

REVOLUTION

THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

NOVEMBER 1978 VOLUME 3, NUMBER 4

PRICE 30p

PROGRESS IN PARTY BUILDING

**BRITAIN AND THE
STRUGGLE AGAINST SUPERPOWER
HEGEMONISM AND WAR**

COMBINE LEGAL AND ILLEGAL WORK



THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

The Revolutionary Communist League is a national organization with branches in half a dozen towns and cities in Britain. It is dedicated to the task of rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

Since the Communist Party of Great Britain was taken over by a band of revisionists, the working class in Britain has had no vanguard party to lead it. Without a party giving leadership it is impossible to overthrow the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and the capitalist system; it is impossible to establish socialism and to enforce a dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie to prevent them seizing power back again.

Without a vanguard revolutionary Communist Party the working class cannot sustain their existing struggles against the attacks of the monopoly capitalists through to the end and cannot raise them to a higher level.

For these reasons building the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class is the central task in Britain today, the task around which we must arrange all our work.

The Revolutionary Communist League of Britain was founded in July 1977 out of the militant unity forged between two former organizations, the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) and the Communist Unity Association (Marxist-Leninist). This militant unity was won through active ideological struggle, the weapon for ensuring unity.

The Revolutionary Communist League takes Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought as the theoretical basis guiding its thinking. It strives to integrate this scientific theory of the international working class with the concrete conditions of the socialist revolution within Britain.

In its mass work the Revolutionary Communist League concentrates particularly on sinking deep roots among the industrial working class. The Revolutionary Communist League implements democratic centralism in its internal life in a centralized and lively way. It has published a Manifesto as an important step towards the programme of the future revolutionary Party.

The founding of the Revolutionary Communist League is an important advance in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

For information about the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain contact:

The Secretary RCLB
c/o New Era Books
203 Seven Sisters Road
London N4

For criticism, correspondence and contributions to 'Revolution' write to:

The Editor, 'Revolution'
c/o New Era Books
203 Seven Sisters Road
London N4

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL.....	p1
MESSAGE FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON THE OCCASION OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY TO THE DEATH OF CHAIRMAN MAO.....	p1
MESSAGE FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN ON THE OCCASION OF THE 29th ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.....	p3
COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT HOLD NATIONAL CONFERENCE. LETTER OF GREETING FROM REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN.....	p5
PROGRESS IN PARTY BUILDING.....	p6
<u>BRITAIN AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SUPERPOWER HEGEMONISM AND WAR.....</u>	p14
<u>COMBINE LEGAL AND ILLEGAL WORK.....</u>	p24
<u>REFUTE THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST LINE IN PARTY BUILDING.....</u>	p28
<u>CRITICISM OF A.C.W. SPLITTISM.....</u>	p44

EDITORIAL

The struggle to rebuild the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class is making good progress!

In this issue of 'Revolution' the successes achieved by the RCL and the Marxist-Leninist movement are made clear. Firstly, clearer lines of demarcation are being drawn between the generally correct ideological and political lines represented by the RCL and others, and those of the 'left' and 'right' opportunists. This is a very necessary prerequisite to building unity that will endure. Secondly, the successes scored in building the RCL itself are a degree of proof that the RCL is on correct lines in the struggle to rebuild the Party.

The article 'Progress in Party Building' points out the self-reliant achievements of the RCL and relates these to uniting the movement. In raising again the slogan 'Unite with the RCL-to Form the Single Leading Centre for Party Building!', this article demonstrates how the correct line can and will win abundant support.

The letters published in this issue relate to the central task of party building. The letters of support to the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China on the second anniversary of the death of Comrade Mao Tsetung and the 29th anniversary of the founding of People's China, express our firm conviction in the correctness of the stand of the CPC in domestic and international matters. This is our clear internationalist position. Our ideological standpoint in party building is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought.

Other letters relate to the struggles within the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain. Most particularly we have published "Draft Organisational Line for Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting proposed by the Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist) and the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League of Britain" and the "Joint Communiqué of 15th July, 1978 issued by the Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist) and the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League of Britain", and our reply to their views. The WPS and the RMLCL are making rightist errors. In our reply, we uphold the truth that the stage of revolution in Britain is for socialism. This is determined by the fact that the principal contradiction in Britain is between the proletariat and the British imperialist bourgeoisie.

The article 'Britain and the Struggle against Superpower Hegemonism and War' upholds the Theory of the Three Worlds regarding Britain's place in the contemporary world and the tasks of British communists in

the situation where world war is inevitable. It analyses the two possibilities, both that of inter-imperialist war and that of a war of national resistance to superpower aggression. It urges preparation for both eventualities.

'Combine Legal and Illegal Work' states the correct view on revolutionary security. The article upholds the proletarian standpoint that reliance on and faith in the masses should be combined with particular methods to protect the proletarian organisation from the attacks of the bourgeoisie. It clearly states that the communist organisation is essentially illegal even under conditions of so called freedom when bourgeois democracy is the state form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The communist organisation can be declared illegal at any time as it was in France in 1968.

Editorial Committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ON THE OCCASION OF THE SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CHAIRMAN MAO.

Dear Comrades,

On the occasion of the second anniversary of the death of Chairman Mao, the great leader and teacher of the Chinese people and the international proletariat, we express to you our profound and continuing grief.

Chairman Mao was the greatest proletarian revolutionary of our time. He defended, developed and enriched Marxism-Leninism in all of its three component parts; political economy, philosophy and scientific socialism. In particular he summed up the experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat, advanced the thesis that classes and class struggle still exist after the socialist transformation of the means of production has in the main been completed and developed his great theory of continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, thus fundamentally solving the problem of preventing a capitalist restoration. He also made major contributions in philosophy, correcting some of the errors of metaphysics which had previously caused errors in the international Communist movement; and in scientific socialism, where his theory of new-democratic revolution, developing Lenin and Stalin's theoretical contributions, is a brilliant solution to the problem of the proletarian revolution in colonial, semi-colonial and neo-colonial countries.

Chairman Mao was also a brilliant example of integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of revolution. His insistence on seeking truth from facts, implementing the mass line and upholding democratic-centralism all stemmed from his profound grasp of dialectical and historical materialism. Chairman Mao taught us all to realise that revolutionary practice is an inexorable judge of theory and that the purpose of theory is to change the world.

Chairman Mao initiated and led the great struggle of Marxism against modern revisionism, headed by the Khrushchev revisionist renegade clique. He fully exposed the bankruptcy of modern revisionism and led the rebuilding of the international Communist movement, which is now tempered and grown stronger in struggle.

For all of these achievements we salute the memory of Chairman Mao and declare that today whether or not to uphold Chairman Mao's teachings is a fundamental line of demarcation with modern revisionism. Today we must refer to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought! It is also a line of demarcation with modern revisionism whether or not to defend the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China, the world revolutionary base area for the proletariat and oppressed peoples and nations.

In particular we must say that to fail to uphold Chairman Mao's great theory of the three worlds is to play into the hands of imperialism and hegemonism, especially Soviet social-imperialism. For obvious reasons, the Soviet revisionists have for a long time attacked this theory. Those in the international Communist movement who have recently openly attacked this theory, loudly proclaiming themselves as the purest defenders of Marxism-Leninism, and who have made scandalous attacks on Chairman Mao

Tsetung, Mao Tsetung Thought, Chairman Hua and the Communist Party of China, are objectively taking the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, actively misleading the working class and people of the world and serving the aims of Soviet social-imperialism.

The Central Committee of the RCLB condemns these actions!

We take this occasion of the second anniversary of Chairman Mao's death to express our full solidarity with the Communist Party of China and its Central Committee headed by Chairman Hua, to express our continued adherence to Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and to declare our continued support for China's new long march to build a great modern and powerful socialist country by the end of the century.

LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-MAO TSETUNG THOUGHT!

LONG LIVE THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA!

VICTORY TO THE GREAT INTERNATIONAL UNITED FRONT
AGAINST SUPERPOWER HEGEMONISM!

The Central Committee of the RCLB

MESSAGE FROM THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST
LEAGUE OF BRITAIN ON THE OCCASION OF THE 29TH ANNIVERSARY OF
THE FOUNDING OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

To Premier Hua Kuo-feng;
To Chairman Yeh Chien-ying;

Dear Comrades,

On the occasion of the 29th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China, we send to you and through you, to all the workers and people of China, the warm revolutionary greetings of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain and the fraternal sentiments of the workers of Britain.

In the twenty-nine years since its founding, Peoples' China has been a great bastion of the international proletariat and a faithful friend of the oppressed peoples and nations and revolutionary people throughout the world. Today, China continues to march down the revolutionary road.

Throughout these twenty-nine years, China has persisted in taking the socialist road and has inflicted one defeat after another on the bourgeoisie. It has inflicted crushing defeats on Kao Kang and Jao Shu-shih, on Peng Teh-huai, on Liu Shao-chi, on Lin Piao and on the "Gang of Four".

We salute particularly the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the smashing of the "Gang of Four", both of which prevented capitalist restoration and led to an all-round revolutionisation of the relations of production.

Today, China has embarked on a new long march to carry out the four modernisations and turn China into a great, modern and powerful socialist country by the end of the century. We are confident that this great goal will be achieved, so long as the working class and people of China persist in taking the socialist road and in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In its revolutionary foreign policy, China has consistently worked for the interests of the working class and oppressed people and nations. In 1950 the Chinese Peoples' Volunteers went to the aid of the fraternal Korean people. In 1955 Premier Chou En-lai went to the Bandung conference of non-aligned nations and helped to propel forward the great revolutionary upsurge of the oppressed nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Since its inception China has given selfless aid to the armed liberation struggles of the peoples of the third world and sincere aid to the countries of the third world. Particularly noteworthy is the fraternal assistance to the three Indo-Chinese peoples in the national liberation wars against US imperialism.

Today, China's revolutionary foreign policy, based on the fundamental principles of proletarian internationalism and guided by the great theory of the three worlds, is a great contribution to the international proletariat's task of forging the broadest possible international united front against superpower hegemonism.

Truly, China is a faithful friend of the working class and revolutionary people throughout the world.

China has friends throughout the world because China serves the interests of the people of the world. Try as the imperialists will, their schemes to isolate and blockade People's China have failed and will continue to fail.

The attitude that one takes to People's China is a line of demarcation with modern revisionism. Let the revisionists and opportunists of all types slander China as they will, the people of the world know who is their friend. They know that Peoples China will continue to be a great bastion of the world proletarian revolution and friend of the oppressed peoples and nations as it has been for the past twenty-nine years.

Long Live the People's Republic of China!

With Warm Revolutionary Greetings,
The Standing Committee of the Political
Committee of the Central Committee of
the RCLB.

COMMUNIST WORKERS' MOVEMENT HOLD NATIONAL CONFERENCE.

LETTER OF GREETING FROM REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN.

To the National Committee
of the Communist Workers' Movement

12.9.78

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain we send warm fraternal greetings to the Communist Workers' Movement on the occasion of your important national conference. The Communist Workers' Movement was originally composed of comrades who took a courageous and principled stand against the revisionist Birch clique in the so-called "Communist" Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist). Since then it has done much work to consolidate itself on all three fronts of ideology, politics and organization. We are more than ever confident that the comrades of the Communist Workers' Movement will bring a valuable contingent of revolutionary fighters to the ranks of the future revolutionary Communist Party that both the CWM and the RCLB are determined to build.

The RCLB warmly welcomes the systematic and principled progress in exchanges on the Unity Committee between the two organizations, in which we are strengthening our common ground on major questions of ideological and political line and narrowing lines of demarcation. We are confident that by persisting in the desire for unity around a correct ideological and political line we will achieve unity between the comrades of the CWM and RCL in a single democratic-centralist organization. This will give a powerful impetus to the struggle for unity in the British Marxist-Leninist movement to found the revolutionary Communist Party, and will greatly strengthen our ability to give a strong lead to the working class.

Standing Committee of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain.

PROGRESS IN PARTY BUILDING

The opening paragraph of the Manifesto of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain declares:

"The Revolutionary Communist League of Britain holds that the central task in Britain today is to build the revolutionary Communist Party, the political party of the working class."

What progress has been made in achieving this task since the founding of the RCLB in July 1977?

The RCLB has consistently followed a policy of walking on two legs in Party-building; that is on the one hand building the League self-reliantly, and on the other struggling to unite with other genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain. Experience shows that this policy is overwhelmingly a correct one. It also shows that the two aspects of the policy are closely interrelated.

Self-reliance means relying mainly on ourselves. It enables us to go on making progress whatever the difficult circumstances and even though other forces cannot be fully relied upon. However it is precisely by being mainly self-reliant, by pressing ahead resolutely and proving that gains can be won in practice that we can show all other genuine forces that victory can be won if we unite around a correct line, even if for various objective or subjective reasons they have problems in forging ahead on their own. Building the Party self-reliantly and struggling to unite the genuine Marxist-Leninists for Party-building are two aspects of a single contradiction which are in contrast to each other but at the same time dialectically inter-related. We press ahead with building the RCL ideologically, politically and organizationally and at the same time we issue the rallying call to all other genuine Marxist-Leninists to "Unite with the RCL - to Form the Single Leading Centre for Party Building".

