

# VANGUARD

WORKERS OF ALL LANDS  
AND OPPRESSED PEOPLES  
UNITE!



ORGAN OF THE COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM, FOR COMMUNIST UNITY

**GENUINE COMMUNISTS, UNITE AROUND CDRCU**

VOL. 4 NO. 6.

NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 1967.

4th ANNIVERSARY OF CDRCU.....

VISIT OF GEN' SEC'

USA CP (M-L)

## CONTENTS

CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM .....	PAGE 2.
STATEMENT 19th NOV. 1967. ....	PAGE 3.
C.P.U.S.A. (M/L) VISIT. ....	PAGE 4.
DAVID GUEST. ....	PAGE 5.
LITERATURE/CORRESPONDENCE. ....	PAGE 6.
BOURGEOIS CONCEPT OF PARTIES.....	PAGE 8.
THE REVISIONISTS OF THE C.P.G.B. ....	PAGE 9.





C.D.R.C.U. and the B.M.L.O. A Challenge

An attempt was made on Sunday, 19th November 1967, at a meeting at Beaver Hall in London to negate the history of the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain. This grouping of "Marxists" with strict petty bourgeois backgrounds attempted, and will further attempt, to erase the history of the true revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain. They laid claim to being the forerunners and originators of the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain "for the first time". These people, far from being asleep to the events of the past 4 years are, in the opportunist nature of the petty-bourgeoisie, attempting to grasp control of the working class movement. This they hope to achieve by gaining hold of the British Trade Union Movement. History which is reality, is shunned. As far as gaining control of the present form of British Trade Unionism, this would in effect crystallise their opportunism and spontaneity and render dis-service to the Marxist-Leninist Movement, creating severe but temporary setbacks. They would in effect be doing the type of harm to Marxism-Leninism as the Labour Party has done to Socialism, by laying false claim.

This however will not be a long drawn out protracted affair precisely because of the nature of the abortive basis of its own existence and the excellent Marxist-Leninist conditions existing outside of it. They obviously do not understand the significance of the Marxist-Leninist Movement being firmly in the hands of the proletariat who have quite a tight hold of proletarian ideology. It is only the proletariat in their practice that can master this. All the abortionists and liquidators will if need be learn this to their cost. Whatever genuine developing Marxist-Leninists they may attract they will find it will be only temporary.

It is obvious that a genuine Marxist-Leninist will soon be able to detect the difference between true and false; positive and negative, correct and incorrect.

The C.D.R.C.U. challenges the B.M./L.O. to reveal what claim it has to the title "Marxist-Leninist" and on what basis it can issue a call to rally the militant workers to form a new Marxist-Leninist party in Britain?

We point out to the B.M./L.O. the conference of British Marxist-Leninists held in London in November, 1963, at which was laid down the basic policy and called for a new Marxist-Leninist party.

The reasons which made such a move necessary for British Communists was clearly outlined by Comrade M. McCreey in 'The Way Forward' published Jan. 1964. The need for a new party had arisen through their struggles with modern revisionism. These British Communists had become the founders of the present British Marxist-Leninist Movement. The C.D.R.C.U. continues to stand by that historical basis and seeks to unite British Communists around it. We ask the B.M./L.O. Where is your policy for uniting the working class? We would like to compare it with this policy of our founders, which we publish below for all to see. The six basic principles which represent the interests of the British working class.

**BASIC PRINCIPLES**

In what ways will the new Party differ from the old? It will be based, firstly upon the principle of proletarian internationalism. Without firm alliance with all oppressed peoples of the capitalist world, and with those who have won their freedom from exploitation, in the struggle against imperialism, there can be no future for the peoples of England, Scotland and Wales. Neo-colonial "economic and political realities" will be ruthlessly exposed. All possible support will be given to those struggling for national liberation from the British and allied imperialists, and in particular those who have been forced to take to arms, as in Oman, and North Kalimantan. For us, there can be no special "associations" or "relationships" between a Socialist Britain and the countries within the Empire and Commonwealth. All Socialist lands will join hands without distinction.

Secondly, the Party will fight to establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Britain. This involves smashing the capitalist state machine in a Socialist revolution which will be led by the workers own organisations (Soviets). Parliament, the instrument whereby the bourgeoisie maintain their rule, can never be used to win working class power. The role of Communist M.P's is to expose the capitalist system, and the fraud of Parliamentary democracy.

Thirdly, the Party will relate the struggles on all immediate issues (wages and conditions of work, housing, against military bases and militarism, for all democratic rights), to this central and final goal, the establishment of working class power. The result of struggles on all immediate issues should be to increase the understanding of the masses for the need to take political power into their own hands.

Fourthly, in the struggles for all immediate aims, and for the final conquest of power, the main line of the Party will be to mobilise the mass of the people for action. This demands organisation of the Party at the place of work. It is here that exploitation takes place, it is here that the workers are drawn together in common action against capital, it is here that agitation and propaganda can most effectively be organised.

Fifthly, the Party will fight for positions, and progressive policies, in all Trade Unions and Co-operatives, as a means of mobilising the mass of the people for action in defence of their own interests, but it will resolutely oppose the false idea that capturing of positions within the legal organisations of the Labour Movement, and the capitalist state within which they operate, is the road to working-class power.

Finally, not bureaucratic but democratic-centralism will operate within the new Party. Full discussion within the Party in order to reach agreement on policy in each new situation must be accompanied by united action to implement this agreed policy, with each basic unit itself translating the general policy into action within its local field of work. Only when the Party as a whole is capable of understanding the principles of Marxism-Leninism so as to apply them to conditions in Britain, and each unit of the Party is capable of understanding each policy and slogan so as to apply it to its own local conditions, can we give that leadership in the struggle against monopoly capital which the interests of the British people demand.

#### CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?

It is a recognised fact amongst developed and developing Marxist-Leninists that the form always lags behind the content of any given thing or phenomena. This is vividly illustrated in capitalist Britain. The means of production being the content, are Socialist in nature. The form, the relations of production, is capitalist. In recognising this basic truth, it is not at all hard to follow the manipulations and scheming of those self styled Labour leaders who wish to perpetuate a dying body which is giving off the usual smells of something going rotten. Now and again in the capitalist press (those that, more often than not, have the smallest circulations), we get a slight glimpse of the truth. The large circulation papers always have the tendency to smother their "discoveries" in euphorisms in order to mislead and confuse the working class.

Meanwhile it remains the task of all true Communists to explain and point to every act of betrayal by the monsters that claim true working class representation. We do not negate the Parliamentary system at this point however, this is the time and place to expose all those that are betraying the proletariat of Britain.

A few cases in point can be made now to substantiate the argument. While the Labour Government lays claim to being the representatives of the working class, we have 'The Times' of Nov.10th telling us that pit



man-power will be cut to a sixth of present requirements by 1980. (With that we can rest assured that it will be much earlier). On Nov. 7th the Earl of Longford was reported to have said ..... "In other words, employers had decided to retain fewer employees to produce the same amount of output.....It was to be hoped that the improvement would be permanent".

Further to these two pieces, or rather, in the middle on Nov. 8th the bombshell was dropped when the Chancellor of the Exchequer, J. Callaghan, was reported to have upheld the speech by Sir Leslie O'Brian to the foreign Bankers in Buenos Aires where the claim was made for a larger pool of unemployed in Britain. Since, of course, all types of fabrications have been made to cover over the real intentions as stated. Marx showed adequately that the capitalist system cannot survive for long without a mass of unemployed. Mr. Crossman was reported in the "Daily Express" of Nov. 8th as saying "It should be a warning to all parties that there are powerful forces in revolt not only against us, the Government of the day, but against the whole political system".

