

VANGUARD

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS
AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES
UNITE!

VOL 4. No 5

SEPT/OCTOBER 1967.



ORGAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM, FOR COMMUNIST UNITY

GENUINE COMMUNISTS, UNITE AROUND CDRCU

CONTENTS

DEMOCRACY, DISCARDING THE THIRD CONCEPT	PAGE 2
LIU SHAO-CHI AND HIS EVIL BOOK	PAGE 4
CELEBRATE A VICTORY	PAGE 7
CULTURAL	PAGE 8
CORRESPONDENCE	PAGE 9

BULLETIN No's 1@2 INCLUDED

oppose other (copy?)

Maoist

EDITORIAL

AN ECHO FROM ABROAD: 'TO STRUGGLE IS GOOD'

Peking Review July 21st 1967, published an article by Rose Smith, a British Communist working in China, 'Eliminate the Pernicious Influence of the book on "Self Cultivation" in the World'. All British Communists will warmly welcome the comrade's article against "Self Cultivation" the "Black Book", its influence around the world and in particular on British Communists. Rose Smith, as an experienced member of the C.P.G.B. since 1920, has seen and felt the steady degeneration of a workers' party over a long period of time through slavish submission to top people in authority by the membership. The author recalls the many bitter struggles among the masses with party activists and of how they eventually became isolated from the masses and engaged in parliamentary "Socialism".

She goes on to openly criticise her own acceptance of what she knew to be wrong, that of passive submission. Now, fully understanding the principle learnt after studying the thoughts of Mao-tse-tung, she has rightly taken her place again among British revolutionaries. For to struggle is good! She quotes chairman Mao:

"Everything reactionary is the same, if you don't hit it, it won't fall. This is also like sweeping the floor, as a rule, where the broom does not reach, the dust will not vanish of itself".

Orientate All British Communists To The Struggle For a Party.

We in Britain endorse this comrade's experiences with our own, more recently. We too no longer blindly accept "Authorities" or "Big persons in command". We have exposed and still are exposing our "little monsters" waving red flags.

We confirm what is evident to those abroad, of the effects of the thoughts of Mao-tse-tung and the cultural revolution in China, on the proletarian revolution here. And add that they are more profound than probably some of our comrades abroad would be in a position to assess, under the present circumstances of apparent confusion. It is precisely this isolation from the struggle at home that becomes apparent in the

tailpiece of the article, with references by the comrade to: "A British Marxist-Leninist party" and "Marxist-Leninist groups....in Britain". It appears that in regard to this most important issue, like many Marxist-Leninists at home, it is fully expected that such a party will emerge. But the writer ventures no further as to how this will objectively come about.

We should not let this state of affairs continue without some attempt to put matters right, even though understandable as it is, for comrades abroad, who may be cut off from the practical struggle at home. C.D.R.C.U. is dedicated to this task and is continually focusing the attention of all genuine British Communists at home and abroad, to the struggles within the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain. All should be familiar with the aspects involved in these struggles, these steps forward, for a new party. A party that is so vital to the needs of our working class, and has now become a possibility in the not too distant future, since British revolutionaries have broken with the reformist party. This we emphasise is a most important development for us all and must not be treated in an arbitrary fashion. We must endeavour to orientate all British Communists to the struggle for a party, including those abroad. We must study the question closely, its history and development.

DEMOCRACY, DISCARDING THE THIRD CONCEPT. By ALF. CROSS.

Recently in London, a meeting was held called 'Press Teach-in'. The speakers were all the riff-raff of bourgeois intellectuals from organs ranging from the multi-million pounds empire of the 'Daily Mirror' to the revisionist 'Morning Star', well upholstered with the learned ones of bourgeois universities. They were as one in bleating about the closing of newspapers through the inability of the owners to combat the ever tightening embrace of monopoly capital. Like the wailing of the clergy, the emphasis was on the threat to democracy.

Now, in order to understand the retrogressive and reactionary nature of this meeting it is necessary to deal briefly with one issue, then examine their concept of democracy more closely and at length. They were treating the present situation to the typical petty-bourgeois idealism by wanting to turn back the clock to private enterprise of capitalist society which would in any case grow into monopoly capital once more.

In studying their concept of democracy it is necessary to examine a pamphlet by the revisionist Gollan who has done as much if not more to spread these same false and dangerous illusions as anyone else in bourgeois society. It is doubly dangerous from this quarter because so many accept this petty-bourgeois revisionist as a Communist.

I intend to show how Gollan and the bourgeoisie that surround him treat democracy as a third concept. Not the issue of capitalist class democracy under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or working class democracy under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

'Democracy and Class Struggle' by Gollan; pp.17; "By such means, bourgeois theoreticians bypass the very real problems of power, freedom and democracy under capitalism, since as the DAILY TELEGRAPH pointed out, to analyse the real situation as it is developing would be a dangerous undertaking - dangerous to the capitalist class whose interests they uphold. For any such analysis, by searching out the centre of political power, could lead to only one conclusion; that the maintenance of even those democratic forms which now exist can only be ensured through political struggle against monopoly capitalism".