Progress in building the RCL self-reliantly has been concrete and unmistakable. Since the founding of the League in July 1977 numbers of members and candidate members have increased by well over a third. This is a concrete proof of the correctness of the ideological and political line of the Manifesto of the RCL and at the same time vivid proof of the growing desire for unity in the Marxist-Leninist movement around a correct ideological and political line. We must go on recruiting new members in a planned and principled way and make sure that they are consolidated as militant fighters in the ranks of the League not only organizationally but even more important, ideologically and politically. This is the guarantee for even greater victories in recruiting advanced workers and revolutionary intellectuals in building the Party of the working class.

From September 1978, "Class Struggle", the political paper of the RCL, which was published monthly, is now being published every two weeks. This also is a vivid concrete proof of the correctness of the ideological and political line of the RCL. While the revisionist Birch clique leading the "Communist Party of Britain Marxist-Leninist" increased the frequency of publication of their opportunist paper, "The Worker" as an act of desperation when their numbers started to decline seriously following the consolidation of their opportunist and splitt-

ist line, the increase in frequency of "Class Struggle" has been achieved from a position of strength. It has been achieved in a planned way on the basis of systematic ideological, political and organisational work. The ideological and political line of the paper and its ability to integrate the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought with the developing practice of the class struggle in Britain and in the world have been strengthened through criticism and self-criticism. Sales of the paper to workers in factories have increased and further valuable experience has been gained in how to use a Communist paper in building revolutionary bases in the industrial working class and how to use it in study classes to win the advanced workers to the cause of Communism and building the revolutionary party of the working class. Thorough all round organisational planning was done to create the preconditions for "Class Struggle" to be published fortnightly. One of the most valuable aspects of this was the successful Fighting Fund earlier in 1978 which raised over £300 more than the target of £1,500. This fighting fund campaign linked comrades and friends concretely with the task of building the Party of the working class; it provided the funds for a self-reliant improvement in the professional quality of the printing of RCLB publications. This improvement is very clear to anyone who compares "Class Struggle" of now and a year ago. At a glance it tells a very important ideological lesson - the seriousness and dedication of the RCLB in boldly and conscientiously building a professional revolutionary Party, which can lead the working class in defeating all the viciousness and cunning of the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and overthrowing them in a glorious socialist revolution. At the same time the strengthening of RCL self-reliance in printing was a crucial precondition for "Class Struggle" to be published fortnightly.

The increased frequency of publication of "Class Struggle" is therefore a vivid concrete proof of the success of the RCL's self-reliant Party-building line. At the same time it provides a most important opportunity for still greater victories. The political paper of a revolutionary Communist organization is a collective propagandist, agitator and organiser. Doubling the frequency of "Class Struggle" more than doubles our ability to educate and organise the advanced workers in the course of struggle against the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie. With increased frequency of sales in factories and more topical news we show the vast superiority of revolutionary Communist ideology over bourgeois ideology concretely, and we proclaim the existence of a revolutionary working class organisation dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalist system. This persistence is indispensable in rallying advanced workers to the revolutionary Party because they have no interest in a petty-bourgeois discussion circle which exists half-heartedly and for its own sake. The increased frequency of publication of "Class Struggle" will also give the League the opportunity and also the obligation to strengthen the integration of its Marxist-Leninist line with the developing events of the class struggle.

Yet another concrete proof of the League's self-reliant policy in Party-building has been its success in leading the first nationwide campaign in Britain in solidarity with the armed struggle of the Zimbabwean people against the agents of British imperialism and its

ally, US imperialism. Although this campaign falls many times short of what we would wish in abstract, considering the limited objective resources it is a clear victory proving the ability of the RCL to campaign on vital issues of the revolution nationally and internationally on a nationwide basis.

These three examples, the marked increase in membership of the RCL, the publication of "Class Struggle" fortnightly, and the campaign of solidarity with the people of Zimbabwe, are vivid concrete proof of success in the League's policy of self-reliance in Party-building. They were achieved through militant organisational work in which many lessons were learnt. But on the final analysis they are all proof of the correctness of the League's ideological and political line. Without the line being correct it would be impossible fully to weld the cadres around it and for them to go into action with one heart and mind. It is because the League's line is overwhelmingly correct that such marked organisational victories have been won since its foundation in July 1977.

UNITING THE MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT

Building the League self-reliantly is the leading factor in our policy on Party-building. But that does not mean we ignore the need to unite all genuine Marxist-Leninists for Party-building. These policies are two aspects of a single contradiction. Since its foundation the RCL has paid great attention to uniting the Marxist-Leninist movement. Correctly handled, building the League self-reliantly does not hamper the work of uniting the Marxist-Leninist movement but facilitates it and is in fact indispensable to it. Unity of many individuals can only come about through unity of thinking: unity that will live must be unity around a correct line. Therefore in holding up the Manifesto of the RCL as the most valuable advance in Britain today towards the Programme of the future revolutionary Communist Party we do so to facilitate, not to hamper unity around a correct ideological and political line for the British revolution. When we press ahead self-reliantly in building the League this helps to prove concretely to sincere but perhaps doubting elements the general correctness of this ideological and political line.

Progress is being made in the struggle to unite all genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain. As far as uniting individuals with Marxist-Leninist views around an emerging centre is concerned this can be seen in the recruitment figures to the RCLB. In terms of Marxist-Leninist organisations a process of polarisation is going on in the Marxist-Leninist movement between those moving towards building a single leading centre on a correct ideological and political line for the British revolution and those opportunist elements resisting this process. This polarisation is inseparably connected with the development of contradictions inside each organisation in the struggle for a correct line against incorrect and opportunist lines.

In particular, heartening work is being done in a militant and systematic way in strengthening unity on ideological and political line between the Revolutionary Communist League and the Communist Workers Movement. Common ground is widening and being consolidated. Lines of

demarcation are being narrowed. While the comrades of each organisation correctly persist in struggling for what is right, an excellent atmosphere is being strengthened on the basis of a desire for unity in which both sides seriously listen to the view points and criticism of the other and struggle for unity in terms of what conforms to objective reality and to the revolutionary interests of the working class. Just before May Day this year the two organisations publicly pledged themselves to struggle for unity on major principles; and in keeping with the spirit of this meeting on August 20th both organisations jointly organised a demonstration in militant protest against Soviet social imperialism on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

Meanwhile the struggle for unity on ideological and political line goes on, and the RCL gives its fraternal good wishes to the Communist Workers Movement and congratulations on the CWM's progress in internal consolidation. The comrades of the CWM largely consist of ex-members of the "CPBML" who left on the basis of opposition to the revisionist line and methods of work of the Birch clique. Since then the CWM has been consolidating itself ideologically, politically and organisationally through summing up experience systematically and through struggling against individualist and opportunist tendencies. We are sure that through persisting in this process of consolidation the CWM will strengthen the influence of its correct line amongst the working class and bring an extremely valuable contingent of revolutionary fighters to the cause of Party building.

At the opposite pole in the struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninist movement, the revisionist Birch clique has exposed its line even more and is heading for crisis. Long echoing the "left" opportunist line on the international situation, it ignores the fact that the oppressed nations of the third world are the main force in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism and superpower hegemonism; it prettifies the Soviet Union which is the more dangerous of the two superpowers and the most dangerous source of war, and it ignores the fact that the peoples of the second world must be won over to the broad international united front against the hegemonism of the two superpowers. Recently it has gone even further with wild and underhand attacks on the Communist Party of China, for example in supporting the social chauvinist attacks by the Vietnamese authorities on Chinese nationals and whitewashing the role of Soviet social imperialism in Indochina. With these manoeuvres the Birch clique is trying to poison the minds of the honest members of the CPBML against socialist China and Mao Tsetung Thought. This is bound to lead to opposition, whether open or silent and the CPBML will further disintegrate under the domination of this revisionist line.

On the class struggle nationally the revisionist Birch clique is persevering with its narrow trade unionism. Under cover of revolutionary phrases it follows the baton of trade union lieutenants of capital and conducts no struggle at all to expose them as agents of opportunism in the working class movement, in defiance of the lessons Lenin taught about the need especially to combat opportunism and revisionism in an imperialist country. (The revisionist Birch clique is not only

throwing Mao Tsetung Thought out of the window but has long ago discarded essential teachings of Lenin.) Meanwhile, their own labour lieutenant of capital, the trade union bureaucrat Birch, is reaching retiring age in the trade union bureaucracy and even the revisionist CPBML clique with all their audacity will not be able much longer to present him as a great leader of the working class! It is essential to keep up the struggle against the revisionist Birch clique not only to rally genuine Marxist-Leninists from the CPBML but of even greater concrete importance to destroy any illusions people may have that Birch is a Marxist-Leninist leader. These illusions must be destroyed in the struggle to unite all genuine Marxist-Leninists for Party building.

The small groups also show signs of the tendency towards polarisation in the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain. The trend is against small group mentality and we must carry through the struggle and educational work against small group mentality. No new small groups have formed recently and several have either died suddenly or are withering, while amongst others there are signs that they see the need to grasp a correct line for the British revolution and break out of their individualistic friendship circles and unite in larger democratic centralist organisations. Although it is inevitable there will be many twists and turns in establishing the single leading centre and clearing up the muddle in the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain all comrades must grasp that the main trend is towards unity around a correct line and that this is excellent.

In the struggle for unity with other Marxist-Leninist organisations the RCL is deliberately concentrating its cadre resources on winning unity with the CWM through militant and systematic work. The CWM is closest to the RCL in ideological and political line and unity between the two national organisations will bring an important numerical increase in strength of the organised Marxist-Leninist forces. Although Marxists cannot prophesy, the prospects are definitely favourable that the CWM and RCL will reach unity in a single democratic centralist organisation on the basis of a united ideological and political line some time in 1979.

The policy of the RCL is to continue to be ready to struggle for unity with other Marxist-Leninist organisations where there is a sufficiently common line, a sufficient desire for unity and where cadre resources permit. It will still be necessary to struggle for unity with other elements and circles even after the founding of the revolutionary Communist Party. This is because the class struggle in bourgeois society inevitably throws up different bands of fighters who may sincerely desire revolution although they are confused or have been misled by bourgeois ideology about how to achieve it.

Such a struggle for unity is essential to ensure that all genuine revolutionary elements are concentrated in one single vanguard organisation of the working class so that the working class can readily recognise the true centre of revolutionary Communist leadership. It is our duty to clear up the mess in the British Marxist-Leninist movement. Part of the process of Party building is ensuring that the working class is able readily to recognise the existence of its own party. At the same time the continuing struggle for unity with even quite small

circles will ensure that all possible valuable experience is concentrated in the future revolutionary Communist Party.

However in terms of building the Party numerically, present experience is suggesting that the process of uniting with other Marxist-Leninist organisations may not bring as many gains as the process of building the League self-reliantly. With the exception of unity between the RCL and CWM which will definitely have an important aspect of uniting two national organisations, it seems that comparatively speaking fewer comrades can be brought together in a year by the struggle for unity with other Marxist-Leninist organisations than the RCL can recruit on a systematic and principled basis by building the League self-reliantly over the same period of a year. While striving to win as many honest comrades as we can from the CPBML, in the struggle against the revisionist Birch clique, we must be mentally prepared for the possibility that in the process of disintegration of the CPBML the majority of honest comrades may be at least temporarily lost to the ranks of the revolution owing to demoralisation and confusion. For ideological and political reasons it is without doubt essential to continue the struggle against revisionism in the Marxist-Leninist movement and for unity of all genuine comrades round a correct line. Nevertheless, in terms of winning numbers for Party building, which is also important (as materialists we know that correct ideas are no use at all unless there are the people to turn them into a material force) it is increasingly necessary to pay attention to building the League self-reliantly.

BUILD THE PARTY - STRENGTHEN MASSWORK

The majority of recruits to the RCL at present and for some time to come will be won on the basis of an all round desire for revolution and a theoretical understanding that to have a revolution it is necessary to have a revolutionary party. Many of them may come from the revolutionary intelligentsia. This is not a bad thing; it is a fine thing so long as they are good comrades and understand the need for intellectuals to guard particularly against bourgeois ideology in their thinking and to be ready to remould themselves over a long period of time in the course of struggle. Nevertheless although intellectuals tend to pick up unfamiliar ideas more readily, because of their position in society of working by their brain, it is essential to pay special attention to recruiting working class comrades to ensure that the Party that is built has a proletarian class character and has deep roots in the working class. For this we must win class conscious workers with a strong fighting spirit in the course of actual struggle against the monopoly capitalist class.