Now recognising that the political system is capitalist, this "Socialist" makes a statement like that!! Its an interesting exercise to see how the different dailies treat those subjects.

The 'Daily Mirror' Nov. 8th '67:- Circulation of over 5 millions. "The Government's aim was to spread employment more evenly throughout Britain, and he would fight for this policy "as long as I live".

The 'Daily Express' Nov. 8th '67:- Circulation (presumed, Ed.) about 4 million.

"Mr. John Mendelson (Lab. Penistone) jumped up to ask: "Would you say you accept or repudiate the Governor's statement that we should have a higher level of unemployment and unemployed resources than we had in the mid-fifties? Mr. Callaghan retorted: "The Governor of the Bank of England is carrying out the Government's policy. He agrees with it".

'The Times', Nov. 8th '67:- Circulation 3 hundred thousand, odd. "In supporting Sir Leslie's argument for a somewhat larger margin of unemployment, Mr. Callaghan developed his doctrine for evening out the levels of unemployment between the prosperous and less prosperous areas of Britain. He refused to go for full employment as such".

There are two particular points here worthy of special note. The 'Mirror's, "To spread employment more evenly". 'The Times', "evening out the levels of unemployment". Why the difference? It doesn't leave much room for guesswork.

The one truth that should be borne in mind by all the proletariat is Marx's prophetic statement. "When the capitalist class goes down, it will go with its teeth firmly embedded in the entrails of the organised working class".

The contradictions of capitalist society in Britain have not yet intensified to revolutionary conditions. When they do, Marx's statement will no longer be prophetic for Britain but fact. The working masses, presented with and accepting Parliamentary "Socialist" parties as alternatives will smash this bourgeois state apparatus and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

A. Cross.

C.D.R.C.U.

19th Nov. 1967

Statement:

The Central Committee of the C.D.R.C.U. at its meeting today condemns the policy of the Workers' Party of Scotland on the National question as being anti-Marxist, a petty-bourgeois deviation and opportunist.

Stalin's formulations of what constitutes a nation have universal validity, and those who deny them are guilty of revisionism. Britain is in an advanced stage of evolving historically as one nation from England, Wales and Scotland inseparably with the historic development of capitalism. To refer to the time when the three national constituents were separate as a justification for separatism is to

ignore subsequent historical development.

What remains of the past language and culture of Wales, Scotland and England are remnants of the past, are not the possession of the mass of the people, but are the preserves of the bourgeoisie. Britain has one language and a common culture. This does not deny specific feudal cultural expressions etc. The condition of Wales, Scotland and England are due to the economic exploitation by the British monopoly ruling class, and not due to the domination and exploitation of so called "English Imperialism". The same conditions as exist in Wales and Scotland also exist in the industrial parts of the north of England.

The national question is a class question, and the Workers' Party of Scotland is substituting petty-bourgeois nationalism for revolutionary class struggle against the British monopoly capitalist ruling class, and in so doing weakening the struggle of the British working class. To talk of a republic of Scotland and Scottish nationalism is to tail on to petty-bourgeois nationalism, and a betrayal and abandonment of the duty of a Marxist-Leninist party to mobilise the forces of the working class of Britain against the British capitalist class.

The support for Scottish nationalism has resulted in the stagnation and decline of the Workers Party of Scotland, since this nationalism is a petty-bourgeois manifestation. To support it is to support the petty-bourgeoisie and reduce the working class to a minor and insignificant role, instead of playing the vanguard role, which if not fulfilled cannot win support amongst the working class.

After reading the declaration of the Workers' Party of Scotland of the 4th Nov. 1967 and noting its national socialist nature, the Central Committee of the COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM FOR COMMUNIST UNITY hereby expels the members of Workers' Party of Scotland from their positions in C.D.R.C.U. This committee is convinced that the solidarity of all British Workers will inevitably assert itself in a single British Marxist-Leninist party.

Central Committee C.D.R.C.U.

Visit to Europe of General Secretary of  
C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist)

On the 19th Nov. 1967 Comrade M.I. Laski, Gen. Sec. C.P.U.S.A. (Marxist-Leninist), returned home on the conclusion of his visit to Europe. During his stay in London a successful first fraternal meeting was held between C.P.U.S.A. (M/L), and C.D.R.C.U. represented by Comrades M.I. Laski, Gen. Sec. and A. Dover, Sec. respectively.

The main subject for discussion was the question of Marxist-Leninist parties in advanced capitalist countries. Agreement was reached on the possibility and the need for utilising the experiences of Marxist-Leninist parties in the advanced capitalist countries, experience gained in the historical process of development and growth of their parties and to make this available for the assimilation and benefit of the emerging Marxist-Leninist movements in such as these countries. In order to facilitate the formation of Marxist-Leninist parties. It being clearly recognised at the outset, that change comes from within.

An objective demonstration of the practical application and utilisation of experiences which was in no way empirical but based on the concrete analysis of the concrete situation. Comrade M.I. Laski suggested and indicated that certain tactical errors were being made by Marxist-Leninists in Britain. As a consequence of these suggestions the C.D.R.C.U. has reviewed its position within the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain most critically and accepted these suggestions as being genuine criticisms based on the historical experience of the proletariat. Efforts are now being made to rectify these errors, thanks have been extended to the C.P.U.S.A. (M/L) through its General Secretary. And a fraternal link has now been established.

Further to the above. Subsequent events in Britain have proved beyond doubt the correctness of the theory presented on the question of



party formation by the C.P.U.S.A. (M/L).

A. Dover

Secretary, C.D.R.C.U.

DAVID GUEST

It seems that not many comrades are familiar with the name of one of the greatest heroes of Socialism. This of course is a direct consequence of the failure of the degenerate C.P.G.B. to keep revolutionary thought and action in the minds of the workers.

As well as the greatest contribution Comrade Guest gave to the international cause, that of his life, it is high time due recognition be given to his particular contribution to the working class movement in Britain. He is to be remembered by Marxist-Leninists for his dedication to the task of introducing the British working class to dialectical materialism and of being the first British revolutionary to take practical steps to do so.

Though it is not apparent that he had begun to apply dialectics to the class struggle here. His many lectures to the workers reveal his profound understanding of the theory and, since he was fully immersed in the practical struggles of the working class, it would naturally have been only a question of time, had he lived, for him to have mastered the application of dialectics and subsequently developed into being our foremost revolutionary leader.

His death in Spain during the summer of 1938 with the International Brigade at the age of 27, deprived the British working class of its most promising Comrade. A Comrade with qualities we were not to see again for a period of 25 years when in 1963 the late Comrade M. McCreery led the revolutionary movement of workers forward with an ability and skill that was based on a developing understanding of dialectical and historical materialism.

The name of David Guest is synonymous with dialectics. Recognition of this fact is a fitting tribute to a fine, and not forgotten revolutionary.

A. Dover

(Note: For the history of D. Guest's life and work:

'Lectures on Marxist Philosophy'. David Guest. Lawrence Wishart. London 1963.

4th Anniversary of the C.D.R.C.U.

