

ARTICLES ON-The fight against Opportunism, Wales, China,  
Reply to "The Broadest Unity is Needed to Stop Soviet  
Expansionism, plus more.

Produced by the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain.

## INTRODUCTION

Both in the content of Section 7, and in the way we work on it, an important principle is to link theory with practice. We have to affirm Marxist principles, not dogmatically but in a way which is linked with reality and serves as a guide to action.

One of the fundamental questions in Section 7 is how to understand the struggle against opportunism. Naturally, on this question Lenin's work is a basic point of reference. When Lenin himself was criticising opportunist trends, he always pointed out that material facts prove that they are wrong, and at the same time material conditions (the material conditions of imperialism) provide the objective cause for the emergence of opportunism. Besides citing the facts, Lenin also referred to the systematic body of analysis developed by Marx and Engels. Not because these are eternal truths which nobody should transgress, but because Marxism represents concrete reality in a way which - through the use of dialectics - is able to embody the richness and contradictory nature of real life. The CC is now suggesting for study Lenin's article "Imperialism and the Split in Socialism", written in 1916. In this article, Lenin refers to the way Marx and Engels showed the opportunism in the working-class movement in Britain to be based on the privileged position of a stratum of the labour movement, caused by the exploitation of the colonies; and Lenin goes on to show that in the era of imperialism this becomes a general phenomenon. In discussing the question of opportunism in our own period, we will have to treat Lenin <sup>in</sup> the same way as he treated Marx and Engels - not as a statement of abstract principles but as something essential to understand the inner contradictions of reality.

In applying Marxism-Leninism to the major questions in Section 7, there are two important points to bear in mind. First we have to maintain an all-round dialectical grasp of reality and not fall into one-sidedness in response to certain particular circumstances. As Lenin said,

"Capitalism creates its own grave-digger, itself creates the elements of a new system, yet, at the same time, without a 'leap' these individual elements change nothing in the general state of affairs and do not affect the rule of capital. It is Marxism, the theory of dialectical materialism, that is able to encompass these contradictions of living reality, of the living history of capitalism and the working-class movement. But, needless to say, the masses learn from life and not from books, and therefore certain individuals or groups constantly exaggerate, elevate to a one-sided theory, to a one-sided system of tactics, now one and now another feature of capitalist development, now one and now another 'lesson' of this development. Bourgeois ideologists, liberals and democrats, not understanding Marxism, and not understanding the modern labour movement, are constantly jumping from one futile extreme to another. .... They seize upon one aspect of the labour movement, elevate one-sidedness to a theory, and declare mutually exclusive those tendencies or features of this movement that are a specific peculiarity of a given period, of given conditions of working class activity. But real life, real history includes these different tendencies, just as life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, breaks in continuity."

(Differences in the European Labour Movement, 1910)

Obviously, the different trends in the 'left' in Britain today make mistakes of elevating one-sidedness to a theory, we ourselves have made errors of this kind in the past and must now progress towards a more mature dialectical line. But the other important point is that Marxists must at all costs rigorously take into account the particular circumstances of a given period in formulating their tactics. In this sense, materialist dialectics can be seen as "the ability to bring to the forefront and stress the various points, the various aspects of the problem, in application to the specific features of different political and economic conditions." (Lenin, Preface to the Russian Translation of "Letters by Johannes Becker, etc", 1907). The kind of factors to be taken into account here include the balance of forces at a particular time, the degree of mobilisation or otherwise of the masses, whether the Communists are isolated from the masses and if so the need to break this isolation.

Thus the question of including in Section 7 an accurate definition of the current stage of class struggle is very important in determining the approach to opportunism. We have to find an approach which really serves to advance the struggle at present,

while avoiding the trap of elevating a particular set of tactics above the general strategic direction of the struggle. There has already been some important debate about questions related to opportunism. In this issue we print part of a contribution made by one comrade last year - and which influenced the majority position on the CC - criticising the view that the main blow should be struck against opportunism. Other contributions on this question will follow.