This question is not just an immediate question of how we recruit; it is a question of the whole character of the Party we are building. The Party cannot be built in a vacuum; that would deny its whole character as the vanguard of the working class. The Party must be built as the vanguard section of the working class able increasingly to lead the class in resistance to the attacks of monopoly capitalism and in preparation for the socialist seizure of state power.

As the first paragraph of section E of the Manifesto of the RCL states:

"The purpose of the revolutionary Communist Party is to lead the

working class in making a triumphant proletarian revolution. The Party will be the vanguard of the working class; at the same time it will be an inseparable part of the working class".

Thus a crucial and indispensable part of Party building is to bring forward increasing numbers of cells of comrades with deep roots in the working class and capable of leading the practical struggles of workers to success and towards the socialist revolution. Advanced workers cannot be won to the revolution on book learning alone but come forward in the course of mass struggles against the monopoly capitalist class. Therefore while the present historical task of revolution is to win the vanguard of the proletariat to a conviction in the necessity of revolution this must be carried out in the course of waging struggles that the mass of workers can take up.

At present in mass work when our resources to achieve our goal of digging deep roots in the working class are united, it is necessary to devote all mass work to the working class and to concentrate particularly on the industrial working class.

Although it is not true that the Party devotes itself entirely to theoretical matters, the relationship between party building and mass work is a manifestation of the relationship between theory and practice. The Party guides the practice of the mass of workers through its line, policies and tactics. This process is one of turning the theoretical ideas of the Party into a material force. It is at the same time also one of testing the correctness or incorrectness of the Party's theoretical line, policies and tactics and strengthening and enriching the line, policies and tactics by summing up the experience of using them in revolutionary practice.

Prior to the founding of the Revolutionary Communist League in July 1977 the comrades of the future organisation spent the greater part of their time in formulating and grasping the ideological and political line of the Manifesto. This was a theoretical task. After the successful founding of the League the urgent requirement was to carry the ideological and political line of the League, theory, into practice and to test it in practice and particularly to test it in mass work with the industrial working class. Inevitably there were some weaknesses in this process. On the one hand there were some cases of lack of faith in the party and the masses and an idealist reluctance to translate correct lines and policies into a material force through mass work; on the other hand, there were some cases of empiricist jumping into practice, forgetting those lines and policies without which practice gropes about blindly. The key is to strengthen our grasp of a fundamental principle of Marxism, the style of work of closely integrating theory with practice. In any task we must both grasp theory (line, policy or tactics) and also push forward in practice. Theory is the guide to practice while social practice is the criterion of truth. One important test of our lines and policies is how well they conform to the desires of the mass of workers and how readily the workers grasp them and use them in mass practice. While continuing to educate the working class in communist ideology and opposing bourgeois ideology, especially revisionism, we must pay particular attention to this test of mass work in our task of integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete

practice of the British revolution.

The League is a national organisation with branches in over half a dozen towns and cities in Britain and by using our democratic-centralist structure to concentrate correct ideas upwards we can accumulate increasingly rich information about the correctness or incorrectness of our ideological and political line. Already experience is strongly confirming certain key points in the Manifesto of the RCLB.

For example, as the Manifesto says, the Labour Party is the "best bosses' party" (paragraph C37). The experience of mass work strongly confirms that this corresponds to the thinking of the advanced workers. At the same time it is a very sharp and practical line of demarcation with the revisionists and all the other opportunists who, as paragraph C38 says, try to tie the working class to the coat tails of a bourgeois political party.

Another crucial example of how the correctness of the line in the Manifesto is being confirmed through mass work and how it is providing an invaluable guide to mass work is the policy laid down in paragraph C51 of striving to "turn the trade unions into fighting class organisations". With the spread of social democratic ideas and the power of the Labour lieutenants of capital as a result of the temporary victory of revisionism, as soon as the workers in any factory start to fight back against the attacks of monopoly capital they run up against the pressing need to turn the unions into fighting class organisations. This correct line and policy gives direction and gives clarity for the immediate struggle. It also educates the class as a whole to get full control of their unions in the struggle with revisionists and opportunists, which is one essential precondition for preparing the balance of forces for the socialist revolution. Several other examples could be given. The lesson therefore is this: we will greatly strengthen Party building if we closely combine and strengthen the ideological and political line of the Manifesto with our mass work among the working class.

In conclusion, we will persist in our dialectical policy on Party building which combines building the League self-reliantly with struggling to unite all genuine Marxist-Leninists. Party building undoubtedly requires the militant and conscientious work of scores and hundreds of comrades and there will be twists and turns, but the overall picture is bright. The RCL together with other genuine Marxist-Leninists will undoubtedly succeed in rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class ideologically, politically and organisationally. We have the world historic cause of the working class as our banner. We have victorious Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought to guide us. Provided we persist in doing what is right and correct what is wrong our ranks will surely thrive.

BRITAIN AND THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SUPERPOWER HEGEMONISM AND WAR

How are we as communists in Britain to view the hegemonism of the two superpowers? What can we do to prepare the working class and people of Britain in this situation where a new war of world proportions is inevitable?

In the Manifesto of the RCL points are made about superpower hegemonism and war and the tasks confronting the workers in Britain. In Section B paragraph I8 this is said:

"The peoples of Western Europe must strengthen their unity and make preparations now for a people's war of national resistance against any invasion by Soviet social imperialism. In the event of an inter-imperialist war between the two superpowers on Western European territory the working class and people of Europe must fight for independence from both superpowers and must not support either of them. We would be for the defeat of our own bourgeoisie if it took us into such an inter-imperialist war."

Also in the RCL Manifesto it is said in Section B paragraph I4:

"The Revolutionary Communist League supports the attempts of the bourgeois governments of Western Europe to unite politically and economically in order to resist the threat from Soviet social imperialism and control by US imperialism".

And in Section C paragraph I the RCL Manifesto says:

"Within Britain the principal contradiction, which plays the leading and decisive role, is the contradiction between the working class and the imperialist bourgeoisie."

In Section C paragraph 3 this is said:

"The working class must overthrow the dictatorship of the imperialist (monopoly capitalist) bourgeoisie by socialist revolution, smash the bourgeois state, and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat".

These theses are correct and are a consistent summing up of our international and national aims. We are communists in the country of a minor imperialist power. We must, as the RCL Manifesto does, uphold our internationalist duty to the world proletariat and take our share of the struggle for world revolution.

Because many theoretical problems have arisen in this respect we must elaborate a little on the meaning of the above quoted paragraphs.

What follows puts forward the Marxist view on the question of the relation of Britain to the superpowers, the tasks of communists in the present political situation and that of the war which will arise from the present situation. We also, for the benefit of those who have forgotten the Marxist view on the question of class and nation, make clear our adherence to this in opposition to the "left" revisionists in

the main and the inevitable Right trend which also exists. We ask our readers to look at present day politics from a Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. We hold that Marxism-Leninism is distinguished from revisionism today by the application of Leninist principles presented by Comrade Mao Tsetung in his theory of the differentiation of the three worlds. Comrade Mao Tsetung said to K.Kaunda of Zambia in 1974:

"In my view, the United States and the Soviet Union form the first world. Japan, Europe and Canada, the middle section, belong to the second world. We are the third world."

"The third world has a huge population. With the exception of Japan, Asia belongs to the third world. The whole of Africa belongs to the third world, and Latin America too."

(Quoted in People's Daily Editorial, "Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism", page 4).

We urge readers to have regard for the history of the socialist revolution and to study hard the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao as these things equip us best in seeking the truth to serve the proletariat. We are aware that the "left" opportunist trend, which owes its views to the mistakes of the Albanian Party of Labour, is widespread. At every turn it agitates for a cut and dried formula negating the living essence of Marxism-Leninism. Our views will never bow to the dogmatism of those with ulterior motives, or who are too lazy to look at the facts. In short, all Marxist-Leninists should uphold the theory of the three worlds and repudiate the "leftist" absurdities.

FIRMLY UPHOLD THE THEORY OF THE THREE WORLDS

The politics of the modern world is such that we can clearly see that the new world war is inevitable. This results from the growing contention between the two superpowers, Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism. It also results from the expansionist demands of Soviet social imperialism which is the newcomer to the imperialist scene. This superpower requires, if it is to survive, a new carve up of the world spheres of influence. It must oust the older, better placed imperialism, it must do this because the world is already divided up in the interests of US imperialism. The Soviet social imperialists therefore are most ready to resort to war to get what they want. That is why they place the greatest emphasis on war preparations of an offensive kind. The national economy of the Soviet Union is geared, like Hitler's Germany, to the principle of "guns before butter". They also use the pretence of still being a socialist country as a disarming ideological weapon against those who oppose them.

For communists in Britain, it is essential to take a clear view on the oncoming war. This means grasping the politics of today which are giving rise to the threat of war. War is an extension of politics by other means. We can see the hegemonist politics of the superpowers. We can see their contention for world domination. These politics of exploitation, oppression and death is opposed by the politics of the proletariat. These are the politics of resistance, liberation and socialism. It is a matter we are deeply involved in.

The contemporary world is divided into three parts. The distinctions between these three must be comprehended clearly if in the forthcoming

struggle we are to know who are our friends, who are our enemies and which forces can be our friends in certain circumstances.

The first world is composed of the two hegemonist superpowers, Soviet social imperialism and US imperialism. It is self-evident that among all the imperialist powers in the world, it is only these two which have the clout to influence world events. It is only these two which can dream of world domination. For them the question is "which of us two shall prevail?" For the other imperialist powers it is a question of survival, of getting through the day. No realistic second world imperialist politician would expect to see his imperialist bourgeoisie to come out on top.

The third world comprises the main force, that is the heaviest force, opposed to imperialism. The national democratic revolution in the third world, involving political, economic, military and cultural struggle against imperialism is going forward in a fine way. This struggle is knocking the inflated arrogance of the superpowers into a cocked hat. Whenever the third world peoples and nations raise their hands in struggle, imperialism suffers setbacks.

In the second world, composed of minor imperialist powers, the imperialist bourgeoisies are in a real fix. Imperialism cannot survive without exploitation of the oppressed nations and the scope for such exploitation is restricted more and more by the struggles of the nations and peoples and by the superpowers who grab the lion's share. The superpowers have no sentimental regard for the lesser imperialisms and subject them to increasing bullying. The second world imperialisms have no way out except to club together against the superpowers and concede to the oppressed nations' just demands. It is a bitter pill for them to swallow and it is one which debilitates the imperialist system. It is a great aid to the peoples of the third world and the communists in the second world who can use the possibilities offered by this weakness. It also makes possible the vacillation of these disgruntled imperialists towards the international united front against superpower hegemonism. This is good for the world's peoples.

For communists in Britain therefore, the world situation greatly affects the political struggle against the British imperialist bourgeoisie. In this intense political situation Marxist-Leninists in the second world can see two possible forms which the coming war will take. The first possibility is that of superpower war and the second possibility is that of a war of resistance to superpower aggression and hegemonism.

If we are to remain true to the interests of the proletariat worldwide we cannot assume a political position which ignores either of the possible forms the new war will take. No Marxist will indulge in prediction, empty crystal ball gazing, about the nature of the tasks that will confront us in due course. Nor can the class standpoint of the proletariat be weakened in any way. For the proletariat, the outlook on the oncoming war is determined by the need to raise proletarian politics high and seek an outcome detrimental to world imperialism and conducive to the proletariat taking power in more countries than before.

Of the two possibilities which are an extension of current politics we have this to say: one possibility is that the two superpowers may

embark on a war to annihilate each other as competitors and seek a post-war situation where one power dominates. This would be an inter-imperialist war and all those who allied themselves with the war aims of one or other power should be condemned and opposed. If such a war was to break out as a consequence of the political and economic struggle between the two superpowers our view in principle is to oppose both superpowers. Should, in the event of an inter-superpower war the British imperialist bourgeoisie weigh in on the side of US imperialism, we should be for the defeat of the British imperialist bourgeoisie and we should prepare the masses for turning the war into a revolutionary civil war. We would be for taking power directly in contradiction to the British imperialist bourgeoisie and both superpowers.

If however the more aggressive superpower, Soviet social imperialism were to invade or threaten Europe with invasion while US imperialism chose not to act, we would have to take a different view. Such a war would be the extension of Soviet global strategy and people's resistance to that strategy in a situation where the other superpower considers itself too weak to act. As with the first example this possibility is a consequence of present day politics. In such a situation, where British imperialism resists the Soviet threat we should see such resistance as just. To see otherwise, and perhaps brand such struggle as inter-imperialist and unjust, would be to comply with the imperialist aims of Soviet social imperialism and to strengthen it in its bid for power against the other superpower. In this case failure to unite with the struggle against Soviet social imperialism by British imperialism would amount to complicity in the inter-imperialist struggle. So our task at that time would be to call for a just war of national resistance.

