

FORUM

FOR MARXIST - LENINIST STRUGGLE

PRIC

November 1965

This issue is made up of extracts from previous issues of Forum. It is intended to provide in a concise form material which has a direct bearing on the 29th National Congress of the C.P.G.B. It should be useful to those attending Congress as a source of information enabling them to judge the statements of the C.P.G.B. leadership and to participate effectively themselves in the discussions. It should also be helpful to Forum's readers generally in assessing this national congress.

SINCE THE 28th CONGRESS PROMISES AND RESULTS

It is over two years since the Party's 28th National Congress, and now that the 29th Congress is in sight, it is appropriate and useful that a review should be made of what was said then, in terms of aims and policy, and what has actually emerged in two years by way of results. Delegates to the 29th

Congress will find this article helpful in providing facts and points of concentration for the exposure of revisionism, on the Congress floor itself. The wholesale abandonment of Marxism-Leninism by the Party leadership has had the inevitable result of rendering the Party as a whole completely incapable of giving any practical leadership in the development of revolutionary struggle, and has caused a veritable crisis (albeit partially hidden at present) in the Party itself.

Anti-Imperialist struggle and peaceful co-existence

In his report (Britain's Future), Gollan spoke of our Labour movement's special responsibility "to give support to the liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean". In no case has this been done, but let us be content with just two examples. First, the Congo. When, last autumn, U.S. imperialism actively aided by British and Belgian imperialism, dropped paratroopers on Leopoldville in an attempt to halt the successful advance of the Liberation army, there was a great outcry all over the world. The Daily Worker joined in to the extent of condemning imperialism for threatening world peace, but not once did an editorial or the B.C. come out with a clear statement in support of the liberation struggle. Still less did they call for action in solidarity with the Congolese people in their struggle, or explain that the cause of world peace would be furthered by the success of this armed struggle. The correct idea of waging a blow-for-blow struggle against imperialism, chiefly U.S. imperialism was deliberately suppressed, because it did not fit in with the revisionist line of peaceful co-existence.

Secondly Vietnam. The essence of the Party's attitude has been paralytic fear of a general war, and the main content of its activity has therefore been to shout 'peace, peace, peace', and sit tail along behind the general, spontaneous concern felt by millions of British people. Building solidarity against imperialism, the brilliant successes of the Vietnamese Liberation Front, the impotence of the 'mighty' U.S. to impose its will, the pathetic plight of U.S. personnel in Vietnam - all these have been deliberately underplayed or ignored. How else can the following facts be assessed:

(1) On 27th April, the N. Vietnamese trade unions appealed to the workers of the world to black all U.S. ships directly or indirectly involved in supplies to Vietnam. The Party has made no attempt at all to respond to this revolutionary demand which would lift the protest movement in Britain to a new level.

(2) On 'Vietnam Sunday' (28th March) the Party demonstration in London raised only 1,000 people, whereas the Indian Workers' Association on the same day rallied 3,000 to march 8 miles demanding the release of political prisoners in India.

(3) The official banners in Party May Day demonstrations in London and elsewhere confined themselves to the question of peace. Solidarity slogans were not allowed, as being sectarian.

(4) Motorcade protests have become much in favour - a form of protest that conveniently evades the necessity of rallying masses of people.

(5) Compare these headlines on 25th May: HEAVY CASUALTIES IN VIETCONG ATTACKS: RAILWAY BRIDGES BLOW UP (Daily Telegraph); and U.S. KEEPS UP RAIDS ON NORTH (Daily Worker). Curiously enough it is the Telegraph which is emphasising successful revolutionary violence, and the Daily Worker is emphasising imperialist violence.

It must be stated that the development of a protest and solidarity movement in Britain is intimately bound up with analysis and explanation of current developments in the struggle. The Party instead of doing this, confines itself to stale and uninteresting repetitions. Latest example is in yesterday's Daily Worker editorial (Saturday, 19 June) which says, "Whether Mr. Wilson's mission takes off or not, and if so whether it will help the cause of peace, is another matter." What the Party should do is to denounce Wilson's 'peace' mission as a manoeuvre to deceive the masses, and call upon others to join in these denunciations.

Nuclear Weapons and Peace

At the 28th Congress Gollan pledged our support for the struggle "for the renunciation of nuclear weapons" by Britain. Shortly afterwards came (July '63) the hoax of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty,

but certainly not the renunciation of nuclear weapons by Britain or any other country. The unreality of the campaign for unilateral nuclear disarmament is shown by the fact that after a number of years it has fizzled out, and even the C.N.D. has turned its attention to Vietnam. Nor has the Test Ban Treaty done anything to strengthen peace. How will Gollan assess these developments at the 29th Congress? Will he applaud China's nuclear explosions? Will he draw the conclusion that to fight for peace today inevitably means opposing U.S. imperialism and actively supporting all those struggling against imperialism, particularly in the strm centres of national liberation wars? Will he point out that a final defeat for the U.S. in Vietnam will materially assist the liberation movements in Malaya and North Borneo, and by weakening world imperialism, will strengthen peace?

National and Local Elections

Gollan laid the greatest possible stress on electoral success. Referring to parliamentary candidates as "our political standard-bearers", he said,

"It is the duty of this Congress to charge the new E.C. with the task of making our election campaign priority number one. We must make the biggest electoral impact we have ever made. Nothing less can satisfy us".

Gollan's argument was that a group of Communist M.P.'s was essential in order to force a Labour Government (after it was elected) "to break with bi-partisan policies", adding that "the main weakness in Parliament is that there are no Communist M.P.'s." In his reply to discussion, Gollan said he would give his right hand to have two or three Communist M.P.'s, thus showing clearly that electoral struggle took precedence over everything else.

Nothing was said of course about the revolutionary role of electoral struggle, that it is one form of struggle which can and must be utilised alongside many others for particular purposes chiefly as a means of exposing to the masses the true nature of bourgeois parliamentary democracy (= bourgeois dictatorship) from within. Gollan's conception of electoral struggle, as everyone knows, is quite different. He

sees the Labour Government as the instrument for operating a policy in the interests of the people and towards socialism, once it has broken with bi-partisal policies - and "a necessary guarantee of this would be a group of Communist M.P.'s" But how has this revisionist line worked out in practice? What successes can be chalked up? Or will Gollan be offering up his right hand for nothing?

A previous article in Forum showed that in last October's General Election the Party actually lost overall support. What is even more significant is that our 46,532 votes among 36 candidates amounted to only 3.3% of the poll in areas contested (less than 0.3% of the total poll). In constituencies where the Party has been relatively strong, e.g. West Fife, Rhondda East, Glasgow, the votes were down, some severely so. And Annie Powell (Rhondda East) has now even lost her local council seat (May 1965). It was in the Rhondda that Harry Pollitt, in 1945, was nearly elected with a vote of about 15,000.