(UNDERLINING MINE.A.C.)

Now, this man Gollan endows bourgeois democracy with forms. He cannot recognise that a thing has only one form or shape at a time. Furthermore, this form is absolute. It has bourgeois form. How else on a capitalist economic base? He calls for the maintenance of bourgeois democracy and adds his abstraction, this third concept by claiming the plural in the existence of forms. Completely divested of its class character what else is it but abstract, or a third concept?

Following chapter, same page: "For every Communist Party the struggle for defence and extension of democratic rights and liberties is a vital concern". (UNDERLINING MINE. A.C.)

For a small instant I shall suppose that Gollan was being realistic and recognised that we live under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. What then would the extension of democratic rights mean? If you give the bourgeoisie more freedom and liberties this must be done at the expense of another class, the working class. Failing this, Gollan's explanation is nothing more than the abstract formula that represents the third concept of democracy.

To ram home this concept, he follows on to pp.18; "Just as they (C.P.G.B. a.c.) were pioneers of the efforts to create the broadest democratic unity to resist fascism in the thirties, so today they aim to unify the democratic and progressive forces to resist the growing threat of the monopolists and to extend democracy and democratic government". (UNDERLINING MINE. A.C.)

This broadest democratic unity is as abstract as one could wish it. Militant unity is another thing. Is it not a fact that the only way to resist the threat of the capitalist monopolists is to smash them and their democracy? Is it not a fact that proletarian power in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the only answer? The dictatorship of the proletariat is the only way to proletarian democracy.

Outside of this what does Gollan propose, liberalising the Capitalist system?

"Communist Parties had noted in Rome 1959," he goes on to say, after describing certain reform movements which European communist parties noted; pp.18, "....., for resistance to unjust electoral laws, for really representative parliaments and other measures as part of the general struggle to limit the power of the monopolists."

Part of the general struggle to limit the power of the monopolists shows Gollan's dialectical ignorance. The Capitalist form of society is RELATIVE TO SOCIETY AS A WHOLE. That form is also absolute at the moment, it is all around us. That form can only be smashed. Would he have us believe that bourgeois democracy can provide the absolute power of the proletariat with a general struggle against the monopolists via Parliament? Marxism-Leninism teaches that the Socialist revolution is the first leap. Does he deny this? Further on he says (same page) "Democratic rights are themselves the product of struggle." WHICH CLASS? I must ask.

The democratic rights that he lists are no more than reforms, mere concessions wrung from the ruling class by spontaneous action. With all the years of this action, the Capitalist state grows stronger than ever. Although, relative to the whole capitalist system it is approaching its death fast.

When he says, pp.19: "These two examples show concretely that there is no abstract "freedom for all" in class society", would he suggest then that there is a real freedom for all in class society?

Doesn't he recognise the absolute, though relative, nature of the capitalist system and the absolute nature of bourgeois democracy?

It is obvious that he and a great many like him, do not and cannot see this. Bearing in mind that he is still talking of the capitalist system, he goes on, "In all industrial and landlord-tenant conflicts, the freedom of the property owners is gained solely at the expense of the working people, and vice versa. This is the essential nature of freedom in a class society: the freedom enjoyed by either class is decided by struggle." On page 20, he goes on: "The Tory dominated Parliament does not strike a balance between any really conflicting social claims - it enforces the right of the propertied minority against the majority." But! he goes on, "A socialist government, determined on decisive social change, would do the opposite. It would enforce the social claims of the majority against the claims of the capitalist propertied minority. To do precisely this is the essence of the democratic struggle". (UNDERLINING MINE. A.C.)

Gollan's dialectics!! Abject capitulation to the bourgeois parliamentary machine. Democracy dangled in the air as an abstract

third concept. At no point does he show that under the capitalist system bourgeois democracy alone operates. Only under the dictatorship of the proletariat does proletarian democracy operate.

With all the pie in the sky idealism that has operated in peoples minds through the efforts of social-democrats, petty bourgeoisie of all streams such as Gollan and his like, it is time that this question on democracy was exposed in Britain. With people such as Gollan presenting a mish-mash of forms of freedom as a third concept of democracy it must be pointed out time and again that there are only two concepts. That which is operated under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that which is operated under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

LIU SHAO-CHI AND HIS EVIL BOOK

Excerpts from a speech by Sydney Rittenberg to a meeting sponsored by the Bethune-Yenan Rebel Regiment, Peking, April 1967.