These possibilities do not fall from the sky. They are as real as the political and economic struggles that are now unfolding before us. The war itself may go through stages and may be judged differently at one part from what it would be at another. This was the case with World War Two. All we can say is that it is necessary for us to be ideologically, politically and organisationally prepared for either possibility. It is wrong for us to prepare for one and not for the other. We will certainly be caught on the hop if we are not so prepared. The war may involve both things at different stages. How can we be dogmatic about this problem? Preconceptions both of the "Left" and the Right will certainly harm our struggle.

THE POSITION OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

The economic and political situation for British imperialism is not good. It is cringing under economic competition from the US, Germany and Japan and to a growing extent from Soviet social imperialism. The third world is less open to British imperialism since it lost most of its spheres of influence to the US. What remains of its sources of raw materials and areas of capital export exists on the sufferance of US imperialism in return for political favours and military alliance. Soviet social imperialism in Africa is expanding rapidly and US imperialism will certainly make the going harder for British imperialism as it finds the going harder for itself. In this situation more vigorous second world powers (especially France) take matters into their own hands by acting independently of the US. But they do not have the strength to seriously

challenge Soviet intentions. The Soviet Union is calling the shots in Africa. Its real intention is to exhaust the US and other imperialisms so that it can press more firmly its demands in Europe. It also intends to cut the supply lines of Europe from Africa and the Middle East. All this testifies to the fact that Soviet social imperialism is the expanding power.

How does British imperialism look at the contemporary world situation? Once an important power in the world, it is now reduced to the position of being at the whim of greater forces. Imperialism is never reconciled to the fate of taking second place but when up against it declining imperialism will choose the course of survival rather than extinction. So British imperialism makes compromises with all forces stronger than itself. Thus it allies itself with US imperialism and appeases Soviet social imperialism. It also gives way to some limited degree to the third world countries' just demands for equality. We are against British imperialist reliance on the US and appeasement of the Soviet threat. We are for, and want more of British imperialist conciliation with the third world. The third world is the mainforce against the superpowers and its peoples are our class brothers with whom we seek iron ties. In the course of our struggles against British imperialism we will find it possible to strengthen the British imperialist bourgeoisie's struggle against the superpowers and force it to make more retreats in the sphere of exploitation of the third world. This is what we mean by struggling *"to make the British imperialist bourgeoisie line up with the countries of the third world in the international united front"* (Manifesto B13)

THE WAR THREAT AND THE BRITISH IMPERIALIST BOURGEOISIE

As far as war is concerned we Marxist-Leninists are firstly opposed to it and secondly not afraid of it. The people's cause is not the root of war. It is the exploitation, oppression and fierce competition of imperialism that gives rise to wars in the modern day. We have no fear of the war inevitably imposed on us by the imperialists because the people's forces are rising and will be victorious using all means necessary. Socialism and communism is in the final analysis the cause of the vast majority of the people. We take our stand on war therefore from the revolutionary viewpoint of the world proletariat. We know that the future is ours regardless of what the imperialists may throw at us in their last hours. As a matter of fact, we cannot deter them from making war by appealing to them with reasoned arguments. Many have tried this before and perished in the terror that they have not prepared against. Chile is such an example. Chamberlain's Munich manoeuvres are a very notable example. For there is only one thing that the imperialists will respect. That thing is the armed preparedness of the people. Only one thing will stay the hands of the warmongers and that is the fear of defeat! The masses of the people are different. Their interest lies in peace and reason. That is why socialism and communism provides the way out of war. But we cannot deal with the imperialist gangsters as if they were members of the people. Soviet social imperialism is the most dangerous imperialist gangster in the world today. Did the new Tsars relent when Dubcek practised sweet reason towards Brezhnev in 1968? Of course not. The

logic of the Soviet global strategy is one which can only be met with armed force. This is not "warmongering" as Birch claims. It is recognition of the fact that we can only deal with the imperialists by matching our power against theirs. They will certainly gain the cheapest victory over us if we do otherwise. We love peace and are ready to fight for it! What else can we say when the Soviets with their "detente" song going at full blast, rattle the most offensive ironware against us?

The Marxist-Leninist approach to war is to support just wars and oppose unjust wars. Pacifism plays no part in communist thinking both before and in the course of all wars. For example, in World War One, communists opposed the unjust inter-imperialist war to redivide world spheres of influence with the slogan of revolutionary defeatism. Revolutionary defeatism means working for the defeat of ones "own" imperialist bourgeoisie and preparing the masses for revolutionary civil war. During World War Two, communists supported the just war aims of the allies for total defeat of German fascist imperialism and the Axis powers. They agitated for opening up the Second Front - for the invasion of Europe by Anglo-American forces. The fact that only the imperialist chieftains Eisenhower and Churchill could organise such an invasion, did not change the fact that it was a just demand, in the interests of the revolution and the peoples of the world. The fact is that communist parties of Britain and other countries did not grasp the revolutionary possibilities that the world front against the German fascists and the Japanese fascists, gave them. They were somewhat akin to the Right opportunists who though grasping the need for an International United Front against the main enemies, deny the leading role of the proletariat, its independent, flexible policies which see unity as a relative and necessary thing for certain objectives but which shun "gentlemen's agreements" and implicit trust in the treacherous imperialist bourgeoisie which it is necessary to unite with in the above conditions. At the same time it is absolutely necessary to struggle with the bourgeoisie. That was the error of the parties concerned. It does not refute the correctness of the demand for a Second Front at that time.

As regards the "Left", let them be as "pure" as they like. Let them be more pure than Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung. They are not proletarian politicians likely to lead the proletarian revolution, but sectarian simpletons. The working class will not and cannot pay enduring heed to their idealist and metaphysical notions. They can only remain a sect or a number of sects. We cannot entirely prevent them being so. However, those comrades under their influence should study the history of socialist revolution and Marxism-Leninism so that they may be able to purge out of themselves the fallacies that their leaders impose. What more can we say? Pacifism, even when expressed in the most militant words is a dangerous corrosive.

As far as the British bourgeoisie is concerned its view on the forthcoming war is different. It is not opposed to war but it is afraid of it. Thus it made some concessions to the superpowers war preparations and attempts to wish reality away. It relies heavily on NATO but appeases the Soviet social imperialists. Nothing is certain about the current situation

for the British imperialist bourgeoisie. It is too weak to oppose the superpowers consistently and fears the anger of both of them. It has chosen the wise path of unity with other European imperialist powers in the EEC, but fears their domination within the alliance. British imperialism is a cat on hot bricks. Should we demand that they stand up more firmly to the superpowers? Should we expose and oppose the squirming of British imperialism in this situation? We certainly should do these things.

Does this amount to support for British Imperialism? To a certain extent it does. But it is support for that part of British Imperialism which can be made to oppose superpower hegemonism and war. And such "support" can only be forthcoming in a situation where the communists have the right to independence of action and where the masses are given weapons to resist the war threat and carry through the necessary resistance. The British Imperialist bourgeoisie are unlikely to behave themselves in the international united front so we must be vigilant and ready to struggle against them and impose to the greatest extent proletarian leadership within the international united front. The stage we are at is for a socialist revolution. Through the twists and turns of many struggles the proletariat of Britain will aim to firmly seize state power.

We are very weak at present and we are accumulating strength. Is this approach invalid because we are weak? No. We shall better accumulate strength in a situation where the nation resists aggression than in one where we are enslaved.

The British imperialist bourgeoisie is afraid of the coming war and is choosing a policy of appeasement. There are contradictions within the British imperialist bourgeoisie on the question of the Soviet threat - the social democrats (Labour Party) are more for appeasement and the Tories are more for resistance. But on the whole Britain has yet to take a clear stand against the superpowers.

REVISIONISM AND THE THREAT OF WAR

We are most concerned here with the matter of revisionism in the Marxist-Leninist movement. The greatest danger is the "Left" revisionist tendency which follows the errors of the Party of Labour of Albania. For some time the "Left" revisionists have opposed preparation of the masses against the war threat. On the oppressed nations, they have objectively opposed the Leninist theory of stages of the revolution in those countries oppressed by imperialism. They have objectively taken a trotskyist line in denying the need for the proletariat and peasantry to ally with the national bourgeoisie against imperialism. They are repeating the long exposed views of Trotsky on the role of the national bourgeoisie in the colonial territories. Stalin exposed Trotsky's erroneous views on the Chinese, Persian and Turkish revolutions in 1927:

"What is the fundamental position from which the Comintern and the Communist Parties generally approach the problems of the revolutionary movement in colonial and dependent countries?"

It is strict differentiation between revolution in imperialist countries, countries that oppress other peoples, and revolution in colonial and dependent countries, countries that suffer from the imperialist oppression of other states. Revolution in imperialist countries

is one thing: in those countries the bourgeoisie is the oppressor of other peoples; it is counter-revolutionary in all stages of the revolution; the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is absent in these countries. Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing; in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states is one of the factors of revolution; this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie, at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national bourgeoisie, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor. Not to make this differentiation, not to understand this difference and to identify revolution in imperialist countries with revolution in colonial countries, is to depart from the road of Marxism, from the road of Leninism, and adopt the road of those who support the Second International." (The International Situation and the Defence of the USSR - Aug. I 1927")

Now under the banner of upholding Stalin, these "Left" revisionists repeat Trotsky's rantings holding up the main contradiction in the oppressed nations as that between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Albanian comrades have much to answer for in their misleadership of many "Leftist" comrades. On the question of war, the "Leftists" do not take the threat seriously and practice pacifism. This is a profound error. Under cover of all kinds of revolutionary phrases they practice bourgeois appeasement of imperialism and seek to imbue the masses with a spirit of fear and forboding. Pessimism on the world struggle is their stock in trade. For all the ills of the world they put forward only intoxicating phrases and stupefying defeatism. They deny the possibility of alliance of the proletariat with weak imperialisms from the point of view of "principle". Counterposing Lenin and Stalin to Mao Tsetung they deny the living essence of Leninism. Were they alive in 1939, they would certainly have been mixed up with Trotsky's "Fourth International".

It is inevitable that there should also be Right opportunism on these questions. So inexperienced is our movement that there are always at these times large numbers of deviations to both the "Left" and Right. The Rightists objectively deny the principal contradiction in all imperialist nations. The contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is that principal contradiction. The Rightists downgrade the struggle for socialist revolution to the point of merely upholding the democratic rights and living standards of the masses. What seems to be theoretically weak about both "Left" and Right deviations is their un-Marxist practice on the relationship of class and nation in the world today.

CLASS AND NATION IN THE MODERN WORLD

Comrade Mao Tsetung has said:- *"In the final analysis, national struggle is a matter of class struggle."*

Does this mean nation and class is the same thing? Of course not. Nor is national struggle the equivalent of class struggle. It is in the final analysis that national struggle gives way to class struggle. It is in the third world that at present national struggle and class struggle are closely bound together. Here it is absolutely necessary to distinguish bet-

ween the relation of class and nation in the oppressed nations (third world) and class and nation in the oppressor nations (first and second worlds). Lenin said in 1913:

"In every modern nation there are two nations"

Why did he carefully use the word "modern"? This is to distinguish between those nations ripe for socialist revolution and those yet to come to the stage of socialist revolution. In the third world with the exception of the socialist countries, the national question is still unresolved. Although divisions between rich and poor are evident in the oppressed nations, the whole national development of these nations is restricted by imperialism. And this affects all classes. National development is essential to these countries to make progress. The interests of the proletariat and the oppressed masses lies, at this stage, with the struggle for freedom from imperialism. Thus the whole nation requires a vigorous anti-imperialist struggle and the national democratic revolution is the stage that such countries are at. When this stage is realised to some extent, it then befalls the proletarian forces to push further forward the class struggle to the detriment of some forces which would have supported the demands of the previous phase, but which inevitably resists revolutionary struggle. All these things are determined by national conditions, assessable mainly by the forces concerned.

The world revolution, as a series of interconnected revolutions, goes forward as nation after nation accomplishes its national tasks and comes closer to putting the socialist revolution on the agenda. For the oppressor nations the socialist revolution is already on the agenda and it remains for the proletariat in those countries to accumulate sufficient strength to make this historic change.

So what of class and nation in the imperialist countries of the first and second worlds? First it must be said that the question of the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is foremost. Even though in many imperialist countries there is a burning national question (i.e. the Soviet Union and the oppressed nationalities, US and the question of the Afro-Americans, Germany divided into two, Canada and the Quebec question Britain and Ireland, etc.) it cannot in any case be said that the national question presides over the question of socialist revolution. In all these cases socialist revolution is the best resolution of the national question. Unlike the oppressed nations, national struggle is a secondary form. In short, national struggle in these countries is not a stage that the revolution must go through. Capitalism, far from solving such problems, makes them worse (e.g. Britain and Ireland) but national tasks are basically completed in these countries and national life, ensuring the fullest development of capitalism, is a fact. This is not true of the oppressed nations which are only awakening to national life. In these countries the development of capitalism is retarded by the overbearing interest of foreign imperialism. That is the main distinction to be made.

