (10.6%)	2.8 million (10.2%)
Total:	28.2 million	27.2 million

This represents a "swing" of voting to the Conservative Party compared with the 1966 election of 4.7%.

That this "swing" is, for the most part, illusory is demonstrated when the votes cast for the parties are calculated as proportions of electors, instead of (as above) as proportions of votes recorded:

Conservative Party:	33.2%	31.7% (plus 1.5%)
Labour Party:	30.7%	36.1% (minus 5.4%)
Others:	7.6%	7.8% (minus 0.2%)
Total:	71.5%	75.6% (minus 4.1%)

The aim of Big Business to secure the replacement of the Labour Government by a government of the Conservative Party was thus achieved by:

1) persuading a significant number of former Labour voters that on this occasion the Labour Party was not worth voting for;

2) persuading a smaller number of electors who formerly voted for either the Labour Party or one of the smaller capitalist parties that they should on this occasion transfer their votes to the Conservative Party.

This process was assisted by the lowering of the voting age to eighteen. All the available evidence shows that a high proportion of the newly enfranchised youth who voted recorded their votes for the Conservative Party, while the proportion of abstentions among those who were not Tory supporters was particularly high - partly as a result of apathy, partly as a result of anarchist and maoist influence which urged abstention as a "left" gesture.

The Decline of the Smaller Capitalist Parties

While the number of votes cast for the smaller capitalist parties was some 200,000 higher than in 1966, this reflected primarily an increase in the number of candidates nominated by these parties. The average vote for candidates of the smaller capitalist parties dropped significantly. As a result the Liberal Party lost 7 of the 13 seats it held in the former House of Commons; the Welsh pseudo-

nationalist party Plaid Cymru lost its one seat; the "Scottish Nationalist Party" parliamentary representation remained unchanged with the loss of the one seat formerly held and the gain of one; the average Communist Party vote dropped by 42% and all 58 Communist candidates lost their deposits.

When, in former days, the British ruling classes were composed of a landed aristocracy and an industrial capitalist class, with divergent interests on many fundamental questions, the Tory Party represented the interests of the former, the Liberal Party the interests of the latter.

With the fusion of these classes into a single social class, the interests of this class came to be represented by the modern Conservative Party, while the place of the Liberal Party in the basically two-party British parliamentary system was taken by the reformist Labour Party.

The Liberal Party political machinery survives today only as an anachronistic remnant which directs its electoral appeal principally towards narrow strata of the petty bourgeoisie - small proprietors - who yearn for capitalism

without monopoly, who nourish the impossible dream of a return to the competitive capitalism of the 19th century.

The burdens imposed upon the petty bourgeoisie by monopoly capital in recent years under both Conservative and Labour governments led to a "revolt" of a section of this class (and of strata of the working class under the influence of petty bourgeois ideas) against the two-party system in the mid-sixties, giving rise to a temporary revival of the smaller capitalist parties - the Liberal Party and, in Scotland and Wales, the pseudo-nationalist parties - reflected in gains in some by-elections held between the 1966 and 1970 General Elections. The revival of Scottish and Welsh pseudo-nationalism, based on the survivals of nationality in these regions of Britain, was assisted to some extent by the Communist Party and the maoist "Working People's Party of Scotland" which urged working class support for the false concept, contrary to all Marxist-Leninist principles, that these regions constitute separate "nations".

The strata which gave rise to the temporary revival of the Liberal Party and the pseudo-nationalist parties in Scotland and Wales are now becoming convinced that there is no way out of their problems by means of these parties and, in the absence of any genuine party of the working class, have turned back to some extent to the established capitalist political parties which have at least the potential of forming a government.

Thus, the seats lost by the Liberal Party at the 1970 General Election include all the geographically central seats - Orpington, Birmingham Ladywood, Cheadle, Colne Valley - leaving it a rump of six seats in the "Celtic periphery" (Cornwall North and Devon North, in the West of England; Montgomery, in Wales; Orkney and Shetland; Roxburgh, Selkirk and Peebles; and Inverness, in Scotland). 182 of the 332 Liberal candidates lost their deposits.

The Welsh pseudo-nationalist party, Plaid Cymru, lost its one seat in Carmarthen, won by the leader of the party (Gwynfor Evans) at a by-election in 1966, and 25 of its 36 candidates lost their deposits.

The relatively higher level of petty bourgeois pseudo-nationalism in Scotland permitted the "Scottish National Party" to do somewhat better, in that it polled 12% of the Scottish vote. Nevertheless, the party lost the one seat it held in the former House, Hamilton, captured by Winifred Ewing at a by-election in 1966; here the S.N.P. vote fell from 46.0% in 1966 to 35.1% in 1970. This loss was compensated to some extent by a success in the Western Isles, where the Provost of Stornoway, Donald Stewart, won the seat from Labour with a small majority (726) on a "nationalist" ticket centred on the detachment of the islands from British standard

time. 40 "Scottish Nationalist Party" candidates lost their deposits.

The worst showing of all the smaller capitalist parties was made by the Communist Party, which "fought" the election on its demagogic programme of "democratic socialism" through Parliament and, in line with the fact that it represents the interests of that section of British monopoly capital which favours continued collaboration with and subordination to United States imperialism, opposition to Britain's entry into the "Common Market".

The Communist Party contested 58 constituencies. In the 47 of these which they also contested in 1966, the average Communist vote fell from 1,185 in that year to 683 in 1970 (a drop of 42%), while as a percentage of the poll it fell from an average of 3.2% in 1966 to 1.8% in 1970 (a drop of 44%). All 58 Communist candidates lost their deposits.

The Real Issues of the Election

So utterly false a facade has "parliamentary democracy" become in decaying imperialist Britain that the real issues of the 1970 General Election were not placed before the electorate at all.

The role of a social-democratic government in a two-party capitalist "parliamentary democracy" is to serve finance capital as a reserve administration during a period when the electorate has turned somewhat against the open party of capital. In so far as a social-democratic administration has any special qualifications, they lie in the fact that - to the extent that it may be regarded as a "workers' government" - it may be able to pass anti-working class legislation with less opposition from that class than if such legislation were introduced by a government formed by the open party of capital - in Britain, the Conservative Party.

The failure of the Labour Government to carry through, under the cloak of "trade union reform", its proposed law to fine and imprison strikers rendered it of little further use to monopoly capital for the time being, in so far as these special qualifications are concerned. As Barbara Castle remarked bitterly at the time:

"We have abdicated our right to govern", meaning, in fact,

"We have failed in our responsibilities as servants of Big Business".

In accordance with the traditional capitalist relationship of master and servant, therefore, Big Business decided to dismiss its unsatisfactory servants and replace them by its "own people".

The aim of British monopoly capital is, of course, eventually to bring about the destruction of the existing trade union

movement and the establishment of a "corporate state" embracing both employers and workers within its framework, in which workers are legally compelled to "cooperate" with employers "in the national interest". The plan that the first stages in this direction should be taken by means of deception, by a Labour Government posing as a "workers' government" and aided by trotskyite propoganda in favour of "workers' participation in management", was not successful. A government of the Conservative Party, the open party of Big Business, cannot hope to deceive workers along these lines where a Labour Government failed. In the absence of a Labour Government, therefore, significant steps in the direction of establishing a "corporate state" can be made only by a government of the extreme right after it has taken active steps to build up a pro-fascist mass base. Since the Heath administration is not a suitable vehicle for these moves, they require a preliminary change in the leadership of the Conservative Party, and it is the aim of the pro-fascist Powellite wing of the party to bring about such a change. The Heath administration may be expected, therefore, to seek to introduce "trade union reforms", i.e., anti-trade union legislation, of a character centred mainly upon the restoration of former laws permitting employers to bring civil actions against trade unions where such actions are not possible at the moment. Such legislation must, of course, be fought by the working class, not only for its own sake but in order to build class militancy and solidarity in preparation for the more serious class battles that are to come.

Furthermore, as a result of the uneven development of capitalism, British monopoly capitalism has, in the opinion of the dominant section of British imperialists, become economically strong enough, when taken in conjunction with the decline of United States economic strength, to begin to break free from the U.S. domination it has been compelled to accept since World War II, by participating in a new European imperialist bloc having sufficient combined strength to throw off the shackles of Washington. In order to bolster the position of still weak British imperialism within a West-European imperialist bloc vis-a-vis West German imperialism (or, if the Soviet-sponsored "European Collective Security" scheme becomes a reality, vis-a-vis Soviet imperialism), the British monopoly capitalists aim at bringing about a special alliance with France, the economic strength of which has declined markedly in recent years relative to that of West German imperialism; it is calculated in London that the French imperialists would welcome such a special alliance in order to bolster their own position vis-a-vis Bonn. The British imperialists aim also at securing

other allies in the shape of the at present friendless white racist states of South Africa and Rhodesia, and of certain states with equally reactionary regimes in Europe - Greece and Spain - which, it is believed in London, would welcome such an alliance to assist them to break free from their present dependence on, and domination by, United States imperialism. The official invitation from the Queen to Franco's successor, Prince Juan Carlos, to visit London on June 19th, the day after the election, and the "private" visit of South Africa's Foreign Minister, Hilgard Muller, two days later, must be seen in the framework of this policy, along with the fact that the first action of the new Conservative government was, in opposition to United States pressure and in flagrant violation of United Nations decisions, to remove the embargo on the sale of arms to the Union of South Africa.

Because of its unwillingness to break its special dependence upon that (now minority) section of British monopoly capital which favours continued collaboration with, and subordination to, US imperialism, the Labour Party has ceased to be, at least for the time being, effective in serving the foreign policy desired by the dominant section of the British imperialists. Despite its lip-service to the concept of British participation in the European Economic Community (the present form of the developing West European imperialist bloc), the Labour Government was held in practice to be sabotaging moves for British entry, while the existing members of the Community were not prepared to admit a Britain which could be an American Fifth Column. The Labour Government was also openly against opposing US imperialism in the field of a rapprochement with South Africa and Rhodesia. Now, as "The Guardian" expressed it,

"Tory policy flies squarely in the face of the UN Security Council resolution of 1963, initiated mainly by Canada and the United States. So the stage is set for a clash with Ottawa and Washington at the very start of the Heath administration." ("The Guardian" June 22nd, 1970; p.1).

The real differences in foreign policy between the Labour Party and the Conservative Party in connection with Britain's entry into the European Economic Community, concealed before the election, were brought out clearly in the press after the election was over.

A "Common Market representative" declared on the day after the conservative victory:

"No-one in the Six doubts that Mr. Heath

is a whole-hearted European. ...

There were serious doubts about Mr. Wilson's innermost thoughts. His heart did not seem to be in it." ("Daily Telegraph", June 20th, 1970; p.2)

"The Observer" confirmed this view the following day:

"In Brussels, the headquarters of the European Commission, Mr Heath is regarded as more committed to 'Europe' than Mr. Wilson. ...

An indication of the importance Mr. Heath attaches to the Market talks is his appointment of his right-hand man in the Conservative Party, Anthony Barber, to be Minister in charge of the negotiations." ("The Observer", June 21st, 1970; p.4)

and commented on

"Mr. Heath's intention of pursuing the strategy he has often advocated of seeking closer co-operation with France. Mr. Heath has always hoped that an offer of pooling British and French nuclear forces to form the basis of a future 'European deterrent' would convince the French that Britain believed in a united Europe more independent of America and so would ease her path into the Common Market." (Ibid.; p.4).

The view of the French imperialists was expressed in the Paris "Le Monde" when it rejoiced

"at the advent of a man whose attachment to the cause of Europe reflects, not tactical considerations, but a profound conviction." (Cited in: "The Guardian", June 20th, 1970; p.3)

and recalled that

"Mr. Heath has approved the pooling of French and British nuclear resources, while his adversary is strongly attached to Atlantic integration." (Cited in: ibid.; p.3).

Similarly, the "Paris-Presse" describes Wilson as

"a new convert, a former opponent of Britain in Europe, some of whose own Ministers even have doubts of the sincerity of his conversion. Mr. Heath is a believer, a man drawn to the idea of Europe, for whom the EEC is more than a market; it is an economic, political and even military community." (Cited in: ibid.; p.3).

On June 22nd, Richard Crossman, former Labour Minister of Social Services and now editor of the "New Statesman" appeared on BBC "Panorama":

"As for the Common Market, Mr Crossman confessed his own lack of enthusiasm, but also implied that the Labour Party

might fight the new government if it tried to rush into the EEC". ("The Guardian", June 23rd, 1970; p.22)

Another important issue of the election which was kept from the electorate was that of Ireland, which had become another source of dispute between the dominant section and the pro-US minority of the British imperialists, whose interests were represented respectively by the Conservative and Labour Parties.

United States imperialism has, of course, long sought the ending of the outright colonial regimes of other imperialist powers, in order to secure the opening up of these territories to a greater extent to US goods and capital, and Ireland was no exception to this policy.