Letting things slide for the sake of peace and friendship when a person has clearly gone wrong. ... In Liu Shao-chi's whole book on 'How to be a Good Communist', there is absolutely no mention of the possibility that anything may go wrong among the leadership, but rather you derive a feeling of inevitability that something is always wrong with the masses and the rank and file Party members which needs to be lectured, criticised, disciplined and corrected..... And yet, Chairman Mao thought long ago and has kept repeating over and over again that the one who sees something harming the interests of the masses and is not stirred to anger and indignation is no real Communist. So the whole approach is not only different but contradictory, antagonistic, opposite. One book is aimed at teaching the rank and file to be loyal, obedient, docile servants of the leaders, regardless of whether the leaders are right or wrong. The other book teaches people always to stand up for revolutionary principle, always to fight for it, always to rebel against anything that you consider harms the interests of the masses. Otherwise you cannot really call yourself a revolutionary...

The Chinese masses, armed with Mao Tse-tung's thinking, have rebelled and our job is also to try to arm the revolutionaries of our countries with Mao Tse-tung's thinking so that they learn to rebel against anything that goes against the interests of the masses and against the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This is a question of whether the proletariat can build its revolutionary party and lead the revolution to success or whether the movement will be taken over in mid-stream by the bourgeois revolutionaries, by the revisionists and become an appendage to the ruling class.

Of course, most of the cadres who are infected with this slave mentality have awakened during the cultural revolution and are continuing to go through a process of awakening and have returned to the proletarian revolutionary line of Mao Tse-tung. But this has only been achieved through revolutionary struggle in which the opponents, the representatives of this bourgeois line, have been and are being isolated and overthrown or forced to correct their errors.

Wherever there are slaves, there must be a slavemaster. If there's no slavemaster then there are no slaves. If there are no slaves, then there's no master. Wherever you find blind obedience among the rank and file you have only to look up and you will surely find someone who demands blind obedience and who's the master over those slaves. That's the dialectic of the situation.

Over and over again Chairman Mao has written and said down through the decades that a Communist must take a whiff of everything with his own nose. He must smell it and see - is it good or is it bad? Is it rational or is it irrational? What is good about it? What is bad about it? Chairman Mao wrote in 1930 in the essay Oppose Book Worship that one of the most artful methods of sabotaging the correct instructions of a correct leadership is to apply them mechanically, absolutely, with

no assessment, with no consideration of the practical situation - just to stamp them with a rubber stamp onto your own practical situation. The best way of sabotage.

The teachings of Chairman Mao, with the work done by Comrade Lin Piao in developing this system of mass self-education-- studying theory with definite problems in mind, living study and living application, study in order to use and to use immediately, study not of whole documents, but study of the basic viewpoints which must be grasped by the rank and file fighter, by the masses in order to solve their problems of class struggle, of production, of science - has placed Marxism-Leninism in the hands of the proletariat itself where it belongs. It has ended the day when the ordinary masses of the people had to rely on the interpretation of their own class outlook as given by "great authorities". Now they are acquiring a critical basis for judging whether or not this or that authority interprets correctly because they themselves can study and master, recognising only the paramount proletarian authority of the greatest Marxist-Leninist, Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

Liu Shao-chi says on page 36, "By then (in other words, by the higher stage of communism) all humanity will consist of unselfish, intelligent, highly cultured and skilled Communist workers. Mutual assistance and affection will prevail among men and there will be no such irrationality as mutual suspicion and deception, mutual injury, mutual slaughter and war." Here we have a society with only love, no hatred, with only support, no opposition, with only mutual assistance, which can exist among capitalists or which can, taken at best, exist and become the basic philosophy for the mutual aid teams in the earliest stage of the transition from capitalism to socialism, but which certainly do not define Communist society in which all work is for the interests of human progress and for the interests of the masses, for the interests of the people.

Secondly, we have a picture of a society without contradiction, without struggle, whereas Chairman Mao had already written long before this book was published that under communism, as in all societies, contradiction and struggle exist and are the main driving force for progress and development and change. How can you explain the fact that your dialectical materialism operates only up to communist society and then stops? What happens to the unity of opposites? There are no class contradictions in the higher stage of communist society because there are no classes. There's no mutual slaughter and war and even no arms. All that's quite true. But the contradiction between the advanced and the backward, the contradiction between the correct and the incorrect, the right and the wrong, the scientific and the unscientific will continue to exist in any and all societies - even the contradiction between the forces of production and the relations of production and the latter's contradiction with the superstructure will continue to exist in any human society as long as there is a mode of production. Since this contradiction persists, then what sort of "intelligence" do we speak of, what sort of "highly cultured" and "skilled" workers do we speak of? What sort of mutual assistance and affection is it which doesn't distinguish between right and wrong, backward and advanced, forward-moving and retrogressive? This is a picture of the concept of a bourgeois heaven, of paradise. It definitely has nothing to do with communist society. Still less does it have anything to do with the world outlook and the philosophy of Marxists. Ours is a philosophy of struggle, the philosophy of analyzing the contradiction in things and placing ourselves squarely and clearly on the side of the progressive aspect of the contradiction, fighting for the continual progress of man.