Another question which is referred to in this issue is the one of democratic rights. This should be seen not as an isolated question, but as part of the overall pattern of the way our understanding of Section 7 is developing. The fullest development of democracy favours Marxism against opportunism. "We have nothing to fear from real democracy, for reality is on our side" (Lenin, On Compromises, 1917). The points made in the amendments already circulated about the line of independence and mass struggle also form part of this picture. Lenin formulated the question in this way: "Through utilisation of bourgeois democracy to socialist and consistently democratic organisation of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and against opportunism. There is no other path. There is no other way out. Marxism, just as life itself, knows no other way out." (Reply to P. Kievski, 1916) This is a statement which it is well worth thinking about in working towards an all-round grasp of some of the crucial issues in Section 7.

## SPEAKING OUT FOR WALES

Early this year, the League arranged a meeting of members and contacts in London to hear two leading members of the Welsh Socialist Republican Movement speak. It is hoped that similar meetings can be arranged elsewhere.

Wales and Scotland are oppressed nations living within the framework of the "United Kingdom." British imperialism oppresses and exploits the people of England, Wales and Scotland, and is their main enemy, but the Welsh and Scottish peoples suffer national, as well as class oppression. The League upholds the right of Wales and Scotland to self-determination, including the right of secession, but believes that the revolutionary struggles of all the peoples of Britain are so inter-connected (of necessity) that it is in the common interest of all for the Welsh and Scottish peoples to exercise their rights in favour of unity with England in a federal socialist republic.

British communists must fight for the solidarity of the peoples of Wales, Scotland and England. For those in England in particular, this means that they must defend the national rights of the Welsh and Scottish peoples, and oppose British imperialist oppression of them.

There are clearly differences between the perspectives which the League has and those of the Welsh Socialist Republican Movement; the WSRM fights for an independent socialist Wales. But we share a common enemy in British imperialism, and have other interests in common. Our differences are secondary; hence there is a good basis for friendly relations.

What follows is material taken from the speeches of the WSRM comrades early this year. Those members and contacts who heard them found them very valuable and interesting. It is hoped that by printing this material, we can help other comrades to get a better idea of what is happening in Wales and why, and of what the WSRM stands for.

The first speaker mainly talked about developments since the "Investiture" in 1969. At that time, the activities of the Free Wales Army and MAC (Movement for the Defence of Wales) were running down. There was growing dissatisfaction with the policies of British parties.

The Labour Government had brought in "regional aid" policies, but this hadn't done much for the Welsh people; private companies simply came, took government grants, and cleared out once they'd taken what they could. Over half the working population of Wales (52%) are in the public sector; this is higher than for any other part of Britain. But a decline was going on there too; industries like coal and steel were contracting.

It was in these circumstances that Plaid Cymru got MPs elected in some rural areas, and won many council seats.

The pace of events speeded up in the late '70s, with the development of the British and world capitalist crisis. In 1978, under the last Labour government, came the announcement of plans to shut down the East Moors and Shotton steel works—both major employers. More shutdowns and redundancies followed. The Labour Party had long had a power base in South Wales and it was worried that it might lose this. This was what prompted it to hold the devolution referendum.

This didn't do it much good; it lost ground, and the Conservatives made big gains in Wales for the first time for 50 years in the 1979 election. The national and class struggles were still developing, however. On January 28th, 1980, 15,000 marched in Cardiff, and 100,000 struck around the steel strike.

### Holiday Homes—A Burning Issue.

There was a great deal of strong feeling in Wales on the holiday homes question. Rich English people have bought thousands of second homes in rural areas of Wales, which they only use for a fraction of the year. This has forced up house prices so that young Welsh people can't buy their own places, adding to the problems caused by lack of jobs, promoting emigration to England, and the destruction of Welsh communities. In 1980, there were a series of attacks on these second homes, and a number were burnt out. The police seized on this as a pretext for raiding many political activists in Wales. This was called "Operation Fire," and was

the biggest operation of its kind, apart from "Operation Julie!" WSRM members were among those raided.

