

# FORUM

FOR MARXIST - LENINIST

STRUGGLE

PRICE 3<sup>d</sup>.

APRIL, 1965.

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.

Khrushchev and his supporters set out to court Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson - the so-called "men of peace". A process began of disarming the international communist movement with the notion that the United States could be reasoned with.

It did not take the U.S. imperialists long to get the measure of this "peaceful coexistence" and to call Khrushchev's bluff.

As one concession followed another, the Americans became more, not less, aggressive. The imperialists took advantage of every concession and always came back for more. Their appetite grew with what it fed on.

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.

So, in a crescendo of misrepresentation, vilification and trickery Khrushchev and his fellow revisionists set about preparing for the International Meeting.

First, they revived the "Drafting Committee" of 26 Parties which had prepared for the 1960 International Meeting, although the work of this Committee came to an end when they submitted their draft to the meeting in 1960.

Ignoring the principle of "unanimity through consultation" which had been accepted at the 1960 Meeting of the 81 Parties they announced that if not all the 26 Parties decided to participate in the Preparatory Meeting, the others would go ahead without them - an open declaration that a split was intended.

Khrushchev and the other leaders of the C P S U would brook no criticism or suggestions from fraternal Parties such as the Rumanians and the Italians, who said that the holding of

the meeting could only serve to formalise a split in the international movement. All objections were brushed aside. The revisionists were determined to force the issue - they were bent on isolating all who oppose revisionism even if it meant rending the movement in two. The leadership of the British Party went along with these manoeuvres.

Thus the stage was set for the International Meeting on the 15th December, 1964.

On the 15th October Khrushchev was ousted. His agricultural and industrial policies had failed miserably, his concessions had weakened the Soviet Union and scared even the Soviet military leaders; the U.S. imperialists had him in a corner - his only way out to make further concessions - probably a sell-out on the German question or on Cuba. He had brought chaos and division in the international communist movement.

The dismissal of Khrushchev was a great victory for the Marxists in every country. The main spokesman of revisionism had been kicked out. This opened the eyes of many to the bankruptcy of the revisionist policy. The pathetic and futile line of the British Party leaders who had slavishly followed Khrushchev and praised his policies was exposed.

But Khrushchev's successors in the C P S U have accepted the job of continuing Khrushchevism without Khrushchev. On all major issues their policies do not differ essentially from his, although they have other ideas on tactics and their capacity to carry through his plans is weakened by his fall and the exposure of his policy. Hence their attitude to the International Meeting.

On the 12th December, 1964 - three days before the meeting was due to open - the Preparatory Conference was cancelled by the C P S U without consultation. The other Parties had to take it or leave it. But in persisting in their revisionist line, the leaders of the C P S U could not give up the policy of trying to isolate China and splitting the movement. This explains their manoeuvres for an International Meeting on the 1st March, 1965.

Any meeting not sponsored by all the Parties concerned must inevitably be a demonstration of a split in the movement and give encouragement to the U.S. in their aggression against Vietnam and China. For this reason the March meeting should never have been held. The U.S. took their cue and responded immediately by stepping up their aggressive policy.

The Executive Committee of the British Party on 10th January 1965 discussed the International Meeting and decided "that an international communist conference to help resolve differences and promote the unity of the international communist movement must be all-inclusive."

Within a few days the Political Committee, turning its back on this decision, sent Dutt and Wainwright to Moscow. Ostensibly they were going to present the British objections to the Meeting to the leaders of the CPSU. In fact, they did the reverse. They returned and on the 27th February - two days before the Meeting opened in Moscow - they persuaded a majority of the Executive Committee to agree to sending Dutt to the Meeting. To this day the members of the Party have had no report on Dutt and Wainwright's visit, nor has any reason been given to the membership for reversing the earlier decision of the Executive Committee.

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.

Eighteen of the 26 Parties attended the Meeting in Moscow, with the U.S. Party represented by an observer. The members from India represented only a rump of the Indian C.P. (the Marxist Party in India were meanwhile winning a majority in the Kerala elections). Two countries, Australia and Brazil, were represented by revisionist groups. Seven countries refused to attend five Socialist countries, Albania, China, Korea, Rumania, and Vietnam, and two of the world's largest Parties, Indonesia and Japan.