What emerges only too clearly is that the Party's electoral impact is nil, a mere joke. And this must be said at National Congress in November. Furthermore, there is no prospect whatsoever of a single Communist M.P. in the foreseeable future, unless we are to pin our faith on some turn of events which will blow us a favourable wind. But the waiting game has no place in revolutionary politics. This too must be said at Congress.

At the 28th Congress Gollan said, "Without winning through to the local councils, we will never make Parliament". Turning then to local elections, we find much the same picture. In 1962 we had 500 candidates, this year 300, and yet the Party leadership's criterion of progress has been the number of candidates put in the field. Votes too have shown anything but an encouraging prospect, when for example among the better results this May we read that 12 Communist candidates in Leeds polled 1,741 - an average of 145. Only the 'best' results were printed in the Daily Worker (15 May). Those not even mentioned were so abysmal, that the comrades concerned must be feeling completely disheartened and disillusioned. Overall figures do not appear to have been published, but they almost certainly add up to a considerable loss of support. As far as seats are concerned, in England and Wales there was one gain and one loss, in Scotland two gains.

How about Daily Worker support and publicity? An article by Annie Powell, one by Reuben Falber, and three short news items were all that appeared before the election date (13 May). In none of these was there a mention of anti-imperialist struggle, not even Vietnam or Dominica. And yet, immediately after the election, a Party statement explaining Labour losses said:

"The Labour Party was not returned to support enthusiastically the U.S. attack on the people of North and South Vietnam or its brutal invasion of the Dominican Republic." We are in fact saying that the Labour Party's results are affected by its attitude on international questions; and at the same time we play down liberation struggles in our own campaigns. Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

At the 29th Congress there must be a sharp demand that the leadership analyses its utter failure to make any electoral impact since the last Congress, either nationally or locally. One thing is sure: to gain the support of the people, we must start by learning from the people what concrete demands to raise, rather than presenting a neatly contrived policy which fails to strike any chord.

The Labour Movement

In 1946 the Labour Party changed its constitution to make Communist Party affiliation impossible. This ended the long series of attempts (right from 1920) by the Party to get inside the broad Labour Party with the aim of transforming it from within. Instead of making a complete reappraisal of attitudes towards the Labour Party, the Party simply took a new tack. First to get the bans and proscriptions removed so that it could once again apply for affiliation, and second to get a broad working alliance between the communists and the 'Left' in the Labour movement in order to defeat the Right wing which was in control of the L.P. machine. The C.P. was seen as a catalyst to help speed the victory. Therefore the Party must grow in numbers to be more effective.

At the 1959 Congress Gollan said, "The Labour Party is a political coalition of Right and Left forces, those who support capitalism and those who are against it. Whatever the temporary situation at this or that moment this struggle is bound to go on until militant policies prevail in the Labour movement". And, "It is these Left and pro-

progressive forces, which, in the last analysis, are responsible for the destiny of the British Labour movement." At the 1961 Congress, Gollan said, "The Communist Party pledges an all-out effort to campaign and work for the Left progressive victory this year." At the 1963 Congress, Gollan said, "The political advance of the British working class and the struggle for socialism in our country are bound up with the transformation of the position in the Labour Movement" (= victory by the Left over the Right in the L.P. and T.U.s).

Superficially this idea of a life-and-death struggle within the Labour Party between Left and Right ending in the inevitable victory of the Left, sounds dialectical: the Right and Left are supposedly in contradiction. This is a naive misrepresentation. The real contradiction here is between monopoly capitalist ideology and working class ideology arising from the corruptive effects of imperialism on the British working class. It is a contradiction among the people and will be fought out among the people as a whole, not just within the Labour Party. Since the Labour Party as an organisation has now completely sold out to monopoly capitalism, a struggle must be waged against it, led by a Marxist-Leninist party. As the struggle develops, the various 'Left' (= class-conscious) elements now in the Labour party will almost certainly leave it or be expelled, rather than succeed in winning control over it. To see the problem this way is to grasp the significance of the independent role of the Communist Party. To see it Gollan's way is to bow down before the 'mighty' colossus of the Labour Party, and to regard the destiny of the working class as dependent on this extremely reactionary organisation. It reduces the role of the Communist Party to subservience.

Wages and the Labour Government

The Party leadership's failure to understand this contradiction is shown by the following example. At the 28th Congress Gollan said, "There must be an all-out struggle in every union and industry to end the wage freeze once and for all... As a result of pressure Maudling is now talking about wage restraint at 3%. We will have none of it." Brave words. But what has the Party done to organise an effective campaign to oppose George Brown's incomes policy, which does precisely what Maudling had in mind, and which was overwhelmingly

accepted by the T.U.C.? The answer is practically nothing. In fact the Party has actually helped George Brown through its failure to explain that a Labour Government could be confidently expected to operate monopoly capitalist policies, that a Labour government can even be successful where a Tory government would meet stiff opposition. The desperate efforts made by the Party leadership to obscure the fact that the Labour government is in practice a monopoly capitalist government, has certainly helped to confuse the working class as to the real nature of the incomes policy.

The Daily Worker

The 28th Congress revealed the sorry position that the Daily Worker sales were on the decline (William Wainwright), that many Party members were not even readers (Annie Powell), that membership of the P.P.P.S. was down (E.C. Report). At a P.P.P.S. meeting just after Congress a more serious situation was disclosed (the information having been withheld at Congress), namely that sales in Britain had dropped by 1900 since the 1961 Congress, only to be offset by an increase of 2000 in overseas sales (i.e. bulk sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe).

As usual Gollan refused to question the political content of the paper but lamely complained that "there has not been the level of effort to extend the circulation". He called for an all-out circulation campaign, the first step in which was to be a drive for 5000 new daily readers. But the circulation has in fact continued its downward trend. Exact figures are not published, but the seriousness of the situation can be judged from the personal appeal from John Gollan (14 May '65) for a "big new Daily Worker circulation campaign", combined with the admission that sales were dropping. Gollan of course blames rising costs, but the truth is that the paper has become dull, insipid and repetitious. Instead of giving us up-to-date, political class analysis of events, it has kept up a stale change of slogans like "A general election now", "the drift to the Right", "preventing a Tory comeback", "rallying the Left in the Labour Party". The only way to re-invigorate the paper is to give it political edge, so that the class-conscious workers find it interesting and helpful as a guide to revolutionary action. Definitely not by gimmicky circulation-boosting techniques.

The Party

As is well-known the membership of the C.P. has fluctuated in the whole of the post-war period, without developing any consistent trend. At the 25th Congress (1957) it was 27,000 then it dropped to 24,900, and picked up to 26,750 by the 26th Congress (1959). At the 27th Congress (1961) membership was up to about 29,000, and then came Party-building year which pushed the figure to 34,350 by the 28th Congress. The much-publicized aim of 50,000 was blazoned in a big banner across St. Pancras Town Hall. Then came a further fluctuation in the news that the 1965 re-registration is 1,000 down.