Faced with the position that the growing movement for civil rights in Northern Ireland made it impossible for the comprador bourgeoisie in the North to administer the country in the old way as a fascist colonial regime, the Labour Government - representing that section of British monopoly capital favouring continued collaboration with and dependence upon US imperialism - had embarked on a policy of pressing the Northern Ireland government to embark reluctantly on a programme of democratic reforms, including the disbandment of its "S.S." (the B Specials) and the transformation of the hated Royal Ulster Constabulary itself into a national police force. The long-term aim behind this policy was the dismantling of the fascist colonial regime in the North and the reunification of Ireland under a nominally independent but in fact neo-colonial regime similar to that operating at present in Eire.

This policy was opposed, not only by a section of the British imperialists but also by an influential section of the Northern Ireland bourgeoisie, whose representatives split away from the ruling Unionist Party to form with the Paisleyite fascists a movement, based on "loyalty to the Crown" and Protestantism, determined to oppose by every possible means the "betrayal" of Northern Ireland to "the Pope".

When British troops were introduced into Northern Ireland by the Labour Government, they were used to help forward the "reform programme"; they did not attempt to intervene in the liberated urban areas; they protected the population to some extent from the attacks of the fascist bands. But within ten days of the election of the Conservative Government the role of the British occupation forces had been reversed. The invasion of the liberated urban areas, the disarming of the Catholic population while leaving the Protestant fascists in possession of a vast arsenal of arms, the armed protection of the

provocative "Orange" marches staged by the Protestant fascists - all this demonstrates that, under the Conservative Government, the role of the British occupying forces has become one of protecting and strengthening the colonial fascist regime.

Discussing the developing civil rights movement in Northern Ireland just over a year ago, we said that this movement

"must develop into a national liberation movement for this colony of British imperialism." (RED FRONT, May/June 1969;p.13).

This is now coming rapidly to pass, and there is no way for the people of Northern Ireland to obtain their national liberation from British imperialist oppression than that of armed struggle.

(A Marxist-Leninist analysis of THE IRISH REVOLUTION from its beginning to the present day will appear in the next issue of RED FRONT).

Clearly, the interests of British imperialism required that the Labour Government should go. The negotiations for Britain's entry into the European Economic Community had been fixed to begin on June 30th, 1970. An obedient lackey to the end, Wilson obligingly called the General Election for June 18th, and set in motion the Labour campaign for a Conservative victory.

THE GREAT ELECTION HOAX

The electoral strategy of monopoly capital, which had the aim of the replacement of the Labour Government by a Conservative government - a strategy which the leaderships of both parties collaborated to put into effect - was primarily to present the Conservative Party as the "inspired" party of "progressive social reform" and the Labour Party as the dull, uninspired party of anti-social reaction.

Thus, the Conservative campaign to win the election was centred around the slogan "A Better Tomorrow!" It drew attention to the manifold broken electoral promises to the discredit of the Labour Party. In contrast to the rising cost of living and increased taxation under the Labour Government, it promised to cut taxation, to increase family allowances and to "take a firm grip" on the prices of goods and services within the state sector of the economy. It reminded the workers - a nice touch! - of the attempts of the Labour Government to attack trade union rights, and pledged that its "trade union reforms" would involve no penalties on workers.

And lest this "progressive" cloak might alienate openly reactionary strata of the electorate and drive them to desert the Conservative Party for the fascist National Front, it allowed the Powellite right-wing of the

party to run an alternative campaign on the basis of the slogans "Keep Britain White!" and "Strong Measures Against Anarchy!"

The Labour campaign, on the other hand, soared into the stratosphere of high finance, where only economists feel at home. The sole claim for electoral support put forward by the Labour Party leadership was that the Labour Government had never hesitated to impose "unpopular measures" and by its "prudent management" of the economy had put the balance of payments in credit. Thus, the Labour campaign to lose the election was based on presenting the Labour Party as a reactionary party completely subservient to orthodox financial dogmas at the expense of the welfare of the mass of the people.

In case this image might prove an attraction to a few strange electors who regard "the pound" as some kind of fetish, official figures issued just prior to the election conveniently showed a deficit of £31 in the monthly balance of trade and a number of unemployed which was the highest for thirty years.

A party desiring to win an election with such an unappealing record would, of course have relied on the promise of "wine and roses" under a government of that same party, now that its "prudent management" of the economy had "put the country back on its feet". The Labour Party leaders were careful to make no promises at all. As Richard Crossman pointed out after the election:

"Its 1970 Manifesto had not contained a single commitment which had not been in the 1964 programme." ("The Guardian", June 23rd, 1970, p.22).

And in case any electors had blind faith in the "wine and roses" even without any promises, Callaghan, in an election speech early in the campaign (June 3rd) implied

"that a further period of wage restraint may be forced on the new government." ("The Guardian", June 4th, 1970; p.1).

True, in his eve-of-poll speech in Liverpool, Wilson did go so far as to declare

"that Labour had not run out of ideas" ("The Observer", June 21st, 1970; p.17)

but, as "The Observer" pointed out sarcastically,

"he omitted to spell out what these ideas might be". (Ibid.; p.17).

Pontificating in its leading article on Labour's election campaign, "The Times" declared:

"Mr. Wilson fought a non-controversial campaign as the man in

possession.

We argued during the campaign that Mr. Wilson had done too little to defend his record, too little to discuss the issues and too little to present future policy to deal with the very difficult situation of Britain and the world". ("The Times", June 20th, 1970; p.11).

The "Sunday Telegraph" spoke of:

"the complacent nature of the campaign he (i.e., Wilson - Ed.) fought. ... Nor did he spark off the sense of idealism Labour Party activists required." ("Sunday Telegraph", June 21st, 1970; p.36).

On B.B.C. "Panorama", Richard Crossman expressed similar views; he

"inferred that Labour's national campaign had been a personality contest ... from which major political issues had been deleted." ("The Guardian", June 23rd, 1970; p.22).

Leo Abse, newly re-elected as Labour M.P. for Pontypool, was more outspoken:

"A campaign replete with vulgarity, mounted by admen and reminiscent of the banality of an American presidential campaign, cannot capture the imagination or the heart of our people. In the self-questioning now facing us, let us emancipate ourselves from the ambiguities and smudged ideals that have blemished our record." ("The Guardian", June 21st, 1970; p.17).

For that not insignificant sector of the electorate who were too disillusioned in the record of Labour to support it actively, but who might turn out to vote for it merely in order to "keep out the Tories", the firms that serve monopoly capital in the field of "market research" brought out a whole series of "opinion polls" which assured them that there was really no need to tear themselves away from the televised World Cup, since Labour was sure to win the election with a substantial majority. Since the statistical sampling methods used by these firms have now reached a high standard of accuracy, their excuses of "gross mistakes" on this occasion cannot be accepted as valid - particularly since the "opinion polls" conducted by the Conservative Party for its private consumption proved strikingly accurate. Clearly such "opinion polls" must be regarded, not as objective in character, but as part of the apparatus of political deception of monopoly capital; their effect on this occasion was not only upon apathetic but basically anti-Tory electors, but also on the electoral workers within the Labour Party machine, in whom the polls induced a complacency which assisted the Conservative Party. That, even if the man-in-the-street has lost faith in such "opinion polls", this is far from the case so far as monopoly capital is concerned, was noted by the "Observer" after the election:

"A round-up of major firms like Rowntree-Mackintosh, Quaker Oats, Fisons, Watney Mann, British American Tobacco, Bass Charrington, Shell-Mex and B.P., confirm that business with the five polling firms will be as normal." ("The Observer", June 21st, 1970; p.11)

The 1970 General Election clearly ranks as one of the most blatant confidence tricks on the part of Big Business against the working people that the sordid history of British capitalism can produce. In the absence of a Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class, the electoral strategy of Big Business - aimed at replacing the Labour Government by a Conservative Government - was successful. And Big Business showed its delight the day after the election:

"During a day of intense excitement, stock markets yesterday responded to the surprise Conservative election victory in startling fashion, prices of both equities and gilt-edged soaring to record some of their best-ever one-day gains and adding over £1,500 million to the value of Stock Exchange securities." ("The Times", June 20th, 1970; p.13).

CONCLUSION

The election of a Conservative Government represents a setback for the British working class - not because such a government can be significantly worse for the workers than a Labour Government, but because with the Labour Party in opposition, the further exposure of social-democracy (the dominant anti-socialist trend which influences the working class movement in Britain) will be rendered significantly more difficult.

As RED FRONT pointed out in its special pre-election issue:

"Workers can gain from their experience an understanding of the true character of a political party more easily and more quickly when that party is in office than when it is in opposition.

When, for example, the Labour Party is in opposition, its politicians may indulge in unbridled 'militant' and 'socialist' demagogy; they may assure the workers with hand on heart that if only their party had been elected in place of the Conservative Party, everything would be sweetness and light; they may bring forward 'left wing' elements to leading positions to 'demonstrate' to their disillusioned supporters that the old reactionary tendencies have been 'eliminated', and so on. But when such politicians form the government, they are compelled to act, to legislate, on behalf of their masters - the monopoly capitalists - and one single piece of anti-working class legislation, such as the Prices and Incomes Act, is more educative than a hundred pamphlets.

In the present circumstances, of the various ideological trends designed to deceive the more politically conscious strata of the working class, only the social-democracy of the Labour Party can be exposed in governmental office. It follows that the election to office of the Labour Party will assist in the exposure of the ideological trends designed to deceive the more politically conscious strata of the working class,

and therefore in the movement of the working class to positions of class struggle and ultimately of revolutionary struggle, more speedily than the election of a Conservative government." (RED FRONT, June 1970, p.4).

As forecast in the above extract, moves to replace the discredited Wilson/Castle leadership of the Labour Party with "idealists" were already being discussed within the party within hours of Wilson's eviction from his tied house in Downing Street. As Leo Abse expressed it bluntly:

"In the self-questioning now facing us, let us emancipate ourselves from the ambiguities and smudged ideals that have blemished our record. And if this means changing the leadership, so be it." ("The Guardian", June 20th, 1970; p.22).

That the 1970 General Election has resulted in the election of the open party of Big Business, at the wish of Big Business; that the reactionary Labour Party has been given the opportunity of adopting a new mask in opposition - this was due above all, as has been demonstrated, to the abstention of masses of former Labour voters. It confirms the view expressed in RED FRONT:

"In the existing circumstances advice to workers not to vote is harmful and reactionary, and it is not accidental that this advice is put forward by such proven enemies of the working class as the anarchists and the more disruptive Maoist groups." (RED FRONT, June 1970; p.3).

RED FRONT also made the point that

"it is possible for militant workers in a few selected constituencies to put forward advanced representatives of the working class within an organisational framework independent of the capitalist parties." (RED FRONT, June 1970; p.2).

While the "left" social-democrat Stephen Davies cannot be regarded as "an advanced representative of the working class", his election as an "independent labour" candidate in Merthyr Tydfil well illustrates the possibility of achieving, with solid working class support and in suitable conditions, successful results independent of and against the capitalist parties.

One further serious feature of the 1970 General Election needs to be emphasised - the gains made by the ultra-right wing of the Conservative Party, headed by Powell. The stimulation of white racism under the "respectable" auspices of the Powellite wing of the Conservative Party was reflected in the fact that the "swing" towards Conservative candidates in the Black Country, where Powellite influence is at present greatest, tended to be above the national average; in the fact that the swing against former Labour M.P. David Pitt (the only black M.P. in the former House) was, at 10.2%, very sharply above the national average; in the fact that the Powellite representation in the new Parliament has increased from 38 to 73 (one-third of the new Tory M.P.s being supporters of Powell).

LETTERS

"CENTRIST" REVISIONISM IN THE UNITED STATES

(A letter from Homer Chase, of "Hammer & Steel Newsletter").

Dear Mr.,

We use this rather formal salutation because there is an ideological gulf between us.

There is a focal contradiction. It is not a focal contradiction, as your letter states, "in the main". It's a number one, primary question. Forces must be evaluated on the basis of their theory and practice on the focal contradiction in this period. The other major contradictions cannot be resolved without resolution of the focal contradiction.

After reading your material and your letter we conclude that MLOB does not know what a national democratic revolution is all about. This conclusion is reached after reading your views on China, the Black Belt, Wales and Scotland.

J.V. Stalin was a great M-List theoretician on the national question. This does not mean that everything either he or Lenin wrote in one period can be mechanically applied to another period. The essence of Stalin's teachings contradicts his statement concerning the national question being resolved, except for Ireland, in the British Isles. M-Lists who uphold Stalin's life and work will support Scottish and Welsh efforts to destroy English imperialism now.