### Political Forces in Wales

The existing political forces in Wales were incapable of taking the popular struggles forward.

Adfer is a small organization which has effectively given up on the anglicised and English-speaking areas of Wales, and wants a national revival based only on the areas where the Welsh language is strongest.

The Welsh Language Society concentrates on specific issues, like the campaigns for bilingual road signs and a Welsh language Fourth Channel TV. It's ideas belong to the liberal, non-conformist, Welsh-speaking tradition.

Plaid Cymru, the Welsh National Party, comes from the same tradition. It knows that, to attain its aims, it has to win South Wales, which is mainly English-speaking, and it has won successes in council elections, but it doesn't know what to do next.

Labour was strong in the past, but it's well on the way out in the rural areas. It is a British party, with a British oriented left, and a social-democratic centre and right in urban South Wales. It assumes a divine right to rule there. However, its power is ebbing. There is widespread disillusionment with Labour among miners and steelworkers, and this has recently spread to other public sector workers, thanks to cut-backs under the last Labour government and the failure of Labour policies generally. At the present, the Labour Party in Wales is concentrating on anti-Thatcherism.

There are still some pockets of CP strength, notably in the NUM; otherwise, there's a few SWP people and not much else.

This meant that when the WSRM was formed in January, 1980, this development took place in a political vacuum. It sees the system of exploitation and oppression in Wales as one over Welsh working class people. The WSRM stands for total opposition to the British state. It considers that Plaid Cymru is a petty-bourgeois party incapable of realizing the demands of the Welsh people, and that the national and class struggles have to be linked in a national liberation struggle for a Welsh Socialist Republic.

The second speaker spoke at greater length about the WSRM today. He said it had begun around a group in Plaid Cymru which had published "Y Saith." This was a quarterly aimed at Plaid Cymru, Welsh Language Society and some elements in the Labour Party. This was very successful and it was decided to launch "Y Faner Goch" in 1978. 2000 of the first issue was republished and they all sold out; sales have been good since then and from the beginning of 1981, "Y Faner Goch" will be an all-Welsh magazine, and an English language monthly, "Welsh Republic" will be published.

The WSRM was set up when more and more differences had with PC had arisen. It has been able to mobilize a fair amount of support, as has been shown by three demonstrations in 1980 (350 at Llangranog, where about 70% of the property has been taken over as holiday homes in the past 12 years, 250 at Abergelle, where there is an annual commemoration of two men killed at the time of the investiture, and another large turnout for the anti-recruitment demonstration at Port Talbot), which were its main mobilizations. It took part in the setting up of the Prisoners Defence Committee, to support people gaoled as a result of actions taken in campaigning for the rights of the Welsh people. At this time, there was one person from the Welsh Language Society and three from the arson campaign in prison.

THE WSRM believes that the struggle for socialism in Wales should take the form of a national liberation struggle, whose content is socialist. It rejects anti-Englishness. It does not believe that the British state can provide a framework for the winning of socialist change, and is opposed to the sort of "idealist internationalism" which some have put forward, saying there will be a simultaneous revolution against all the institutions of the British state.

## FOREIGN DOMINATION OF WALES

Wales has been dominated throughout this century and longer by outside capital. Ownership of industry by overseas companies has been growing, but they still only employ about 15% of the Welsh work-force. 75% of Welsh workers are employed by English companies; there is no real Welsh capitalist class. Under present conditions, the Welsh working class is forced to work on a British level politically, which is useless for winning specific demands of its own.

Wales has faced specific problems caused by its military subjugation by feudal England. Colonialist policies included attempts at linguistic and cultural genocide. An inferiority complex was deliberately inculcated into Welsh people, and the Welsh language itself was represented as inferior.