Chairman Mao gives what I think is the best definition of communism in his work On Practice. He says, "The epoch of world communism will be reached when all mankind voluntarily and consciously changes itself and changes the world." In other words, as Chairman Mao says in another place, it's the Marxist concept given by Marx and Engels of the progress of man out of the kingdom of blind necessity into the kingdom of freedom, out of the realm of necessity and into the realm of freedom. Any idea of

stagnation, of pessimism, of inertia, of retrogression is absolutely wrong. Man marches forward, history marches forward, in pre-historic days through non-class struggle then through class struggle, and then back to non-class communist society developing through non-class struggle but definitely through struggle. Ours is a philosophy of struggle, not a philosophy of tranquillity. It was Marx who first said, to his daughter, that his greatest joy in life lay in struggle and that the defect which he could least abide, which he could least tolerate was servility. How like his great student and the great continuator of his work, Mao Tse-tung! The keynotes that he struck, how well they've been elaborated and made the property of the masses of revolutionary rebels in China by Chairman Mao!

The Liu Shao-chi view of progress, the ideal of communism as a society without struggle and contradiction, as a paradise of bourgeois tranquillity with nothing but mutual love, lays the foundation for selling revisionism to revolutionaries who accept this idea. Because if your ultimate purpose is tranquillity then the artful revisionist has an opportunity to persuade the revolutionary of the possibility of tranquillity even before communism, that he can show you the way to peaceful transition, to the peaceful attainment of socialism or in socialist society to peaceful transition to communism without class struggle. And in this way, he can lead the revolutionary away from the central problem for all - the problem not even mentioned once in this book on "self-cultivation" - the problem of revolutionary seizure of power.

How different from what Chairman Mao teaches - not to long for tranquillity, not to compromise with the enemy, but to recognize him as a retrograde character doomed to disappear from the face of the earth. Strategically, to spit in his eye; tactically, to labour hard, scientifically, patiently, working among the masses, to understand, grasp and implement their main orientation which is always correct. They may be deceived for a time, but their main impetus, their main driving force is always correct, always conforms with the needs of historical development. And he teaches us to penetrate and discover this main orientation and to serve its needs, to become a core force among the masses to lead them to its realization. He teaches us tactically to work very hard, to take the enemy very seriously but always to have supreme confidence in victory.

The genuine Marxist-Leninist always looks forward to a life of revolutionary struggle as long as there is life in the revolutionary himself. He constantly renews his strength and his energies and his youth and revolutionary vitality from this revolutionary source in the masses. So these are two ideas, two world outlooks, absolutely antagonistic. It must be one or the other. I think that the explosion of the spiritual atom bomb in China, the unleashing of boundless energy among millions and tens of millions of revolutionary masses has proved what Chairman Mao's ideas and world outlook can accomplish compared with the tarnished bourgeois ideology which masqueraded as Marxism under the reactionary line and which still does so, which still parades itself as revolutionary doctrine in many places.

I think that when the lessons of the cultural revolution are brought home even to a relatively small number of revolutionaries in other countries and become a part of the understanding of the masses in whatever struggle they demand to carry on and do carry on that we will see the same atom bomb explode in different ways, under different conditions and to different degrees in other countries and we will begin to solve the problem which has held back victory for the revolution and advance for the revolutionary forces in so many countries for such a long time. That's why I think that the victory for the revolutionary line of Chairman Mao in the cultural revolution in China has indeed opened a new epoch for the proletarian world revolution. China has indeed opened a new epoch for the proletarian revolution. And that we will see victory a hundred years sooner than we had thought possible.

(Rittenberg is an American who has long lived and worked in China).

CELEBRATE A VICTORY

Communists in Britain celebrate a victory that was achieved one year ago this month. Reprinted below in full is the 'September' statement, the issue of which revealed a leap forward for us, due to the internal struggles of CDRCU. This document was the indication that collective leadership had been re-established and our big person in command toppled. Also a conspiracy was later smashed that was designed to usurp the committee of the working class.

This historical statement is yet another milestone on the road to socialism in Britain.

POLICY STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER, 1966COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM FOR COMMUNIST UNITY

CDRCU has been in existence nearly three years and during that whole period ideological struggle has never ceased within it.

We have experienced one split after another and these splits have all reflected the struggle between proletarian and bourgeois ideas, methods and practices. Some people attracted to Marxist-Leninist ideology could not get rid of the inherited dead weight of bourgeois ideology, influence and pressure, and this reflected itself, inevitably, in inner-Party struggle.