So our attitude to the defence of national sovereignty in Britain is entirely different from that question when it arises in the third world. Whereas in the third world it is absolutely necessary to ally with the

national bourgeoisie as a class in the struggle against imperialist oppression, in Britain such a question only arises in the situation where the imperialist bourgeoisie stands in the way of the global strategy for domination of one of the superpowers and does not ally with the other superpower for its strategic aims. At all times the need for struggle against the bourgeoisie presides over the tactical value of uniting with the bourgeoisie against the superpowers. This tactical value of unity is related to the advantages to the international proletarian struggle worldwide and its precise value rests with the weakening of world imperialism that can be achieved with such unity. This weakening of world imperialism mainly is a general weakening, affecting different struggles in different nations differently. But nonetheless it is an advantage which all proletarians can take advantage of to some extent.

In the third world unity between the proletariat and oppressed peoples on the one hand and the national bourgeoisie and leading figures is strategic in nature. It is impossible there for advances to be made without such strategic alliance for reasons already given.

The theory of the differentiation of the world into three parts elaborated by Comrade Mao is a strategic concept. Is this at variance with the view that possibilities of unity with the imperialist bourgeoisie of Britain is a tactical one? Not at all. The world strategy of the communists embraces a cool estimation of all the basic contradictions in the contemporary world. It embraces the specific conditions of struggle in all the countries of the world. It is an accurate Leninist guide to all the forces of the world clearly showing who are friends (the workers, oppressed peoples and nations), who are enemies (the superpowers) and who may become friends in the course of struggle. (the lesser imperialist powers). It is a living concrete analysis and not an abstract dogma which can only be held out of blind faith. As such it embraces a whole series of possibilities in different countries. Strategies are like that if they are to be of use to the proletariat. Analysing concretely the conditions in the second world we see the truth that it is the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie which is the leading and decisive one. So we recognise that the possibilities of uniting with the British imperialist bourgeoisie depend on the strength of the proletariat and that unity can only be conditional. "Our" bourgeoisie will play a positive role only in certain conditions and it will certainly vacillate wildly under pressure. If we view our tasks tactically on a national scale, we can realise the strategic value of Britain as a nation of the International United Front. To do otherwise would be to dissolve our forces in favour of the British imperialist bourgeoisie - this would let the British imperialist bourgeoisie have its head. In these circumstances it would almost certainly play the traitor's role and capitulate to the aggressors. What good would that do to the International United Front? So the world strategy is best realised by us taking a tactical approach to the question.

All this means that the proletariat should take the lead in the national struggle against superpower hegemonism. That is how things stand as regards class and nation in Britain.

COMBINE LEGAL AND ILLEGAL WORK

Genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain are achieving greater clarity and confidence in the struggle to unite and reconstitute the Communist Party. Inevitably we've had to pay attention to such practical questions as revolutionary security, bourgeois legality, and combining legal and illegal work. In the past, in the days when small groups reigned supreme, hardly any serious consideration could be given to these matters. But those days are definitely numbered. As Party-building work advances we will have to pay a lot more attention to these questions.

Revolutionary security is vital in Party-building. It is an essential part of democratic centralism and of the RCL's whole style of work. For one thing, communism and the Communist Party are essentially illegal even in a bourgeois Parliamentary 'democracy' such as Britain. Parliamentary 'democracy' is a disguise for the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. This is true even in the 'freest' and most 'democratic' of times. One thing is certain. If the capitalist state is not attacking the communists today then it is systematically preparing to attack them tomorrow or the day after. Consequently the RCL can never rely on bourgeois 'legality' for its existence. It must rely instead on the working class. This should be our starting point.

The question of security is first and foremost an ideological question; it is part of the irreconcilable struggle between Marxism and revisionism which is focused on the central question of all politics - state power. In the struggle to formulate the correct line on security we must practice Marxism not revisionism and step by step overcome all vestiges of sectarian, small group mentality in our methods of thinking and methods of work.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tsetung, generalised the whole history of the class struggle in the Marxist analysis of the state. The state is the special apparatus of force, of violence, for the suppression of one class by another. All states are class dictatorships. The destruction, the smashing up of the capitalist state by the working class, the establishment of its own state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is the first step in the emancipation of society from capitalism and the building of socialism. An indispensable condition for the victory of the working class is its organisation and especially the organisation of its vanguard party, the leading detachment of the proletariat which has the clarity and will to lead the way forward.

IS COMMUNISM REALLY LEGAL?

What of bourgeois democracy and legality? They are a sham.

The capitalist ruling class always and everywhere exercises its dictatorship over the working class through a combination of dual tactics - repression and deception. And nowhere with more sophistication than in Britain where the ruling class, despite its senility, is still a master of the carrot and the stick. At home the imperialist ruling class still practices bourgeois democracy. In other words the capitalist dictatorship is maintained through the parliamentary form of state, relying heavily on deception, not an open, fascist form of state. But what does all this 'democracy' amount to? What do the freedom of speech and of assembly, freedom to organise, strike and vote actually add up to? They amount to

the "best political shell for capitalism" as Lenin put it. Bourgeois democracy is the proverbial velvet glove which hides the iron fist - the real state power - the armed forces, police and secret police, jails, courts and judiciary. Throughout all its wheelings and dealings this ruling class has never, for one single moment, ceased to strengthen and perfect its repressive state apparatus. For example there was the drastic reorganisation of the police force in the early 1970s; the arming of the police; the training of the army in 'low intensity operations' at home the increase in police army co-operation; the existence of the SAS, SPG, DII squad etc. The 'unexplained' death of 169 people in custody since 1972. Police pogroms in Lewisham and elsewhere. The zealous enforcement of of racist immigration laws and the Prevention of Terrorism Act; the prospect of identity cards, etc, are common knowledge and serve as a reminder of what the state is really about. Nevertheless, bourgeois illusions remain a strong force inside the working class. For generations the social democrats and the revisionists have been used to peddle reformism and orthodox trade unionism and divert the class struggle away from revolution. Our revisionists (mainly the CPGB) come in all manner of guises and disguises but whatever their particular brand-name, they all push bourgeois ideology and revise the revolutionary essence out of communism. Revisionism preaches the permanence, inherent democracy and superiority of one form of capitalist state or another. It negates the dictatorship of the proletariat, liquidates the Party and mass line. It preaches the gospel of reform and class collaboration. The revisionists, along with the trotskites and all other varieties of opportunism wallow in bourgeois legality, are organised accordingly and have no need for revolutionary security. They are legal.

But how can the capitalist state ever really regard communism and the communist party as legal? The party's very existence is a declaration of war on capitalism - it openly proclaims that it is organised for the sole purpose of mobilising the masses to overthrow capitalism. Of course in Britain today such views are quite 'legal' and it is likely that the Party will enjoy at least a couple of years of nominal 'legality' too.

If the Party and communism are nominally 'legal', that is all part of the deception of the masses. And it is meant to lull some communists into a false sense of security, to dupe them into dropping their guard.

Lenin said in 1922: *In all the countries even the freest, 'legal' and 'peaceful' in the sense that the class struggle is least acute in them, the time has fully matured when it is absolutely necessary for every Communist Party systematically to combine legal with illegal work, legal with illegal organisation. For in the most enlightened and free countries, those with the most 'stable' bourgeois-democratic system, the governments already, notwithstanding their false and hypocritical declarations, systematically resort to secret blacklists of Communists, to endless violations of their own constitutions in order to render semi-secret and secret support to the White Guards and to assassinations of Communists in all countries, to secret preparations for the arrest of Communists, to placing provocateurs among the Communists etc., etc. Only the most reactionary philistinism, no matter what beautiful 'democratic' and pacifist phrases it may be cloaked in, can deny this fact, of the imperative conclusion that follows from it, viz., that it is necessary, immediately for all legal Communist Parties to form illegal organisations for preparing for the moment when the bourgeoisie resorts to persecution."*

Lenin's warning was to prove correct, 'even' in Britain. The CPGB leadership was arrested six months prior to the General Strike in 1926. This was a major factor in the enormous tactical defeat the working class suffered in that period. Throughout the thirties communists and anti-fascists were systematically persecuted. The out-standing communist veteran, Tom Mann, was dragged before the courts and imprisoned on several occasions. Mike Kane, the communist leader of the Harworth miners, along with ten other comrades was imprisoned for leading the strike there in 1938. In 1940 the state banned the 'Daily Worker', but under William Rusts' direction, a secret chain of printing presses had already been established throughout the country to produce the daily 'Industrial and General Information'. Then there was the imprisonment of the three Kent mineworkers' leaders in 1942, and of Ted Dickens and his six colleagues during the London Docks struggle in 1951. All this will shade into insignificance compared to what the bourgeoisie has in store when the revolutionary storm begins to break in Britain.

The bourgeoisie is class conscious and far-sighted. It is aware of its insoluble economic and political crisis and the inevitable emergence of a revolutionary working class. The deepening crisis of imperialism and the intensification of the class struggle at home will impel the bourgeoisie to find new ways of ruling, to discard the facade of democracy and systematically introduce ever more fascistic measures. The imminence of war between the superpowers can only serve to accelerate the militarisation and fascisation of the British state. Consequently whether the party is nominally 'legal' or not, it masters all methods of work, legal and illegal, open and secret, peaceful and finally armed, to educate and lead the class in the revolutionary struggle for power. Even under the most 'democratic' condition the Party keeps much of its organisation hidden. All work is organised on the basis of democratic centralism and a strict division of labour. Democratic centralism is strengthened.

But the Communist Party must never become a conspiratorial sect. If that ever happened it would cease to be the Communist Party in every single sense. While perfecting its own illegal, hidden apparatus, the Party must always act upon the leading role of the working class, and rely on the working class. For one thing, Party organisation begins in the factories, mines and docks etc. It is here at the point of production that exploitation takes place, where the basis for all round class struggle is most firm and where the class is at its best. It is here that Communist propaganda, agitation and organisation are most effective, and most safe. Communists need to be like fish in water, to use Mao Tsetung's descriptive phrase. The mass line is the only correct line, in security as with every thing else.

Communists and the working class are not indifferent to whether the bourgeois state uses parliamentary 'democracy' or fascism. Firstly, even the limited freedoms that do exist under bourgeois democracy have been won by the workers in bitter class struggle. The ruling class has made concessions partly out of cunning but also out of fear. Secondly, the working class will fight tooth and nail to defend the limited rights it has won. Furthermore only communists can lead the anti-fascist struggle, expose the essence of the capitalist state, and actually transform the struggle into one for state power and real democracy.

Brazen revisionism and social democracy are relatively easy for us to see through and combat. But in the practice of building the party we continuously come up against vestiges of bourgeois ideology in our own thinking and methods of work which require vigilance to combat. Small group mentality and the circle spirit are objectively characteristics of revisionism. Even the best small groups cannot act upon the leading role of the working class or implement the mass line. The small groups do not usually implement democratic centralism and overcome amateurism and liberalism in organisation. Hence, the characteristic disregard for security, the open discussion of internal matters over the phone or in places where there should be no discussion. And so, even the best small groups despite their avowed opposition to revisionism and the bourgeois dictatorship in practice frequently rely on bourgeois legality for their continued existence. On the other hand, some become totally impotent conspiratorial sects which in trying to hide from the state actually become completely hidden from the working class.

THE BOURGEOISIE ARE TRYING TO KEEP COMMUNISM UNDER CONTROL!

According to the official '1975-76 Supply Estimates', the amount "required in the year ending March 31, 1976, for Her Majesty's foreign and other secret services" was £22 million; but in all probability the amount spent on all secret services is over £30 million this current year. The Special Branch and MI5, along with local CIDs, routinely collect information on 'left' organisations. Every communist should know that at some time or another he or she is under surveillance. Telephone tapping intercepting correspondence, photographing demonstrations and the like, keeping tabs on revolutionaries, especially those in any type of leading positions, are routine for the state agencies. Information is compiled, checked and double checked.

And so, at this early stage of building the party communists are duty bound to pay serious attention to security. First and foremost, communists must break out of their relative isolation from the masses. We need to sink deep and permanent roots in the working class, implement the mass line in all our work on security.

A constant flow of advanced workers into our ranks, plus a solid base among the working masses, is the surest guarantee that the bourgeoisie will not be able to destroy the communist party we are building. This is the first task in developing the correct line on security. Secondly, we must begin to combine legal with illegal work, strengthen democratic centralism, maximise efficiency and discipline and minimise the amount of information leaked to the state. Temporary expedients should not be put above the long term interests of the Party and the revolution.

In conditions of bourgeois dictatorship and the inevitable intensification of that dictatorship, the future Communist Party will have to be prepared to defend itself and lead the class struggle in all conditions, including fascism and war. In a very real sense, preparations must start now.

By fighting revisionism and struggling to overcome all vestiges of small group mentality we will develop security consciousness, heighten vigilance and lay secure foundations for the Party.