The effect of this on the Welsh working class was to cut it off from its past. Up to the start of this century, most workers' papers and union meetings were in Welsh, but today, even Welsh speaking workers are not necessarily very literate in their own language.

Much of the British left has taken an anti-Welsh stand, or swept the national oppression of Wales under the carpet. The revisionist Eric Hobsbawm has said that the Welsh working class losing its Welsh identity is a big step forward. What he and people like him ignore is the fact that this identity is not being lost because the Welsh people are willingly relinquishing it to merge into a greater whole, but because of national oppression. What's being built up instead of Welshness is not some kind of internationalism, but loyalty to the British state, and British imperialist ideology. British imperialism is destroying the Welsh language to cement its own control.

The WSRM does not believe it is realistic to demand the preservation of the Welsh language without there being a Welsh Republic, which would require and assist the learning of Welsh. It believes that only the Welsh working class can achieve the foundation of the Welsh Republic, and it cannot rely on others to do this for it.

In the present crisis, emigration from Wales is running at 45,000 a year, as high as at any time during the Depression, while English (bourgeois) immigration is 50,000 a year. There has to be a fightback in Wales now, while there is still some strength for it; Welsh workers can't wait for the rest of Britain to join in. Their best contribution to the establishment of socialism in the whole of Britain will be to leave the British state, and fight on from outside.

There should be unity in action between the workers of Wales, Scotland and England, but there is no need for bureaucratic unity in the fight for common class interests. The WSRM wants a genuinely autonomous Welsh TUC; as it is, it is more effective than the British TUC. It was set up out of the miners' strike in 1972, and trades councils play a larger role in it than they do in the British TUC. The latter tried to ban the first Welsh Congress, and at first appointed its General Secretary. This sort of "workers' unity" is no good for workers in Wales or England.

After the talks, there was a lot of discussion. On some matters there was disagreement, on others, lack of a common understanding (in particular, over the question of national liberation struggle, which League members understood in terms of a stage in the longer term struggle for socialism, with its own specific features, whereas the Welsh comrades didn't see any need for stages, or distinctions between the national liberation struggle and that for socialism), but attitudes were comradely, and both sides seemed to respect each other's standpoint. For its part, the RCL needs to deepen its understanding of the Welsh people's struggles and re-affirm its opposition to the national oppression of the Welsh people by British imperialism.

A CRITIQUE OF THE DOCUMENT "SUPPORT FOR THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA TO BE AN IMPORTANT PART OF OUR PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM".

I hold that support for China, as a socialist country, is a correct stand and that such support is indeed part of the proletarian internationalism of the RCLB. The Chinese people's struggles for the attainment of the four modernizations is an important struggle for the people of the world and demands our support.

What I wish to draw lines of demarcation with is NOT support for China, but with some of the specific arguments contained in the document circulated by the SC written by an individual cde. It is my opinion that there are some gravely serious errors in that document which need struggle and clarification.

I should state my position on China briefly,

- 1) the working class holds state power and China is a socialist country.
- 2) the Chinese have been forced to take a step backwards on the economic front (this is similar to the NEP under Lenin in that it is a step backwards in order to go forward) in order to rectify the severe damage done by the gang of four in the cultural revolution.
- 3) the CPC is making some rightist errors (i.e., the way and form of their recognition of the Italian and Spanish CPs, stepping even further back from international debate and polemic) on which the RCLB should state its disagreements publically but not make a great fuss over.

WHAT IS THE ESSENCE OF OUR SUPPORT FOR CHINA?

"We supported China in the past as the best example of a socialist state in the world. Summing it up broadly, we supported China as a democratic model of socialism in contrast to the internal repression and external oppression of the Soviet Union"

(circulated document, hereafter CD)

We supported China in the past as the best example of a socialist state in the world. Summing it up broadly, we supported China because it exercised Dictatorship of the Proletariat in contrast to the internal fascist rule by the new bourgeoisie and the external imperialist relations of the Soviet Union. For Marxist-Leninists the essence of the distinction between the two states was not and cannot be the question of "democratic ideals". The question is and must be 'what class is in power'.