It is abundantly clear that the Party leadership has failed completely in its aim of building a mass party; every device imaginable has been used to lure people into taking out a Party card; the political duties of members, set out in the Party rules, are never mentioned. But what is much worse is that the very aim of the mass Party is in conflict with the Marxist-Leninist conception of a disciplined, democratic-centralist organisation, steered in practice and able to give theoretical leadership. Such a Party must have a mass line, which will win mass support, but can never have the aim of mass recruitment.

Even when new members are made there is no serious attempt to give them political education - as long as they pay Dues and re-register, this satisfies the leadership. Jack Cohen, shortly after becoming head of the Education Department, wrote (Oct. 1962): "We lack anything like a system of Party education, catering for the varying needs of our membership". He regarded the theoretical weakness of recent recruits as constituting "a real problem and a great weakness". Every honest comrade recognises that nothing has been done since this pronouncement to change the position. In the majority of Branches up and down the country there is no political education at all. And where it does take place, the method is formal and static, with theory reduced to the question of learning a set of formulae, unrelated to answering specific questions. A recent example of this is the Party syllabus on the State, where Lenin's "Lecture on the State" is recommended reading, but not "State and Revolution". The point is, that the first work, written in 1921, was

a general account of social progress and did not stress transition from one form of society to another. Whereas "State and Revolution" was written in 1917 when the question of transition to socialism was a burning issue, and therefore how it was to be accomplished was the practical question. It is also the practical question for us in Britain now.

At the last Congress Gollan said we must "stress the importance of the factories, that there "has been a modest advance", but that "we have not done nearly enough". Just how serious he was about doing anything more can be judged from the fact that there was no mention of the need to get a change, anywhere in the Draft Political Resolution submitted to Congress. In fact only 15% of Party membership is organised in factory Branches. Harry Pollitt's slogan "a party rooted in the factories" has been thrown on the scrapheap, and even where factory Branches do exist they have a second class status. "The biggest weakness in our factory work is that in the main it has a narrow, economic nature. The Party does not appear before the workers as an organised, all-round political force, but more typically as a group of workshop militants". Sam Aaronovitch wrote this in the pre-Congress discussion. Well said, Comrade Aaronovitch, but what has the leadership done to overcome this grave weakness? Not much it seems, when we find one District Congress after another since then, reaffirming the formula that factory work = the economic struggle, and electoral work = political struggle.

But whether the Branch be factory or locality, there is a general state of apathy that is enough to dispirit even the staunchest comrades. Let us challenge the E.C. to give details of Branches that do not even meet once a month (some not twice a year), that carry out no political activity at all. Before the last Congress an official attempt was made to do something about this deplorable state, by the publication of a new journal "Party Life". Two or three issues appeared, and then we heard no more.

This article cannot and has not attempted to give a blue-print for the future. It is simply an honest effort to show that the logical and inevitable result of revisionism is a creeping paralysis, which has beset our Party, and made it incapable of giving any kind of leadership in the development of revolutionary struggle in Britain

It can

now hardly even maintain its organisation and finances. Despite all this the Political Committee resulting from the 28th Congress is exactly the same as the one emerging from the 27th Congress, with the addition of Sid Foster. Is there room for such complacency? Most certainly not. IT IS TIME THESE GUILTY MEN WERE REMOVED.

Gollan's speech at the Congress, "Britain's Future", was a static description of certain superficial features of the situation, without any attempt to trace the development of various struggles in the period since the 1961 Congress, or to assess what progress had been made by the movement as a whole, or what setbacks had been suffered. Therefore as a guide to future action it was utterly useless.

We are confident that delegates to the 29th Congress will raise some of these questions most sharply, and call upon the present Executive Committee, headed by John Gollan, to admit their mistakes and resign.

COMMENT ON THE DRAFT POLITICAL RESOLUTION
FOR THE 29th NATIONAL CONGRESS

I. WHY THE CRISIS

The Draft Political Resolution begins with the question: Why is there a crisis facing the country today? "It is a crisis of British imperialism", the draft says (line 10), because imperialism results in increasing arms expenditure, overseas military spending and overseas financial investment, all of which "finds expression in the chronic balance of payments problem." (line 20).

Since the crisis is a crisis of imperialism, it could have been avoided, the draft resolution implies, if the Labour Government had not continued "the familiar and bankrupt imperialist policy". (line 26).

This is completely unMarxist. Imperialism is not simply a policy which governments can follow or not as they please. Imperialism is the inevitable form capitalism takes in its final monopolistic phase.

By following this bankrupt policy of imperialism, the draft resolution continues (line 36), nothing will be solved and the future

of the Labour Government is endangered.

But since the Labour Government has "turned to the same restrictive measures as the Tories" (line 28), what difference does it make whether it is endangered or not? The "crucial question" (line 40) which one might have expected to be how to defeat imperialism whether implemented by a Labour or a Tory Government is stated instead to be whether "a change in policy (on the part of Labour) can defeat the Tory attempt at a come-back."

II. THE NEED FOR A CHANGE

The second section of the draft political resolution deals with the need for change.

The three main political parties are criticised (line 56) because, while recognising in their propaganda that great changes are needed, they do not propose a fundamental change "for they are wedded to the present economic system".

But precisely the same criticism can be levelled at the Communist Party of Great Britain as revealed in this resolution. There is no Marxist analysis of what is wrong with Britain in terms of the basic contradictions of capitalism and therefore no conception of how real change might be brought about by mass action under correct leadership.

Instead of such an analysis there is a rag bag of various social ills and some random popular reactions to them (lines 63-99). These include such vague statements as "the social consequences of automation are just beginning to be grasped", or "young people are questioning the old ideas and values more than ever before" or "the commercialisation of culture and the arts is arousing increasing concern". How, one might ask, could political action for real change be based on such imprecise formulations? And of course the answer is that real change is not envisaged. "The labour movement above all should be the voice and leadership of the movement of protest." (line 102).

In other words the role of a Party calling itself Marxist-Leninist is to lead the labour movement in protest at the way capitalism is "distorting the economy", "restricting social advance" and "intensifying class divisions"! It is just because capitalism does all these things that it can and must be changed. To protest about the inevitable consequences of capitalism is to wish it were something else so that it would not have to be changed.

The greatest confusion in this draft resolution is to be found in the last part of this section on the need for change. How is change to be brought about? -- By changing the balance of forces in the Labour movement which means breaking the right-wing domination of the Labour Party. If it were not for this right-wing domination which "presents itself as the alternative capitalist leadership to the Tories" then, presumably the Labour Government could stop following "capitalist policies". (Lines 104-106).