On the 9th of November, 1963, with the issuing of 'An Appeal to all Communists', the Committee to Defeat Revisionism for Communist Unity led by its invincible leader, Michael McCreery, came into being. This followed directly in the wake of the London Conference that had conceived the triumphant policy of the principled revolutionary Marxist-Leninists against the policy of the transformists who wished no more than to transform the old party from within and without. With 'An Appeal to all Communists' being published in the name of the Committee to Defeat Revisionism for Communist Unity and led by Michael McCreery the British Working Class had at last embarked on to the highly principled revolutionary road of Marxism-Leninism. While the movement was activated within the womb of the old Communist Party of Great Britain, the true revolutionary Marxist-Leninist movement was born with the issue of 'An Appeal to all Communists' on the 9th November, 1963. From this date began the history of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain. In February, 1964, came the publication of the 'Vanguard' containing 'The Way Forward'. This was the first step of the Marxist-Leninist movement with Michael McCreery leading on the long hard road to Socialism.

We, of the Committee to Defeat Revisionism for Communist Unity are proud to announce and celebrate this fourth year of our history.



Thoughts of a Worker ..... "Forward"

Hell its hot!  
 Another shovelfull  
 Wouldn't ~~like~~ if it really done some good  
 Heave!  
 "Collosal amount of fuel boilers burn"  
 Phew! Not so fit as I used to be.  
 Best years gone, don't they say?  
 Must have done some good though.  
 Helped society forward I suppose,  
 Yeah, Capitalist society.  
 Hmm, forward to its decline. Ah thats better.  
 Best years gone? Not mine.  
 How you've changed since .....,  
 Ooh! my aching back. Never mind.  
 It has begun hasn't it?  
 In fact you're part of it.  
 Makes you feel proud.  
 Yes of course the meeting is tonight.  
 The new Comrade. He's very promising.  
 Well that job's done. What's next now...?  
 Be glad when dinner break comes.  
 Read my book then, .... be nice to study all the time.  
 No! be like them, then. Ugh. Its better like this.  
 Haven't done bad in a couple of years though, eh!  
 All helps to push things forward, the new society, that is.  
 Hmm, dialectical isn't it.  
 Ah well! Roll on break time and a feast on history.

A. Dover.  
 15/11/67.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Comrade,

July-August 'Vanguard', the letter entitled "Communists in Britain" really amazed me. The writer says "Communists in Britain .... think that revolutionary change is something that can be effected within the superstructure of capitalism". Who does he mean by Communists? Obviously the revisionists. John Gollan in "The Case for Socialism in the 60s" says "For socialism we need a socialist revolution" and later, "We seek to get the transition to socialism in the existing political conditions of Britain". Genuine Marxist-Leninists on the other hand, follow the teaching of Lenin in 'State and Revolution' that "the preliminary condition for every real people's revolution is the smashing, the destruction of the ready-made State machinery". So the writer, who says "I dearly want to see this system smashed" should apparently be on the side of the Marxist-Leninists. But what does he say? "I am of the conclusion that non-participation with Communist groupings (from the context he seems to mean both revisionist and Marxist-Leninist), has been correct and that for the overthrow of the system I must look elsewhere". Elsewhere, from his further comments, seems a very strange place. He discards the whole concept of the mass line stating that the millions of working people in the country will never forfeit their jobs, their H.P. commitments, the latest car model, the gimmicks of capitalist society, for participation in the proletariat-socialist revolution..... they are in a state of euphoria". (And this after alleging that we are "perhaps more ruthlessly exploited than ever were the Russians"!!!) How can you have a "proletariat-socialist revolution" without a proletariat?

Genuine Marxist-Leninists are not in the movement for the pleasure of leading or being led, but because they recognise that the basic struggle in society is the class struggle and, in this struggle, they place themselves unreservedly on the side of the working class and



devote themselves to the struggle for that ultimate victory of the working class - the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Can this be the case of someone who describes the workers as "more moronic than mere animals"? Of course there is widespread apathy. For many people this is a defence against the painful realisation that the working class is coming under greater and greater pressure from the capitalist class, and is in a situation from which there is no escape other than the proletarian revolution. As Chairman Mao says "All work done for the masses must start from their needs and not from the desire of any individual, however well intentioned. It often happens that objectively the masses need a certain change, but subjectively they are not yet conscious of the need, not yet willing or determined to make the change. In such cases we should wait patiently. We should not make the change until, through our work, most of the masses have become conscious of the need and are willing and determined to carry it out".

If the writer really wishes to smash the system he should realise that the only force capable of doing so is the working class of this country, aided by and expressing its wishes through, a Marxist-Leninist party.

As to the question of the formation of a party and the relationship between Marxism-Leninism and anti-revisionism, the meaning of anti-revisionism can only be fully understood when revisionism is understood. Revisionism is the betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles, as a result of opportunism and the influence of bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology. It is the belief that existing parliamentary systems can be used by the working class to obtain power, that the main enemy of the working class in this country is a small monopoly capitalist clique, against which all other social classes can be united and that the ideal society is as the Soviet system will be after the Libermann "economic reforms", i.e. a society in which the managers receive huge "incentives" and other bourgeois elements also benefit, at the expense of the workers, in other words, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

True anti-revisionism must therefore mean the complete negation of this bourgeois-collaborationist line, that is, the continued acceptance of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. Thus criticism of some of the features of revisionism, without a total commitment to Marxism-Leninism, is not anti-revisionism, merely a half way stage, from which people must eventually move, either to revisionism or to Marxism-Leninism. True anti-revisionism is therefore acceptance of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism. These must be the basis of Marxist-Leninist unity (or genuine anti-revisionist unity - the two are the same), not merely common opposition to the C.P.G.B. line on some issues.

How can it be judged whether or not individuals or groups do accept these basic principles? To demand agreement with a particular wording of a statement of these principles is clearly not sufficient. After all, the basic split in 1903 between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, between revolution and betrayal, came on the minute difference in wording between two forms of a resolution concerning membership of the Russian-Social Democratic Labour Party. The Leninist wording demanded active participation in a party organisation, the Mensheviks only wanted "regular personal co-operation under the guidance of one of its organisations".

So not only formal acceptance of certain stated principles is required, but acceptance of the attitude behind those principles, and this will be largely judged on the basis of actions taken in the struggle for unity and the building of a party organisation.

The basic principles which must be adhered to are the necessity for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the necessity for democratic centralism in the party and the recognition that although the parliamentary system has uses in the field of propaganda, it cannot be a means of transferring state power from the hands of the capitalists into those of the working class. The history of the neo-revisionists in Indonesia and in Kerala illustrates the need for this recognition.

Yours fraternally,  
John Ritson



THE BOURGEOIS CONCEPT OF PARTIES AND THE CORRECT ONE

The cause that gives rise to this article is the sudden spate of bourgeois analysis that has appeared in the capitalist press on the Russian Revolution of Oct' 1917.

As dangerous as it is comical, their pious condemnation of the one party system of Socialism needs a better comparison than they are capable of giving. Such are the "democratic rights" of the Proletariat of this country, these views could only be published in a Marxist-Leninist journal. The bourgeois press would, because this serves to enlighten the proletariat, be inclined to relegate these views to the dustbin. The biggest display of this nonsense was reflected in the business section of the 'Times', Nov. 6 1967. The day after the 'serious Sunday Papers' had had their fill. All the bourgeois intellectuals (of severe limited understanding) were summoned to misrepresent history and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Careful note should be made though of their praise for the revisionists (You don't insult those that are working in your interests, do you?)