*The statement issued by the 13 Parties in Moscow makes fulsome references to "Unity and the fight against U.S. imperialism" but these are meaningless in the face of the real policies being pursued by the leaders of the CPSU and other revisionists. To hold the Meeting at all in the face of opposition from many Parties was a calculated act of disunity which could only bring comfort to the U.S.*

The Moscow Meeting stated that "what unites the Communist Parties greatly outweighs that which at the moment disunites them" and "declared themselves in favour of discontinuing the public polemic". This suggests that a compromise on principle is possible. But Marxism is not a bill of goods which can be bargained over by political hucksters who will, after they have haggled long enough, agree to some middle course.

Marxist principles cannot be watered down in order to arrive at a phoney unity. To compromise on these fundamental principles is to replace Marxism by something else - whatever you call it. This can never become a basis for an international communist movement nor for unity between Marxist Parties. Unity can only be achieved when those who have departed from it return to a Marxist position. This is important above all on the question of the attitude to U.S. imperialism and our support for the people of Vietnam, Laos, Congo and other areas where the national liberation struggle is being fought out.

To cease discussion of the issues in the International controversy would be a great disservice to the movement. For the first time in many years, questions of principle affecting every aspect of Party policy are being debated. This is the way to improve the theoretical understanding of all comrades, for these are no abstract issues. Here theory and practice are combined.

In Britain the leadership of the Party has for many years tried to divert comrades from theoretical and political discussion into "practical tasks." Meanwhile "centralism" without "democracy" rules the day and decisions of major importance are taken without any consultation with the rank and file. No wonder the life and fighting spirit have gone out of the Party. Who can go on year after year doing

only the practical chores without any theoretical sustenance or ideological development and with no opportunity to engage in discussions on the main political tasks confronting the Party?

Dissatisfaction and discontent within the Party are widespread and there is a danger that many devoted and hard-working comrades will despair and drift out of politics altogether. This would be to capitulate to the revisionists and the imperialists whose interests they serve.

The revisionists in Britain, the Soviet Union and other countries are responsible for creating a highly dangerous international situation. The people in the national liberation areas with weapons in their hands are in the front line of the fight against the imperialists. There is no peaceful coexistence for them. If the revisionist policy can be defeated, the power of the socialist camp and the pressure of the workers in the capitalist countries can be mobilised to stop the imperialists in their tracks. This is no time for Marxists to retreat.

The British Party Congress is to be held in November this year. Every member who has the interests of the Party and the international movement at heart and wishes to see an end to imperialism must use the coming months to bring the issues out into the open in the British Party.

Among the actions you can take now in your own Branch are:

1. Insist that the Moscow Meeting be discussed in your Branch;
2. Condemn the Political Committee for sending Dutt and Wainwright to Moscow.
3. Criticise the action of the Executive Committee which at its meeting on the 27th February assisted the splitters by agreeing to send Dutt to the Moscow Meeting;
4. Demand that the issues in the international controversy be fully debated throughout the Party, starting now and continuing up to the Party Congress, and call for the election of comrades

who will lead the fight for Communist policies in Britain.

5. Demand that the leaders of the Party prepare for Congress a full, Marxist analysis of the role of the Wilson Government in the present situation both on domestic and foreign issues;
6. Discuss in every Branch the issue of Vietnam and the threatened U.S. attacks on China; expose the deceptive line of "peaceful coexistence" preached by Gollan, Dutt and Matthews and the leaders of the CPSU; focus attention on the main enemy, U.S. imperialism, and its lackey the Wilson Government.

By discussing these issues you will bring politics and interest back into Branch life.

Should your Branch refuse to put these questions on the agenda, start informal discussions locally with those comrades who feel as you do.

In this way you will deepen your understanding of revisionism and help prepare yourself for the day when Britain will have a truly Marxist Party.

ooo000ooo

#### ANNOUNCEMENT:

Forum came into existence to provide a platform for the exchange of views and experiences of Marxist - Leninists inside and outside the Party in the struggle against revisionism. The necessity for such a journal was born out of the closing of C.P.G.B. publications to the expression of any line but that of the revisionist leadership.

It was not the intention of those producing Forum to lay down a line of their own but simply to provide an opportunity for Marxist - Leninists to discuss the vital issues raised by differences within the world communist movement - particularly as they affected the class struggle in Britain. Therefore no editorial policy was laid down and all contributions, provided that they were not tainted by Trotskyism or Revisionism, were printed as submitted.



While this was considered correct in the formative period of Forum's development, there has been some criticism of the policy as one of avoiding the responsibility of putting forward a point of view for general consideration and comment. The London Political Organisation, since assuming the task of bringing out Forum, has been discussing this problem and in the next issue will be making a statement about future policy in this respect. Any changes will only be undertaken with the intention of increasing its usefulness to sincere Marxists.