But this conception of the Labour Government as merely led astray by its right-wing is in flat contradiction with its description as "a social-democratic administration of capitalism running the so-called "mixed economy" in close co-operation with the big monopoly capitalists and their expert representatives in the state machine" (line 116). Nothing about a wicked right-wing there, the whole Labour Government is seen as the agent of British capitalism.

And yet, immediately afterwards, we come once more to the old cry that "A Tory Government again would be a disaster. It would represent a victory for big business" (which a Labour Government also represents!)

In fact, the Labour Party alters its nature in this resolution as often as the drafters are caught in the contradiction of both criticising it as capitalist and wanting to be identified with it as a progressive agency for change. Hence the idea of a wicked right-wing; but it may be noted that the present right-wing leadership which has led the Labour Party astray consists of such men as Wilson, Greenwood, Swingler, Harold Davies etc. who in the past have been praised by the CPGB as stalwarts of the left.

Where in all this verbiage is any reference to class struggle, to the proletariat and to its vanguard, the Communist Party? All such Marxist concepts have been swallowed up in a lot of loose talk about the labour movement and whether or not it is being betrayed by certain right-wingers. Past Labour defeats are said to be "the verdict of history on those who compromise with capitalism instead of breaking with it". (line 110).

This is precisely the verdict history will pass on this draft resolution.

III. BRITAIN AND PEACE

The section on Britain and Peace is thoroughly confused by the refusal of the drafters to recognise the relationship between imperialism and war. This refusal stems from their erroneous

contention that it is possible to co-exist peacefully with imperialism. Therefore if war is being waged, as in Vietnam, it is not because U.S. imperialism is by nature aggressive but because U.S. imperialism is gratuitously misbehaving and thereby needlessly endangering peace.

Hence such statements as "American aggression is not only a crime against Vietnam, it poisons the international atmosphere and makes any real progress towards international understanding impossible." (line 150) Or, "Every possibility exists to defeat U.S. imperialist policy, and achieve peaceful coexistence." (line 201) as if defeating U.S. imperialism and achieving peaceful coexistence were two separate and equally realisable goals, whereas the only possibility of peace depends on the defeat of U.S. imperialism.

Imperialism is described as "still seeking to dominate the newly independent states" as if this were an incidental aspect of imperialism instead of its essential nature. (line 171)

The same sort of confusion results from failing to grasp the relationship between national liberation struggles and peace. Instead of seeing such liberation struggles as defeats for imperialism which makes war and therefore as blows for peace, this resolution counterposes the two as the need "to prevent a third world war and, while maintaining full support of the struggle for national liberation and resistance to aggression, to strive for peaceful coexistence while imperialism still exists." (line 208) This absurd argument that it is possible to resist imperialist aggression while peacefully coexisting with it is typical of the contradictions into which the CPGB leadership's incorrect analysis of the question of war and peace has landed the drafters of this resolution.

The draft resolution statements on the differences within the international communist movement (lines 232-245) are simply not true. The claim is made that everything is being done to strengthen unity on the basis of the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement; but it must have been forgotten that in those documents revisionism, of the sort found throughout this draft political resolution, is considered the greatest danger to the world communist movement. Moreover, building up Yugoslavia as a socialist country as has been done recently is in flat contradiction with the way Yugoslavia is described in the two documents of 1957 and 1960. Indeed, the Daily

Worker was praising Yugoslavia at the very time when Tito was most actively carrying out Johnson's wish of securing a respite in Vietnam by means of phoney peace negotiations.

The claim to work for unity is also vitiated by the alacrity with which the leadership turned up for the March conference of splitters in Moscow, intended to put China in the dock. It was this open advertisement of the split in the movement which gave the U.S. the green light for stepping up its aggression in Vietnam.

IV. A NEW IMMEDIATE PROGRAMME

In the section of the draft resolution on a new immediate programme the same contradiction noted before is once again repeated. While it is not expected that "a social democratic Government will introduce socialism" and the Communist Party "has never encouraged any illusions in this respect", the immediate programme which mass pressure on the Labour Government is to bring about (line 261) includes such socialist measures as ending colonial wars, closing down all overseas bases, nationalising land etc. If the Labour Government is a capitalist Government (as the draft resolution has already admitted) how can it be expected to participate in the voluntary winding up of British imperialism?

This new immediate programme is another rag bag of suggestions as to how capitalism might be made to function better by such means as "proper economic planning, special attention to areas of higher unemployment...a national fuel and power plan, integrated transport, guided development of automation" etc. (line 324).

More nationalisation is called for, especially of steel, (line 312) without any reference to the fact that nationalisation carried out by a monopoly capitalist state has absolutely nothing to do with socialism.

Racialism is condemned (line 358) but there is no Marxist analysis of the situation giving rise to it and no proposals as to what Communists can do about it, nor is it mentioned that the Labour Government has revealed itself, in the white paper on immigration, to be every bit as racist as the Tories we are urged to keep out at all costs.

This section ends with a great 'revolutionary' plea for proportional representation as the condition for "democratic advance"

Britain, and for the ending of the ban which is keeping the Communist Party off the air. (line 367).
(Considering this draft political resolution, it does seem unfair that the CPGB should not be allowed to appear on TV along with the other bourgeois parties).

V. THE LEFT PROGRESSIVE ADVANCE

The first thing that must be said about the section on the left progressive advance and the Communist Party is that no real evidence is given for this great "left progressive advance" in Britain. This advance is made up of: "mass movements on the bomb" (which the Party tried to get in on with its usual band wagon tactics and which, in any case, has declined over the last few years since the phoney test-ban treaty); "mass movements on colonial wars and social questions" (which must refer to a few MCF rallies in Trafalgar Square and several tenants associations); "left developments in important unions" (like the E.T.U. ?) and the "resumed growth of the Communist Party and the Young Communist League (though later the draft has to admit that communist membership has recently declined).

And what has been the result of this 'tremendous left advance'? It has paved the way for the Labour electoral victory, has put into office a party indistinguishable from the Tories which large sections of big business wanted to see in power any way!

The resolution is so obviously not addressed to Communists but to those who might be reading the document over their shoulders that it actually includes this curious statement (line 510): "Anti-communism is a menace to the whole movement, only helps reaction, and should be rejected as sterile, disruptive and dangerous." If the 29th National Congress rejects anti-communism that's at least something!

VI. THE COMMUNIST PARTY

In the final section on the Communist Party we get the same demand that the Party must work primarily for the unity of the left, never that it should give a lead. "We should continue to support every left movement and left expression." (line 533) Does this include Trotskyists or anti-communist peace movements? The resolution goes on: "We should do all in our power to work with all sections of the peace movement, the committees on Vietnam, the movements against colonialism, and other similar bodies." In other words, get in on everything that's going! Don't give a lead or try to inject any Marxist understanding into these other movements. Just disguise yourselves as vaguely of the left and hop on board!