As a consequence of this, we have a situation where there are many splinter groups claiming to be Marxist-Leninist and to support the 25 points of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, as outlined in their reply to the letter of the CC of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

OUR RELATIONS WITH THESE GROUPS

These splinter groups publish aims and material which give the impression that they are sincere Marxist-Leninists. Although at times good articles have appeared in them analysing revisionism, the world situation and the position inside the Communist Party of Great Britain. They offer at best a pseudo Marxist interpretation of the development and growth of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain or at worst no explanation at all. The fact is that they are splinter groups, that they have split away from Marxism-Leninism just as much as the revisionists and trotskyists have done.

The struggle for a Marxist-Leninist party was being, is being and will be fought inside the CDRCU. These people have been tried and tested inside the CDRCU and have been found wanting. There is little chance that they can ever be reclaimed for Marxism-Leninism, but their deception does and will fool and confuse temporarily many genuine Communists. Granting recognition to these groups as leaders in the Marxist-Leninist movement would be a betrayal, a step back in our proletarian revolution.

In view of this, we consider it necessary to point out that the CDRCU and VANGUARD has no official relations whatsoever with such publications as FORUM, HAMMER & ANVIL, FINSBURY COMMUNIST (and others). * We draw a clear line between CDRCU and these splitters, do not prettify them by granting them any form of recognition, do not attend meetings called by them in the name of Marxism-Leninism.

The way to genuine unity comrades is to unite around CDRCU !!

* The inclusion of "and others" was an error and was subsequently corrected in the following issue of Vanguard!

EDITORIAL _ _ _ NOTICE

*see p. 9 for
more hatred*

The editors wish to apologise for the delay in the publication of 'Vanguard'. This was due to severe production difficulties encountered, a result of which, we now issue a 'Bulletin' in addition.

TWO IMPERIALIST SOLDIERS

Into the army - defend you must
This freedom and democracy for all of us.

Young men whipped by chauvinist phrases new,
Burdened with armour of "glories" past.

Blinded were they to the realities of class.
Two proletarians thrust together in bourgeois bondage grew

Closer as brothers with identity of view
Landed on Korean soil for reasons neither knew.

From sublime ignorance to rude awakening
Of Imperialist war, too late!

Oh to return to fight at home, to understand
And destroy this class of greed and hate.

But, one soldier falls, no grave has he
Save in some other's memory.

Not forgetting now this capitalist breed
The other returns to where he came, but, as a bitter seed

Now, to fight as two men with patience for victory
And brothers new, armed with book and sword

Together they interpret history, dialectics their eyes to see
In order to construct and pass the word.

A new party for proletarian democracy
A world of workers to be free.

A. Dover.

In memory of Alan, a worker brother, whose kindness and
unselfishness denotes the qualities of our class.

LATEST LITERATURE RECEIVED

Betrayal Of Proletarian Dictatorship Is The Heart Of The Book On
"Self Cultivation". Pamphlet F.L.P. Peking.

Patriotism Or National Betrayal? - On the reactionary film 'Inside
Story Of The Ching Court'. Pamphlet F.L.P. Peking.

Commemorating Lu Hsun - Our Forerunner in the Cultural Revolution.
Pamphlet F.L.P. Peking.

REPORT: On the role and tasks of the Democratic Front for the
complete triumph of socialism in Albania. (4th Congress) Tirana 1967.

The Albanian Populacion In Yugoslavia does not Allow Itself to be
Deceived and Subdued by the Tito Clique. Tirana 1967.

Published by: A.Cross, 18 Lincoln Road, London, E.13.

Printed by: A.Dover, 152 Upton Park Road, London, E. 7.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Comrade Editor,

The great Chinese proletarian cultural revolutionary has seen among other things, the confrontation of two lines on inner-party struggle. Liu Shao-chi in his book "On Inner-Party Struggle" gives no guidance what to do when the party leadership is bureaucratic and rotten. By this he, in effect, supports rotten bureaucratic leaderships.

Mao-Tse-tung on the other hand, says "Dare to rebel!" And when the revolutionaries rebelled against the former Peking Municipal Party Committee which was taking the capitalist road, chairman Mao supported them.

It is in this light that we must see the great significance of the 1963 statement issued by the C.D.R.C.U. Here were comrades with a completely unsignposted choice to make, whether to attempt to transform a bureaucratic revisionist party by inner-party struggle or to rebel against that party. That the comrades rebelled makes them the fore-runners of the great proletarian cultural revolution.

One cannot help wondering why this rebellion has been ignored by so many people who should know better; why a conscious effort is now being made to present those who were slavishly engaged in "transforming the party" in 1963 as the leadership of the anti-revisionist movement.

Ivor Kenna. Sec.
Finsbury Communist Assn.