You are not taking a serious M-List view on the Afro-American question in the US. It is simply nonsense to deny, as you and Laski do, the contradiction between non-proletarian Afro-Americans and US imperialism. You and Laski claim to uphold national democratic revolutions in general, but in the specific you insist that only socialist revolutions, with proletarians firmly in leadership, should receive support. Since the present objective situation is not favourable for Socialist revolutions, this leaves you opposing revolution in stages and serving counter-revolution strategically. Of course the working class will eventually unite with the rural poor and lead national democratic revolutions in oppressed nations. This is precisely why H & S exposes pseudo-Marxists in all countries who oppose liberation struggles.

Your evaluation of the Cultural Revolution is not based on the actual relationship of

forces which has caused the focal contradiction. The temporary strength of imperialism probed weaknesses in the countries headed by CP's. Imperialism forced the CPs in state power to side with the oppressors against the oppressed. Brezhnev deserted the oppressed nations under a right flag while Lin Piao raised first the right standard and then the left to betray the national democratic revolutions.

Your articles on May Day and Role of the New Left in Red Front May-June 1969 do not challenge the rampant white and great power chauvinism which infects the English and US workers. You have much in common with the English Trotskyites, the CPGB and the Cultural Revolution on the national question. M-Lists would have asked why no action on Ireland, why no support to the immigrants against Powell at this London demonstration which, according to you, featured "tremendous feeling of class conscious militancy".

Since you have printed Laski's attack on H&S 's M-List position on the Afro-American question we request that you print the above criticism.

Sincerely,
Homer B. Chase for the
Editorial Board

Editorial Comment

There is indeed, Mr. Chase, "an ideological gulf" between us and it is, as you imply, the gulf which separates Marxism-Leninism from revisionism. But on which side of this gulf stands RED FRONT and on which side stands HAMMER & STEEL? This is determined, not by the fervency of our respective protestations, but by objective analysis of our respective political positions.

THE "FOCAL CONTRADICTION"

Your journal has defined the "focal contradiction" of which you speak in para. 2 of your letter as

"the struggle between the oppressed peoples of the world and imperialism". ("Hammer and Steel Newsletter"; April 1969; p.3).

You declare (para.2) that "the other major contradictions" - among which you are prepared to include the struggle between the working class of each capitalist country and the capitalist class which exploits it - are secondary to, subordinate to, this "focal contradiction" which is, you say, the "number one, primary question". In other words, you declare that class struggle is secondary to, subordinate to, national liberation struggle.

Marxist-Leninists, however, hold the opposite view:-

"The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront. It advances them unconditionally. For the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle.

The proletariat values most the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and evaluates every national demand, every national separation from the angle of the class struggle of the workers.

Marx had no doubt as to the subordinate position of the national question as compared with the 'labour question'. But his theory is as far from ignoring the national question as heaven from earth.

The conclusion that follows from all these critical remarks of Marx is clear: the working class should be the last to make a fetish of the national question.

Marx does not make an absolute of the national movement, knowing, as he does, that the victory of the working class alone can bring about the complete liberation of all nationalities." (V.I. Lenin: "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" in: "Selected Works", Vol. 4; London; 1943, p. 264, 265, 275, 276, 278).

"I do not want to quote my teacher, Comrade Lenin, since he is not here, and I am afraid that I might, perhaps, quote him wrongly and inappropriately. Nevertheless, I am obliged to quote one passage, which is axiomatic and can give rise to no misunderstanding, in order that no doubt should be left in the minds of comrades with regard to the relative importance of the national question. Analysing Marx's letter on the national question in an article on self-determination, Comrade Lenin draws the following conclusion:

'Marx had no doubt about the subordinate significance of the national question as compared with the "labour question".'

Here are only two lines, but they are decisive." (J.V. Stalin: Reply to the Discussion on the Report on National Factors in Party and State Affairs, Twelfth Congress of the RCP(B) in: "Works", Vol. 5, Moscow; 1953; p. 271).

It is, therefore, clear that your declaration that class struggle is secondary to, subordinate to, national liberation struggle is a reversal of a principle of Marxism-Leninism is, revisionist.

Also in the second paragraph of your letter you extend this revisionist declaration to assert that "the other major contradictions" (such as the class struggle between the working class of each capitalist country and the capitalist class which exploits it) "cannot be resolved without resolution of the focal contradiction" (that is, before the world-wide victory of the national liberation struggles of the peoples oppressed by imperialism).

Again, Marxist-Leninists hold the opposite view:-

"Marx does not make an absolute of the national movement, knowing, as he does, that the victory of the working class alone can bring about the complete liberation of all nationalities." (V.I. Lenin: "On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" in: "Selected Works", Vol. 4, London; 1943; p. 278).

"The victory of the Soviets and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship are a fundamental condition for abolishing national oppression, establishing national equality and guaranteeing the rights of national minorities." (J.V. Stalin: "The Immediate Tasks of the Party in the National Question", in "Works", Vol. 5; Moscow 1953; p. 20).

"In the epoch of the Second International ... it was tacitly assumed that ... the national question could be settled without overthrowing the rule of capital, without, and before, the victory of the proletarian

revolution. That essentially imperialist view runs like a red thread through the well-known works of Springer and Bauer on the national question. But the past decade has exposed the utter falsity and rottenness of this conception of the national question. ... The revolutionary experience of recent years has again confirmed that ... the national and colonial questions are inseparable from the question of emancipation from the rule of capital; ... the unequal nations and colonies cannot be liberated without overthrowing the rule of capital." (J.V. Stalin: "Concerning the Presentation of the National Question", in "Works", Vol. 5; Moscow; 1953; p. 56-57).

"Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed, that the national question can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution." (J.V. Stalin: "The Foundations of Leninism" in "Works", Vol. 5; 1953; p. 146).

Permit us to ask you a simple question: was it "impossible" for the Russian working class to bring about the October socialist revolution until the nations oppressed by the Russian Empire had won their national freedom? History demonstrates, on the contrary, that it was the Russian socialist revolution which brought about the liberation of these oppressed nations.

It is clear that your declaration that socialist revolution cannot be successful before the world-wide victory of the national liberation struggles of the peoples oppressed by imperialism is a reversal of a principle of Marxism-Leninism, is revisionist.

SPURIOUS "NATIONAL MOVEMENTS"

From "making an absolute of the national movement", as Marx aptly put it, you proceed in para. 4 of your letter to urge support for the spurious "national movements" centred upon Wales and Scotland. These movements are spurious because Wales, Scotland and England do not conform to the Marxist-Leninist definition of nations, but form regions of the British nation; and because these movements are spurious, they are reactionary and divisive and have to be fought by all who work for the destruction of British imperialism. Since you admit that Stalin (whom you correctly acknowledge as "a great Marxist-Leninist theoretician on the national question") held explicitly that the national question had long ago been resolved in the British Isles except for Ireland, we will not repeat the analyses of this question made by Lenin, Stalin and the Communist International. Again, however, it is clear that the MLOB and its organ RED FRONT adhere to the Marxist-Leninist position on the national question in relation to the British Isles, while you have taken up an opposite revisionist

position. Your "defence" - "this does not mean that everything he or Lenin wrote in one period can be mechanically applied to another period" - must be taken to mean that the national question in Britain was resolved long ago, but not today! This is an apology for revisionism on a level of fatuity to which even Khrushchov hardly sank.

MISREPRESENTATION

In para 5 of your letter you assert that we "deny the contradiction between non-proletarian Afro-Americans and US imperialism". On the contrary, we recognise, as do the Marxist-Leninists of the M.-L. Organisation of the U.S.A., the existence of the negro nation in the American South and express our full solidarity with the national liberation struggle of its people - proletarian and non-proletarian.

You go on to assert that we "insist that only socialist revolutions, with proletarians firmly in leadership, should receive support." On the contrary, we urge support for all national-democratic revolutions directed against imperialism. What we do say, however, is that only when the working class leads a national-democratic revolution can this be transformed uninterruptedly into a socialist revolution - an important principle of Marxism-Leninism.

That in your polemic you should have to resort to such gross misrepresentation of the clearly stated position of the MLOB provides additional testimony of the untenability of your own revisionist position.

Let us examine your political position in greater detail as it has been put forward in recent issues of your journal "Hammer and Steel Newsletter".

MARKIST-LENINIST TASKS IN AN OPPRESSED NATION

What, first, are the principal tasks of Marxist-Leninists in an oppressed nation, such as the black nation of the southern United States or in Ireland?

You say:

"Marxist-Leninists in every oppressed nation will lead in developing anti-imperialist coalitions including all classes who oppose imperialism for whatever reasons. They will struggle for working class leadership of these coalitions. They will place primary emphasis on the core of the anti-imperialist coalition, i.e., the unity of the working class and the rural poor." ("Hammer and Steel Newsletter", July 1969; p. 3).

But one task which Marxist-Leninists regard as essential is significantly missing from your formulation?

"The Socialists of the oppressed nation on the other hand, must particularly fight for and maintain complete, absolute unity (also organisational) between the workers of the oppressed nation and the workers of the oppressing nation." (V.I. Lenin: "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-determination" in: "Selected Works", Vol. 5, London 1935; p. 272).

That this omission is not accidental is demonstrated by your paper's support for so-called "black nationalist leaders" of the type of R. Williams ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", April 1969; p.11). Far from working for unity between the workers of the oppressed south and the oppressing north, Williams has been putting out for some years, under the protection of the counter-revolutionary "left" revisionists in Peking, the most virulent anti-white racist propaganda calling for a racial war against the white race.

The role of "black nationalist" leaders of the type of R. Williams is to divert the anger of exploited black people away from their real enemy, the US imperialists, towards a false "enemy", the "white race". Their role is to assist the white racists by urging segregation, by campaigning in favour of black ghettos and the right of black workers to be hit on the head by black cops. It was not accidental that "black nationalist" leaders urged their followers to vote for the white racist Wallace in the last Presidential election.

MARXIST-LENINIST TASKS IN AN OPPRESSOR NATION

What, secondly, is the central task of Marxist-Leninists in an oppressor nation, such as the northern United States or Britain?

Lenin makes it abundantly clear that their central task is to lead the working class step by step to realise the necessity of socialist revolution and eventually to bring this socialist revolution about. On this analysis the demand for the self-determination of oppressed nations takes its correct perspective as a demand to further this aim of socialist revolution and to win the confidence of and solidarity with the oppressed peoples, who are objectively the allies of the working class of the oppressor nation:

"It is absurd to contrast the socialist revolution and the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with one of the questions of democracy, in this case, the national question. We must combine the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and revolutionary tactics relative to all democratic demands: a republic, a militia, election of officials by the people, equal rights for women, self-determination of nations, etc. While capitalism exists, these demands can be achieved only in exceptional cases, and in an incomplete, distorted form. Basing ourselves on democracy as already achieved, exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we demand the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, as a necessary basis both for the abolition of the poverty of the masses and for the complete and all-sided achievement of all democratic reforms. Some of these reforms will be started before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the process of this overthrow, and still others after it. The social revolution is not a single battle, but represents a whole epoch of numerous battles around all the problems of econ-

omic and democratic reforms, which can be consummated only by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It is for the sake of this final aim that we must formulate every one of our democratic demands in a consistently revolutionary manner." (V.I. Lenin: "The revolutionary Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-determination", in "Selected Works", Vol. 5; Moscow; 1935; p.283).

"The demand for the immediate liberation of the colonies, as advanced by all revolutionary Social-Democrats, is also 'impossible of achievement' under capitalism without a series of revolutions. This does not imply, however, that Social-Democracy must refrain from conducting an immediate and determined struggle for all these demands - to refrain would merely be to the advantage of the bourgeoisie and reaction. On the contrary, it implies that it is necessary to formulate and put forward all these demands, not in a reformist, but in a revolutionary way; not by keeping within the framework of bourgeois legality, but by breaking through it; not by confining oneself to parliamentary speeches and verbal protests, but by drawing the masses into real action, by widening and fomenting the struggle for every kind of fundamental, democratic demand, right up to and including the direct onslaught of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, i.e. to the socialist revolution.

The proletariat must demand the right of political secession for the colonies and for the nations that 'its own' nation oppresses. Unless it does this, proletarian internationalism will remain a meaningless phrase; mutual confidence and class solidarity between the workers of the oppressing and oppressed nations will be impossible.

The proletariat will be able to retain its independence only if it subordinates its struggle for all the democratic demands ... to its revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie...

Marx, having in mind mainly the interests of the proletarian class struggle in the advanced countries, put into the forefront the fundamental principle of internationalism and socialism, viz. that no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations. ...

It was precisely from the standpoint of the revolutionary struggle of the English workers that Marx in 1869 demanded the separation of Ireland from England. ... Only in this way was Marx able, also in the sphere of the solution of national problems, to oppose the revolutionary action of the masses to verbal and often hypocritical recognition of the equality and the self-determination of nations. Marx's policy ... must serve as the model for all the advanced countries; for all of them now oppress other

nations." (V.I. Lenin: "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" in "Selected Works", Moscow; 1935; p.269, 272, 273, 274).