REFUTE THE RIGHT OPPORTUNIST LINE IN PARTY BUILDING

The following statements, "Draft Organisational Line for Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting" and "Joint Communiqué of 15th July, 1978" were published jointly by the Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist) and the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League of Britain. They contain serious right opportunist political and organisational proposals.

The RCL is publishing these documents alongside its criticism of them in the interests of the two-line struggle in the Marxist-Leninist movement.

DRAFT ORGANISATIONAL LINE FOR MARXIST-LENINIST CONSULTATIVE MEETING PROPOSED BY THE WORKERS' PARTY OF SCOTLAND (MARXIST-LENINIST) AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

Upholding Chairman Mao's scientific theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds, in order to implement the agreed general line for a Broad United Front to oppose the Soviet social imperialist menace and US hegemony; to defend national independence, democratic rights and civil liberties; to defend and enhance living standards; and thus advance the cause of socialist revolution; the dictatorship of the proletariat and communism, it is decided:

(I) to unite all Marxist-Leninists in a single proletarian vanguard party based upon democratic centralism; and taking into account the peculiar features of Britain as a multi-national state.

(II) as a first step in the process of unification of the Marxist-Leninists, to establish a leading central organ based upon democracy, to set up a provisional Central Committee of the Party, consisting of leading cadres from the Marxist-Leninist groups and organisations which accept the general line, on the basis of equality and implementing the principles "Unite all those who can be united" and in the course of struggle win unity with other Marxist-Leninists outside the Party. The

provisional Central Committee will have a Convenor. It shall meet at least once in three months.

(III) to establish a Central Secretariat from among the Provisional Central Committee, for organising and co-ordinating all the political, ideological and organisational work as well as mass work of the Party. The Secretariat shall meet at least once a month. The P.C.C. Convenor shall also convene the Secretariat meetings. Between P.C.C. meetings the Secretariat shall issue public statements and internal directives for all the constituent organisations;

(IV) the Secretariat shall publish a monthly or bi-monthly theoretical journal as well as other propaganda and agitational material;

(V) in co-operation with available cadre the Secretariat shall organise investigations for evolving specific policies for class struggle against monopoly capital on:

(a) Reconstruction and democratisation of the state machine at central, national and local level for maximum participation of the people to organise national and civil defence;

(b) to strengthen national unity by recognising and implementing the right of self-determination including the formation of independent states of the four main nations in the U.K. - English, Scots, Irish and Welsh - by establishing democratic self-government, with the direct participation of the people, and a central federal government, thus eliminating all forms of national oppression and discrimination against national minorities;

(c) for the reconstruction and all-round expansion of the national economy to meet the requirements of national defence and welfare of the people, to overcome inflation, unemployment and stagnation of production;

(d) for the democratisation of industrial, agricultural and commercial enterprises with working class control over investment, production, sale, allocation of profits and wages;

(e) for the defeat of bureaucracy and social-fascist disruption of the trade unions, to defend and enhance the democratic rights of the members;

(f) to defend and enhance democratic liberties, civil and human rights, by combating government and other official racist policies and fascist-racist organisations and protecting national, religious and racial minorities.

(g) on equality for women in all fields of social and domestic life;

(h) on democratisation of education in the interests of national defence and the welfare of the people;

(i) for building revolutionary organisations of students and youth;

(j) for strengthening the economic, political and military unity of European peoples and countries including the E.E.C. and other second world countries on the basis of independence and equality and mutual respect of all countries and non-interference in their internal affairs and by opposing superpower hegemony;

(k) to strengthen unity with the Third World by recognising the independence and state sovereignty of all countries and establishing relations with them on the basis of equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in each others affairs, while supporting national

liberation movements, their struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, zionism, and hegemonism; to support the struggle for establishing a new international economic order which recognises the sovereign right of all peoples to be master of their national resources and fruits of their labour;

(I) upholding Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought and proletarian internationalism to establish close relations of unity with fellow Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations of other countries, in particular with the correct Communist Party of China led by comrade Hua Kuo-feng, on the basis of equality and mutual support and non-interference in each others' internal affairs;

(VI) on the basis of the experience of concrete struggle on the mass fronts as well as inner-party struggle over a period of time to draft a basic programme, tactical and organisational line and Constitution of the Party, and organise thorough-going discussion among all members;

(VII) on the basis of the above, to convene a Central Congress for the adoption of the above documents and election of central organs of the Party, and thus reconstitute the proletarian vanguard party of the working class.

Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League
Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist)

JOINT COMMUNIQUE OF 15TH JULY, 1978

ISSUED BY

THE WORKERS' PARTY OF SCOTLAND (MARXIST-LENINIST) AND
THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

The spokesman of the Workers' Party of Scotland (Marxist-Leninist) and the Revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist League of Britain met together in the second week of July 1978 in Glasgow to exchange views on the present tasks of the British working class and peoples to meet the Soviet social imperialist threat to the independence and sovereignty of Britain and the world war menace posed by the new Czars in the Kremlin.

The two Marxist-Leninist organisations, through comprehensive discussion in a comradesly spirit, found themselves in complete agreement Chairman Mao's scientific theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is the strategic guide for the international proletariat and oppressed peoples in their road of social advance to safeguard national independence against the hegemony of the two superpowers, particularly Soviet social imperialism the most dangerous source of world war and the main enemy of the world's people at the present time.

The two organisations reaffirmed that, Chairman Mao, the greatest Marxist of our times, who has applied, defended and developed the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, has bequeathed this theory to mankind as a powerful weapon which is based upon objective analysis of the fundamental contradictions of the contemporary world and the changes in them in accordance with Lenin's theses on the present era of imperialism and proletarian revolution; that the uneven development of imperialist countries inevitably leads them to the redivision of the world by means of war, and that, as imperialism has divided the whole world into oppressor and oppressed nations, the international proletariat must fight in unity with the oppressed nations and thus march forward to its historic mission.

In the contemporary world adherence to, and implementation of, Chairman Mao's Three Worlds theory is the touch-stone to distinguish genuine Marxist-Leninists from modern revisionists of all types - not only the Soviet modern revisionists but all the social fascist parties including the so-called 'Eurocommunists' and especially the 'super-revolutionaries' (led by the renegade Hoxha) who, by donning a very 'revolutionary' mask and pretending that they make no distinctions between the two superpowers in fact serve the Soviet social imperialists. While posing as the heirs of Lenin and Stalin, they distort and debase the latter's teachings and have become Trotskyites in the garb of 'Marxist-Leninists', joining the Soviet-led attack on the great revolutionary bastion of socialism, the People's Republic of China.

The two organisations stated that it is the basic programmatic task of Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations to fight for the broadest

Nor is it without significance that the Vietnamese authorities have been supporting social imperialism's expansionist policies for quite some time. They supported Indira Gandhi's fascist regime and its declaration of emergency for intensifying the exploitation and oppression of the Indian people - the same regime which acted as an instrument of Soviet hegemony when it intervened in East Pakistan and grabbed Sikkim. For a mess of pottage, military aid and other material the Vietnamese revisionists, like the Cuban mercenaries, have for some time been selling out to social imperialism but the heroic Vietnamese people who did not liberate their country from U.S. imperialism in order to hand it over to social imperialism are sure to defeat such reactionary plots.

The two organisations expressed their full support for the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Azania in their protracted and complex armed struggle and efforts to unite the people's forces on the basis of self-reliance against the racist regimes of southern Africa and the defeat of neo-colonialist schemes. Both organisations demanded that the British government side clearly with African democracy and against white racism by extending full moral and material support to the popular forces of these countries.

They further expressed their full support for the struggle of the Palestinian and other Arab peoples against zionism and superpower manipulation for the regaining of their lands and national rights.

The two organisations also declared their confidence in the correct policy, at home and abroad, of the People's Republic of China led by the Communist Party headed by comrade Hua Kuo-feng. Adhering to Chairman Mao's revolutionary line in the course of the struggle against the Gang of Four, the people of China are sure to build their country into a powerful modern state by the end of the century while never becoming a superpower, and thus make a still greater contribution to humanity.

The two organisations acknowledge with profound gratitude and admiration the great positive effect which these and other heroic struggles of the peoples of the world have on the situation and tasks confronting them and vow to do their utmost to lead the British working class and its allies in taking up their fighting tasks.

"Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!"

LETTER OF THE RCLB TO WPS-ML AND PARTICIPATING ORGANISATIONS

MARXIST-LENINIST CONSULTATIVE MEETING

9-10TH SEPTEMBER 1978

Dear Comrades,

In a letter of 17th July the WPS repeated a proposal from the NCG that each participating organisation should prepare and circulate a statement outlining their position on the question of Marxist-Leninist unity to other participants in advance of the meeting.

We welcome the increased attention to the need for unity in the Marxist-Leninist movement and the need for serious discussion and debate between Marxist-Leninist organisations. At the same time it is only inevitable that in the course of such exchanges certain organisations should for a time put forward views that others consider to be seriously incorrect and harmful to building the genuine revolutionary Communist Party of the working class. To clarify our position we wish in this letter to concentrate on what we see as serious federalist errors in the organisational proposals put forward by the WPSML and the RMLCL and serious right opportunist and even revisionist errors in the political line proposed by the WPSML and RMLCL as shown in their joint communique of 15 July 1978.

Before dealing with these two main points we will briefly re-iterate or clarify our position on some other issues.

We must repeat that while the proposals for a Marxist-Leninist consultative meeting was not inevitably federalist it contained grave dangers of federalism. This is being shown in practice. We cannot build the revolutionary Communist Party by uniting all those who call themselves Marxist-Leninists. We must in the first place attempt to unite the genuine Marxist-Leninists. Practice shows that in order to make real progress in unity on a principled basis there has to be a process of mutual selection, however much this may be represented as arrogance. The only unity that will live is unity that is built around a common ideological and political line among comrades whose record shows they will not indulge in individualism or small group mentality.

The range of views of those organisations invited to the consultative meeting is far too large for a principled unity that will live to be established in the immediate future. We would oppose slipping into a liberal proposal for further Marxist-Leninist consultative meetings (in the plural) with the same participants because such a proposal, however innocuously presented, would have slipped into setting up a federalist organisation.

We agree with the idea that there should be two representatives from each organisation at this forthcoming meeting and we hope they will be authoritative and leading comrades in each case. We criticise the

proposal that in addition other comrades can come as observers as ultra-democratic, liberal and impractical and which opens the door to the type of demagoguery which we have witnessed in the past.

Chairing: in the interests of orderly debate which will promote conditions in which unity can be strengthened around correct lines, we think that it important that the meeting is chaired firmly and wisely by an authoritative and mutually acceptable comrade. We have proposed Comrade X as a veteran communist from the organisation which convened this meeting.

Agenda: We understand that the proposed agenda is: Saturday morning, political line; Saturday afternoon, organisational proposals for Party-building; Sunday morning, discussion of practical work. We propose that the agenda deals only with political line and organisational line. It is clear that discussion will be centred around the line of the WPS-RMLCL's joint communique and joint organisational proposals. We see a danger of federalism if the meeting as constituted discusses practical work and also believe that the time should be made available instead for winning greater clarity on the political and organisational lines.

ORGANISATIONAL LINE ON PARTY BUILDING

The essence of the RCL's position on organisational steps to Party-building is that unity must be won around an agreed ideological and political line. That done, the comrades concerned must overcome any feelings of small-group mentality and unite in a single organisation practicing democratic centralism. That is the individual must be subordinated to the organisation, the minority is subordinate to the majority, the lower level is subordinate to the higher level and the entire membership is subordinate to the central committee. No organisational unity can live if it has skated round the need to win common thinking on major ideological and political issues and if it dodges the question of combating and guarding against small group mentality and individualism.

At present we are concentrating our efforts on winning unity with the Communist Workers Movement some time in 1979. In view of our limited resources we believe this is the best way decisively to speed up the movement towards Party-building round a correct ideological and political line. Both organisations are learning from each other and there has already been valuable progress.

The RCL does not rule out a unity committee of more than one organisation, similar to that organised by the October League before the founding of the CPML(US). But in accordance with our general line on unity we believe for such a committee not to stagnate in federalism it is essential that there are three preconditions: 1) that all participating organisations genuinely proceed from the desire for unity and have settled accounts with small-group mentality; 2) that all participating organisations already subscribe to a fairly substantial minimum level of ideological and political unity; 3) that there is an acknowledged centre of revolutionary leadership.

The RCL's views are put forward in more detail in recent issues of 'Revolution'. We ask comrades to study them and to support what is

correct in them and criticise what is wrong.

It is clear that the discussion at the Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting on organisational steps to Party-building will focus on the "Draft Organisational Line" proposed by the WPSML and the RMLCL. In our opinion this line is basically a federalist one and in practice will set up a federation. Here are some of the major points which we will try to elaborate at the Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting.