The International Communist Movement has had to struggle over this question since its birth and many, many criticisms have been made against petit-bourgeois laudings of democracy whilst ignoring the question of class.

"Engels expressed this splendidly in his letter to Bebel when he said, as the reader will remember, that the proletariat uses the state "not in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist."

"Democracy for the vast majority of the people and suppression by force, i.e., exclusion from democracy, of the exploiters and oppressors of the people - this is the change democracy undergoes during the transition from capitalism to communism."

Lenin, The State and Revolution

We must understand clearly that democracy is a means to an end and not a goal in itself. The withering away of the state is the withering away of democracy for democracy is a form of a state. This is not to underrate the extreme importance of democracy to the proletarian state. It would be correct to argue that the narrowing of democratic procedure such as the period of War Communism in the USSR or in the 1930's under Stalin weakened socialism: It did so by weakening the hegemony of the proletariat by weakening its alliance with the peasantry. In China the gang of four were destroying democracy as they were destroying socialism - that is to say they were changing the class nature of the state. However, it is not democracy that is the essence of the question - it is 'what class is in power'.

#### DEMOCRATIC AND UNDEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM?

Building on his original error our cde then implies that there is a new phenomena in the political heavens, democratic and undemocratic socialism. Accepting that the key link in our understanding is what class is in power we are faced with the spectre of a class that exercises dictatorship over itself; i.e. a systematic and ruthless repression of itself! Perhaps we should formulate a new 'term' for our undemocratic socialists - Marxism-Masochism (Freud would be pleased). It is indeed possible for a section of the working class to aid the bourgeoisie in its dictatorship over the proletariat. I have in mind the labour aristocracy in Victorian Britain or today in Northern Ireland and South Africa. In time of war it can also be argued that formal democratic procedure is abandoned but, the use of the mass line and consultation with the masses can and must continue. To argue however, as our cde has, albeit by implication, could be amusing if it were not such a serious error.

A Party which ceases to have a democratic relationship to the masses which ceases to use the mass line and ideological and political struggle and in their place uses coercion and violence against the masses is no longer a proletarian Party. It represents the interests of a rising or established (in power) bourgeoisie. To argue for the existence of 'undemocratic' socialism, even by implication, is to also accept those arguments popular with some of the revisionist parties that the Russian army can bring socialism by force of arms to other countries.

#### WHAT CAN WE SAY?

"Yet what socialism actually is, cannot be dreamed up or judged in the mind of any individual."

CD

I am aware of two people, two individuals (at least) who made an attempt at such a judgement.

"Socialism is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transition point to the abolition of class distinctions



generally, to the abolition of all the relationships of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production; to the revolutionising of all the ideas that result from these social relations."

Marx, The Class Struggles in France

and

"Theoretically, there can be no doubt that between capitalism and communism there lies a definite transition period. It cannot but combine the features and properties of both these forms of social economy. This transition period cannot but be a period of struggle between moribund capitalism and nascent communism - or, in other words, between capitalism which has been defeated but not destroyed and communism which has been born but is still very feeble."

Lenin, Economics and Politics in the Era of Dictatorship of the Proletariat

We are Marxist-Leninist and we can decide what socialism is - not by providing a blueprint (what Marxist has ever said he could?) but by determining, through analysis, what class holds state power. This can be determined by an analysis of the policies (the political line) of the Party, which will reveal whether they are the lines of the proletariat or those of the bourgeoisie. It must be added that if we no longer have any criteria of how we are to get there, how it judging what socialism is, then we no longer have any real criteria of how we are to get there, how it will be established. This opens the door to policies such as the 'peaceful road to socialism' or as above with the Russian army (or any army) imposing it from the outside. Our cde's argument is not simply opportunist - it is liquidation of Marxism-Leninism.