But, according to your journal, the most important anti-imperialist force in the United States of America is not the American working class, but the internal national liberation movements:

"The Afro-American and Puerto Rican liberation movements are the most important anti-imperialist forces in the US". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", December 1969; p.9).

According to your journal, the primary task of Marxist-Leninists in an oppressor nation such as that of the Northern United States is not the leading of the working class step by step to realise the necessity of socialist revolution and eventually to bring this socialist revolution about, but - the building of support for oppressed peoples.

"In the oppressor nations Marxist-Leninists will lead in the development of anti-imperialist coalitions which will (1) support the oppressed people." (Hammer & Steel Newsletter; July 1969; p.3).

Here the working class, which is in fact the leading anti-imperialist force, disappears into a vague "anti-imperialist coalition". A coalition of which classes? Under the leadership of which class? Your formulation is silent on these all-important questions, but despite this deliberate vagueness it is apparent from numerous references in your journal that this "anti-imperialist coalition" is to be composed primarily of

"Afro-Americans in the north and west". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", June 1969; p.6)

You say, in fact, that

"a large percentage of white workers ... are poisoned with concepts of great power (white) chauvinism", ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", July 1969; p.3)

and five months later this "large percentage" has become "the vast majority" of the working class:

"Rotten great power chauvinist ideas ... now infect the vast majority of people in the US including the working class." ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", December 1969; p.9-10).

"Consequently", you say that the participation of white workers in anti-imperialist activity is a possibility only in the future:

"Objective conditions are emerging for effective anti-imperialist activity among the white people" (my emphasis. - Ed.) (Ibid. p.3).

It is true that you say that a secondary aim of this "anti-imperialist coalition" in the oppressor nation should be:

"(2) struggle against the imperialist oppressors." (Ibid.; p.3).

Perhaps, therefore, your formulation introduces socialist revolutionary work as a secondary aim? Far from it. Socialist revolutionary work is dismissed in a single fatuous and emphasised line:

"There is not a proletarian revolution in the US at this time"; (Ibid.; p.3)

Nor was there, Mr. Chase, a proletarian revolution in Russia in 1916, but the Bolsheviks did not therefore confine their political activity to the Georgian national movement!

It is clear that this secondary aim of "anti-imperialist activity" should, in your view, be confined to struggle against racial discrimination, should be confined to seeking

"an end to oppression of the Afro-American minority in the north and west"; ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", June 1969; p.10);

that is, for equality with white citizens in the field of

"jobs, housing, schools and civil rights"; (Ibid., p.7).

But this direct "anti-imperialist activity" in the oppressor north is secondary to support for

"the struggle for self-determination in the Black Belt" (Ibid.; p.7)

and it is this national liberation struggle which will - without the necessity of socialist revolution in the north! -

"guarantee the destruction of US imperialism". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", July 1969; p.4)

When, in the seventh paragraph of your letter, you censure the London workers for demonstrating against the British government's attempts to gag and bind the organisations of the working class, instead of confining their activity to the questions of Ireland and racism, the whole anti-working class, anti-Socialist content of your pernicious, counter-revolutionary revisionist line stands exposed.

Perhaps, it may be argued, your line of urging that Marxist-Leninists in an oppressor nation should confine their activity to the building of support for oppressed peoples and for oppressed minorities is at least progressive as far as it goes. On the contrary, you make it clear that such support ought to be purely verbal (and therefore harmless to the imperialists), for you condemn effective, organised, mass action against the imperialists - including the great, broadly based demonstrations against imperialist aggression in Vietnam that have shaken the US administration to the core - as "helping the imperialists to foster illusions about democracy"!

"Nixon often allows and even encourages, pre-publicised open 'demonstrations' on Vietnam. Such demonstrations objectively serve his democratic pose and aggression against oppressed peoples". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", September 1969; p.7).

"PROGRESSIVE LABOR" AND NATIONAL LIBERATION

The revisionist political line which you

put forward is, in important ways, complementary to that put forward by the mercenaries of the Peking counter-revolutionaries in the leadership of the American "Progressive Labor Party". They denounce all national liberation movements.

They reject the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the revolutionary process in colonial-type countries - that this must pass through the stage of national-democratic revolution before it can proceed to the stage of socialist revolution - and demand, as the trotskyites have long done, "socialist revolution now" in the colonial-type countries:

"For many years we in the Progressive Labor Party held to the idea of two types of nationalism: revolutionary and reactionary. But a look at world reality shows there is no such thing. ... Any form of nationalism is bad! ...

We were confused by the concept of the two-stage struggle, which claimed that first there is the battle for national liberation, and then communists transform it to the battle for socialism. ...

The NLP's program is a nationalistic program that ignores the international situation and looks only to Vietnam. The day has long passed, if there ever was such a day, when this type of program could be of real value to the oppressed people of any country. The fight for liberation is the fight for socialism. It is wrong for communists to advocate two-stage struggle. Communists have no business advocating national liberation movements that do not openly proclaim socialism as a goal. ...

When Communists work in a nationalistic movement, or national liberation movement as they are sometimes called, they must put forward the goal of socialism. ...

Black separatism in the South would only split workers further." ("Progressive Labor", August 1969; p.6,7,8,9,12).

You, from the opposite ditch, reject socialist revolution in the developed capitalist countries and urge progressives to confine their political activity to support for national liberation movements and to the reformist struggle against racial discrimination.

These two revisionist lines are complementary in that, from opposite angles, both seek to prevent the building of the essential alliance between the oppressed peoples of the colonial-type countries and the working classes of the developed capitalist countries without which imperialism cannot be destroyed.

"The interests of the proletarian movement in the developed countries and of the national liberation movement in the colonies call for the union of these two forms of the revolutionary movement into a common front against the common enemy, against imperialism.

The victory of the working-class in the developed countries and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism are impossible

are impossible without the formation and the consolidation of a common revolutionary front." (J.V. Stalin: "The Foundations of Leninism", in Works, Vol.6, Moscow, 1953; p.150).

A "NEW MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT"

You say:

"A new Marxist-Leninist movement must be built" ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", April 1969; p.12).

Very true. But from what class forces is this "new Marxist-Leninist movement" to be built? Stalin, as usual, is very explicit on this question:

"The Party must be, first of all, the advanced detachment of the working class. The Party must absorb all the best elements of the working class. ...

It must at the same time be a detachment of the class, part of the class, closely bound up with it by all the fibres of its being.

The Party is an inseparable part of the working class. ...

The Party is the organised detachment of the working class. ...

The Party is the highest form of class organisation of the proletariat." (J.V. Stalin: "The Foundations of Leninism", in "Works", Vol.6; Moscow, 1953; p.177, 179, 180, 181, 186).

But you say, contrary once again to Marxism-Leninism, that the vanguard party will be built, not primarily from the working class, but from those engaged in the national liberation struggle and from their supporters in the oppressor countries, from students, and from the revisionist elements around "Hammer and Steel":

"A new Marxist-Leninist movement ... will emerge mainly from out of the needs and experience of those in the front lines of struggle against imperialism - the national democratic revolutions - and those supporting them in the imperialist countries." ("Hammer and Steel Newsletter", April 1969; p.12).

"Some of the student forces ... will help H&S build a genuine Marxist-Leninist Party". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", July 1969; p.4).

CONCLUSION

To sum up: you say

"The enemies of Leninism, Khrushchov and Mao, have done great harm to the anti-imperialist cause. Their strength is completely dependent on the temporary success of the imperialists. The next crisis to hit imperialism will puncture the Khrushchov-Mao balloon. They will join their predecessors - the leaders of the 2nd International and Trotsky". ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", June 1969; p.12).

Your role, Mr. Chase, is therefore to put forward yet another variant of modern revisionism - which is, in fact, a form

of the "centrist" revisionist trend analysed by the Central Committee of the MLOB in its Report on "The Role of 'Centrist' Revisionism" published in "RED FRONT" of March 1970.

This new anti-Marxist-Leninist trend objectively fulfils the purpose of serving imperialism among strata of the working people among which both the right revisionism of Moscow and the "left" revisionism of Peking have become discredited.

The main features of your revisionist political line are:

It repudiates in practice the class struggle of the working class and the Marxist-Leninist strategy of leading the working class of the developed capitalist countries step by step towards socialist revolution and the destruction of imperialism;

instead, it seeks to confine progressive political activity in these countries to purely verbal support for national liberation movements and to purely verbal support of the struggle of oppressed minorities for reforms in the sphere of employment, housing, education and civil rights; it opposes effective, organised, mass action for these limited objectives on the grounds that such action "helps the imperialists to foster illusions about democracy";

it gives support to all kinds of spurious "national movements", such as that of "black nationalism", "Welsh nationalism", and "Scottish nationalism" which, being spurious, are reactionary and divisive;

it strives to build a new spurious "Marxist-Leninist movement" based on these revisionist and counter-revolutionary concepts, a movement built not from the advanced section of the working class but primarily from petty bourgeois elements who repudiate socialist revolution.

The "centrist" revisionist character of the political line which you are putting forward is manifested not only in the aspects of that line which relate to the United States of America (aspects which are very similar in principle, allowing for the differences between the situation of the American imperialists and those of Belgium, to the programme of the "centrist" revisionist-led "Communist Party of Belgium",) but also in your defence of the Korean "centrist" revisionist leader Kim Il Sung ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter", December 1969; p.6) and your characterisation of the strategy of the leadership of the Workers' Party of Vietnam (which is "centrist" revisionist in character and represents the interests of the Vietnamese national capitalists) as "Marxist-Leninist":

"The essence of Lenin's and Stalin's teachings on the imperialist stage of capitalism has been practised by the N.L.F. (i.e., by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, which is under the leadership of the "centrist" revisionist-led Workers' Party of Vietnam - Ed.) ("Hammer & Steel Newsletter" July 1969; p.3).

While such a neo-revisionist line may have, like its forerunners, some temporary diversionary success in the service of imperialism, the historical needs of the working class will in the not distant future relegate it to the dustbin along with the right revisionism of Moscow and the "left" revisionism of Peking.

Only Marxism-Leninism, the science of socialist revolution, can enable the working people of the world to solve their problems and all the attempts of peddlers of revisionism like yourself to confuse and disrupt the working people are doomed to ignominious failure.

There is, indeed, an ideological gulf between us.

It is the gulf between Marxism-Leninism and revisionism.

THE TACTICS OF ANTI-FASCIST STRUGGLE

The efforts of the "Left-wing" of the Parliamentary Labour Party to oppose the growing menace of right-wing extremism by means of words and useless gestures are clearly worse than useless. The smashing of right-wing extremist groups that have in recent years tried and failed to become independent forces has been largely due to no more than a handful of active anti-fascists; all these groups were receiving such active opposition that they were compelled to amalgamate in the National Front - and the National Front still has a terrific struggle to carry on. In London almost every one of its meetings has either been stopped or cancelled beforehand as a result of the anti-fascist activists, and those of its meetings which did take place were attended only by thirty or forty of their members under strong police protection - the rest being too scared to attend.

All this has been done by no more than a few dozen active anti-fascist guerrillas. How much more effective would the struggle against fascism be if even a quarter of the 'left' were

involved in the anti-fascist struggle. Yet in Croydon and Lewisham, for example, which are well-known as hard centres of the National Front, very little opposition comes from the Communist Party, Young Communist League, Labour Party, Young Liberals, Young Socialists or the Jewish Groups.

A typical example of the damaging "support" some Left groups are, in fact, giving the National Front was the debate arranged to be held last October between the Independent Labour Party and the National Front, at the invitation of the former. By this kind of invitation the "Left" gives the National Front quite undeserved credit by suggesting that it has something intelligent to say that is worth listening to, that is worthy of serious consideration and discussion.

The best thing such "debaters with fascism" can do is to join the National Front, where they would do much less harm than they do in the "Left" camp.

The National Front and all the right-wing extremists must be presented as the last weapon of imperialism against the working class - to be smashed, not debated with.

"Anti-fascist activist",
London W.11

A REPLY FROM THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

On behalf of the London ILP, I take issue with your anonymous correspondent on just about everything he says.

It is idiotic to say that the activities of "a few dozen anti-fascist guerrillas" - presumably he means the 62 group - have succeeded in smashing the fascists. On the contrary, the hysterical violence of these people has been of invaluable assistance to the growth of the right-wing extremists, winning them both publicity and sympathy.

While it is not for me to defend the left and pseudo-left

FOREIGN NEWS SUMMARY

BRAZIL

In May Amnesty International issued a report on the findings of its commission of inquiry which visited Brazil in 1969. The report confirmed the use of torture against political prisoners by both police and military authorities.