L. P. O.

### WHAT IS THE LABOUR GOVERNMENT.

Leaders of the C.P.G.B. speak of "being disappointed in the Labour Government". How much more disappointed are the people who followed the revisionist C.P. policy and voted for the Labour Government in the belief that it would fulfil election promises even when they ran counter to the interests of the Capitalist Class. What the people see now is the mixture as before - support for U.S. aggressions abroad and a lowering of the standard of living at home.

The refusal to govern in the interests of the working class is ascribed to the difficulties left from past Tory policies. But the truth is much simpler. It lies in Lenin's concept of a British Government - Conservative or Labour. The British Government is none other than the "the Executive Committee of the Capitalist Class" (see Lenin on Britain)

Isn't this precisely the role of Wilson's Government?

The Labour leaders as in all previous Labour Governments are acting as lackeys for the Monopoly Capitalists but under the guise of working class representatives. They attack the living standards of the people which would not have been tolerated by a Conservative Government.

Because the study of Marxist theory has been discouraged and class collaboration taken the place of class struggle, militant workers have become corrupted and the rank and file

dull and uninspired.

Trade Union leaders fall over each other to sign away the right to fight for increased wages (won by bitter struggle over the years) and accept package deals. The signatures are hardly dry before the increases negotiated are swallowed up by the rising Cost of Living. We have the example of the "leaders of the London Postmen" urging the doctors to accept a meagre increase and to negotiate for a further claim with the Minister of Health (D. W. 18/2/65). This advice comes well from representatives of one of the poorest paid sections of workers who were threatened with the force of the State when they were so bold as to demand a decent wage last year!

But above all in foreign policy we see the betrayal of the Labour Government clearest. Refusing to act according to the 1954 accord on Vietnam, they have made a deal with the U.S.A. to get help for their aggression in Malaya in return for assistance to the aggressors in Vietnam. All who support British independence must be aroused to express their anger at this sell out.

Certainly Karl Marx's summons "Workers of all lands - Unite" should be blazoned on every banner and poster.

And whilst the United States Imperialist forces backed by British Monopoly Capitalists pursue a policy of aggression in South East Asia which could engulf the world in a nuclear war, the Daily Worker secs fit to give prominence to a group of women lobbying the House of Commons on a domestic issue in preference to a meeting on Vietnam with Labour Party speakers. Obviously the Daily Worker can no longer be regarded as a working class paper leading the fight for British independence.

The British people must be aroused to a consciousness of their common interests with the colonial people.

Even the smallest group of Marxist/Leninists can influence numbers of people to renounce the policy of class collaboration which is corrupting the working class. Participation in discussions, sales

of Marxist literature, holding of house meetings and the issuing of propaganda material - all help. Simple leaflets directed to particular sections of workers stating facts which can easily be confirmed will bring more results than the wide distribution of general leaflets, written in the style of manifestos. Leaflets advertising meetings should carry a point of Marxist/Leninist policy which will remain in the minds of the readers for future digestion. Every day that passes the people learn from experience that the Labour Government is acting in the interests of the Monopoly capitalists and has no intention whatever to carry out the policy on which it won the support of the people - and it is our duty to explain why ...

Because it is 'the E. C. of  
the capitalist class'

ooo000ooo

### ON "BROAD" AND "MASS" ORGANISATIONS:

The article on this theme in February FORUM has been of great interest. The present state of affairs in progressive movement and high degree of political apathy among many sections of people including the Communists emphasises the need to debate this issue fully in order to understand this question.

It is very doubtful if the author of February article has succeeded in bringing any clarity on the character of present-day organisations. According to him -

A "broad" organisation -

(a) unites "classes and strata - without differentiating between the exploiters and exploited".

(b) has an objective - that isolates "the most reactionary forces"

A "mass" organisation -

- (a) unites "different classes and strata commonly oppressed"
- (b) in order to fight "a specific aspect of oppression" perpetrated by
- (c) "the most reactionary forces."

Generally speaking, "the most reactionary forces" always practise "oppression". Any organisation which wants to isolate "the most reactionary forces" must, perforce, fight in one form or another, one or more aspects of this oppression. In reverse, any organisation which fights a "specific" aspect of oppression must also aim to isolate the most reactionary forces in order to win. Thus, in practice, the distinguishing line between the two organisations will become thinner and thinner. Finally, if we were to accept the definitions advanced by the author, the only difference would be that a "broad" organisation will unite "different classes and strata without differentiating between the exploiters and exploited" whereas a "mass organisation will unite "all classes and strata commonly oppressed". Without splitting hair any further, is it not clear that this distinction between "broad" and "mass" organisations is somewhat artificial? If the author had given examples of each, perhaps the matters would have been clearer.