As a Marxist-Leninist organisation the RCLB has, or should have no trouble in stating that the Russians, the Polish Party, Vietnam, etc are not building socialism. We can also state that the CPGB, the Spanish and Italian CPs are not socialist (Marxist-Leninist) Parties.

#### AN EQUAL EXCHANGE - DOGMATISM FOR DOGMATISM

In criticising our previous dogmatism on China - ultra-leftism - our cde substitutes a new form of dogmatism - that of petit bourgeois baton following. Marxism is scientific socialism - it is a critical science or it is nothing! The cde attempts to turn us into the very armchair Marxists he attacks. Following his line Marx would never have written a large portion of his works - The Holy Family, Critique of the Gotha Programme; Engels his Anti-Duhring; Lenin his Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky, Left Wing Communism etc. These cdes even had the arrogance to criticise (to judge) what went on in other countries. Surely they, of all people should have known

"what socialism actually is, cannot be dreamed up in the mind of any individual". CD

## LIBERALISM FOR MARXISM

We find that proletarian friendship and solidarity is replaced by liberalism in the guise of attacking "ultimate judges". The RCLB will be no friend of China if we ignore the process of criticism and self-criticism.

"We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organisations in the interests of our fight. Every Communist and revolutionary should take up this weapon.

But liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace, thus giving rise to a decadent, philistine attitude and bringing about political degeneration in certain units and individuals in the Party and the revolutionary organisations." Mao, Vol II.

Criticism is not the absence of solidarity in the International Communist Movement, it is the expression and exercise of real proletarian solidarity. Where we disagree and have lines of demarcation on serious issues we should state them clearly (this does not mean engaging in mud-slinging polemic) and if we find ourselves to be wrong we should make clear self-criticism. For example, does the RCLB think that the Italian and Spanish CPs are members of the International Communist Movement or do we think they are degenerate and revisionist organisations? We should not fear to speak our minds. If we skink into liberalism, into the 'marsh', we will be no friends of China. We will become incapable of rebuilding the revolutionary Communist Party and of fighting our own bourgeoisie effectively and finally to their destruction. Our side speaks of fools but the real fools are those who follow the baton without critical thinking; they are those who open the doors wide to liberalism.

## AN UNEQUAL EXCHANGE - VULGAR DETERMINISM FOR MARXISM

"Because the economic base more or less directly determines the superstructure..." CD

This statement is incorrect - it is vulgar Marxism or more accurately, vulgar determinism of the worst kind. Errors such as this have been fought against time and again in the Communist movement and it is worth quoting extensively to correct it.

"According to the materialist conception of history the determining element in history is ultimately the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure - the political forms of the class struggle and its consequences, constitutions established by the victorious class, etc - forms of law - and then even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the combatants; political, legal, philosophical theories, religious ideas and their further development into systems of dogma - also exercise their influence on the course of the historical struggles and in many cases PREPONDERATE IN DETERMINING THEIR FORM. There is an interaction of all these elements, in which, amid all the endless host of acci-

dents (i.e. of things and events whose inner connection is so remote or so impossible to prove that we regard it as absent and can neglect it), the economic movement finally asserts itself as necessary. Otherwise the application of the theory to any period of history one chose would be easier than the solution of a simple equation of the first order."

Engels, Letter to J. Bloch (my emphasis)

I might add that in society as a whole there are no final moments.

Considering the historical background to our cde's monetarist po-  
Considering the historical background to our cde's article this should have been reasonably obvious. Is Thatcher's monetarist policy (an event belonging to the superstructure) developing British industry or doing it great damage? The activities of the gang of four in the superstructure nearly destroyed China's economic base. Engels summed up such errors well, in the same letter,

"Unfortunately, however, it happens only too often that people think they have fully understood a theory and can apply it without more ado from the moment they have mastered its main principles, and those not always correctly. And I cannot exempt many of the more recent "Marxists" from this reproach, for some of the most wonderful rubbish has been produced from this quarter too."