CHINA

In March China and Yugoslavia resumed diplomatic relations after a break of twelve years.

In March a "friendship delegation" headed by Kuo Mo-jo, vice-chairman of the standing committee of the National People's Congress, paid an official visit to Pakistan, where it promised China's support for "the liberation of Kashmir" from Indian rule.

In April China launched successfully its first space satellite. Officials of the US Defence Department said in Washington on April 26th that the launching confirmed the prediction made earlier by US Secretary of Defence Laird that China would possess inter-continental ballistic missiles by 1973. (The Chinese plans to develop a 6,000-mile ICBM capability would bring the Soviet Union and India within range).

In May, following the invasion of Cambodia by the US imperialists, the Chinese "left" revisionists felt themselves compelled to "postpone" the planned diplomatic talk with the United States in Warsaw.

In June a Romanian delegation headed by Vice-President Bodnaras paid an official visit to Peking and was promised the "constant support" of China by Chou En-lai.

In July, following the signature of the treaty of friendship and mutual aid between Romania and the Soviet Union, a further Romanian delegation headed by Defence Minister Ionitsa visited Peking to re-assure the Chinese "left" revisionists of continued Romanian sympathy.

CUBA

Aiming that Cuba should, as a neo-colony of Soviet imperialism, continue the economic dependence upon a single export crop - sugar - that was a feature of the country's former position as a neo-colony of United States imperialism, the Cuban "centrist" revisionists have for the past nine months made it a cardinal aim of their policy to attain an output this year of ten million tons of sugar. During this period all the country's resources were mobilised along military lines around the slogan "10,000,000 tons" and hundreds of thousands of office, factory and building workers were conscripted to go into the country to cut cane.

In July Castro, in a speech to a mass meeting in Havana's Plaza de la Revolucion, was compelled to admit that the campaign had failed to reach its target by 1½ million tons. He offered his resignation to a dispirited crowd.

Meanwhile sugar continues to be rationed within the country at 3 kilos per person per month.

CYPRUS

In March an unsuccessful plot took place, organised by the Greek military-fascist regime in collaboration with the CIA, to assassinate President Makarios and set up an extreme right-wing government in Cyprus that would bring the island into "Enosis" (union) with Greece and into NATO.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In June Dubcek, leader of the ultra-revisionist faction of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, was dismissed as Ambassador to Turkey and expelled from the party.

With this step, the removal of ultra-revisionists from leading positions in the party and state by the dominant pro-Soviet "orthodox" revisionists may be regarded as virtually completed.

EGYPT

During the first half of 1970, the Soviet Union stepped up its military aid to Egypt, as a result of which the Soviet SAM-2 anti-aircraft batteries placed 15 miles from the Suez Canal have been augmented by newer SAM-3 batteries further back.

On July 2nd, Nixon, in a television interview, characterised the developing situation in the Middle East as

"more dangerous than the Indo China situation, since it holds out the possibility of a Big Power confrontation."

It was anxiety to avoid such a confrontation with Soviet imperialism, before agreement had been reached at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) on limiting the arms to be used in war, which led the United States imperialists to put forward in June their new "peace plan" for a 90-day cease-fire in the Middle East, including vaguely worded provisions for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories.

Under Soviet pressure (Nasser extended his visit to Moscow by several weeks) the Egyptian government accepted the US

proposals in principle, against the opposition of the Iraqi government and most sections of the Palestine national liberation movement. On July 31st, Yasser Arafat, leader of Al Fatah, said that the aim of the movement was and would continue to be not merely the liberation of the Arab territory occupied by Israel in the 1967 war but also the liberation of Palestine itself from Zionist occupation. On August 5th, Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr, President of Iraq, said that Egypt was not capable of leading the Arabs; that the US "peace plan" 'would benefit only Zionism and its imperialist supporters'; and that

"There can be no talk of settlement before the Israelis are defeated.

There must be an end to the existing state of Israel, which is merely an extension of Western imperialism. ... Then the Israelis and the Palestinians can live side by side with equal rights in a new state." ("The Guardian", August 6th, 1970; p.1).

On August 5th, a "summit meeting" of the Defence and Foreign Ministers of five Arab countries opened at Tripoli, in the absence of an Iraqi delegation.

Under United States pressure and after secret assurances from Washington (that the build-up of the forces of the Arab states from outside would not be "permitted" during the cease-fire and that no withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab territories would be expected until a "permanent peace settlement" had been ensured) the Israeli government accepted the US plan in principle.

FRANCE

Under the pressure of the Soviet revisionists, the removal of ultra-revisionists from leading positions in the French Communist Party has been proceeding apace over the last two years.

At the 19th Congress of the Communist Party in March, ultra-revisionist Roger Garaudy was not re-elected to the Central Committee, and later he was expelled from the Party by his local branch. Garaudy had strongly supported the Dubcek ultra-revisionist regime in Czechoslovakia and opposed the Soviet invasion of that country in 1968. He stood for recognition, in the name of "creative Marxism", that intellectuals now constituted the leading force in French society, and for freedom of factions within the party. In the Christmas 1969 issue of the Franciscan magazine "The Gospel Today", he had described the coming of Christ as "a new birth for mankind".

The Congress re-elected Waldeck-Rochet as nominal General Secretary of the Party, in the knowledge that his continued ill-health would permit his duties to be performed by the orthodox revisionist Deputy General Secretary, Georges Marchais.

In July another leading ultra-revisionist, Charles Tillon, revealed on French television that his local branch had expelled him from the French Communist Party.

GREECE

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia for the purpose of removing the ultra-revisionist Dubcek leadership was followed in 1969 by the closing down of the offices and publications centred in that country of the ultra-revisionist-led Communist Party of Greece, headed by Kostas Kolyannis.

In recent years a faction even further to the right has formed a rival "Central Committee" headed by Antonis Brillakis. This faction takes its stand on the submerging of the Communist Party in a broad front embracing all opponents of the military-fascist regime to be headed by the liberal, Andreas Papandreou, and for the restoration of the 1952 Constitution (under which the Communist Party and other anti-fascist parties and organisations were banned!)

In May composer Mikis Theodorakis, a leading member of the extreme right-wing faction of the party headed by Brillakis, was released from prison by the Greek military-fascist regime on the intervention of Greek millionaire Aristotle Onassis and French millionaire Jean-Jaques Servan-Schreiber, leader of the French Radical Party. At a press conference in Paris following his release, Theodorakis put forward the programme of the Brillakis faction of the party, as outlined above.

In April the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe found Greece guilty of violating ten principal articles of the European Human Rights Convention. The resolution reflected the Council of Europe's distaste, not for fascism, but for regimes in Europe dependent on United States imperialism.

In June a former leading member of the Communist Party of Greece, George Georgalas, accepted the post of Under-Secretary for Information in the Greek military-fascist government, declaring that its aim was "a democratic society".

INDO-CHINA

CAMBODIA

On March 17th, the Cambodian head of state, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, was overthrown while visiting Moscow by a right-wing coup engineered by the CIA, and replaced by Lieutenant-General Lon Nol.

During April the Lon Nol regime appealed

for American military intervention to maintain itself in existence.

On May 1st, Nixon personally, against the advice of most of his Cabinet including the Secretary of State Rogers and without consulting Congress or any of its committees, ordered US troops to invade Cambodia. The aim of the invasion was stated to be primarily the destruction of the mythical "headquarters" of the Vietnamese army of national liberation, which was alleged to be on Cambodian soil.

Within a few days of the invasion, Cambodian guerilla units had cut all the main railways and liberated most of the northern areas of the country.

The opposition to the invasion within the United States - an act which stood in blatant contradiction to Nixon's declared policy of bringing about a gradual withdrawal of US troops from Indo-China - was rapid and demonstrative, even among the ruling class itself. In early May the Senate Foreign Relations Committee accused Nixon of

"conducting an unauthorised Presidential war in Indo-China",

repealed the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution used by Johnson to justify the original US military intervention in Vietnam, and passed a resolution cutting off all funds to US troops in Cambodia after July 1st. These moves represented the first occasion in American history where Congress has attempted to use its control over national finance to bring an overseas military operation to an end.

On May 5th Nixon was compelled to pledge withdrawal of US troops from Cambodia by June 30th - a pledge which was substantially kept, although the presence continued of some 39,000 troops of the South Vietnam puppet government.

On May 10th an editorial in "The Sunday Times" declared critically:

"Innocent Cambodians have been bombed and slaughtered. So far the very existence of the headquarters has proved, to say the least, speculative. The operation was begun on the discredited advice of the generals. ...

This time the nation has failed to rally as it habitually does in a moment of foreign crisis. The Senate is opposed, and the Cabinet is publicly split. The President, in fact, having asserted his right to act alone, finds himself more lonely and more enfeebled than it is safe for any President to be. The politics of the silent majority has finally collapsed.

Mr. Nixon now has to rescue America from becoming ungovernable."

Meanwhile on April 25-26th a summit conference was held at the request of Sihanouk, attended by Sihanouk himself, Pham Van Dong (Premier of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam), Nguyen Huu Tho (President of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam) and Prince Souphanouvong (head of the Laotian national liberation front, Pathet Lao). As the communique issued by the conference announced, agreement was reached on a common strategy of all the nations of Indo-China against US imperialism, "the most cruel and most dangerous enemy of the Indo-Chinese people and mankind", which was "seeking by every means to prolong and widen the war".

On May 5th, Sihanouk formed a government-in-exile in Peking.

LAOS

In March Nixon declared:

"No American stationed in Laos has ever been killed in ground operations".

In April, however, publication of evidence given to a Senate sub-committee revealed that the United States had begun a secret war in Laos as far back as 1964, in which 200 US military personnel had been killed; not all of whom had been airmen. The evidence established that the US military operations in Laos had been kept secret at the request of the Prime Minister of the "neutral" "Royal Laotian Government", Prince Souvanna Phouma, in order to try and disguise the fact that the United States was in flagrant violation of the 1962 Geneva Agreement, which guaranteed the neutrality of Laos.

IRELAND

At a unity congress in March, the revisionist "Communist Party of Northern Ireland" fused with the revisionist "Irish Workers' Party" to form a single revisionist "Communist Party of Ireland".

(A full historical analysis of the Irish Revolution will appear in the next issue of RED FRONT).

LESOTHO

In Lesotho (formerly Basutoland), the territory of which is completely surrounded by that of the Union of South Africa, elections in January resulted in a victory for the nationalist "Basutoland Congress Party".

The leader of the defeated ruling party, Chief Jonathan, immediately declared a state of emergency, and British police officers arrested and gaoled the leaders of the Congress Party

In April the government expelled King Moshoeshoe, who had opposed the coup.

MUSCAT AND OMAN

In recent months the armed revolt by the national liberation movement of south-eastern Arabia - the Popular Front for the Liberation of the Occupied Arab Gulf (PFLQAG) - has been able to liberate a considerable part of the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman, even threatening the British air base at Salala.

In these circumstances, the British imperialists (under whose "protection" the Sultanate lies) decided that it was necessary to try to put a new face on the mediaeval despotism of its ruler for the past 38 years, Sultan Sayyed Said bin Taimur. Under this regime, slavery was legal and the Sultan himself owned more than 500 slaves; the courts administered the primitive code of Islamic religious law, and prisoners were subjected to public torture; women were compelled to wear the veil; electricity, radio, football, tobacco, alcohol and the wearing of spectacles were illegal; and the Sultan refused to use any of the country's £30 million a year oil revenues for any public purposes.

In July, a coup was organised against the ruler, who was shot and wounded, and replaced by his son Gabus, educated at Oxford and Sandhurst and pledged to "modernise" his country.

NIGERIA

As has been made clear in past issues of RED FRONT, the long and bloody civil war in Nigeria was caused by the attempt of a section of the Nigerian capitalist class to break away from the national state and form, on a purely tribal basis and with the aid of France, Portugal, China and certain other capitalist powers, a separate "republic".

In January this war came to an end with the surrender to the Nigerian authorities of the "head of state" of the "Republic of Biafra", General Effiong, to whom the former "head of state", General Ojukwu, had handed over "power" and fled the country.

ROMANIA

In May, at the COMECON conference in Warsaw, Romania refused to take part in setting up a joint investment bank in the administration of which the former "principle of unanimity" was to be dropped, permitting the orthodox revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, to overrule the wishes of the Romanian ultra-revisionists.

....

At the beginning of July Nixon extended an invitation to President Ceausescu to pay an official visit to Washington.

....