The one party system, The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, which represents about ninety five per cent of the population is presented as being undemocratic because it leaves no other choice.

If the interests of the great majority are served via this process, what other choice do they need? The choice of that small minority the bourgeoisie which is diametrically opposed to that of the proletariat, to the mentality of the bourgeois experts constitutes democracy.

"But!" they cry "Haven't you got the Labour Party and all the other left wing parties to vote for on your behalf?"

Quite apart from the bankruptcy of the bourgeois apparatus of Parliament, we would like to point to the essence of the parliamentary parties. All this has been proven time and time again in practice and written about just as much. We have today in Parliament as Prime Minister, the ex-"left-winger" Wilson, surrounded by his clique, all aspiring to the same dizzy heights, breaking their necks in trying to solve the inherent contradictions of capitalism. In Stepney a poster stuck on the wall of the local Conservative Party office proclaims "Ten years of wasted Socialism". In the "Times" of Nov. 8th 1967, under the title "increase in productivity", the Earl of Longford, Lord Privy Seal, said latest forecasts of private investment for 1968 were encouraging. It seemed that not only was investment likely to be higher in 1968 than in 1967, but within manufacturing the increase would be for most part concentrated on the capital assets most vital to competitiveness-plant and machinery".

"It was true that the steps that the Government took last year to cope with the balance of payments problems led to a sharp slackening in demand for labour which proceeded faster than past experience would have suggested. A major reason for the shake-out of labour seemed to be a reappraisal by the employers of their labour requirements."

"In other words, employers had decided to retain fewer employees to produce the same amount of output. This meant there had been a considerable increase in productivity in manufacturing industry". Now typical of all those that are idling about in Parliament and just blowing, they have no worry over jobs. (Except of course, those that are busy climbing up the backs of the working class in order to land themselves cushy numbers) i.e. Ernest Bevin. From Dockland to Carlton House Terrace. Only one of many. All we have to do is study the background of any of these leading lights. See where they started and are going or finished. To survey the whole scene of Parliamentary procedure and practice, you will see that you only vote for a different label but capitalism all the time. Something like the wily landlady who, when seeing the disgruntled look on the face of her guest when eating bread and market produced marmalade, offers her own make which turns out to be worse in taste. All in all, can anybody admit to a different society via Parliament? Who but a capitalist would call the present system of society socialist? Who can point to any part of the world at any time in history or the present and say "there is Socialism gained by the Parliamentary system? Not even the good Lord himself.

A. Cross.



THE REVISIONISTS OF THE C.P.G.B. UNFURL THE WHITE FLAG  
OF SURRENDER AND COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY BETRAYAL FOR ALL TO SEE

On the 27th April the E.C. of the C.P.G.B. issued a statement which it entitled "Questions of Ideology and Culture", in which it enunciated its views on art, religion, science and politics.

What this statement amounts to is a complete renunciation of the philosophical basis of Marxism-Leninism. Behind a screen of petit-bourgeois platitudes revisionist ideology is shamelessly paraded, and revolutionary viewpoints rendered meaningless from a scientific, class approach. This statement is ineffect an application for the revisionist C.P.G.B. to be admitted to the Establishment "club", as a respectable, non-revolutionary, "democratic" party. This statement has publicly announced that British monopoly capitalism has nothing to fear from King Street. Through this statement the revisionist leaders of the C.P.G.B. have renounced the right to use the honourable name of Communist.

Nowhere in the statement is the word "Marxist-Leninist" used. Of course there is nothing wrong for genuine revolutionaries to use the name Marxist, but the revisionists now use the word to cut themselves adrift from the revolutionary teachings of Marxism, as developed each in their time by Lenin, Stalin and Mao, to meet the changing revolutionary conditions. In this way the revisionists jettison the revolutionary content of Marxism-Leninism, and reduce "Marxism" to an academic philosophy, as they say "based" on science. Marxism, as developed by Marx's inheritors, is a complete science ---- the science of revolution. The revisionists all the way through the statement refer to themselves as "Marxists", but Lenin said, "Only he is a Marxist who extends recognition of the class struggle to recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat". By this test the leadership of the C.P.G.B. are not Marxists as we shall see.

It (the statement) speaks of "man on the threshold of a new society", as if "man" were an abstract, and not a class creature divided into two irreconcilable classes, engaged in the present historical era in a great life and death struggle in which the dominant aspect of the contradiction is the rising revolutionary consciousness of the people in one continent after another fighting for national and social liberation, an era which Mao has characterised as "the defeat of imperialism and the victory of socialism on a world scale".

Even the use of Wilsonian pragmatism is not shunned in creating the impression that the "new problems" which "Marxism" must face is a matter of making the best use of science and technology, even mentioning the restrictions imposed by monopoly capitalism the effects of which Wilson himself is trying to undo for the better benefit of other sections of capitalism. Socialism to the revisionists is reduced virtually to a matter of opinion, and not of scientific principle, to a system that can solve problems better than the Tories can; but it is not a matter of "solving problems" but of overthrowing the capitalist system in order to solve them.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that in the struggle for socialism, which is primarily a question of class power, the working class must take the leading role, for it is the most revolutionary class in the struggle against capitalism, and that it must ally itself with other proletarian strata, and win over or neutralise sections of the petit-bourgeoisie. This was the case in Russia when the poor peasantry were the allies of the working class in the October revolution. In China, a broad anti-imperialist front united to defeat imperialism, feudalism and the anti-national section of the capitalist class. China's national and social liberation was a revolution contributed to by different social strata, and as long as the economic base existed for them these classes could be mobilised to unite the people to continue the struggle for socialism. The existence of democratic parties, side by side with the party of the working class Mao referred to "long term co-existence and mutual supervision"; but the main influence was the Communist Party of China, a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party.



Britain is a highly developed independent capitalist country. The working class is the main force to be mobilised to overthrow the capitalist system, with potential allies among the lower petit-bourgeoisie. However, the C.P.G.B. envisages the advance to Socialism in Britain as the work, not of a single party, but of a "broad front", which it defines as "communist, socialists of the Labour Party (?) and labour movement, and industrial, professional workers and intellectuals." Socialism through a "broad front", with people from a party and movement which has traditionally been dominated by the right wing, still continuing with the fallacy that there is a "left wing" which is socialist, the left wing that Wilson once belonged to, and to which future right wingers belong to now. It is through this idea of a broad front that the revisionists destroy the revolutionary content of Marxism. This has nothing to do with allies, tactics, unity or leadership. It is the disguise under which revisionist fallacies are peddled, and the leadership of the working class submerged in social-democratic policies. This is not a new idea. It has always been in the forefront of C.P.G.B. calculations, and even emerged as an application for affiliation to the Labour Party during World War II, when the party was most acceptable. Herbert Morrison put an end to that dream, much as de Gaulle ended Britain's hope of joining the Common Market in 1963. But what need has the British ruling class of such derelicts as the Dutts, Campbells and Gollans, when they have Wilson. This revisionist broad front has nothing in common with Mao's "long term co-existence", which is fully in line with Lenin's idea of a special alliance of classes, because whereas Mao and Lenin are Marxists-Leninists, the revisionists are so-called "Marxists" who deny the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is only possible through revolution.