Socialism is the transition period between capitalism and communism. Therefore, it is a period when aspects of both systems exist and exist in struggle - in contradiction. Contradictions which are both antagonistic and non-antagonistic - depending upon concrete historical circumstances. The key to understanding these relations is the domination of the proletariat overall, in other words what class is in power. The Communist Party and the proletariat, in a socialist country must lead the struggle economically, politically, and ideologically to limit and eventually destroy bourgeois relations while developing communistic ones. But bourgeois relations cannot be abolished or legalized out of existence. They must be progressively eliminated over a period of time (which may take many, many generations). Consistent with his vulgar determinism our cde ignores the political and ideological struggles by reducing the struggle for socialism to the struggle for the development of the economy. What is being presented here is none other than the "Theory of Productive Forces" which is an argument belonging to the Soviet revisionists.

"It is not enough to assert that the development of large scale industry is the foundation for the socialist transformation of the economy. All revolutionary history shows that the full development of new productive forces is not the prerequisite for the transformation of backward production relations. Our revolution began with Marxist-Leninist propaganda, which served to create new public opinion in favour of the revolution. Moreover, it was possible to destroy the old production relations only after we had overthrown a backward superstructure in the course of revolution. After the old production relations had been destroyed new ones were created, and these cleared the way for the development of new social productive forces. With that behind us we were able to set in motion the technological revolution to develop social productive forces on a large scale. AT THE SAME TIME WE STILL HAD TO CONTINUE TRANSFORMING THE PRODUCTION RELATIONS AND IDEOLOGY." Mao, Critique of Soviet Economics (my emphasis)

## WHICH CONTRADICTION?

"Undoubtedly there are contradictions, for example between the dangers on one hand of too much flexibility for individual enterprises which could lead to economic anarchism, and on the other the problems of bureaucratic rigidity. In fact the situation teems with contradictions as we should expect in any living system. It will be on the correct handling rather than the denial of those contradictions that the highest possible speed of China's socialist modernization will depend".

CD

It is not just living systems that "teem" with contradiction.

"There is nothing that does not contain contradiction, without contradiction nothing would exist." Mao, On Contradiction

Contradiction exists and between all things; living and dead, nature and society. The question is, what is key at particular moment. The contradiction that our cde has indicated is a false one. The concept "economic anarchism" has a specific scientific formulation.

"The contradiction between socialised production and capitalistic appropriation now presents itself as an antagonism between the organisation of production in the individual workshop and the ANARCHY OF PRODUCTION in society generally. The capitalist mode of production moves in these two forms of antagonism immanent to it from its very origin."

Engels, Anti-Duhring my emphasis

In the above quote from CD the role of the masses (the makers of history), ideological and political struggle have all disappeared. The development of socialism in China is now dependant upon the (false) contradiction between economic anarchism and bureaucratic rigidity. The masses are not longer the makers of history and we have revolution from above. This is completely divorced from Marxism Leninism.

## ON CLASS STRUGGEL

The most prominent class contradiction in China today is indeed that between the proletariat and the peasantry. However, the abolition of the peasantry and their transformation into proletarians will not end class struggle.

"Just as one does not judge an individual by what he thinks of himself, so one cannot judge such an epoch of transformation by its consciousness, but on the contrary, this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relations of production."

Marx, Introduction to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy

The struggle against bourgeois and feudal ideology remain as an important task of the revolution, but these cannot be finally eliminated until the basis for these ideologies (bourgeois ideology will most certainly involve the most protracted and difficult struggle of the two) has been transformed. The basis for these is or lies

in the relations of production. These forms of consciousness are but the appearance of the essential, underlying, material conflict - that between "the social forces of production and the relations of production."