But one cannot escape the feeling that in terms of general theory, Marxists in Britain would do better to break away from some stale and meaningless terms that might have existed, and look at the whole problem afresh.

It is also a pity that the author has gone no further than saying that the political parties are class organisations, because as far as the Communist Party is concerned, the mass line must be the fundamental political and organisational line of the Party. Liu Shao Chi said, "Our mass line is a class line, a mass line of the proletariat." It is very, very necessary to understand the fullest implications of this, because the whole question of correct methods in any organisation revolves round the relationship between the Party and the masses. Rather than waste FORUM's valuable space, I would urge all comrades to read Liu Shao Chi's "ON THE PARTY" Section 4, headed "Regarding the Mass Line of the Party."

It seems to me that the author's formulations are loose and, in practice, capable of various interpretations. There are several practices of revisionist CPGB leadership in "broad" and "mass" organisations which may be justified in terms of isolating "the most reactionary forces", but which do destroy the effectiveness of these organisations. Study of Peace Movement in recent years will make the point clear.

It might be better if we thought of only two types of organisations-

(1) Working Class Organisations:

These are essentially organisations of the oppressed, and in concrete conditions of this country likely to be preponderantly working class. Examples, Trade Unions, Co-operatives, Tenants' Associations, etc. These constitute the means of waging class struggle against the oppressors. Obviously, the employers, shopkeepers and landlords (big or small) cannot be placidly accepted in such organisations. A small shopkeeper (very suspect in a co-operative) may be a member of Tenants Association, but Communists would expect him to bring the traces of his class thinking in such an organisation, and should be critical - NOT necessarily hostile. In all events, interests of the mass of members to be the uppermost.

(2) Peoples' Organisations:

These are not directly participating in obvious forms of struggle - not in local terms, at any rate, but are devoted to organising the people for achieving various progressive aims. Examples: British Peace Committee, Anti-Apartheid, Friends of China, CND, MCF etc. In such organisations, we must strive to unite all who can be united to pursue the agreed aims at any given stage. It would be sectarian and erroneous to discriminate on the basis of class and strata. People can come in on the basis of various philosophical concepts including idealist. On the other hand, Communists must understand how the class positions of various members can be reflected in the

working of such an organisation, effecting its quality one way or another. This must constantly be borne in mind in working the detailed tactics. Also certain principles like that of democracy must be insisted upon at all times.

In relation to methods of working in such organisations, one can agree to most of what the author says in the last two paragraphs of his article. However, at this stage, when several Marxist/Leninist groups are already in existence and the number of similar individuals is also on the increase, it would be better to avoid individualism as far as possible. We owe it to each other. For, a Marxist-Leninist Party cannot suddenly come into existence. Working in unity with other Marxists and gaining each other's confidence in course of our work in service of the masses is the only way of building a sound Marxist Party quickly. May I also draw comrades' attention to Chapter IX of Liu Shao Chi's book, dealing with "Fractions in Non-Party Organisations?" It would not be exactly applicable, but must provide some food for thought.

In terms of concrete conditions in Britain, let us realise that, few as we are, our responsibilities are serious. We must think thoroughly and try to avoid both opportunism and sectarianism. We must hold firm to a working class standpoint and yet avoid dogmatism. We must constantly think of increasing the effective revolutionary strength of any organisation we may be in.

"In order to exercise correct leadership, to the experiences of the leaders there must be added the experiences of the rank and file ... of the working class, of the toilers, as well as of the so-called 'persons of no consequence' ...." (Stalin)

Let us always bear this in mind.

ooo000ooo

#### COMMENT ON MARCH ISSUE OF FORUM

The editorial which headed the March issue of Forum took a big step forward towards the practical leadership that Coventry rightly

demands. It gave a concrete analysis of two important questions, de Gaulle's attack on U.S. imperialism in relation to Europe, and the Wilson Government's line, not of merely following a Tory policy (as the Daily Worker so regretfully sees them doing) but of outdoing the Tories in helping the U.S.A., and strengthening British imperialism "east of Suez" quicker and better than the Tories could.