And what is the grand conclusion of this whole draft political resolution? "To the extent that we take advantage of the opportunities, and strengthen the activity, organisation and influence of the Communist Party, we shall develop a united left movement which can reverse the present dangerous trends and enable the labour movement to set Britain on a new path." (line 661) There is nothing here about the Communist Party taking its proper place as the vanguard of the working class. It is to become an indistinguishable part of a vague united left movement which will enable the labour movement to help capitalism work better in Britain.

This is not even revisionism. It is liquidationism. The glorious perspective open to Communists in Britain is that once they have shed Marxism-Leninism they will be able to creep unnoticed into the ranks of social democracy.

The Draft Political Resolution and the Trade Unions

Once more in the draft resolutions for the 29th National Congress the leadership of the C.P.G.B. plays down class struggle in Britain by subordinating work on the industrial front to elections. "Our electoral advance," the resolution states (line 624), "requires an extension of our work and influence in the factories." In other words, Communists are urged to work harder in the factories not to help realise the revolutionary potential of the proletariat but simply to gain more votes for the Party on the electoral front. This point is further emphasised when the resolution says: "No amount of work in other fields can substitute for it (electoral work)." (line 595)

Some Practical Questions Involved in T.U. Struggle

To struggle or not to struggle. Typical Party advice in disputes between workers and management, is caution, for example the advice given by Len Wells when on the EC of the ASCW. According to him one must be very careful about what disputes are entered into, and if the possibility of success is less than 50/50 it is best not to get involved. But militant trade-unionism demands that issues be taken up irrespective of the chances of winning, because workers are being involved in struggle and there are tremendous lessons involved, more than the 3d. an hour demanded, the gumboots wanted because of the conditions on the job, more than the teacups the men were trying to get changed, the toilets rather than the

At the time the Party-led ETU offered Cousins financial assistance but would not withdraw their men from the sub-stations that supply power for the Underground trains - London Transport could have been crushed like a fly in the hand. But Cousins, a man who has always talked Left and acted Right, did not take up the offer, and the Party-led ETU hid behind the facade of legality and did nothing.

Negotiating Machinery and Grass Roots - How to Organise.

It is often better to have negotiations direct with the management on the job, but Union officials, including Party officials and those with strong Party backing, always try to get the thing on a national basis using the national machinery, combined with a recommendation to return to work. The dispute then gets removed from the workers concerned and becomes bogged down in various levels of arbitration, which can go on for twelve or eighteen months with no result - negotiations at local level followed by failure to agree, then to the District, to the Area, to the National Joint Industrial Council. The whole process could not be better designed to take away from the men directly concerned any feeling of power, and to spread disillusionment, frustration and cynicism. Often the management will use the opportunity thus given to them to sack the shop stewards from the job and destroy rank-and-file organisation.

Another evil of delegated negotiation is when the Union official is called in, goes and negotiates with the management, then comes to tell the men what he has got for them. There is no question of the official first going to the men on the job, finding what it is they want, and acting under their instructions as their paid servant (and Party leaders such as Kerrigan are in touch with Union officials, but not with the rank-and-file). Examples of the handiwork of such officials, unchallenged by the Party, are (1) in the motor industry where a $4\frac{1}{2}$ -night week was accepted, rather than arguing for a shorter working week based on four nights: the workers still had to go in five times during the week, and so, if anything, this meant a worsening of conditions. (2) Among gas workers in Coventry a half-hour reduction in the working day was negotiated, enabling them to start at 8.30 instead of 8.00. Because of rush-hour traffic to offices this made no practical difference to the time they had to leave home in the morning. Had the officials taken their instructions from the men, these 'improved conditions' would have been rejected as unacceptable.

The CPGB pays lip service only to the value of Shop Stewards Committees. Even when the Party was in the leadership of the EUT, it did not bring them into being, and yet they existed all the while in the AEU and the electricity supply industry. The Party has even stood by when Shop Stewards Committees have been smashed and the shop stewards themselves have been sacked from the job as a result of the Union intervening, declaring them 'unofficial bodies' and advising a return to work. This was the fate of Charlie Doyle, and also Kevin Halpin whom the Party once built up as a leading figure.

The need for Genuine Revolutionary Leadership. The essence of revolutionary leadership in T.U. work is to understand the relationship of class forces in any given situation so that the correct tactical lead can be given, bearing in mind the fundamental aims and methods outlined above. Each particular dispute must be seen in relation to every other dispute and also in relation to the political questions involved. To put the struggle on this scientifically precise basis a Marxist revolutionary Party is absolutely necessary, and the core of the Party must be industrial workers in touch with the masses and always learning from them. Only such a Party, with an all-round revolutionary outlook, can effectively guide the working class towards the defeat of monopoly capital both economically and politically, that is by the seizure of State power.

WILL PAYNTER DOES IT AGAIN

Some months back, we criticised Will Paynter for advising N.U.M. members against strikes to enforce their wage claim. Once more, he has shown an attitude hostile to militant class struggle.

Mr. Lec, the Minister of Power, has been openly threatening the closure of "uneconomic" pits.

At the annual conference of the N.U.M. at Margate, the Scottish delegation had intended to move a resolution insisting that alternative employment must be found before any pit was closed.

But Cde. Paynter barred this resolution by moving a watered-down "emergency resolution" from the Executive, calling for urgent consultations with the Government and National Coal Board about the closures and safeguards for men.

Further, he said he did not expect a fair hearing at the Miners' Energy Advisory Council. He hinted to the Labour Party that they might lose the Miners' political support.

What is Will Paynter up to? Instead of paying attention to the aspect of class-struggle (which distinguishes a Communist from a Social-democrat) he even went so far as to appeal to the delegates not to give weapons to those hostile to the industry. And this in face of high feeling as witnessed in speeches by delegates from Cumberland, Durham and South Wales.

No wonder even A. Moffat felt disturbed while moving a resolution on behalf of the Executive!!

Will the C.P.G.B. have the courage to investigate Will Paynter's behaviour?

THE BRITISH ROAD TO SOCIALISM

It is no accident that, as British imperialism has developed and expanded, so the "admission" of the working class into parliamentary politics has progressed. In fact, relationship especially between the growth of the parliamentary state and the growth of monopoly capitalism and imperialism is central to the whole system of ideological corruption which the ruling class has pursued among the working class in the era of imperialism.

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

No one will find gentlemanly elections in progress in any crown colonies today. Nor will they find them where British or U.S. or any other imperialist control is still dominant behind

the facade of "independence". The rooms which strew the revisionists' parliamentary path to power have been watered by the sweat and tears of the oppressed masses of the world. Their thorns not their petals are most significant to the exploited millions of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REVISIONISM AND "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

or

HOW TO INCREASE THE DANGER OF WAR

The statement of the nineteen Parties (including the British) which met in Moscow from the first to the fifth March was issued on the tenth of March. On the same day President Johnson and his advisers met at Camp David and decided:

- (a) to extend the bombing of North Vietnam to industrial targets;
- (b) to continue the (unannounced) bombing of Laos;
- (c) to blockade the North Vietnam coast;
- (d) that China would not be permitted to intervene without massive retaliation.