A big plank in this revisionist betrayal is the proposal for "discussions" between "Marxists" and Christians. Are the "Marxists" to convert the Christians, or vice versa? Remembering what Marx said about religion being the opium of the people, and since Marxist-Leninists correctly appraise religion as one form of ruling class ideology imposed on the people, what can there be in common between genuine revolutionaries and Christians as such, except as workers? Marxist-Leninists believe that "to rebel is justified", whilst Christians preach submission to class exploitation. Discussions on other than a class basis is a concession to a pernicious ideology, and a retreat before metaphysics. This liberalism towards religion is an integral part of revisionism. Such discussions are not for the purpose of countering metaphysics, but to find what common ground exists between pseudo-Marxists and Christians as part of the revisionists plan to break into respectable politics, by repudiating revolution.

Revisionism does exactly this in that part of the statement which says, "We believe that the possibility now exists of achieving socialism through our traditional democratic institutions, including parliament, by struggle, but without armed conflict and civil war". In other words the fallacy of "peaceful transition" expounded by Khrushchev and his disciples, which has the aim of corroding the revolutionary spirit of those struggling for social and liberation. The statement of the C.P.G.B. is completely contrary to all historical experience. Even the history of bourgeois revolutions deny this. But the revisionists of the C.P.G.B. try to ring the changes by pretending that there is a "British road to socialism", the road of class peace, and that democracy is majority rule, that if the workers wanted to end the capitalist system in Britain, and voted accordingly, the British ruling class would stand by the result. "Traditional" democratic institutions would ensure that. But the fallacy in this argument is not the obvious one, but that to lead the workers to that outlook requires leading them in revolutionary struggle against the capitalist system, of which "traditional" institutions are a part and armed struggle is the culmination. If struggle against capitalism is real, and not sham, the revisionists do not explain how this struggle can be stopped short of armed struggle when it reaches a certain



stage. It is their theory of "peaceful transition" which brands the revisionist C.P.G.B. as a social democratic party, and therefore anti-Marxists.

In a speech to the First International in Moscow on the 4th March, 1919, Lenin, whom the C.P.G.B. have now repudiated in practice, said, "History teaches that not a single oppressed class ever came to power, or was able to come to power, without going through a period of dictatorship, i.e. without winning political power and using force to put down the most desperate and most frantic resistance, and resistance which stops at no crime and to which the exploiters have always resorted." Mao Tse Tung has also said, "Everything reactionary is the same; if you don't hit it, it won't fall." Most will accept the words of Lenin and Mao, because they are founded on experience, in preference to the nonentities in the leadership of the C.P.G.B. Following the revisionist line of Moscow is not something new for the C.P.G.B. On the 24th March, 1956, in the "Daily Worker", Harry Pollitt wrote, after the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. when Krushchov made his attack on Stalin, "More and more Stalin based himself on the theory of the intensification of the class struggle within the socialist state, even after the complete victory over the capitalists and landlords had been established. To accept this theory as a guide was bound to lead to an atmosphere of distrust and suspicion, and an exaggerated role being assigned to the security service which placed them above the Soviet Govt., and the Party". One look at the Soviet Union today under the conditions of the restoration of the system of commodity production proves that Stalin was right, that his policy was correct, and supported Lenin's views and theories. The great proletarian cultural revolution in China, under the guidance of Mao, who has developed Marxism-Leninism to its highest level in the present era, has smashed Pollitt's fallacies to smithereens. Mao writes in "Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People", that "The class struggle is by no means over. The class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the class struggle between the different political forces, and the class struggle in the ideological field between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, will continue to be long and tortuous, and at times will become very acute." All the great revolutionary leaders agree that socialism can only be achieved, established and consolidated through revolution, yet the revisionists deny this historical truth, which make their fraudulence the more transparent, since the world has had twenty years of modern revisionism, first denounced by Stalin in 1948, and later more fully exposed by the Communist Party of China and the Albanian Party of Labour.

Much is said in the statement of "free discussion" and "freedom of the Press". This comes oddly from a party which is expelling members from its ranks for holding to the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint of classes and the class struggle, supporting revolutionary China, and opposing the counter-revolutionary behaviour of the revisionists of the Soviet Union. Not being able to defeat their opponents ideologically by inner party struggle the revisionists of the C.P.G.B. have to resort to expulsions.

As for Press freedom, this is utter hypocrisy coming from a party whose organ, the "Morning Star", suppresses any criticism of the Soviet Union on grounds of revisionism, and of any viewpoint favourable to revolutionary China. The pages of this degenerate revisionist "rag" are only open to those who vilify revolutionary China and Mao Tse Tung, and prettify revisionism in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. The C.P.G.B. is using the terms "free discussions" and "freedom of the Press" in a bourgeois way for the purpose of hawking revisionism, and deceiving its misguided supporters and any who will believe it. Mao has described revisionism as "one form of bourgeois ideology", and the C.P.G.B. statement is stuffed with this poison from beginning to end behind a false label of "Marxism", which it uses as a trading sign to try to avoid political bankruptcy. This poison of bourgeois ideology emanates from the class composition of the cultural committee which produced this statement. This committee is overwhelmingly composed of



petit-bourgeois intellectuals. Working class revisionists are infected with an ideology alien to their class interests, but without Marxist-Leninist leadership intellectuals naturally gravitate towards petit-bourgeois ideology, which is expressed in the working class movement as opportunism and revisionism. The statement reflects this class influence of the petit-bourgeois intellectual, and it is this alien influence which is uppermost in the leadership of the C.P.G.B. Hence its revisionism.

In speaking of democracy the C.P. statement suggests a "wider democracy, and refers to it as if it were a state of Arcadian bliss in which everyone participates only for the asking. The class content of democracy is not approached. Democracy, like any other phenomenon of class society is a class conception. Democracy is a disguise for bourgeois dictatorship under the capitalist system. It is the sum total of the rights, freedoms and liberties which the working class have been able to win for itself in class struggle against the capitalist class, represented by the capitalist state machine. It is not capitalism, the capitalist class or the capitalist state machine which creates, or has created, democracy, but the working class over a period of struggle. Were it not for the working class there would be no democracy, for the capitalist class would exercise absolute dictatorship in open form as under fascism. For example, when workers in Britain formed trade unions in the early 19th Century, the bourgeoisie reacted by passing the Combination Act of 1824. Only working class struggle eventually won the right to organise. Democracy is a limitation on bourgeois dictatorship in varying degree, which gives the working class greater scope for its struggles. This state of limited freedoms for the workers is always under attack by the capitalist state machine whenever the workers use the rights they have won, as is evidenced by the anti-trade union legislation of the Labour Government, and the way the police are used increasingly against demonstrators.

Yet the C.P.G.B. is creating the idea that it is only a matter of "wider" democracy that is at stake, like letting out the seams of a coat. The statement says that "monopoly capitalism is attacking the achievements of democracy." Yet in the preceding paragraph of the statement it is asserted that, "..... the possibility now exists for achieving socialism through our traditional democratic institutions". "Our traditional institutions" are capitalist institutions, designed to serve the perpetuation of the capitalist system. This is anti-Marxist-Leninist, because socialism can only be achieved by smashing the state machine of the capitalist class. If democracy is under "vigorous attack" it is by the forces of suppression of the capitalist state machine. The statement refers to "monopoly capitalism" in this respect to hide the repressive character of the capitalist state machine in order to serve its purpose of "peaceful transition". Under such conditions how can the possibility exist for "peaceful transition", now or at any other time. When mentioning the "vigorous attack" on democracy the term "monopoly capitalism" is also used to hide the guilt of the Labour Government, for it, and the Labour Party as a whole, is just as much an instrument of monopoly capitalism as is the Tory Party. The fact that it depends on working class votes is not the deciding factor, for so does the Tory party.