Above is a letter to Vanguard from a reactionary group of communists who broke away from C.D.R.C.U. and now see fit to sow confusion on the history of our movement. To which the editors reply:

Comrades,

In answer to your most provocative letter containing your appraisal of the significance of certain events. We have no desire to comment on the first two paragraphs in spite of the most obvious errors contained therein, but will proceed directly to the issues raised in paragraph 3 etc. which relate to the revolutionary struggle in Britain, of which we are much concerned. Here you refer to "statement". Presumably you are referring to the 'Appeal to all Communists' printed and distributed 9/11/63 (for we know of no other like document).

To begin, we must correct you. These were not comrades with a "choice to make". Here were comrades who had already made a choice in no uncertain way, as the 'Appeal' shows:

"In short democratic-centralism has been replaced by bureaucratic-centralism within the C.P.G.B. It is no longer a Marxist-Leninist Party.

UNITE TO SMASH REVISIONISM

To remain silent in the face of this treachery by the revisionists is to aid and abet their treachery.

Communists must act now. We, the under-signed Communists, representing cadres throughout the country, have therefore met to issue this Appeal.

We call upon all Marxists, all Communists, to unite in condemning the revisionist faction which controls the C.P.G.B.

We call upon all Marxists, all Communists, to work for the defeat of this faction, and the establishment of a genuine Communist Party, based upon the principles of Marxism-Leninism, which will lead the working class and all working people in their struggles against monopoly capitalism and for its final overthrow.

We call upon all Marxists, all Communists, to unite around the principles of the 1960 Statement of the International Communist Movement."

A decision to openly struggle against revisionism, and calling all Communists to unite for this purpose.

A decision to rebel had been acted on. No, comrades, it was in

fact the London Conference that presented comrades with a choice to make. The 'Appeal' was the objective outcome of that meeting. It therefore naturally follows that the real significance here lies in the Conference itself. It was here that British Communists rebelled against the C.P.G.B. and broke with the transformists who wanted to work within the confines of the old party and led by dogmatists who by now were a mere appendage to that party. The rebellion against the old party was quickly followed by a call for a new party. This was the significance of events involving C.D.R.C.U. in 1963. We cannot permit you to obscure these events with vague talk of "forerunners of the great proletarian revolution". Whatever that means is anyone's guess. We view it as just another attempt to blur the class struggle that has been taking place in Britain and is a slur on the forerunners of a Marxist-Leninist party. For such they were. The proof of this we find in the publication of the first issue of their journal 'Vanguard', Feb.64. V.1.No.1. which contained 'The Way Forward' clearly calling for a new party and announcing the establishment of the committee as follows:

"COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED

In November 1963 the Committee to Defeat Revisionism, for Communist Unity, was set up in Great Britain by Communists who had come to recognise, in the course of struggle against the policies of the Communist Party of Great Britain, that to transform this Party from within, by accepting rules operated by men such as Gollan, Dutt and Matthews, was an impossibility. This Committee is now organising a public campaign to expose revisionism, and win the militant industrial workers and intellectuals, to understand that a genuine Communist Party must be established before advance can be made against monopoly-capital in Britain. We shall, before long, achieve this goal."

What could be plainer? No talk here of cultural revolution for this was a revolt against petty bourgeois political leadership of the working class.

We read with amazement in your letter "One cannot help wondering why this rebellion has been ignored by so many people who should know better".

Well, comrades, first let us explain who the people are who "should know better". These people are the comrades who, being part of the above mentioned committee both past and present, do in fact know better. But some choose to ignore such a rebellion, (or even suddenly remember it, whichever is the more convenient to them at a given moment) for very real political reasons. Secondly, as for the present C.D.R.C.U. members and supporters who have not chosen to ignore these events and most certainly know better than to do so. Now surely it must be they who are left wondering if perhaps you comrades have been potholing over recent months or put off in some other similar way from the Marxist-Leninist Movement. How else can it be explained why it is you have just come to be aware of the "significance" of an action of C.D.R.C.U. some three years and more ago? The more so since these comrades have spent many months propagating publicly these truths in their Journal 'Vanguard'.

You comrades were among those who knew better but chose to ignore, you were part of that rebellion, your reason for breaking eventually from the rebels are political and will emerge for all to see. As is happening with other groups who are involved in this struggle for leadership capable of establishing a genuine Marxist-Leninist party. In such a protracted development we cannot but help to struggle and rebel with and against one and another of the aspects of the movement accordingly for our own decline or growth. This is essential, this is a universal law.

As for your statement: "A conscious effort is now being made to present those who were slavishly engaged in "transforming the party" (Pages II & I2. Cont. at back of Bulletins I. & 2. respectively).

VANGUARD

C.D.R.C.U.
BULLETIN

1st

NO 1

WHAT'S NEW?

One might well ask "What is new in the Marxist-Leninist Movement today?" Contrary to the view of some comrades who see things in the movement as inert and stagnating.