Firstly, the line does not put primary emphasis on winning strong unity around a correct ideological and political line. The opening preamble is a very minimum statement of line while paragraph (II) merely says that the new organisation will consist of all Marxist-Leninist groups and organisations "which accept the general line". The need to select which groups are to unite on the basis of ideological and political line and how trustworthy their past practice has been, is glossed over and it would be difficult to bar from the new organisation groups that have little real unity of political line and which have little real desire to settle accounts with small group mentality and individual individualism.

There is no statement about the crucial need to battle for conviction for the basic principles of democratic centralism against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualism. Paragraph II speaks of setting up a leading central organ (presumably a newspaper) "based upon democracy", not "based upon democratic centralism". The provisional Central Committee is to consist of leading cadres from the different Marxist-Leninist groups "on the basis of equality". This last phrase is a hallmark of federalism because it defends the special interests of the small groups by giving them equal representation. By contrast the only Central Committee that could be authoritative would be one that consisted of cadres who had proved to all their comrades their readiness to represent the interest not of one or another group but to represent the interests of the working class. A Central Committee as proposed by the WPS and the RMLCL could not have authority because authority cannot be conferred it can only be won. And if the Central Committee has not won its authority no participating organisation will have the conviction to apply the democratic centralist principle that the lower level must be subordinate to the higher level. The component organisations will not act like branches of a national organisation, subordinate to the Central Committee of that national organisation. Instead in practice they will act as component members of a federation. The leap from autonomous local small groups to subordinated branches is a qualitative leap that cannot be won by stealth - only by conscious struggle.

The rest of paragraphs II and III go on from this essentially federalist basis of the proposed organisation to talk of the setting up of a Convenor and a Secretariat. These proposals come close to looking like an authentic attempt to set up a Marxist-Leninist organisation but in the absence of having won a living unity around ideological and political line and in the absence of having won conviction for the proletarian principle of democratic-centralism against individualism and small-group mentality, these proposals will either be bureaucrat-centralist, if they succeed in being imposed, or if they crumble they will be shown to be a pious dressing on an essentially federalist foundation. Who

will be Convenor of the new organisation? The words on the page give him substantial powers, but without him having won the genuine confidence of all comrades taking part in the new organisation he will not have real authority. The dangers are great that he will be forced to give leadership either by commandism or by opportunist waffle and deals with certain constituent organisations lining up against others. In short a recipe for splits!

Similarly according to the words on the page, between Central Committee meetings the Secretariat "shall issue public statements and internal directives for all the constituent organisations" (our emphasis). In the absence of having won firm unity on ideological and political line and for the proletarian principles of democratic-centralism, how could this be accepted by the constituent organisations? Again it would be a recipe for endless splits and wrangles. It would be either bureaucratic centralist or pious. In practice we suspect pious, otherwise the new organisation would split very rapidly. That is why the organisational proposals from the WPS and RMLCL should be seen as fundamentally federalist although they contain other errors as well. In practice they are most likely to set up a new federation if they set up anything at all.

Paragraph V refers to a long list of investigations to be carried out before founding the Party. Of course it is necessary to carry out investigations and to test lines in practice diligently but once again we ask comrades to learn from the negative experience of federalism that many of the comrades now in the RCL have had in the past. There is a great danger of investigations being used as an excuse by those particularly infected with small-group mentality in a federation, to postpone forever the implementation of democratic-centralism. There is after all always more to be investigated. A crucial point in the WPS-RMLCL organisational proposals is that it is not stated clearly that all the constituent organisations of the proposed organisation will maintain their separate identity until all the investigations are completed. In practice every single constituent organisation will have a veto against going forward into a united democratic-centralist organisation. Everyone can agree to unite on the basis of investigations but not everyone can agree to unite on the basis of democratic-centralism. The truth is that federations are easy to get into and difficult to get out of. (Except by a split!)

Paragraphs V and VI speak about investigations and summing up experience but make a significant error of empiricism in failing to say that these activities must be guided by the universal principles of Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought. We must guard against both empiricism and dogmatism.

Lastly we wish to ask what name should be given to the proposed new organisation. If comrades address themselves to this question we think they will see the essentially federalist nature of the proposal.

We believe that the great majority of comrades who put forward this proposal are sincere in their desire for unity. We too desire unity and urge comrades to remember that unity that is won through yielding will perish; unity that is won through struggle will live.

POLITICAL LINE

Organisational unity must be based on unity around a correct ideological and political line. Comrades' thinking must be brought into line on major questions otherwise they can't march in step and win one victory after another. The organs of thought must be on parallel lines for the feet to march in step. Therefore to win unity of all genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain we must concentrate on winning unity around a correct ideological and political line which comes nearest to correctly integrating the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the British revolution.

In our opinion the Manifesto of the RCLB is at present the most advanced document in the British Marxist-Leninist movement in this respect. We urge all genuine Marxist-Leninists to declare their support for it where they think it correct and to draw lines of demarcation and make criticisms where they think it wrong. The Manifesto of the RCL is the best thing we have at present on the road to hammering out the Programme of the future Party. We say this not in a spirit of boasting: 90% of the "Manifesto" is the indirect experience of the international Communist movement and if the document is strong it is strong because we conscientiously tried to study that experience and integrate with the concrete conditions of the British revolution. Also the text was strengthened through much internal struggle and debate under the guidance of democratic-centralism. The principles and policies in the Manifesto must be tested and strengthened in practice. Where it is one-sided or where we come to agree it objectively makes an opportunist error this will be corrected through criticism and self-criticism. We ask fraternal Marxist-Leninists to play their part in this process.

As far as the Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting is concerned however, it is clear that the main focus of debate on the question of political line will center on the line of the joint communique of the WPSML and the RMLCL of 15th July 1978. For the sake of clarity and unity it is desirable that the consultative meeting should unfold orderly debate around this line in a manner which combines ideological struggle with ideological education.

While we appreciate that the majority of comrades who support the line of this communique are no doubt sincerely attempting the necessary task of integrating the theory of the three worlds with the concrete conditions of the class struggle in Britain we consider the line objectively makes a number of very serious right opportunist and even revisionist errors.

The central error is that it avoids the fact that the stage of revolution in Britain is that of socialist revolution and it denies that the principal contradiction in Britain is between the working class and the British imperialist bourgeoisie. By contrast the implicit line of the Communique (although it opportunistically evades saying so) is that the "stage" of the revolution in Britain is to struggle for national independence against the hegemonism of the two superpowers, and that the principal contradiction in Britain should be taken as that between the people of Britain and Soviet social-imperialism. In the international arena the line of the Communique implies that Soviet social-imperialism is the main enemy of the peoples of the world rather than the correct view of

the present situation that the two superpowers are the main enemies of the people of the world, with the Soviet Union the more dangerous of the two.

As Mao Tsetung argues in any complex situation in which there are many contradictions one of them plays the leading and decisive role. In Britain today does it really conform to facts to say that the contradiction between the people and Soviet social-imperialism plays the leading and decisive role? No. Events in Britain are not mainly determined by this contradiction. On the contrary, events are overwhelmingly determined rather by the contradiction between the British imperialist bourgeoisie and the working class. This is true in the international role that Britain plays too where the class nature of the British imperialist bourgeoisie determines that Britain plays a very servile role to both US imperialism and Soviet social imperialism while continuing to try to exploit and oppress the nations of the third world instead of allying with them against the two superpowers. Even from the point of view of international affairs alone we can change Britain's position to any significant degree only if we grasp decisively as the principal contradiction the contradiction between the working class and the British imperialist bourgeoisie.

Without doubt we must also pay attention to what is at present a secondary contradiction in Britain, that between the people of Britain and the two superpowers. The correct and dialectical way to integrate the struggle against the two superpowers with the struggle against the British monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie is under present circumstances to treat the struggle for independence from the two superpowers as one important aspect of the struggle for socialist revolution, as stated in section B11 of the Manifesto of the RCLB.

By contrast the Joint Communique of the WPS and RMLCL makes some serious right opportunist errors in the circumstances of Britain today. Section 1 para 5 states that "...it is the basic programmatic task of Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations to fight for the broadest possible united front of all political forces, all classes, organisations and individuals" (our emphasis), to oppose the hegemonist ambitions and plots of the two superpowers, in particular Soviet social-fascism. Later it is made clear that this united front is to be at the national as well as the international level. In other words, it is proposed to strive for a national united front which can include the imperialist bourgeoisie (and even organisations like the National Front). It would be a "left" opportunist error to exclude all possibility of alliance with some sections of the bourgeoisie under certain important conditions but to put this proposal now is a severe right opportunist error. While something along these lines might be arguable in the conditions of some second world countries (that is for the Marxist-Leninists in those countries to determine) it is quite wrong in the concrete conditions of Britain in which the imperialist bourgeoisie, although very decadent, is still one of the most powerful in the world. Such a proposal uses Marxist words in a revisionist manner which robs Marxism of its revolutionary class content. After such a statement (in Paragraph 5 of Section 1 of the Joint Communique), merely to say "And within this united front both at the international and national level, the proletariat must maintain its independence and initiative" so underplays the revolutionary role of proletarian class struggle as to be objectively making a revisionist error.

Section II of the Joint Communique lists some points in which the two organisations say the proletariat must "wage a struggle against monopoly capital for the defence of the living standards and democratic rights of the people". Yet even within the context of a proposed united front some of the formulations make such serious revisionist errors as to spread gross illusions among the working class about Marxism and which repeat classically revisionist positions.

How can we teach the working class to fight for the "reconstruction and democratisation of the state machine", (as it says in point a) rather than teaching them that the state machine must be smashed?

How can we suggest (as in point b) that all forms of national oppression can be eliminated under capitalism?

How can we imply (as in part c) that capitalism can expand the national economy and overcome unemployment and stagnation of production when we should be making clear that unemployment and stagnation are an inherent and inseparable part of the capitalist system, which can be overcome only when the capitalist system is overthrown by force?

How can we call (as in point d) for the democratisation of industrial enterprises and use notorious phrases about working class control over enterprises without throwing dust in the workers' eyes to blind them to the fact that there will be true democracy for the workers and true worker's control only when the working class holds state power as a class? This revisionist line embellished the reformist path and teaches that capitalism can be run in the interests of the working class.

How can point i) refer to the building of revolutionary and patriotic organisations of students and youth without referring first to revolutionary organisations of workers and to the need for all such organisations to be led by the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class?

All these errors rob Marxism of its revolutionary class content and serve instead the imperialist bourgeoisie.

In the next paragraph the demand is raised to "achieve relations of equality and mutual benefit" with US imperialism, a demand which in the present circumstances can only demobilise the working class from a militant and ruthless struggle against US hegemonism, as an enemy which it must fight along side its more major and immediate enemies of British imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism.

The following paragraph, after this, completely glosses over British imperialist exploitation of the Third World nations and the fact that we cannot build unity with these nations unless we struggle militantly against British imperialism as well as against superpower hegemonism. This is a social-chauvinist policy!

Similarly the sixth paragraph of section III ignores the fact that British imperialism (in alliance with US imperialism) is at present the main enemy of the Zimbabwean people and that the racist regimes of Southern Africa are agents of British and US imperialism.

To ignore this and merely call for the British government "to side clearly with African democracy and against white racism" prettifies the British imperialist bourgeoisie and objectively colludes in its exploita-

tion of the peoples of Southern Africa.

Certainly we must grasp the great strategic theory of the Three Worlds and strive hard to apply it to our own objective circumstances. But we do not agree that it is "the" touchstone (that is the only touchstone) to distinguish genuine Marxist-Leninists from modern revisionists of all types. We must not forget the class struggle in Britain while grasping the theory of the Three Worlds. We must combine the class struggle in Britain with the class struggle internationally.

We understand that comrades in the WPS would refer to Lenin's argument about the need to seek out forms of transition or approach to the socialist revolution, and imply that a national united front against the hegemony of the two superpowers, especially Soviet social-imperialism, is a desirable stage or substage on the road to socialist revolution. The passages in question appear to be found in Dimitrov's speech to the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International on the Fascist Offensive in 1935, in the section on the United Front Government (Red Star Press edition, August 1973, pages 97 and 98) and "Left-Wing Communism", Peking Edition pages 96 and 97. We should be ready to debate the lessons of these passages more fully at the Marxist-Leninist Consultative Meeting. At this stage we wish to point out that Dimitrov criticises *"The Right opportunists (who) have tried to establish a 'democratic intermediate stage' lying between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat for the purpose of instilling into the workers the illusion of a peaceful parliamentary passage from the one dictatorship to the other."* And Lenin's reference to "forms of transition" in "Left-Wing Communism" cannot be interpreted as an immediate stage. The theory of an intermediate stage between the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions is a revisionist theory! Furthermore, of particular relevance to us at this stage of party-building in Britain, Lenin's argument is in the context of his distinction between the two historical tasks (of winning the class conscious vanguard of the proletariat to the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and secondly, in being able to lead the masses to the new position that can ensure victory in the revolution). To attempt the five tactical manoeuvres needed in the second task before we have made a substantial amount of progress in the first task of building the Party with deep roots in the working class contains considerable dangers of right opportunism.