The London "Times" Washington correspondent reported "Whatever spirit emerges this time from Camp David, the situation here appears ripe for war."

THESE TWO EVENTS ARE NOT UNCONNECTED

The American statement marks the latest but certainly not the last stage of an aggression which has become more naked and unashamed in recent years. Yet the stepping up of American attacks has been taking place in a period when the national liberation movements are growing stronger and when the socialist powers are capable of presenting a powerful deterrent to the imperialist warmongers. Why, then, this contradiction?

The deterioration began when Khrushchev introduced his own brand of "peaceful coexistence" at the 20th Congress of the C.P.S.U. in February, 1956. From that time Soviet foreign policy has been based on this phoney concept. It has meant that the U.S. imperialists have been appeased with one concession after another - Camp David; West Berlin; Congo; the Test Ban Treaty; Laos, Vietnam.

Imperialism is insatiable. Whilst trying to wean the Eastern European countries away from the socialist camp with offers of loans and trade and other blandishments, the U.S. imperialists, if their long-range plans are to be carried out, must attempt to prise out of the international movement the country and the Party which has taken the lead in exposing the true nature of imperialism and has refused to be bullied by its nuclear blackmail - the People's Republic of China. The U.S. imperialists - have been seeking opportunities to attack China from the day, over fifteen years ago when the People's Republic was founded.

But whilst the international movement is united and the Soviet Union and China, the two great powers in the socialist camp, stand together the U.S. imperialists, who also have the national liberation movements to contend with, cannot attempt such an adventure. It is essential, militarily, that the United States should first isolate China from the rest of the international movement. This is the role cast for the revisionists.

This is why the leaders of the C.P.S.U. went to such extraordinary lengths - almost unbelievable to the rest of the movement which subscribes to the principles of proletarian internationalism - to attack China and try to weaken her economically and militarily and to slander her within the international movement and before the world.

This was the build-up. Thus the demand for an International Conference at which the Chinese and all other Parties who stand for Marxism-Leninism were to be outlawed from the movement - the green light for the U.S. to go ahead with her long-term plans.

In sending Dutt to this Meeting the Executive Committee of the British Party has contributed to widening the split in the International Communist Movement and to encouraging the U.S. in their adventures in the Far East.

PARTY CONGRESS OR MASS MEETING?

What can anti-revisionists expect from the 1965 National Congress of the Communist Party of Gt. Britain?

Communist Party organisation, including the Party Congress, is based upon "democratic centralism". Just how democratic and centralist is the Communist Party in this country?

A real Communist Party, a proletarian Marxist party, is the organised vanguard detachment of the working class. The Party is the sum of its organisations. Not only that, it is at the same time a single system of organisation, and from this democratic centralism flows.

But how does this work? If the Congress of the Party is the highest body, and if there is a single system of Party organisation, there must be systematic elections to this Congress, and not some sort of a "democratic" anarchy.

The answer is a pyramid type of election as follows. Every primary organisation of the Party after thorough discussion elects delegates to an Area meeting, the Areas then elect delegates to a District meeting. In turn these District meetings elect delegates to the National Congress. That is how the Bolsheviks operated.

A real Congress has a smaller number of delegates in relation to the size of the Party. This is not a restriction of democracy, on the contrary. Such delegates would be more experienced, practically and theoretically, would be more used to speaking, and have greater knowledge of each other, than the delegates at an ordinary C.P.G.B. Congress. They would have been through the various testing levels of the Party. But more important, there would be more time for most delegates to speak and thrash out the general theoretical and political line.

At C.P.G.B. Congresses the delegates have not been tested by the system of democratic centralism. They are elected straight, in one jump, from the primary organisations of the Party to the National Congress. There are literally hundreds of delegates. This in a Party of only 33,000 members. Huge Communist Parties of a million or more do not have so many in relation to their size.

At a C.P.G.B. Congress, many are completely raw to politics, because as is well known the Party recruits any sympathiser. There is no real thrashing out of Party problems. There is never time for thorough political discussion, and the Congress is clogged with the elaborate activities of the standing orders committee.

Although lists of nominations are issued to delegates, the pernicious method of recommending chosen names, (referred to as the "recommended panel") perpetuates the present leadership ensuring no inclusion of opposition. This despite the fact that in 1937, after a report by Zhdanov the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party resolved: "To forbid voting by lists in the election of Party bodies; voting should be for individual candidates, all members of the Party being guaranteed the unlimited right to challenge candidates and to criticise them."

In essence what we have at a National Congress of the C.P.G.B. is a vast mass of delegates, and the platform, composed of the E.C. and District leaderships, who step forward and shout into a microphone. They speak as if they were at a street corner meeting instead of a serious discussion. The line is rammed down the delegates' throats; with here and there a minor concession. Nothing is thrashed out. Instead of a proper Congress, we get a mass meeting agitated by the leadership.

The British Communist Party's syllabus "The Role of the Communist Party" declares on democratic centralism; "The organisational structure of a political party depends on and reflects its political aims and its conception of how these aims are to be achieved.

The National Congress of the C.P.G.B. differs very little from that of the Labour Party Conference. The same sort of peculiar electoral structure obtains, the elaborate committees etc. Both parties are organised on an electoral basis. So, as we would expect, the similar organisation derives from the similar aims, and all healthy forces in the movement know this to be true. The C.P.G.B. is just another Labour Party. It organises itself on a Social-Democratic model.

This Congress will be like the Labour Party Conference. Just as Wilson did not have to put himself out to contain the 'lefts', so in a similar fashion Gollan will deal with them, or make a few concessions, so that it appears as if a victory has been gained. The E.C. may agree to a more militant wording of this or that phrase, but the essence will remain.

Despite the expulsion of the more obvious critics, Gollan & Co. cunningly allow 'left' elements to remain in the Party, using them as a safety valve. At the same time a false impression of democracy is given to the rank and file. But 'pressure' of the left critics cannot change the fundamental line of the Party. Opportunism cannot be overcome within an opportunist Party.

The restoration of Marxism in Britain requires a powerful movement both inside and outside the existing Communist Party. The greater freedom of action of those now outside the Party, imposes on us a greater responsibility in this necessary task.

The Labour Government: Servant of Imperialism

"Labour Lieutenants of the capitalist class" - Lenin's description of the "Berne" International, applies to the entire history of the Labour Party. The record of the 1945 Labour Government in particular was such as to enable even John Gollan to write in 1954 "The capitalist State was adequate for the Labour Government because it was carrying out a capitalist policy. It used the coercive powers of the capitalist State as ruthlessly as any Tory Government before it. Externally it deployed the full military might of the State against the Colonial Liberation Movement, internally it introduced the Emergency Powers Act against its own people. Government by decree was used - but against the workers, not the capitalists".