If we watch closely, we can see the serpentine movements of the reactionaries who move so stealthily to infiltrate the working class leadership. It must be admitted that their moves are not always easy to perceive. But beware!, for it is just these motions that are so deadly, being designed to bring themselves in a position to strike at the very heart of their prey. Knowing full well that not all Marxist-Leninists are oblivious of their motives, they continue to adapt themselves to the popular demands, thereby camouflaging their real nature.

For an example of this we need look no further than the latest moves of A.C.M.L.U. the would-be liquidators of the Committee of the working class, C.D.R.C.U.

Self Refutation.

In the A.C.M.L.U. Journal 'Hammer or Anvil', Vol.3, No.1, August 1967, they announce that a "Preparatory Committee for a conference of Marxist-Leninist Unity was established in April 1967... for a conference of Marxist-Leninist Unity in September 1967". Obviously there is nothing new in this for it has been the aim all along and is just another attempt to secure what they failed to achieve before, which we exposed, when they called for a May Day conference for Marxist-Leninist Unity. A unity incidentally for "re-establishment of the Marxist-Leninist party", (all previous issues of 'Hammer or Anvil') the precondition of which "is the broad and principled unity amongst the Marxist-Leninist forces, their groups and organisations throughout Britain".

Clear enough you must agree. Their particular policy for a party has until now been one of broad unity of groups, etc.

Those who do not watch closely must beware, for in their editorial of July-August 1967 they reveal for all who wish to see, their treacherous agility in performing deceptive motion.

Very subtle and deadly, they cover the move from their bankrupt policies with a smokescreen of talk about "dialectics and mechanistic views", all to conceal the fact that they are refuting their own policy on the question of a party. This is done in the most deceptive way, as will be seen when they say -

"There has been a long standing and widespread illusion in the ranks of the anti-revisionist and developing Marxist-Leninist movement that the latter consists, and has from its inception consisted, of a number of separate and genuine Marxist-Leninist groups. From this illusion has spread the false view that the

essential process of building a united Marxist-Leninist organisation would consist of the simple quantitative one of mechanically merging these groups together In contradistinction to this false mechanical view of the process of building a united Marxist-Leninist organisation is the dialectical materialist view, which sees a Marxist-Leninist organisation as the forerunner of a Marxist-Leninist party, as being built around a developing Marxist-Leninist programme, reflecting the application of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions in Britain. It sees the elaboration of such a programme and the building of a Marxist-Leninist party engaged in practical struggle on behalf of the working class with the strategic aim of winning them for proletarian revolution

Compare this with their often stated policy of broad unity, etc. (Above). Was there not a move? Was it not a tactical one at that, and isn't the strategy the same?

Then, with the cunning of any form of life that uses deceit as a weapon, they feign death. (This is not for the first time, as other comrades can relate).

Declaring that "The Action Centre for Marxist-Leninist Unity, the sponsoring organisation of the preparatory committee, is now disbanding, its task having been fulfilled, and its forces will be absorbed into the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain, which the conference will establish. This, therefore, will be the last issue of 'Hammer or Anvil'. It will be replaced by the organ of the Marxist-Leninist Organisation of Britain," IBID.

In their "dying breath" they call for a September "Conference of Marxist-Leninist Unity".

As we know, they are far from dead. They are simply sliding behind a new screen and hoisting a new banner, calling for a party on the basis of "A developing Marxist-Leninist programme".

What virulent proof we British Marxist-Leninists have of infinite class struggle. Yet some do not see it, precisely because they are immersed in it and continue to look behind their immediate class struggle.

As many of our readers will know, in our exposure of the A.C.M.L.U. policy of Broad Unity, as opposed to the desire of many sincere Marxist-Leninists for unity. Knowing that many others now see the logic of it, it appears that A.C.M.L.U. wish to adopt this logic as their own for the purpose of hoodwinking many Marxist-Leninists into accepting their "leadership".

"Make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again'till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries" - Mao Tse-Tung.

"Cast Away Illusions, prepare for struggle" - selected works Vol.IV, P.428.

THE SECRETARIAT OF THE C.C.

THE COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM FOR COMMUNIST UNITY.

STATEMENT

The Committee To Defeat Revisionism For Communist Unity and the Workers Party of Scotland

The former members of The Committee To Defeat Revisionism For Communist Unity who recently formed the Workers Party of Scotland, and more recently published their "Manifesto" in which is clearly outlined the strategic aim of formation of a Scottish Socialist Republic, have by

in 1963 as the leadership of the anti-revisionist movement".

Here we would like to clarify some points for you. Prior to the London Conference in 1963, for a comrade to be struggling for the transformation of the party, he was taking objective action. To be engaged in this struggle was commensurate with Marxism-Leninism. It was only after the greater number of Marxist-Leninists found through their practical struggles that this was an impossible task, they subsequently united and stated this objective fact. Then re-charted the way forward to the only possible way for the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist party. Which was to build a new one.