In July the long-delayed 20-year "Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Aid" between the Soviet Union and Romania was signed, after the Soviet revisionists had agreed to the demands of the Romanian ultra-revisionists that the treaty should explicitly recognise the principles of the independence, sovereignty, and equal rights of both states, and the principle of non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

SOVIET UNION

The struggle between the dominant faction of the Soviet revisionist leadership, headed at present by Brezhnev and Kosygin, and the remnants of the pro-US Khrushchovite revisionist faction continues. The former faction represents the interests of the new class of Soviet imperialists created as a result of the restoration of capitalism, and stands for an economically and militarily strong Soviet Union with a highly

centralised state in which the "Communist Party of the Soviet Union" functions, under a false red flag, as a fascist-type party. The latter faction, originally a creation of the Central Intelligence Agency, sought to base itself on the petty bourgeoisie - the collective farmers and intelligentsia - and stands for an economically and militarily weak Soviet Union that would be a collaborator and subordinate of United States imperialism.

For several years the magazine "Novy Mir" (New World) had been the main organ of the Khrushchovite revisionist faction under the editorship of Alexander Tvardovsky. Its staff had developed a skilled technique of evading the censorship by means of "historical studies" on tyranny and repression which were in fact thinly disguised attacks upon the dominant revisionist leadership.

In February the Bureau of the Secretariat of the Writers' Union dismissed four of the editorial staff of the magazine, and the editor, Tvardovsky, resigned in protest.

.....

As a result of these factional struggles the 24th Congress of the Party, which was due to have been held in March 1970, was postponed and in July was further postponed until March 1971, by which time the new "Five Year Plan", which the Congress was supposed to authorise, will have been in operation for three months.

.....

At the beginning of July secret talks took place in New Delhi between Indian leaders and a Soviet delegation headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Firubin.

SPAIN

A strike of building workers in southern Spain, demanding an increase in their basic wage from 160 pesetas (about 19s.) a day took place during the early summer.

On July 21st about 2,500 strikers demonstrated in the city of Granada. When armed police attempted to disperse the demonstrators, they replied with stones. The police opened fire on the demonstration, killing three workers who were quickly buried by the authorities (one without being identified) in the city cemetery. The demonstrators then took refuge in Granada Cathedral, which the police surrounded in an attempt to starve them out.

On August 5th the Ministry of Labour announced a wage increase for the building workers concerned to 174 pesetas (about £1.1s.) a day.

.....

On July 28th workers on Madrid's privately-owned underground railway system began their first strike for 51 years in support of demands for a basic wage of 290 pesetas (about £1.15) a day. Within twelve hours of the commencement of the strike, the fascist government drafted the striking workers into the armed forces and threatened them with court-martial unless they returned to work.

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

During the spring and summer of 1970, the Union of South Africa was, for its racist policy in sport, expelled from the international organisations for football, lawn tennis, table tennis, weight-lifting, boxing, basketball, fencing, volleyball, judo, gymnastics and the Olympic Games.

In Britain a successful and well-organised campaign forced Government intervention to secure the cancellation in May of the invitation by the Cricket Council to an all-white South African cricket team to tour Britain.

.....

At a meeting between Vorster and Smith in July, the South African Premier pressed the Rhodesian counterpart to negotiate a "constitutional settlement" with the new Conservative British Government.

UNITED STATES

In November 1969 American Indians seized the island of Alcatraz in San Francisco Bay, claiming that under a treaty of 1886 all federal lands declared surplus - the island was a former prison - were to be returned to the Indian people.

Appalling as is the racist policy of United States imperialism

towards its negro and Puerto Rican citizens, its policy towards the aboriginal inhabitants of America can be described only as two centuries of genocide. Even today the life expectancy of the Indian population is only 44 years, compared with 71 for white citizens; infant mortality is 53.7 per 1,000 births - twice the rate for the population as a whole; 40% of the Indian population is officially unemployed; their average income is 75% below the national average; and an average of 18 dollars per child is spent on the education of Indian children, compared with the national average of 40 dollars.

.....

In March the US State Department issued a 25-page policy document entitled "US and Africa in the 70s." The document attacked apartheid, pledged the US Government to maintain the arms embargo in relation to South Africa and offered US travel documents to refugees from South Africa. It made clear that US policy was directed towards seeking dependent "allies" in the smaller states of southern Africa which were "seeking to create multi-racial societies".

WEST INDIES

On April 21st large demonstrations took place in Port of Spain, Trinidad, demanding the release of 13 detained leaders of the national liberation movement. Later troops mutined and attempted to release the prisoners by force.

Premier Eric Williams declared a state of emergency and appealed to Britain for help. On the following day the United States despatched warships to Trinidad.

CITY NOTES

In March it was announced that Dunlop and Pirelli, with joint sales valued at £940 millions a year, are to merge. This will be the first substantial merger between European firms in different countries since Royal Dutch Shell and Unilever were established. The new combine will be third in the world's tyre manufacturers after Goodyear and Firestone.

Pirelli has 82 factories and 76,000 employees, Dunlop has 128 factories and 102,500 employees.

In Milan Leopold Pirelli, president of the Italian company, said on March 2nd that a combined attack on the North American tyre market would be one of the major results of the amalgamation.

CS GAS

In February, as a gratuitous gesture of support for the use of CS gas by United States forces in Vietnam, the former Foreign Secretary, Stewart, announced that, in the view of the British Government, the Geneva Protocol did not ban the use of CS gas.

At a press conference on April 6th, the Chairman of the United Nations' Association Disarmament Committee, Sir Michael Wright, said that the British delegation working in the United Nations Disarmament Committee had been "stabbed in the back" by the British Government.

In July Members of Parliament bravely underwent a personal investigation into the effects of CS gas.

THE GENERAL ELECTION, 1970

Continued from page 10

The increase of white racist sentiments, primarily as a result of the pernicious racist propaganda of the Powellite and National Front fascists; the gain in strength of the openly fascist right-wing of the Conservative Party; the increased opportunities of the Labour Party in opposition to disrupt the working class unity which alone can give effective resistance to fascism - all these factors have been brought out in the great 1970 election hoax and they make it even more abundantly clear that the rebuilding of a Marxist-Leninist party of the working class in Britain is a task of the utmost urgency.

THE DARK SIDE OF THE MOON

July 21st, 1969 will go down in history as the day on which man first landed on a natural material body beyond Earth.

But behind the technological expertise which made this achievement possible lies the fact that it is the flag of US imperialism - the most aggressive power on our planet - which stands on the airless moon.

When a mountaineer is asked why he feels impelled to climb Everest, the traditional reply has been: "Because it's there!" But the United States imperialists - and their counterparts, the Soviet revisionists who represent the interests of the new Soviet capitalist class - are not spending the huge sums involved in the space programmes (the US expenditure to date is officially put at \$24,000 million) to plant their flags on distant satellites and planets simply "because they are there". Their motive is, as always, the search for profit.

As Lenin emphasised more than fifty years ago, one of the essential features of the imperialist stage of development of world capitalism is that

"the territorial division of the whole world among the greatest imperialist powers is completed." (V.I. Lenin: "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism", in: "Selected Works", Vol.5, Moscow, 1935, p.81).

In this situation the continuing need of imperialist countries to capture new markets, to obtain new sources of raw materials, to establish new military bases for expansion, to seize new colonies, to extend their area of exploitation, makes wars between imperialist powers for the redivision of the world inevitable and recurrent.

As Stalin wrote in 1952:

"Some comrades hold that, owing to the development of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist countries have ceased to be inevitable.

For all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force - and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force.

To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism." (J.V. Stalin: "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"; Moscow; 1952; p.37, 41).

Since Stalin wrote these words, the world peace movement has largely disintegrated,

the upsurge of national liberation movements in the colonial-type countries has removed many of these countries from the sphere of imperialist exploitation, while the restoration of capitalism in the USSR by the Soviet revisionists and the transformation of China from a semi-colonial country into a strong capitalist state has increased the number of capitalist powers striving at all costs for a better "place in the sun". These factors have increased still further the forces driving towards a new imperialist war.

The development of nuclear weapons over the last thirty years has been to some extent an inhibiting factor in the drive towards a Third World War, in that the possible use of these weapons in such a war threatens not only the obliteration of capitalist property but the annihilation of individual monopoly capitalists. Thus, in the absence of effective international banning of such weapons, the wealthier and most developed imperialist powers are seeking areas of colonial expansion outside Earth.

Already the capitalist press - and not only in the USA - has expressed its joy at the discovery that elements which are rare and costly on earth (such as yttrium and zirconium) appear to be abundant on the moon.

And beyond the moon lies an infinity of yet unknown planets and solar systems in comparison with which the dreams of El Dorado of the early merchant capitalists pale into insignificance. Perhaps indeed, the imperialists speculate, the colonisation of all these new sources of super-profit by workers from earth may not be necessary; perhaps some of the planets yet to be reached may prove to be inhabited by indigenous primitive peoples who can be transformed into cheap colonial slaves for the benefit of the monopoly capitalists of Earth.

Such is the dream of the imperialists - a dream only slightly disturbed by the nightmare of bourgeois science fiction that the imperialists' expansion into other worlds may bring them into conflict with a more technically developed people who will, in a just war of planetary liberation, destroy them.

Such is the dream of the imperialists, threatened on every side by the struggle of oppressed peoples and working classes on earth - the dream that by colonial expansion into other parts of the universe they can provide a new material basis for their decaying system that will sustain it for centuries to come...;

But there is, of course, a more immediate military relevancy in the imperialists' space

programme than these long-term (and unattainable) dreams. In order to journey much beyond the moon, not merely more powerful rockets are necessary but manned space platforms orbiting the earth. And the "military experts" of the United States make no secret of their belief that "the power which first puts up such a manned space platform has a weapon with which it can dominate the earth".

In these long-term and short-term dreams lies the meaning of the statement by Frank Borman, commanded of Apollo-8, that the US space expenditure must be seen as "technical life assurance for the future of this country".

This is the reality behind the planting of the Stars and Stripes on the "Sea of Tranquillity".

This is "the dark side of the moon"!

LETTERS

Continued from page 15

organisations he mentions in Croydon and Lewisham, it is a lie to say that they give the fascists "little or no opposition"; on several occasions there have been anti-fascist rallies, marches and meetings in South London, in which the I.L.P. has also taken a prominent part. On one demonstration through the Croydon streets last July, the marchers had to repulse fascist violence, while the "anti-fascist guerillas" were conspicuous by their absence.

But by far the most effective way to combat racialism and fascism is by consistent and persistent propaganda, counterposing a reasoned socialist case to the demagogy of the rightists. This the I.L.P. has always done. We were the first organisation to produce anti-fascist and anti-racialist stickers; and our journal, the "Socialist Leader", has devoted more space to attacking and exposing fascism than any other paper in the country.

This is why we decided to debate with the National Front. "Anti-fascist activist" may consider that they have nothing to say worth listening to, nothing worth serious discussion. We may agree with him. But the trouble is that increasing numbers of quite ordinary working people do think that they have a case. I know because, unlike the so-called anti-fascists whose only argument is the fist and the boot, I have taken the trouble to argue with racist-minded, and even fascist-minded, workers. And sometimes, with patience, I have succeeded in making them see reason. This is a task which is made much more difficult by the hooliganism of the "anti-fascist guerillas", whose attitude and methods appear to be no different from that of the fascists themselves.

Anyone who thinks that the National Front is supported only by capitalists, petty bourgeois,

or lumpen elements, is totally ignorant of the facts. It is gaining working class support and the left has to take united action against it. But this does not mean emulating the thuggery of the Zionist "anti-fascist guerillas" of the 62 group. This only helps the fascists. We should use violence only in self-defence.

Finally, when "anti-fascist Activist" heaps abuse upon Socialists, he is showing his real worth only too clearly. It is he, and not we, who should join the National Front, where he "could do much less harm to the anti-fascist cause". Although even they might shrink from accepting someone who lacks even the courage to sign his own name to a letter of attack!

Bill Turner,
London I.L.P.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

We agree with the criticism which "Anti-Fascist Activist" levels at the I.L.P., that it was a serious error on the part of the latter to invite the fascists of the National Front to a debate, so giving the impression that "it has something intelligent to say that is worth listening to, that is worthy of serious consideration and discussion".

In our view, this error stemmed from the mistaken, petty-bourgeois, libertarian outlook of certain leading figures in the I.L.P., an outlook which causes them to stand for "free speech" in the abstract - abstracted, that is, from its class content. It is clearly no part of the responsibilities of the Left to provide a platform for fascists, the most open enemies of the working class and the working class movement. The genuine Left takes its stand on free speech for the working class, for its organisations and representatives. It does not take a non-class position, a position of fighting for "free speech" for the enemies of the working class.

While it gives us no satisfaction that members of the I.L.P. who attempted to hold this debate were severely attacked, along with the representatives of the National Front, by the "anti-fascist guerillas" referred to in the correspondence, nevertheless we cannot but see in this incident a certain poetic justice. "Whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad".