Now that we have another Labour Government, the same sorry tale is being retold, but this time everything is being done more swiftly, more crudely. Even the few points in Labour's election programme which augured some slight variations from the foreign policy of the Tory Party have been quickly forgotten. No class conscious worker can retain the slightest doubt but that the Wilson Labour Government has sold itself body and soul to the cause of imperialism, and is doing just as good a job -- in some respects even better -- than the Tory Party itself could have done. It is even clear, as we shall see in a moment, that the whole thing was planned long before the General Election of October 15th. It is clear also that the Labour Government is using the full resources of the monopoly capitalist State machine, including those of the Tory Party itself. Such a blatant betrayal of the working class is in accordance with the historical role of social-democracy even since the Mensheviks and socialist-revolutionaries in Russia set the pattern half a century ago by trying to bamboozle the Russian proletariat and peasantry into supporting the great imperialist war of 1914-18. It was clear well in advance that the 1964 Labour Government would tread the same path, and the events of the last two months show clearly that they have actually done so.

The Communist Party leadership, in deliberately avoiding a wholesale exposure of Labour imperialism and in continually peddling the idea that there may after all be something "good" in the Labour Government, is conniving with Labour imperialism and shamefully betraying the cause of the working class both in Britain and in colonial countries. Thus we are served up with such hypocritical utterances as the editorial in the Daily Worker on 23rd November, which said, "the main trouble with the Government's policy is that it does not break sufficiently with that of the Tories". There may well be differences on this or that minor point, but the question we must ask is -- in what precise ways do Labour Government actions serve the capitalist class?

On 21st November, Wilson held a top level Cabinet Meeting in order, among other things, to take "a long cool look at defence", the implication being that cut in expenditure might be forthcoming. But it was quite obvious from the whole character of the meeting what the result would be, for among his advisers were the Chief of the Defence Staff, Admiral of the Fleet Earl Mountbatten, the Chiefs of the Army, Naval and Air Staffs, and top permanent civil servants - almost all men who three months earlier were advising the Tory Government. Wilson was in fact thinking of "value for money", for the good reason that the present figure of over £2000 million (which will rise to £2500 million in the next three - four years) threatens a serious economic crisis for the capitalist class. Wilson's dilemma is how to avert the crisis and at the same time to preserve and if possible strengthen Britain's imperialist position. His aim is to solve this problem in the interests of monopoly capitalism, that is to make certain economies while assuring that all necessary military steps are taken to ensure colonial profits for example tin and rubber in Malaya, oil in the South Arabian peninsular. This is one part of the solution Wilson has in mind when he talks of keeping certain V-Bombers out of NATO for the purposes of Britain's "world-role", and then refuses in Parliament to specify what their function will be. The other part was clearly expressed by Zilliacus (the champion of the Socialist "Left" in the Labour Party!) in Parliament on 24th November, when he called for a reduction in armed spending so that the money saved could be used to give technical and other aid to underdeveloped countries. A straight neo-colonial line. Could the Tories have done it better? On the contrary they must be grateful to Wilson, Zilliacus & Co., for this highly intelligent scheme to re-deploy finances by cutting down on "inessential" military expenditure in order to protect direct colonial rule and to further the cause of neo-colonialist penetration, just as they are grateful for Wilson's offer in the Commons (17th December) to have secret talks on "defence" with the "Opposition".

The Communist Party leadership, far from exposing the real character of the Labour Government by making an analysis of this kind, uses another, more subtle and thoroughly dishonest, argument. Thus, a statement by the Political Committee on the 26th November reads, "(the financial crisis) is the direct result of the imperialist policy which all British Governments have pursued since the end of the War", and a Daily Worker editorial on 30th November explains, "it is now obvious

that the cost of military operations overseas is a crippling burden on the balance of payments and a main cause of the Country's economic and financial difficulties. Spending on troops and bases abroad is like paying out money for imports we do not get." Elsewhere the Party lumps in the £300 million a year spent in export of capital as a further drain on the economy. In other words the Party is handing out advice to imperialism on how to solve its problems that can be summarised as follows: give up your colonies abandon neo-colonial investment, because they are costing you more than you get from them"! Doesn't this add up to denial of the fact of colonial exploitation? Is the capitalist class spending £350 million a year on overseas military expenditure for nothing? Are they really so stupid?

But the Labour Government has more than one master. As well as trying to further the interests of British monopoly capitalism, it has also to meet the demands of the arch imperialist power, the U.S. It is common knowledge that on 8th November the Government received a loan of £360 million from the International Monetary Fund (largely controlled by the U.S.), that on 25th November the Government announced that foreign banks had agreed to loan over \$3000 million in support of the £, and that the Government's decision on 18th December to defer payment of £61 million of U.S. and Canadian loan payments was accepted without demur by the U.S. treasury. One cannot be naive enough to imagine that all this sympathy for Britain's economic difficulties and all this material aid come as a loving Christmas gift, marked "from the U.S. with best wishes for the New Year."

Without making any suppositions about the price Wilson has to pay for this help or whether he pays it willingly, we can let the facts speak for themselves. First, the Labour Government secretly connived with the U.S. and Belgian imperialism in planning, well in advance, the armed aggression on the Congolese People in November. The first the British Public know of it was that Belgian paratroopers had actually landed on Ascension Island. Since the event, the Government has officially warmly thanked the U.S. and Belgium for saving "so many lives". Secondly the Government is fully supporting the U.S. dirty war in South Vietnam and approves of the puppet regime's aim "to end Communist insurrection". Thirdly the Government has volunteered to raise the strength of B.A.O.R. from

51,000 to 55,000. Fourthly the Labour Government has stated publicly its intention to maintain the Polaris base at Holy Loch. And fifthly Wilson has stated that his Government is wholly committed to NATO.

We now come to the official C.P. comments on the Labour Government. Starting from a complete failure to recognise in practice that social-democracy is the ideology of the upper stratum of the working class bribed by the proceeds from imperialist plunder, and that it therefore, always and inevitably, represents the class enemy in our midst, Gollan, Dutt and others persist in their ridiculous stand that perhaps, after all, there is some good in them. To quote only a few recent examples from the Daily Worker: on 27th October, "the People look to Labour to break with Tory policies"; on 23rd November, "Whoever gave the order that Belgian paratroopers were to be allowed to use Britain's Ascension Island...made a shocking blunder". On 27th November, the main headline, "HOW TO SAVE BRITAIN - if Government fights, people will support it"; on 4th December, "the Labour Government should do its utmost to stop all imperialist interference in the Congo"; on 12th December, "this (ANF) is a fatal policy for a Labour Government".