We were greatly concerned to see what we regard as serious right opportunist and even objectively revisionist positions adopted in the joint documents of the WPS and the RMLCL. Nevertheless errors can be corrected and be turned into good negative lessons. We hope all the genuine Marxist-Leninists involved in these errors will take our militant but comradely criticism in the spirit in which it is meant, and seriously review their political line.

Nevertheless, strongly as we would criticise the right opportunist nature of the political line of the WPS and RMLCL we hope that even if they still hold to it for the time being they will not persist with their organisational proposal which would confuse the movement with another almost certainly abortive attempt at federalism. If the WPS and the RMLCL continue to hold their political line the only principled organisational step for them to take is to proceed to unite together in a single democ-

atic-centralist organisation (together with any other group that holds the same political line) and dissolve their existing organisations. While we couldn't welcome such a step, it would provide the best conditions for all genuine members of the two organisations who have an open mind and a self-critical spirit to sum up experience and turn negative experience to good account.

Naturally however, we hope that all genuine Marxist-Leninists will repudiate both the federalist road in Party-building and the right opportunist deviation on the application of the theory of the Three Worlds.

In struggle for clarity and unity, with revolutionary greetings!

The Political Committee of the R.C.L.B.

CRITICISM OF A.C.W. SPLITTISM

The following letter from the Association of Communist Workers was published in a recent issue of "Revolutionary Zimbabwe" in the name of the Zimbabwe Solidarity Front. The RCLB has replied, refuting this criticism and criticising in turn the splittist attitude of the ACW. This reply follows the ACW's letter.

THE SAME OLD SHOP UNDER A NEW SIGNBOARD:

ON THE RESURRECTION OF THE LATE AND UNLAMENTED Z.S.C.

A new organisation under the name of the Zimbabwe Solidarity Campaign has stepped onto the stage with a great fanfare, promising to move heaven and earth in support of the national revolutionary war of the Zimbabwean people against British imperialism and its representative, the fascist Smith regime in Salisbury. It is worthwhile asking the question, therefore, what is this organisation and what are its credentials and what are the credentials of those gentlemen and ladies behind this "new" organisation? It is painful to have to say this, but it would be a sin against truth not to state that a significant number of the gentry behind the new enterprise are people who were in the late and unlamented Zimbabwe Solidarity Committee (ZSC) precisely at a time when the latter could have done some useful work; that these very worthies hounded us out of the ZSC and forced us to form the Zimbabwe Solidarity Front (ZSF) for no other fault on our part than that we wanted to carry out the political programme contained in the basic document of the ZSC; that this crowd refused to give solidarity to the struggle of the Zimbabwean people on the only basis on which such solidarity can properly be extended, namely, on a proper anti-imperialist basis, which in turn involves the explanation, on the one hand, of the connection between imperialism and the prevalent opportunism in the working-class movement in imperialist countries, and, on the other hand, the connection between the liberation of colonies and the social emancipation of the proletariat in imperialist countries. Some of these fellows, fine 'Marxist-Leninists' that they are, who remained in ZSC until only the other day, degenerated to the extent as to have become the deadly opponents of ZANU, the organisation that has throughout spear-headed the revolutionary war against the fascist Smith regime, and enthusiastic supporters of the ANC under the leadership of the Muzorewa/Sithole clique, the despicable tool of the settler fascist regime and of Anglo-American imperialism. Without uttering a word by way of criticism of their past sins - if indeed they are past - or by way of explanation for this apparently one hundred and eighty degree turn, they have, with typical disregard for the intelligence of the people around them, launched themselves afresh under a new name in the hope that people will forget about their past and will be unable to recognise the wares they peddle. These gentlemen obviously believe that if you change the name of things you change their essence. But, gentlemen, this is an absurdly forlorn hope. For if you had really intended to work for the sole purpose of sup-

porting the struggle for national liberation of the Zimbabwean people there was only one honourable course for you and that was that you should have joined forces with the only organisation that has consistently, and on a principled basis, been extending fraternal solidarity in this country to the national liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, to wit, the Zimbabwe Solidarity Front. Such a course is all the more incumbent on the people who call themselves Marxist-Leninist, on the one hand, and never tire of beating their breasts about the need for unity, on the other hand. It is clear from your conduct that you follow a splittist line under the cloak of honeyed phrases about unity. All of this goes to show that you are acting in a manner disruptive of the working-class movement. That despite the change in name you are offering nothing new. In short, we are witnessing the latest example of setting up the same old shop under a new signboard.

Zimbabwe Solidarity Front.

LETTER OF THE R.C.L.B. REFUTING THE A.C.W.

Dear Comrades,

We are writing to strongly criticize your splittist activities in publishing in "Revolutionary Zimbabwe" a "criticism" of the Zimbabwe Solidarity Campaign of the RCLB.

The very first time that the RCL knew of your "criticisms" of our work on Zimbabwe was when we heard about them in "Revolutionary Zimbabwe". Is this the way to promote unity among Marxist-Leninist? Instead of approaching the leadership of the RCL and making sober, principled criticisms you make wild and unprincipled accusations in public. You show little desire to implement Chairman Mao's great call "*Unite, and don't split*", but instead seize opportunities to widen differences. Split, and don't unite, is your motto!

We in the RCLB firmly uphold Chairman Mao's line that active ideological struggle "*is the means for ensuring unity*". But you use ideological struggle as a means to disunity. You see struggle as an end in itself and hit out wildly in all directions without grasping the purpose of ideological struggle is to achieve unity. In this you show one of the characteristic features of small circles which Lenin described when he referred to "*the circle wrangling that goes by the free 'process' of the ideological struggle*". (One Step Forwards, Two Steps Back. Moscow ed., p189)

The fact that this is the case is clearly demonstrated by the fact that you have ignored the two letters sent to you in the last five months by our Central Committee, requesting that a meeting be held between representatives of the ACW and RCL to discuss Party-building and the question of unity between the ACW and the RCLB. Instead of taking up this offer you launch an attack on the RCL!

On the content of your "criticism" of the RCL:-

Firstly, we have not launched "a new organisation under the name of the Zimbabwe Solidarity Campaign". We have started a campaign of practical solidarity work with the struggle in Zimbabwe by the RCLB itself. If you had taken the trouble to approach us first with your criticisms you would

have found this out.

You claim that we should have "joined forces" with the Zimbabwe Solidarity Front on Zimbabwe work. To the extent that we should have approached you and seen what scope that is for co-operation, this is true, but it is not in the interests of the working class for the RCLB to join ZSF. This is a question of putting Party-building first, and of which class we rely on in Zimbabwe work.

The Central Task in Britain today is Party-building. All other work must serve this central task. Zimbabwe work is important but is subordinate to Party-building. Frankly comrades, you put Zimbabwe and other broad front work first and show little interest in building the Party, as is shown by your refusal to meet the RCL to discuss Party-building. Even from the point of view of Zimbabwe work itself, it is essential to put Party-building first. Really effective Zimbabwe work, that heightens the consciousness of the working class on this question and really mobilises them, can only be carried out by the Party, or by a Party-building organisation, in a way which does propaganda and mass work on Zimbabwe as an integral part of the struggle to build the Party and lead the revolution, not as an end in itself, unrelated to the struggle for socialist revolution.

It is essential that Zimbabwe work is work done mainly among the working class, the leading force and the main force in the British revolution. It is our experience (and we have seen no evidence that the ZSF is any different) that at the present stage broad fronts can do work only among the petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. This is simply because such broad fronts (in the absence of principled ideological and political unity and democratic-centralist leadership) inevitably forget that mass work is only correct mass work when it is led by Marxist-Leninists and directed mainly towards the working class. The work of the RCLB on Zimbabwe is an integral and inseparable part of our factory work, not 'broad front' work divorced from the struggle of the working class.

For these reasons we are not prepared to join any broad front on Zimbabwe. We are prepared to discuss how we can co-operate on Zimbabwe work.

We very much agree with your point that Zimbabwe work must involve the explanation of "the connection between the liberation of the colonies and the social emancipation of the proletariat in the imperialist countries". This line is being firmly put into practice by the RCLB in its mass work among the industrial working class. We suspect that you do not put this line into practice. Unless Zimbabwe work is subordinated to Party-building and carried out as an integral part of factory work, the unity of the working class of Britain and the people of Zimbabwe will remain a pious wish.

We agree with your theoretical point about the "connection between imperialism and the prevalent opportunism in the working class movement in imperialist countries", as the Manifesto of the RCLB makes clear. Unless we have a firm grasp of this question we cannot possibly fight imperialism. As Lenin said "*the fight against imperialism is a sham and a humbug unless it is inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism.*" We do not think though that this is a point which we should make much of in our propaganda, it is rather, mainly a matter for the understanding of the Communists. Our propaganda and agitation among the working class must in the main emphasise the fundamental unity of interest between

the struggle of the working class in the imperialist countries and the struggle of the oppressed people and nations. We must win the conviction of the working class to carry out their internationalist duty on the basis of materialism, i.e. their common interest with the oppressed people and nations in overthrowing imperialism. You on the other hand want to use the question of the connection between imperialism and opportunism as a stick to beat the working class with; you think that the working class must feel guilty about imperialism before they will support the struggle of the oppressed people and nations. In fact the vast majority of the working class have nothing to feel guilty about - they do not share in imperialist plunder, and have no material interest in the continuation of the exploitation of the oppressed people and nations. That part of imperialist superprofits which the bourgeoisie use to bribe and corrupt, goes mainly to the stratum of labour leaders, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia.

Finally, your statement that those members of the RCLB who worked in the old "Zimbabwe Solidarity Campaign" have not "utter(ed) a word by way of criticism" of past errors is not true. The CUA, which is the organisation the RCLB members in question worked in, sent a written self-criticism to the ACW for their errors in often opposing the line of the ZSC of supporting the ANC. So infected with small-group mentality is the ACW that it simply cannot remember receiving this self-criticism. You did not reply to the self-criticism of the CUA, as you likewise did not reply to the self-criticism of the CFB sent to the UWL for some errors of bourgeois feminism made by the CFB.

Comrades, the ACW has some achievements to its credit. In particular you have fought hard for Marxism-Leninism against opportunism and revisionism. You have also made errors of sectarianism and small-group mentality, among others. Despite comradesly criticism you are digging in your heels and refusing to heed criticism; if you persist in this you will become a reactionary obstacle to Party-building and the revolution, and will inevitably be swept aside by the working class.

This is the third letter we have sent you in five months. We insist that you reply to this letter and take seriously your responsibility to struggle for Marxist-Leninist unity and Party-building. We urge you to agree to our request for a meeting to discuss Party-building and unity between the ACW and the RCLB. If we do not hear from you within a reasonable period of time, and as you have chosen to attack us openly, we reserve the right to reply to that attack in public.

Comradely Greetings,

The Political Committee of the Central Committee of the RCLB.

NEW ERA BOOKS

"WITHOUT REVOLUTIONARY THEORY THERE CAN BE NO REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT" (Lenin)

MARXIST-LENINIST CLASSICS

PUBLICATIONS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN AND OTHER MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATIONS

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS FROM SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

PUBLICATIONS OF MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANIZATIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS ON THE STRUGGLE IN THE THIRD WORLD

BOOKS AND JOURNALS ON THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN AND OTHER IMPERIALIST COUNTRIES

HANDICRAFTS AND POSTERS

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO 'REVOLUTION' - £1.65 per 4 issues

'CLASS STRUGGLE' - £1.80 per 12 issues

NEW ERA BOOKS
203 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD,
LONDON N.4.
Tel: 01.-272-5894

Nearest Tube - FINSBURY PARK
Opening Hours: 10 - 6 Mon. - Sat.
Late Night Thursday till 7.30

CLASS STRUGGLE ★

POLITICAL PAPER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF BRITAIN

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE WORKING CLASS

'CLASS STRUGGLE' is the political paper of the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain. It is produced to help the working class build its own party - a revolutionary Communist Party.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' carries news and analysis of the class struggle in Britain, supporting the interests of the working class. It opposes the bourgeoisie, and all those opportunists who talk about socialism but whose actions are for the preservation of capitalism.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' carries many articles on the situation internationally. It supports the struggle against the two superpowers' aims of world domination, and supports all forces in their opposition to the two superpowers. It supports the struggle against British imperialism.

'CLASS STRUGGLE' reports on the socialist countries, and the gains made in continuing the revolution under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in socialist construction



READ AND SELL 'CLASS STRUGGLE' - THE PAPER OF THE WORKING CLASS!

SUBSCRIPTION:
£1.80 per 12 issues
available from:
NEW ERA BOOKS,
203 SEVEN SISTERS RD,
LONDON N.4.