An oblique attack on dialectical materialism is also made in the statement through a reference to Lysenko, a Marxist-Leninist biologist in the time of Stalin, which says, "... to determine as foregone conclusions theories which could not be established as a result of research, debate and experiment, as in the case of Lysenko, the result has been extremely harmful." The reader gets the impression that Lysenko's scientific conclusions, whose philosophical basis is Marxism-Leninism, had been groundless and hasty. In fact at the time they were published there was wide discussion around them. The revisionists are treating Lysenko the same way as they treated Stalin, because both were dialectical materialists, i.e. Marxist-Leninists.

On art and culture the statement says, "We do not think that under socialism, painting, sculpture, literature and music must comply



with a single standard, congenial to all, or be immediately comprehensible without effort and study." This is a disguised bourgeois, classless view of art and culture. It is a revisionist plea for "art for arts sake", "freedom" in art, as an attack on art as a means of developing revolutionary social conscienceness. This attack on proletarian art is put in words so absurd that "everyone" must agree with the conclusion, and thus endorse revisionism in art and culture.

Marxist-Leninists know that culture cannot stand above classes and expresses the ideological interests of the ruling class in power under given social systems and historical periods. Art, literature and culture express definite class politics. The "single standard" referred to in the statement is an invention by the revisionists for the purpose of attacking by implication proletarian art, creating the false impression that art which represents the interests of the working class is of single standard, but that bourgeois inspired art, with its abstractionist, surrealist, and idealism in general gives greater "freedom" to the artist. This is the petit-bourgeois individualism which is the basis of revisionism, and in art disguises itself as "neutral" behind a facade of over-emphasis on form. We are told that "Marxist" historians have made contributions to the study of the history of culture, of its relations to society and struggle of classes, "but much difficult and exciting work lies ahead". This is utterly meaningless and will win the approval of the cosmopolitans in Hampstead and Montmartre. Mao's quotation, "Letting a hundred flowers blossom" means clearing the ground of poisonous weeds. The C.P.G.B. attitude to art stifles proletarian art.

But if the C.P.G.B. claims not to believe in laying down a "line" in art, it is for the purpose of hiding the line it has, because the line it really stands for is the bourgeois revisionist line. But Mao Tse Tung, as a Marxist-Leninist has a line, and which he has openly declared. In "Talks at the Yen-an Forum on Literature and Art", Mao says "The first problem is; literature and art for whom?" This is a key question which the revisionists in the C.P.G.B. cannot ask, because it is a class question. Mao goes on "This question was solved long ago by Marxists, especially Lenin. As far back as 1905, Lenin pointed out emphatically that our literature and art should "serve ... the millions and tens of millions of working people."

As in the rest of the statement those who composed it deny in one line what they avowed in the preceding one. So we read, "We welcome artists .... who lend their talents to the struggle for peace, freedom and socialism". Then, "But the Communist Party does not see its task as being to direct what is written, painted or composed". Is not this a "line"? This is both a distortion and a denial of the role of a real Communist Party. Revolutionary artists and writers must understand Marxism-Leninism if their work is to express the life of socialist reality, meet the cultural needs of the working people in the highest possible artistic form, and be an ideological factor in bringing the subjective and the objective closer together under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To reject a "line" is to accept social democratic spontaneity.

By referring themselves to the workers as "Marxists", and not Marxist-Leninists, the C.P.G.B. leaders are not only unwittingly recognising the line of demarcation which exists between themselves and anti-revisionists, who are the true Marxists since they stand by the development of the revolutionary teachings of Marx by both Lenin and Mao, but by dropping the name of Lenin the revisionists are trying to expunge the revolutionary content of Marx's teachings, and give it the petit-bourgeois attraction of being an academic "science" only, which can be discussed with complete safety without its devotees incurring the "stigma" of being revolutionaries.

The C.P.G.B. statement on "Ideology and Culture" is not written for a future socialist Britain, for socialism cannot be achieved without a revolutionary Party, and without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary party. Its purpose is to assure the bourgeoisie that the C.P.G.B. has not retained a vestige of Marxism-Leninism on anything in its policies.



Just as Gollan said on his return from the recent meeting of European revisionist parties in Czechoslovakia about the statement issued afterwards, "There is something in it for everybody", the same can be said for the C.P.G.B. statement, except that there is nothing in it, or the Karlovy Vary statement, for Marxist-Leninists and the working class.

R.A. ARCHBOLD

READ THE

VIETNAM

COURIER

FOR NEWS OF THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE

IN VIETNAM weekly

price 6<sup>d</sup> (Inc. Postage)

Advertisement.

Gateway to British-Chinese Friendship  
Organiser: Mrs. E. Ba gley, 2 Vincent Road,  
Croydon, CRO 6ED. Tel. 01-654 5185.

I have pleasure in announcing the opening of a cultural and educational centre, where Chinese literature, art, hand-crafts, greeting cards, (Xmas, New Year, etc.), stamps, childrens books, pottery, sculpture and many beautiful objects will be available-- articles and cards that will make excellent and extremely attractive gifts.

For complete details send stamped addressed envelope.  
aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

THE COMMITTEE TO DEFEAT REVISIONISM FOR COMMUNIST UNITY  
WISH ALL OUR READERS AND THOSE ENGAGED IN THE STRUGGLE  
AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM A HAPPY NEW YEAR.

Printed by L. Swann 123 Norman Road, Leytonstone, London. E.11.  
Published by A. Cross 18 Lincoln Road, London. E.13.



## A QUESTION OF DEFINITION

### ANTI REVISIONISTS AND MARXIST-LENINISTS

There is much confusion in the writings of some Marxist-Leninists as to the distinction between Marxist-Leninists and Anti-Revisionists in Britain.

We often read and hear references to "Anti-Revisionist" and "Marxist-Leninist" movements, organizations and individuals, without any explanation of the real differences involved, for apparently it has not been grasped and thereby remains obscure for many Communists.

The common factor in these two definitions (for they are two distinctly different phenomena) is; the need for a revolutionary party.

The next step is of course, to reveal the particular differences inherent in each of these manifestations of class struggle. This must be done from the historical materialist standpoint, as one is necessarily related to and born of the other.

First we take Anti-Revisionism and its development as the highest form of working class struggle in its opposition and efforts to defeat revisionism in the then workers party (C.B.G.B.) and its emergence and development inside that party.

The law of contradiction teaches us the identity and difference in opposites. Here we had one aspect which knew of the necessity of violent overthrow of the State struggling with the other aspect, with its ideas of peaceful evolution. This struggle was waged in, around and for control of the party. Even though some of these Anti-Revisionists had been expelled and carried on a struggle from outside. Their fight was centred on and for that party.

It must be stated that this struggle was a correct one up to this point and naturally they referred to themselves as Marxist-Leninists.

This was quite a legitimate claim for the Anti-Revisionist faction both inside and outside the party. Thus far we have the identity of the then highest form of Marxism-Leninism as being the 'Anti-Revisionist movement', which laid in the womb of the old order, whose ideas briefly aimed at transforming the old party into a revolutionary party.

But, here again as with all things, this movement was not a single united entity. There was a new content struggling with the old form.