On the other hand, we agree with Mr. Turner that the tactics so strongly supported by "Anti-fascist Activist" - the tactics of setting up bands of "anti-fascist guerillas" to attack the fascists - are incorrect and do, in the long run, help the fascists in that they present to the mass of the working class the picture of rival gangs of "hooligans" waging attacks on each other. The tactics of organising Multi-Racial Defence Groups to protect, particularly, the coloured sections of the population from fascist attack are qualitatively different from those of "Anti-fascist Activist", since they expose the violent attacks - as is essential at the present stage of building the anti-fascist movement - as being launched by fascist hooligans against working people.

Of course, the organisation of such Defence Groups is by no means enough. As a Marxist-Leninist organisation, the MLOB takes its position on the strategy for fighting fascism elaborated in the thirties, on the basis of working class experience throughout the world, by the Communist International. By this strategy alone - that of building a united front of the working class against fascism - can the threat of fascism, the threat of an "open, terroristic dictatorship of monopoly capital", be defeated. This movement can be built - not by educative propaganda alone, as Mr. Turner appears to suggest (and certainly not by the organising of debates with fascists) - but by leading the working class step by step in day-to-day struggle to realise the necessity of organised resistance to fascism and to undertake it. The movement

for the setting up of Multi-Racial Defence Groups will be successful, in our view, only if its leaders see this movement, not as something in isolation, but as an integral part of this strategy of building a united front against fascism.

Birmingham Claimants Union,
2/9 Trafalgar Road,
Moseley, Birmingham 13.

Tel: 021-449-5454.

Dear Comrades,

Birmingham Claimants Union is a militant association of National Assistance claimants - unsupported mothers, unemployed, pensioners, long-term sick, low-paid workers etc. Now over nine months old, we are growing at a phenomenal rate in power and in numbers, as we score repeated victories over the DHSS (in terms of hard cash, lots of it, and in terms of justice). The Union is now firmly established as the voice and power behind Birmingham's claimants, and this despite the growing opposition of the DHSS.

We have made no attempt to seek publicity, having put the building of a strong movement as the only priority. Newspapers and TV cannot do that for us. But a stage has now been reached where it is vital that the movement spread to the whole of the country if advance is to be speeded. Without a claimant movement there can be no hope of genuine change in the rotten Social Security system. BCU wishes to spread from being a local pestilence to a national blight on the NAB (now called the DHSS: but it remains the NAB until something changes besides the signs outside the office).

We should like to hear from any activists or groups who have experienced the NAB in recent years and are interested to form Claimants Unions. The Union is non-sectarian, believing in 100% organisation of claimants, and will supply further information and put contacts in touch on this understanding. We are now in a position to give considerable help to new Unions in their organisation.

Fraternally,
Roger Clipsham

SHOP FRONT

THE DOCKS

In July the first official national dock strike since 1926 took place in Britain and demonstrated, in so far as the workers themselves were concerned, admirable disciplined solidarity.

At the outset of the strike, Jack Jones, the General Secretary of the Transport and

General Workers' Union, tried unsuccessfully to persuade the dockers to defy the decision to strike adopted by their delegate conference.

Although the Pearson court of inquiry set up in connection with the strike found the basic wage rate of £11.1s.8d. "outdated" and "a manifest defect in the present wages structure", it recommended on July 27th that the demands for an increase in the rate should be rejected.

Despite this, Jones succeeded in convincing a majority at another delegate conference held on July 29th that the court's recommendations for increased guaranteed minimum earnings and overtime pay constituted "a major reform" which should be accepted, and the decision to return to work on August 3rd was carried by 51 votes to 31, with 2 abstentions.

CO-OPERATIVE INSURANCE SOCIETY

In June 7,000 Co-operative Insurance Society agents began a national strike for an expense allowance (they have to pay overhead expenses relating to travel, telephone, post, lighting, heating, of about £6 a week out of their earnings).

A statement issued by the agents declares:

"Our Union (part of USDAW), to which most Co-operative Employees belong, raised this question with the Co-operative Insurance Society about eighteen months ago. We asked that the Society should meet us half-way with out expenses, giving us for the first time an expense allowance of £3.0.0d. per week. Rising costs of transport, telephone and postal charges, etc. have swallowed up an increasing proportion of our earnings and we have found it impossible to maintain a reasonable standard of living. Our claim however has been completely rejected by the C.I.S. and has not been resolved in negotiation or at conciliation.

Since we have been on strike, the Society has issued a letter, part of which is quoted below:-

"If you decide to continue work then you need have no fear for your position with the Society. After fully considering the circumstances of this dispute at their last meeting, the C.I.S. Board of Directors decided to give a categorical assurance to every agent that if any agent is expelled from USDAW for continuing to work during this dispute (or for refusing to submit to any fine or any other penalty which USDAW seeks to impose because an agent has continued to work during this dispute) then the C.I.S. will not subsequently enforce against the agent concerned the clause in his Agent's Agreement requiring him to be a member of a trade union!"

Coming from the C.I.S. (which is a part of the Co-operative Movement) this statement of their intentions is deplorable and furthermore an encouragement to black-legging.

We therefore call on all our fellow Trade Unionists to give us their support by protesting through their own organisations.

TEACHERS

In March the National Union of Teachers called off its strike after the Burnham Committee, following the intervention of the former Secretary for Education, Short, granted a £120 a year all-round pay increase from April 1st.

AN IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING I. DELAY, L. DECREZ AND E. DESMOND OF THE "BRITISH TRICONTINENTAL ORGANISATION"

The Political Bureau of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain finds it necessary to issue a warning to all militant and progressive organisations and individuals concerning the activities of the above.

The experience of many months of work in broad organisations such as the Action Committee Against NATO and the Socialist Alliance Against Racism has yielded incontrovertible evidence that the above individuals and their cover organisations act on behalf of, and are guided and financed directly by, the Soviet revisionist leading clique in Moscow.

These activities have been conducted with a three-fold aim:

- 1) to lure young and inexperienced militants, especially those prey to personal weaknesses open to exploitation, into assisting in the formation of bogus "anti-imperialist" and "friendship" organisations subservient to Soviet neo-imperialism;
- 2) to form a centre from which the weakening and ultimate removal of the ultra-revisionist leadership of the Communist Party of Great Britain can be organised, in order to bring this organisation, the present policies of which objectively serve the interests of US imperialism, into the camp of "orthodox" pro-Soviet revisionist parties; and
- 3) disrupting efforts to establish genuine, independent organs of struggle of the working class and working youth.

In the furtherance of these aims, evidence also exists that the centre of political espionage and corruption organised initially by Delay, Decrez and Desmond includes in its armoury the basest weapons of blackmail, mercenary enticement and moral degeneracy. It is clear that, being unable to present any principled political line or programme of work and struggle to the militants whom they had deceived into supporting them, the Soviet revisionist clique and their hirelings are now compelled to employ as a bait the most sordid methods in order to have any chance of making headway in pursuance of the above aims.

The politically corrupt basis of the "British Tricontinental Organisation" soon led to the attempt by Delay, at a time when he acted as chief liaison agent between it and the Soviet Embassy, to cover up the ever clearer character of this organisation as a tool of Soviet revisionism, by advocating the wildest leftist adventures. This, together with Delay's notoriety as an agent of the Soviet revisionists, made it necessary, at a certain stage, to carry through a bogus "expulsion" of Delay - an expulsion which nevertheless envisaged Delay continuing to perform a leading role in the affairs of the "B.T.O." behind the scenes.

As a consequence of the exposure of the true political aims of the "British Tricontinental Organisation" (see the Report of the Central Committee of the M.L.O.B on the Role of "Centrist" Revisionism), the Delay-Decrez-Desmond group was compelled to perform a charade of "disbanding" the "B.T.O.", which was now too exposed to be a politically tenable vehicle, and to concentrate their efforts within the "Action Committee Against NATO". By this means they had hoped to extricate their leading personnel so as to leave them free and relatively unscathed to continue engaging in other actions of political espionage and disruption in the future.

These measures, amounting essentially to an attempt to diversify the spheres of involvement of the leading clique of the former "British Tricontinental Organisation", revealed its first fruits in the appearance of a body calling itself the "Friends of Korea", with E. Desmond as Secretary. This move clearly illustrates the "centrist"

revisionist political orientation of these elements, which conceals their role as servants of Soviet neo-imperialism.

It was at this time that a useful subsidiary tool was recruited to the service of the Delay-Decrez-Desmond group: W. Turner of the so-called "New Socialists", an anarchist-libertarian grouping which, it will be recalled, was recently involved in an attempt on the part of trotskyite elements to shield an accused police informer who had been placed within the ranks of another fraternal organisation, the Socialist Alliance Against Racism. For all its traditional splanetic anti-Sovietism - manifested, needless to say, solely against the period of Socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union and directed primarily against the person of Comrade J.V. Stalin - this rubbish-bin of psychological instability and leftist adventurism within the wider political scrapyard for the disillusioned pseudo-left, the Independent Labour Party, is now fully integrated into the structure of political espionage, mercenary opportunism and personal degeneracy organised by the Delay-Decrez-Desmond group.

The principal efforts of this group and its cover organisation, the "British Tricontinental Organisation", in relation to the Action Committee Against NATO has been to secure the reversal of the militant internationalist aim of linking together the struggle against NATO with the struggle against the developing corporate states of Western Europe, including Britain, to which they had been compelled for tactical reasons to agree after the isolation and exposure of the ultra-revisionist Communist Party of Great Britain and Youth Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament representatives on the Action Committee against NATO in October 1969 and their desertion of ACAN shortly thereafter. Finally, they were left with no other resort than to declare illegally the previous decision as "invalid" and thus to bring the aims and programme of ACAN into line with the interests of Soviet neo-imperialism and its policies of expansion and inter-imperialist power politics framed within the proposals for a so-called "European Security Conference".

Clearly, the Soviet revisionist leading clique has not abandoned its aim of attempting to use this rump of corrupt political mercenaries, international adventurers, degenerates and anti-communist hacks for the purpose of establishing a "centrist" revisionist type organisation in Britain. All who treasure the aim of building genuine independent mass movements of struggle in Britain will know what scorn and contempt they should mete out to the instigators of these manoeuvres and intrigues, and will see to it that they are exposed and isolated from top to bottom and receive no support whatsoever.

The Political Bureau,
Marxist-Leninist Organisation
of Britain

August 9th, 1970

COMMENCING SHORTLY

a RED FRONT READERS'
DISCUSSION CIRCLE

is to be formed in the West
London area.

Admission is by invitation
only.

Readers wishing to participate
should write for details of
programme to:

MLOB Education Department,
34 Upper Tollington Park,
London N4.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST RACISM

The Socialist Alliance Against Racism was set up at the First Socialist Conference Against Racism held on September 21st, 1969, at which fourteen organisations were represented.

It was during the initial period of development of the Alliance that the Indian Marxist-Leninist Association, which had taken a leading role in initiating the founding conference, presented a statement analysing on Marxist-Leninist principles the character of racism and racialism, their roots in decaying capitalist society, their role in dividing the working class and working people, and the strategy and tactics needed to fight these evils.

By the spring of 1970 it had become very clear that a majority of the organisations which had participated in the founding conference held a purely nominal opposition to racism, and had no wish to participate actively in building the mass movement against racism which is so urgently required in Britain. Thus, by May 1970 the work was being shouldered, in practice, by four organisations:

- 1) the Indian Marxist-Leninist Association;
- 2) the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain;
- 3) the "New Socialists", a libertarian-anarchist organisation headed by W. Turner; and
- 4) the "Socialist Current" Group, a trotskyite organisation headed by F. Rowe.

During the spring of 1970 racist attacks on black people in London, particularly in the East End, reached a new organised level. As a leaflet issued by the SAAR expressed it:

"the organs of capitalist 'law and order' themselves, the police, are openly shielding and abetting the racist thugs and hooligans!"

In case after case, the attackers and race murderers are allowed to go scot free, whilst those they have beaten up, robbed and left bleeding and helpless in the street are themselves arrested on trumped up charges! "

The SAAR accordingly began the work of approaching the black population of the East End with a view to convincing them of the necessity of setting up Multi-Racial Defence Groups. This work, in which the Comrades of the Indian Marxist-Leninist Association took a particularly active role, met with a

most positive response.

Towards the end of May, however, evidence reached the SAAR from a leading member of the Pakistani Workers' Union that an individual whose strange conduct included pressing the view that Multi-Racial Defence Groups should associate themselves with the police and the bourgeois-reformist organisations was in fact a police informer acting on behalf of Chief Inspector Roberts, the police officer concerned with "race relations" in the Tower Hamlets district.

In accordance with long-established precedent, the IMLA and MLOB representatives took the line that this individual should not be permitted to associate herself further with the SAAR unless and until an impartial investigation were to establish that these charges were without foundation. By this time, however, the accused police informer was being openly sponsored by W. Turner of the "New Socialists", while both this group and "Socialist Current" insisted that she should be permitted to associate herself with the SAAR until further notice. This standpoint they adhered to rigidly against all evidence and all argument.