You rightly hint that the Tories may try to play the European Common Market against the pro-U.S. line of Wilson's though it is probably also true that the Tories - temporarily out of office, but by no means out of power - are at the moment glad to see Labour taking the responsibility for decisions that will make the British people hate those responsible for them.

But you then give a formula for our "long term job" - "to put forward a programme which will unite the maximum number of people under the leadership of the working class - a programme which would include a total break with imperialism, once and for all."

It is of the greatest importance that our basic long term aims should be stated with the utmost care and precision, and I suggest that your formulation needs amendment.

First we must seek to unite all those who can be united not "under the leadership of the working class," but against the main enemy. The leadership will in fact belong to the working class if the programme is correct and correctly carried out (otherwise the working class will lose the leadership and the movement itself will founder). To put the aim as "to unite the maximum number of people under the leadership of the working class" is reminiscent of the CPSU, which has for years sought "to unite the maximum number of people" under the leadership of the CPSU - whereas the CPC "uniting all those who can be united against the main enemy" and not claiming leadership, has achieved it in fact, whereas the CPSU is left with the empty claim.

Secondly, there can be no "once and for all" break with imperialism. It is naive to think that a "total break" can be achieved by the simple adoption of a programme. So long as imperialism exists we shall have to fight it, and so long as we have to fight it as an enemy, we shall also have to continue to struggle with those in our ranks who, often uncensciously, are still influenced by its ideology.

Here is a brief statement of suggested aims:

1. We must constantly aim to mobilise all those who can be mobilised against the main enemy, which is U.S. and British imperialism, at present in close alliance - and this alliance is at present led in this country by the Wilson government, which is therefore at the moment the main enemy.
2. We have to get the Labour movement to understand that Wilson is the Macdonald of today. Whereas Macdonald, in the economic crisis of 1931, split the Labour movement in going over to a Tory policy, in the crisis of 1964-65 Wilson has so far succeeded in getting the whole Labour movement to accept a Tory policy, and in thus establishing a Tory government without the Tories.
3. We must aim at both Socialist unity and national unity. In both cases the enemy is imperialism, at present led here by the Labour imperialist Wilson, but with its headquarters in Washington. Criticism of Wilson here corresponds exactly to criticism of Johnson in the U.S. American liberals are also criticising Johnson, just as our Labour left wing, including King Street, is criticising Wilson. The principal difficulty of the working class movement in Britain has always been to make an effective fight not against the Tories, but against the Liberals, and when the fight against the Liberals was weak, it was the Tories who profited. This is likely to repeat itself, with the Labour imperialists replacing the Liberal imperialists.

... ..



THE LOWEST LEVEL YET OF TITOITE REVISIONISM  
(Extracts from an observer's article in Peking Peoples  
Daily, March 22nd.)

"Tito, a U.S. Stool-Pigeon" is the title of a commentary published on March 18th by the Vietnamese paper, Nhan Dan (People) sternly denouncing the Tito clique for peddling the sinister design of "peaceful negotiations" on the Vietnam question to serve U.S. imperialism. This sinister design of the Tito clique has once again brought to light its ugly countenance as a detachment of U.S. imperialism.

Let us review how Belgrade acted to the will of Washington.

Washington was blustering out threats that the South Vietnam war would become a "local war" and "a bigger war" unless the Democratic Republic of Vietnam puts an end to the "aggression" against South Vietnam.

Belgrade came out immediately with the response that an escalation of the war would give rise to a danger fraught with endless consequences and that, therefore, the conflict must be prevented from expanding. It viciously attacked China. It said that China had "aggravated the Vietnam crisis" by supporting the Vietnamese people in their resistance to U.S. aggression.

Washington, then, declared that its "political channels are open" and that what it sought was a "peaceful settlement".

Belgrade lost no time chiming in and, on March 2nd, Tito wrote a letter to Johnson proposing speedy "negotiations to seek a political solution". Belgrade followed it up by dispatching its top officials to various places to peddle this proposal.

Washington stated hypocritically that "the central object of American policy and action is peace in south east Asia";

Belgrade immediately flattered the United States that its consent to negotiate would be "a demonstration of its strength" and "a very important act in the service of peace".

It is not necessary to use any more words to show that the

Tito clique is merely dancing to the tune of the Johnson administration. The "peaceful negotiations" fraud it peddles is out-and-out of U.S. make. No wonder Johnson had lauded Tito to the skies and expressed the hope that "in your conversations and communications with the leaders of other countries, you will reflect this understanding."