A point had been reached where some Marxist-Leninists realised the impossibility of the transformation of the old party. A division was appearing that culminated in a clear split which was manifest in the 1963 Conference when the objective Marxist-Leninists openly called for a new party and eventually, through the ensuing struggle, raised the level of Marxism-Leninism in Britain to a new level, advancing it to its highest form yet. At the same time as they broke completely with the old party so too they left behind the dogmatists who could not grasp the need for a revolutionary break and could not readjust their ideas or correct mistakes. Ignoring objective lessons and stubbornly persisting with their subjective ideas, they slid to their inevitable defeat and subsequent oblivion, just as the after-birth, reluctant to leave but unwanted in the womb of the parent, soon also to be discarded as a fetter by the child. In this process they forfeited all title to Marxism-Leninism, for Marxism-Leninism moved on, but historically speaking, the identity they still retain is that of 'Anti-Revisionists'.

Anti-revisionism has been a historical stage in the development of Marxism-Leninism in Britain and from it we learn much. Anti-revisionists there are still. Some are comrades objectively treading the same path as those before them on the road to Marxism-Leninism.



So we can see how this new entity was born. The identity and aims of which are for a NEW revolutionary party and accordingly, those Communists who right up to the present moment call openly for such a party can legitimately lay claim to being Marxist-Leninists.

But, watch closely, other changes have since taken place with more to come; new divisions have appeared. Marxism-Leninism will yet again rise to a higher form in Britain leaving behind those who really have nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism.

In conclusion it should be recognised that:

- A. The correct definition of an Anti-Revisionist is clearly a 'Transformist', as one who has not yet broken with the old form of struggle or old party.
- B. It should be defined that a Marxist-Leninist is one who is engaged in a movement of the highest development of class consciousness. As being a Communist who is calling at this moment for a NEW revolutionary party, based on the recognition of the need for the forcible overthrow of the State by the working class and its allies led by such a party of the working class.

Editors.

prepared August 1967.

(It is regretted the late appearance of the above has been due to production difficulties).

#### A FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION FOR THE MARXIST

A study of the history of human thought reveals that man can only correctly posit what is absolute in things. That which he cognises as being definitely so in any phenomena at a given moment. Since all things in nature are continually undergoing change, so must man's definitions change accordingly, for we see things that were once definitely so become not so. In fact the definite does not remain so indefinitely. The definite is also indefinite.

The above relates to man's notions which reflect the real world. His language consists of a history of definitions, a history of his notions of the real world. Each definition is an approximately correct reflection of phenomena at a given moment, reflecting the absolute content of things. Things that are absolutely so. But, being Marxists and recognising change in all things, how do we define that which is absolute yet is not? For we can see that this absolute is in itself relative.

Marxism long ago resolved this question inherent in all things. The Marxist definition is there is an 'Absolute within the Relative'. History proves this concept to be a correct reflection of the nature of things. For example, the Capitalist nature of society is the form of society at the moment because of its dominance, which gives rise to the appearance of society as a whole as being Capitalist. No need to be reminded of the Socialist part of society and its not being Capitalist, also that there can never be an "absolute" absolute, (that is an absolute in the mechanical materialist sense). For we recognise change in all things, thus we recognise the relativity of all things also.

History has shown us the one sided subjectivist ideas on the relativity of things, namely Relativism, that all things are relative and exclude the absolute. On the other hand the absolute of metaphysics, which excludes the relative, are manifestations of philosophical idealism which have interpreted both instability and stability in nature as a one sided basis for a doctrine. Though many may scoff at idealism it does nevertheless have its roots in objective reality. This is where the danger lies for any Marxist who does not clearly understand the Marxist conception of the absolute and the relative. For he is always prone to falling into either of, or shades of, these one-sided modes of thought. Some may even be observed to vacillate from one side to the other, thereby creating confusing ideas about this



It is only after fully understanding the Marxist definition of the absolute within the relative that we can begin to appreciate that essential change comes from within things. From struggle within all things. A quantitative struggle that leads to sudden qualitative change. Essential change which will change appearance also, though the appearance lags behind real content and is always in contradiction with it. This lag corresponds in society to the difference between the economic base and the superstructure, or in human thought between being and thinking. Man's ideas arise out of his being, also the superstructure rises out of the economic base in order to satisfy its requirements.

Since society is class society the changes are class changes and classes all differ only in their relation to the means of production. But only one class at a given moment controls the means of production. This class and its mode of production dominates and gives rise to the form of society, the absolute form. But, the mode of production further develops and brings into being new classes, with new ideas to change the old superstructure to conform to the new emerging mode of production and so struggle to change the form of society to overthrow the old absolute with its class laws. To establish a new absolute and its class laws.

Now some will say that any Marxist-Leninist knows this already. But the point to be made here is this. Marx revealed in 'Capital' the absolute within the present relative form of society and revealed the struggle of opposites and all the subsequent, interdependent contradictions in this form. Both Mao-tse-tung in 'On Contradiction' and Lenin in 'On the question of dialectics' (V.38) point out that this exposition was the method by which Marx treated a particular contradiction. Marxists should endeavour to master this method and examine all contradictions in this way. Whether it be a complex process such as Capitalist society or lesser ones as for example the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain.

#### NEW FORM

The emergence of the new form of workers movement which arose out of reaction to the old form (C.P.G.B) culminating in a revolutionary break and call for a new form, (New party), established itself with a qualitative difference. Its identity was Marxist-Leninist. This was absolute. But immediately there were two lines, two roads to the new party. To rebuild anew or transform the old. History again shows us which aspect was objective and which subjective, which in fact achieved dominance and now gives rise to the appearance of the particular form of Marxism-Leninism at the moment.

Now this working class organisation (C.D.R.C.U) which was established in 1963 out of the Anti-Revisionist movement. From the Marxist point of view it was to be expected that though this was the highest form yet reached by the class conscious workers of Britain, was this the apex of class leadership? The answer is of course "No", for development goes on towards a higher form. This present form would not remain so indefinitely.

As Marxists we must look for the development leading to change from within things as we have said, from a struggle of opposites. Since 1963 the class struggles took place between the developing proletarian ideology and practice and bourgeois ideology and practice. A higher stage of proletariat leadership was engaged each time with a higher stage of bourgeois reaction, a higher degree of class struggle took place. This was a process by which the differences within the new workers organisation were manifested and resulted in splits to which the several aspects of the Marxist-Leninist movement owe their existence. Their common identity is the same but their particularity is different and exclusive.

The group of leaders within this committee (C.D.R.C.U) of the proletariat, has continually purged itself of bourgeois ideology and practice, and with each purge it has enriched itself. But the struggle goes on with these aspects still, for one of them is necessarily dominant and is holding back progress, obstructing genuine unity. We must continue the struggle with it, for it has our identity also, for



constitutes the present form of Marxism-Leninism in Britain today. Out of this form will come the new form of leadership. The aspect that puts forward the objective proletarian demands around which it will be possible to form proletarian unity.

Those who have been unable to accept the change to higher forms of leadership, those who cling to the old form of ideology, are left to stagnate with ideas around which there could not possibly be any proletarian unity.