Comrades who thus engaged in attempts to transform the party will reject your reference to them being "slavish". And as to the anti-revisionists, who then organised to continue with their subjective ideas for transformation after the 63 Conference. In spite of the objective truth proved by the practice of so many comrades who had tried to conduct inner-party struggle but who had been disarmed by the bureaucratic control of the revisionists. Subjective as these were, with their continued efforts doomed to failure. Surely the term "slavishly" is inappropriate and nothing more than an exercise in phrase mongering of which your letter is a patchwork.

In regard to your allusion to:

"A conscious effort is now being made to present those who were slavishly engaged in transforming the party in 1963 as the leadership of the anti-revisionist movement"

When will you people learn that the Anti-Revisionist movement as such no longer represents objective Marxism-Leninism. Whereupon we cast your references and fears of such "efforts" back down to the subterranean labyrinths of clandestine obscurity, from where such gloomy talk of reincarnation can only emanate.

CORRESPONDENCE

CORRECT ORIENTATION IS THE RESULT OF CORRECT MARXIST LENINIST LEADERSHIP

The struggle on a world scale between Marxism-Leninism on the one hand, and modern revisionism on the other, could not leave Britain out of account, despite the absence of a revolutionary situation in this country, because this struggle is the concentrated expression of the struggle between the revolutionary interests of the working class and the counter-revolutionary interests of capitalism. Modern revisionism is the bourgeois method of conducting a campaign against Marxism-Leninism along 'external lines' of attack in the ideological sphere. In other words it is carrying on this struggle on the ideological 'home' ground of the revolutionary proletariat.

The anti-revisionist movement in Britain arose out of the dialectical principle of 'one becomes two', as a result of the betrayal of Marxism-Leninism by the revisionist anti-communists in the leadership of the C.P.G.B. The same principle of dialectics has applied on a higher level to produce a body of Marxist-Leninists as a result of the contradictions within the anti-revisionist movement.

The positive factor and basic characteristic in this higher development is that Marxist-Leninists are consciously motivated in the realisation of the need for a Marxist-Leninist Party, without which the British working class is defenceless against the onslaughts of the monopoly capitalist ruling class.

It is a basic law of dialectics, which is the philosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism, that all phenomenon in nature and society is in motion, and moreover, constant motion. Even when to external appearances some phenomenon gives the impression of quiescence or 'stagnation', the internal contradictions within it are determining its future development.

This is so in the anti-revisionist movement as a whole, because although it is the weaker aspect of the contradiction with revisionism, which represents bourgeois interests in the working class and communist movement, and therefore historically is faced with defeat.

these actions forced the remaining members of The Committee To Defeat Revisionism For Communist Unity to publicly divorce themselves from such action.

It is the considered opinion of these members of C.D.R.C.U. that the now members of W.P.S. have acted arbitrarily before fully debating the National question within this committee. In consequence of these actions and the motives underlying, having severed themselves from C.D.R.C.U. they can only be viewed as deviationists, for these actions will serve to temporarily divert and isolate the Scottish workers from ultimately uniting with their class brothers in England and Wales for their final aim, the overthrow of the British capitalist state. To then replace it with a British Socialist Republic. This the only possible form of nation to come into being from, and made possible by a moribund capitalist state such as ours.

Due to the defection of these comrades in taking this issue outside the sphere of inner party struggle, C.D.R.C.U. must now openly refute the nationalistic ideas that have been cloaked in revolutionary phrases and also blatantly expressed in the most anti-working class manner, as contained in their 'manifesto', such as 'English Imperialists' etc.

Ideas which stem from petty bourgeois nationalism.

The C.D.R.C.U. also refute such previously published ambiguous statements on the National question by this Committee as:

"A genuine Communist Party must be established in England, in Scotland and in Wales".

It is now seen and readily admitted that such ambiguous statements represent incorrect views on the National question. In order to correct this the C.D.R.C.U. issue the following declaration:

This Committee exists to unite Marxist-Leninists in Britain for a new Communist Party of Britain.

In view of the above development it becomes necessary to explain the events leading to the present policy of C.D.R.C.U. on the National question in Britain. A development that illustrates once again the internal self development of the Marxist-Leninist movement, revealing a contradiction that has co-existed under certain conditions but has eventually reached a stage of antagonism and divides into mutually exclusive opposites. A contradiction that has existed from the beginning within the committee of the working class.

It is hoped that a full explanation can be prepared, to appear in Vanguard in the near future, tracing the history of this contradiction. Comrades have a right to criticise our actions and every opportunity will be afforded for this purpose.

COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM FOR
COMMUNIST UNITY

September, 1967.

Published by: A. Cross, 18 Lincoln Road, London, E.13.

Printed by: A. Dover, 152 Upton Park Road, London, E.7.