The C.P. leadership daily tries to obscure the imperialist, anti-working class role of the Labour Government, and tries to make us believe that Wilson & Co., may act in the interest of the working class. This is why Dutt failed to draw conclusions in his article referred to above. This is why we are treated in the Daily Worker to the most nauseating equivocation about the Labour Government. This - combined with the fact that the C.P. itself has renounced exposure of imperialism and the struggle against it, and is rapidly turning itself into an electoral machine like the Labour Party.

One of the primary tasks for Marxist-Leninists in Britain is to carry forward in mass organisations an unsparing exposure of the Labour Government for what it is - the faithful servant of imperialism.

A New Law at King Street

"A big new effort to compel changes in Government policy in a Left, progressive direction is urgently needed said Mr. John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party, at its Executive Committee Meeting at the weekend.

"Right wing policy, now as before, endangered the Labour Government and produced the barest General Election majority and the local losses, he said.

But already there had been a big development of the movement to change Government policy, far in advance of the first six months of the 1945 Labour Government.....After the General Election the Communist Party had appealed for united action of the Labour Movement and stressed the great importance of the battle to change Government policy. The events of the last six months had shown this analysis was correct".

Thus spake Gollan to the Executive Committee on the weekend of May 22nd and 23rd. When we ask, naturally enough, in what concrete ways the "analysis" has been proved correct, we find nothing in all the windy, gas bag exhortations that follow in the Daily Worker report of Gollan's speech.

The nerve of this man and his colleagues passes all belief. Not one single action of any significance whatsoever has come from the Communist Party either over Vietnam or over the Dominican Republic. The verbal castigations of the Wilson Government in this speech are matched by a continuous and unparalleled support of the Labour Government by the Daily Worker since last October.

On Vietnam the Communist Party has been one of the last in this country to come into so-called action, and that "action", itself, has been a nauseous vitiation of the real issues in the Vietnam situation. We hear nothing from these people but peace, peace, peace in Vietnam. The May Day Communist Party demonstration in London emphasized nothing else. Not "get out Yanks" but "stop the war in Vietnam" was the official theme. Where was the banner that ought to have been there, stretched across the street, itemising the four simple points that the Liberation Front itself has put out?

The Communist Party leadership have now taken up medical aid for Vietnam. Nearly a year ago this was being organised by a handful of individuals in conjunction with the British Vietnam Committee. At that time King Street didn't want to know. Where has been the response to the call of the Vietnam' Trade Unions on April 27th for all dockers, transport workers and the like throughout the world to refuse to handle U.S. goods, directly or indirectly, connected with the war in South Vietnam? Of all organisations in this country the Communist Party might be expected to be doing something on this.

These people have lost all right to speak for the working class. They know this full well themselves for they can see nothing but continuous failure over the past two years since the last Congress. The Daily Worker sales are falling, the Party is losing members (1,000 since last Congress), the financial support for both the paper and the Party is dwindling, the election campaign and results amounted to a ludicrous farce. The only answer forthcoming is typical of such place-saving hypocrites. On membership, Alexander said at this Executive Committee meeting, "we must return to the concept that a member remains a member until he is either lapsed or expelled". If you can't keep them in keep their names on the books. King street is now emerging as twin brother of the Roman Catholic Church according to which "once a Catholic always a Catholic" unless you join a rival organisation. Soon the Political Committee won't need to bother about re-registration at all - just carry the books forward!

Revisionism Helps U.S. Imperialism in Vietnam

Over the past few years the C.P.S.U. leadership has sunk deeper into the mire of capitulation to imperialism on every issue. The contrast between the flattering pictures of the imperialists on the one hand and the predatory and aggressive actions of those same imperialists on the other has become sharper and sharper.

The situation in Vietnam has exposed - the revisionists more than ever before; it is a climax to a long series of such exposures.

ARMED STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION

The distortion of the very essence of imperialism in revisionist writing is paralleled by the distortions about peaceful transition. The most important truth, vindicated by the Vietnamese revolution, is the need for armed struggle to defeat the imperialists. In the quagmire of revisionist verbiage the very word "violence" is feared. Instead we are fed on a steady diet of disarmament, negotiations, compromise etc., as the means for achieving national liberation and socialism.

The significance of the great national liberation movement of our time - Vietnam, Algeria, Cuba - is either completely ignored or deliberately distorted by the revisionists who see these 'just wars' merely as a form of defence imposed upon peoples. They fail to recognise the many political lessons that can be drawn from any of these struggles - the tactics of struggle, of united front, of guerrilla warfare, of calling the imperialists' nuclear bluff. Thus, even in their articles on the war in Vietnam the usual revisionist pieces, whether in the Daily Worker or any other similar paper, there is only a harping on the horrors of war and mighty little about the successes of the people. That confrontation through armed uprising guided by a correct political ideology and organisation is proving successful must be deliberately obscured so that the completely incorrect line on peaceful coexistence can be peddled. Thus the British Party Tribune, after a token appreciation of the national liberation struggle, dwells at length on the new possibilities for preserving peace through "the agreed settlement of disputed questions by negotiation." (pp. 19-22).

SAME OLD EVASIONS AND ILLUSIONS:

On the 6th January, Cdo. Collan wrote an article in Daily Worker urging for a "fight for a change to a radical policy". It turned out to be the same old ragbag of deceptions, evasions and illusions. Instead of examining the facts of the changing British situation, in the light of Marxism-Leninism, he clung to his revisionist dogma.

The central issues he has chosen to ignore are British Imperialism and the traditional role of Social-Democratic Parties. Thus, in the whole article, we find no reference at all to the imperialist war build-up in "Malaysia", to the unchanged imperialist policies in Aden and South Arabia, to the naked machinations against freedom of Guiana and to suppression of freedom-movement in Southern Rhodesia. Having pushed these issues out of his consciousness, he evades the responsibility of organising the Communists for any action whatsoever. Actually, he wants "the Peace Movement" to go into action to "end colonial wars". Anyone with knowledge of the present state of the "Peace Movement" will straight away see that this implies an abdication of political responsibility, of C.P.G.B.

Having adopted the dogma of parliamentary road to Socialism, Gollan is forced to ignore the Leninist teachings on Social-Democracy and enter the realm of ambivalent attitudes, wishful platitudes and exaggeration of what he chooses to call "Left force". Thus, he accuses "Big Business" for "seeking to carry out" imperialist policy including wage-restraint "through the Labour Government" - as if the Labour Government is not a willing tool of monopolies. Big Business is actually carrying out these policies via Labour Government, not "seeking" to do so.

He follows this up by a series of laments and moans about the Labour Government "thwarting the expectations of those who made Labour's victory possible"!

No, comrade Gollan! We refuse to be kidded any more. Your empty words are not backed by any action. That is why the branches are not active. To us, Tories are bad, but the Labour Party is not the workers' party. Comrade Gollan, either get busy building a genuine Marxist Party suitable to the great working class or get out and make way for your betters.