A point was again reached where a revolutionary break had to be made. This time in September 1966 C.D.R.C.U issued its statement clearly distinguishing itself from these bourgeois elements of the movement. Who not accepting change not attempting to remould their non-proletarian ideas are unable to correct their mistakes. So we take up the challenge and dare to struggle against that which is dominant, struggle to change the form to a higher one. C.D.R.C.U has as its weapon a qualitatively higher class consciousness than these petty bourgeois adherents to Marxism-Leninism. A new content based on dialectical and historical materialism, a content that will transform the old petty bourgeois base of Marxism-Leninism in Britain, which even now is absolute. Into a real revolutionary base of struggle for objective change from within. Not to struggle to patch up that which is breaking down. But begin to build the new on a firm basis in order to break down the old decadent unity. Demand a higher form of leadership.

### NATURE OF STRUGGLE

It must be pointed out that clearly the nature of class struggle for us at the present time is predominantly ideological, though of course we know this will not always be so. For it is essentially a question of class leadership, hence the necessary call for a new party. This will continue to be so until the most advanced class conscious workers firmly establish themselves as leaders by practical demonstrations of putting forward correct theory and proving its ability to resolve the class question at each stage of development, which in our case at the moment is the question of a new party. The way forward to unity. A fine example of this was the C.D.R.C.U policy openly calling for a new party in 1963 against all opposition. This was correct class leadership which has been borne out by objective developments. This also bears out the fact that leadership must be established first in any development in society. The correct plan of action must first be put forward. This applies for us no less today, for within the Marxist-Leninist movement exists the leadership to carry the development of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain a revolutionary leap, to a higher form of unity. Marxist-Leninists must not be fooled by the absolute appearance but look for the new objective aspect that is not necessarily dominant for this is a question of quality and quantity. Leadership consists of the highest qualitative development in a given thing at a given moment. For us this leadership is to be found right here in the ranks of the most class conscious workers in Britain. It is now up to all honest Marxist-Leninists to examine the particular aspects of the Marxist-Leninist movement in their relations to the question of a new party. It is here that you will identify the dominant aspect and the secondary aspects, also which of these is the objective one that is emerging with a higher qualitative difference.

The Marxist-Leninist movement as is shown here is not an absolute unchanging thing but is an absolute that is relative to the moment, and is subject to change. Without leadership there can be no change. The need for change will, however, bring forward leaders.

Together with the ultimate concept of the 'absolute within the relative' there is a correct reflection of the ultimate law of nature, 'Contradiction', the law of change. The Marxist definition of the absolute within the relative is the cognition of change, movement in things and therefore identifies thinking with being.

Mao-tse-tung in 'On Contradiction' further explains this process of change from within things and the struggle of opposites brought about by external conditions. Also in 'On Practice' (the Marxist theory of knowledge) he directs us to observe the general appearance of a thing and then to proceed to the particular aspects returning again to the general. Further that the nature of a thing is determined by its



it is the contradictions within the anti-revisionist movement which has produced a Marxist-Leninist body, which is the dominant aspect of the contradiction within that movement, and will ultimately be the dominant aspect of the contradiction with revisionism, and beyond that with capitalism. The fulfilment of this role demands the formation of a Marxist-Leninist Party. A Marxist-Leninist Party can only be formed by Marxist-Leninists, and not merely anti-revisionists. There can be no such political entity as an anti-revisionist party, as the I.C.O. trotskyists claim.

To form a Party demands theoretical, ideological, political and organisation unity, and these can only be achieved through a process of struggle and patient preparation. It is no use trying to stake a claim first to the title of 'Marxist-Leninist' in order to beat others to the 'gun', to forestall a spurious outfit from usurping the name 'Marxist', rushing to win foreign recognition on the basis of foreign language bulletins, dinner parties to foreign delegations or wreath laying at Highgate Cemetery. This is mere adventurism, and the chicanery of careerists. Nor is false claim made in transitory disguise, and hurrying people along to unconvinced acceptance of incorrectly formulated and tendentious theories a substitute for correct Marxist-Leninist leadership.

Mao says 'take a whiff at everything', and after much investigation, analyses and experience within the anti-revisionist movement, I have finally decided that the 'Committee for the Defeat of Revisionism and Communist Unity' is the only Marxist-Leninist body in Britain. It is unnecessary to use the word 'genuine' where Marxism-Leninism is concerned, because the shams and the spurious expose themselves in due time, and those who insist on its use do so to cloak their make-believe, and impose acceptance on others through the conformity of intimidation, or desire to associate with what is 'genuine'.

It is because C.D.R.C.U. as a body has seen the need to study and understand materialist-dialectics in its highest philosophical forms that it has been able to make correct Marxist-Leninist formulations on theoretical questions, at the same time recognising its own limitations through the need to learn from others who have something to contribute from their own experience, and thus enrich its own. It has been able to deal correctly with contradictions between 'the people' on the one hand, and 'enemy' on the other. In other words, it has not made 'enemies' of those who have disagreed with it, except those who are clearly anti-Marxist-Leninist by their actions. What is more, it has put revolutionary principle first - and that is the guarantee of honesty - a rare quality in some quarters. Without it there cannot be either a correct policy or confidence among comrades.

Finally, what is a correct policy? One which advances the interests of the working class. Like all simple truisms it has the disadvantage of sounding like a platitude, but when one remembers that a correct policy will ultimately result in the formation of a Marxist-Leninist Party, one can realise the force inherent in such a simple truth. As Mao says, 'truth is what conforms to reality', and the reality that faces the British working class is that at the moment it has no Marxist-Leninist Party. Recent events in the anti-revisionist movement have strengthened the position of C.D.R.C.U. as a Marxist-Leninist body. Now is the time for those who have remained uncommitted to re-examine their position, and those who have made errors to correct them.

R.A. ARCHBOLD

In the next issue of Vanguard we shall be publishing an article by the above comrade entitled:  
 "The Revisionists Of The C.P.G.B. Unfurl The White Flag Of Surrender And Counter-Revolutionary Betrayal For All To See".



dominant aspect thus giving rise to absolute appearance.

An understanding of this will certainly lead to an understanding of things in themselves.

Identity is synonymous with the thing. Synonymous with Universality in contradiction.

This ultimate concept that defines both being and not being. The absolute within the relative is fundamental and therefore is of paramount importance to the Marxist.

A. Dover.

Reference.

( From studies of the texts of V.38. Lenin in particular 'On the question of Dialectics'. Also 'Materialism and Empirio Criticism' and Mao-tse-tung 'On Contradiction' and 'On Practice'. )

Editor's note:

This article was presented to Vanguard for publication in July 1967, but delayed due to production difficulties.

#####

Correction

Vanguard bulletin No. I. page 2 line 33 read: "beyond" in place of "behind".

Poor print,

Vanguard bulletin No. I. page 2 bottom line reads: ..... the strategic aim, formation of a Scottish Socialist Republic, have by .....  
.....

Poor print this bulletin: page I two bottom lines read: .....Others are old die-hards who will never see the necessity for revolutionary change and therefore, can never be revolutionaries. ....  
Ditto page 2 bottom lines, read: .....Some may even be observed to vacillate from one to the other thereby creating confusing ideas about things. ....

Page 3, bottom lines read: .....OUR common identity (New Party) is the universality of this contradiction. Precisely the question of a new party and the differences related to it, .....

RECENT LITERATURE

THE CHINESE PEOPLE FIRMLY SUPPORT THE ARAB PEOPLES STRUGGLE AGAINST AGGRESSION. Pamphlet F.L.P. Peking.

FIVE LESSONS OF A GREAT VICTORY. (Winter 1966 - Spring 1967) Pamphlet F.L.P. Hanoi.

GENUINE

COMMUNISTS

UNITE

AROUND

C.D.R.,C.U.

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

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