The MLOB and IMLA were completely satisfied that the work of the SAAR could not continue to win the confidence of the black population in these circumstances, that the aims of "New Socialists" and "Socialist Current" were not in truth those of building a mass movement against racism, and that they had taken up their "strange" position on this elementary question merely as a pretext for splitting the Socialist Alliance against Racism.

On Sunday July 5th, therefore, a joint meeting of representatives of IMLA and MLOB, after discussing the lessons to be drawn from the scission of the SAAR, constituted itself into a new Provisional Committee to continue the struggle against racism on the basis of a broad multi-racial united front to be known as the BLACK AND WHITE WORKERS' UNITY FRONT (BWWUF). A sub-committee was set up for the purpose of drawing up the documents of the Provisional Committee, namely:

- 1) a Declaration of Struggle against Racism;
- 2) a Statement of Principles and Aims; and
- 3) a draft Constitution and Rules.

Among the practical activities undertaken

by the Provisional Committee of the Black and White Workers' Unity Front has been the continuation of work begun by the SAAR in the Brick Lane area of East London, where racist attacks have been particularly widespread and frequent, in order to mobilise black and white workers to implement essential basic measures of self-defence. Steps will shortly be taken to convene an initial meeting of a Preparatory Committee to establish a Multi-Racial Defence Group in this area. All anti-racist militants who support the aims and methods of work proposed in the Declaration below and who wish to participate in this and other activities of the Black and White Workers' Unity Front should contact:

Provisional Committee,
Black and White Workers' Unity Front,
5 St. Charles Square,
London W.10.

We reprint below the text of the Declaration adopted by the Provisional Committee of the BWWUF.

DECLARATION OF STRUGGLE AGAINST RACISM

The BLACK AND WHITE WORKERS' UNITY FRONT bases its principles, aims and programme on recognition of the fact that the British imperialist ruling class, seeing that the system of exploitation and oppression on which the rule of monopoly-capital depends has entered into a period of prolonged and intensifying crisis, and being determined to solve that crisis in a manner most likely to ensure the continuance of the economic and social sources of its wealth, has already taken into its reckoning THE MULTI-RACIAL WORKING CLASS in Britain, recognising in it the only social force capable of opposing its designs and of achieving a solution to the imperialist crisis which would guarantee to the mass of the working people, the vast majority of the population, the protection and extension of their most fundamental and inalienable social rights; and has accordingly embarked upon a policy of encouraging and fomenting, through the agency of the political and state organs under its control, RACIAL TENSION, PERSECUTION, HATRED AND VIOLENCE between the various nationalities and races comprising the British working class movement.

It is further recognised that these arch-reactionary measures form the necessary preliminary to attempts to create a general ideological climate favourable to the whipping up of a reactionary fascist mass movement

intended to regain for the imperialist ruling class the social base which it is so rapidly losing and, through attempting to split, undermine and ultimately destroy the mass organs of struggle of the working class and all working people, to pave the way for the imposition - when the objective level of intensity attained by the class struggle of the working class should require it - of a CORPORATELY ORGANISED STATE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF MONOPOLY CAPITAL, modelled on the infamous example of the German and Italian fascists.

It is under the heel of this corporate state, the collective organ of rule no longer merely of the economic and financial parasites who live in idleness and luxury on the wealth created by the labour of the working people, but also of the butchers and hangmen of the working class, that monopoly capital hopes at long last to achieve that age-old dream of exploiting minority classes of all lands and all historical periods: THE ELIMINATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE. It was in pursuance of this megalomaniac illusion that Hitler and his gang of degenerates and psychopaths plunged the entire world into the holocaust of war, causing the deaths of over 20 million human beings and the laying waste of the heritage of centuries of social development.

By such means, amounting to a declaration of class war on the part of the most reactionary section of monopoly capital, is it hoped to depress, continually and without interference, the living standards, democratic rights and liberties and cultural standards of the working people. to the greater glory of the imperialist god who goes ever athirst: THE MAXIMUM RATE OF PROFIT.

In the face of the reactionary offensive of the imperialist ruling class, the working class holds but one weapon: its CAPACITY TO ORGANISE FOR STRUGGLE. But this inherent capacity of the working people for struggle on behalf of their class interests is dependent upon the exposure and liquidation of the influence of capitalist ideology within the ranks of the working class. In this sense, racism and the fomenting of racial prejudice, hatred and violence are but the most intense culmination of a history of attempts to disarm and split the working class from within which are as old as capitalism itself and the conflict between labour and capital which lies at its heart. Whenever and wherever the established machinery of state power of the capital-

ists: begins to break down because it can no longer contain the rising intensity of class struggle between workers and capitalists which follows from the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism, the final weapon remaining in the hands of parasitic monopoly capital is that of seeking to divert the working class into releasing its pent up revolutionary energies, not against its fundamental class enemy, monopoly capital, but against a section of its own forces which monopoly capital tries to separate from the rest of the working class through the inculcation of nationalist or racist propaganda and the stirring up of nationalist or racist prejudices. In this way, the most reactionary stratum of finance capital seeks to avert a developing series of blows in the intensifying class struggle and the ensuing danger of a revolutionary situation, and seeks to turn that situation into its opposite: a counter-revolutionary situation favourable to the strengthening of its dictatorship over the working class and all working people.

The cardinal strategic principle, therefore, of the forces of the working class and of all those who aspire to lead them to the final victory of the workers' cause must be the building of an effective framework of struggle against racism which is independent of the superstructure of combined force and deception under the control of monopoly capital - a militant mass movement which will secure the liberation of wide sections of the working people from the corrosive poison of racist divisions and which will be capable of development into a weapon powerful enough to curb and defeat the attempts of monopoly capital to disarm and destroy the working class movement from within; and which will simultaneously promote the militancy and combative class spirit of all levels of the working people.

In the strategically fundamental and decisive sphere of class struggle against racist hatred and violence, as also against racialist prejudices and inequalities inculcated by monopoly capital within the ranks of the working people, the primary and immediate task of the developing multi-racial united front is to promote the formation of the independent organs of struggle of the working people. These organs will comprise:

1) Multi-Racial Defence Groups, on a locality and industrial basis, the aim and functions of which will be to adopt all measures necessary for the protection of working people against the spontaneous or organised attacks and provocations of reactionary racist and/or fascist elements in a given area. These groups will represent the most fundamental and germinal form of the organs of self defence

of the working people against the developing corporate state;

2) Anti-racist Unity Committees, through which effective unity of action between the broad masses of the working people of all nationalities and races in a given industrial enterprise, educational establishment or residential area and the established organisations of the working class and student movement (trade union branches, trades councils, shop stewards committees, tenants associations, student bodies, etc.) will be achieved;

In addition to these primary spheres of leadership in militant struggle against racism, the Black and White Workers' Unity Front will engage in all types of ideological, propagandistic and agitational work, with the aim of raising the level of class consciousness and political understanding of the working people in regard to questions of race and their relation to the class struggle and both the fundamental and the short term interests of the working class. These measures will comprise the organisation of such events as public meetings, discussion groups, education classes, film shows, and other activities of a propagandistic or agitational character.

By thus affirming in militant practice their active unity in struggle against the poison of racism and racialism, it will be possible for the multi-racial working class of Britain to inflict decisive blows against their class enemy, the capitalist class and its most reactionary top stratum of monopolists and financial parasites, and finally to defeat the reactionary aim of finance capital to split the forces of the working class and to erect a corporate state structure of intensified repression on the basis of a racist-inspired fascist mass movement. The fascist/racist "united front" of monopoly capital and all reactionaries, which can only be imposed on the working people from above by means of combined force and deception, will be answered by the overwhelmingly broad and powerful united front of the multi-racial working class itself from below, factory by factory, college by college, area by area, section by section, on the basis of its own independent class experience and understanding in struggle.

Long live the militant internationalist unity in struggle of the working class and working people of all nationalities and races!

Down with racism and racialism and all forms of reaction!

The aim of the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN is to build a Marxist-Leninist party of the working class in Britain which can lead the British working people to bring about the revolutionary overthrow of the present capitalist state, establish a People's Republic based on the rule of the working class, and build a socialist society based on planned production and the common ownership of the means of production.

To: THE M.L.O.B.,
34 Upper Tollington Park,
London N.4.

I wish to apply for candidate membership of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain.

Name

Address

.....

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN

RED VANGUARD

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE
OF MARXISM-LENINISM

Contents of issue No. 1 include:

"THE THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG"

The first part of a major study which, through its analysis of the writings, including some hitherto little known outside China, extends and deepens the case already made in the Report of the C.C. of the M.L.O.B. on "The Situation in the People's Republic of China" in the light of the history of the C.P.C. and the Chinese Revolution and the role of the "Thought" in both.

"THE THEORY OF THE GUERILLA ELITE"

An analysis of the theories of Regis Debray, and their relevance to the revolutionary struggle in Latin America.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: 6s. single copy 27s annual subscription (4 issues)
Airmail rates on application

PROGRAMMATIC MANIFESTO
OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST
ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN

The fundamental policy statement of the MLOB based on the Report delivered to the Foundation Conference and amended and enlarged in the light of subsequent national and world events.

Price 7s.6d.

RED FRONT

is the organ of the MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATION OF BRITAIN. All communications should be addressed to the Editorial Committee.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Annual subscription (6 issues): 9s.0d. Single copies: 1s.0d. (postage extra)
Airmail rates on application.

Printed and published from the editorial address, 34 Upper Tollington Park, London N4
by M.Scott

THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT IS GROWING
continued....

THE COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT FROM NUCLEUS TO PARTY MAY BE, THE OBJECTIVE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE WORLD PROLETARIAN-SOCIALIST REVOLUTION WILL ENSURE ITS SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT.

THE NEW MARXIST-LENINIST INTERNATIONAL IS BEING AND WILL BE BUILT.

=====

The following is the text of a telegram received by the Central Committee, MLOB on August 5th:

"CONFERENCE A SUCCESS. STALINIST NUCLEUS FOUNDED, WE REQUEST THE ESTABLISHMENT OF FRATERNAL RELATIONS.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE, QUEBEC."

=====

INQUISITION AT HEATHROW

This letter is to bring to your attention a regrettable incident involving Comrade Dhruba Sen, Co-ordinating Organiser of the Indian Marxist-Leninist Association.

Comrade Sen is an Indian national, a graduate of the University of London who has been resident in this country for more than twelve years. On 18 September 1969, on his arrival at Heathrow airport from Paris at 22.10 hours, his luggage was ransacked by a Customs Official who, finding in Comrade Sen's briefcase a report and a leaflet on racism called in a non-uniformed person who in turn called in another non-uniformed person. These individuals proceeded to interrogate Comrade Sen at length about the aims of the Indian Marxist-Leninist Association and the second of these "mystery men" confiscated the documents referred to without any explanation or even a receipt. Despite repeated requests, they refused to reveal their official capacity or to identify themselves. It was 0.15 hours before Comrade Sen was through this rather strange "customs examination".

Since the shameful capitulation of the present Administration (the former Labour Government - Ed.) to the forces of fascism and racism, such attacks have reached a high level of ferocity and frequency, especially for entrants with darker complexions - whether fully-fledged British nationals or Commonwealth citizens. On the pretext of immigration

controls and customs examinations the vicious elements of the Immigration and Customs department wrongfully harass and try to humiliate people of other racial origins - most often covertly in the guise of exercise of their authority with a pretence of legality, but on occasions overtly in excess of their authority without any semblance of legitimacy at all.

Comrade Sen has written to the Home Secretary asking for an enquiry into the incident, for an apology, for the restitution of the documents wrongfully seized, for disciplinary action against the officers concerned for their blatant violation of civil rights, and for preventive measures against the occurrence of similar incidents to anyone regardless of race, colour or creed.

In our view, the most important aspect of the present case is the flagrant infringement of fundamental civil liberties. Moreover, this case should not be seen as an isolated incident but in the general context of the gradual but growing erosion of basic rights by the officers and organs of a corporate state. The pattern is incomplete, but the process is indubitably clear. We sincerely hope, therefore, that you will do everything within your power to support Comrade Sen in his stand against this naked despotism.

Ambuj Mukharji,
for Executive Committee,
Indian Marxist-Leninist
Association,
5 St. Charles Square,
London W.10.

(RED FRONT expresses its complete solidarity with Comrade Mukharji's letter and suggests that readers could usefully write to the Home Secretary in support of Comrade Sen's demands).

You can help RED FRONT :

- * By taking out a subscription
- * By persuading your militant workmates to take out a subscription
- * By sending a donation or, better still, a monthly guarantee
- * By assisting in the sale of the paper outside factory gates and in public places in your locality.

Sale or return details from the Literature Dept.