The Tito clique is not only completely silent about the U.S. crime of aggression but has, hand in glove with the United States, asked the Vietnamese people to accept so-called "peaceful negotiations". What "peaceful negotiations" are there to talk about in the face of the increasingly ferocious aggressive war by the U.S.? The Vietnamese paper Nhan Dan has rightly said: "when U.S. imperialism is openly declaring and flagrantly pushing ahead with its aggressive war in South Vietnam and extending it to North Vietnam, there is no question of holding negotiations with it". The Tito clique is serving as a Cat's paw. By advocating "peaceful negotiations" it is, in fact, asking the Vietnamese people to go down on their knees and beg for peace in face of U.S. war blackmail. This is absolutely impossible.

To put it bluntly, the Tito clique has no right whatsoever to speak on the South Vietnam question. It has never condemned the U.S. aggression against South Vietnam but has always tried to whitewash U.S. imperialism. When U.S. imperialism began its "special war" of aggression against South Vietnam more than three years ago, the Tito clique presented arguments in defence of the United States and slandered the just struggle of the South Vietnamese people against the U.S. Ngo Dinh Diem gang as "riots". When the whole world was indignantly condemning the Johnson administration for creating the Gulf of Bac Bo (Tonkin) incident and launching armed aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in August 1964, the Tito clique parroted the U.S. imperialists' slander that the incident was "deliberately created" by the DRV. It whitewashed the U.S. war provocations by saying that "the United States was adequately executing its right of defence". The Tito clique cheered the United States when it was committing aggression and proffered it advice when it suffered setbacks in its aggression. Such has been the role of this clique. It.. must be exposed and smashed."

from "Hsinhua" March 22nd, 1965.

The following publications are available from "FORUM"

A reply to James Klugman on Peaceful Co-existence	6d.
The National Liberation Movement Today (A reply to Dutt and others)	1s
Statement on John Gollan	6d
Revisionism and Imperialism	1s
Classes in Modern Imperialist Britain	4s

Chinese Publications :

The Origin and Development of the Differences	6d
On the question of Stalin	6d
Is Yugoslavia a Socialist Country ?	6d
Apologists of Neo-Colonialism	6d
Two Different Lines on the Question of War and Peace	6d
Peaceful Co-existence - Two Diametrically Opposed Lines	6d
The Leaders of the C. P. S. U. are the Greatest Splitters	6d
The Proletarian Revolution and Khrushchev's Revisionism	6d
On Khrushchev's Phoney communism	6d
Whence the Differences - A reply to Thores and others	6d
The Differences between Cde. Togliatti and Us.	6d
More on the Differences between Cde. Togliatti and Us.	1s6d
A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement	1s
A Comment on the Statement of the C. P. U.S.A.	6d
The Struggle between two Different Lines at the World Congress of Women	6d
Workers of the World Unite - Oppose our Common Enemy	6d
The Truth about how the Leaders of the C. P. S. U. have allied themselves with India against China	6d
The Fighting Task Confronting Workers in Philosophy and the Social Sciences	6d

In Defence of Stalin Postal Order 2s8d

This pamphlet only is obtainable from

J. Masters, 9 Marchmont Street, W. C. 1.

(by Post only) as well as from FORUM direct.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE JOURNAL EXISTS :-

- (1) to open a forum for all views and experiences of comrades inside and outside the Party, long denied expression by the revisionist leadership;
- (2) to help carry out the work of exposing revisionist errors in the class struggle in Britain, and develop inner-Party struggle, thereby assisting in the international struggle against revisionism;
- (3) to carry out this without dictating a 'line', and in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist principle of gathering the revolutionary forces - a task never carried out by the revisionist leadership;
- (4) to exclude all Trotskyist views as disruptive of this hard task;
- (5) to preserve anonymity (a) to protect comrades in the Party from attack by the revisionists (b) to avoid the suggestion of leadership by any contributor, or contributors who are able to name themselves since at this early stage of the struggle complete equality of exchange and mutual criticism are necessary.

THIS IS YOUR JOURNAL - USE IT.

---

PLEASE TAKE OUT A SUBSCRIPTION NOW Rates 6/- a year post free, payable by P.O. (blank) or case to FORUM, 41 Atholl Mansion South Lambeth Road, London, S.W.8.

Also contributions and correspondence.

.....

PLEASE TEAR OFF AND SEND TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.

I enclose £.    s.    d. as subscription/donation to FORUM.

for ..... month(s)/year

NAME..... )

).    Optio

ADDRESS..... )

.....

.....