The continued struggle to transform the relations of production; the struggle against bourgeois right, the law of value, between mental and manual labour, between town and country, men and women, etc is a task that will require many generations but, it is nonetheless class struggle. How the struggles will develop (antagonistic, non-antagonistic) will depend upon the nature of the contradictions themselves and upon concrete historical circumstances. To deny the role of the masses and in particular to disregard large scale mass struggle is to deny the collective nature of the proletariat and to deny the only method by which these contradictions can be solved - by collective conscious activity on all fronts. Bourgeois relations of production and the concomitant ideologies cannot be abolished; cannot be legislated away, but can only be dealt with in a process of COLLECTIVE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL struggle by the class, led by its Party. One of the criticisms that must be leveled at the practice of the CPSU in the 1930's and 1940's is that the masses became depoliticised, became passive in the political process.

#### MORE ON THE ROLE OF THE MASSES

"Democracy is not ultra-democracy, and reliance on mass upsurges of emotion rather than systematically developing democratic methods, may provide the conditions for demagogues to establish a semi-fascist system of power." CD

This is unbelievably arrogant and elitist! The poor, unfortunate "emotional" proletarians and peasantry. Perhaps our cde feels that the masses are incapable of upsurges that are systematic, organised, thought out and emotional? What do the Chinese themselves say?

"Why is it that the gang of four was overthrown at one stroke? This is because the gang was acting against the law of historical development. Their evil deeds were a lesson to the people and the people had long been ready to put up a fight. the Tian An Men incident itself had prepared the ground - mass support - for toppling the gang. In the last analysis, the blow that ultimately smashed it represented the strength of the masses and was the inevitable outcome of the development of history and a graphic illustration of the masses propelling history forward; comrades of the Central Committee who made the policy decision in compliance with the wishes of the Party and the people and accordingly toppled the gang of four to avoid further losses to our Party truly performed a meritorious deed. But it would be anti-Marxist and wrong to reverse the role of the two - the masses and the comrades concerned." Beijing Review, No 52 1980

Would our cde be opposed to reliance upon "emotional" upsurges such as the Tian An Men incident?

#### WHERE IS IT ALL LEADING OR SHOULD THE RCLB JOIN THE CPGB?

"But after Marxism had ousted all the more or less consistent

doctrines hostile to it, the tendencies expressed in those doctrines began to seek other channels. The forms and motives of the struggle changed, but the struggle continued. And the second half-century in the existence of Marxism began (in the 'nineties) with the struggle of a trend hostile to Marxism within Marxism." Lenin, Marxism and Revisionism

All the above errors in the Circulated Document are extremely serious, in fact they are revisionist, but they only exist to serve the most fundamentally dangerous idea that is being 'floated' in this article - that is that the Soviet Union is a socialist country (albeit undemocratic). I state this categorically despite the argument (p. 7, CD) dealing with the "objective criteria of an exploiting class". I must, given the other errors in the document and the particular nature of those errors, consider this as a smokescreen to cover the main thrust of the argument. The analysis of the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union requires much deeper and detailed investigation but, what must be clear is - that just as a revolution occurs in concrete historical circumstances (potentials and limitations) so must counter-revolution and that these concrete historical circumstances will determine the form - but not the essence, which class hold state power.

The 'floated' argument that the Soviet Union is a socialist country occurs in three main places in the Circulated Document and is backed up by the other rightist errors.

1. "Summing it up broadly we supported China as a democratic model of socialism in contrast to the internal repression and external oppression of the Soviet Union...nevertheless the essence of this important distinction between the democratic ideals of China's socialism and the SYSTEM in the Soviet Union holds true today."

CD my emphasis

We have already seen above that this "essence" is not one used by Marxist-Leninists in their analysis. What must be asked is why does this "essence", false as it is, "hold true today after the counter-revolution in the Soviet Union? What is being implied is that the fundamental difference between the two countries is one of democracy rather than the class and economic nature of two fundamentally opposed systems.

It should be noted again that internal repression is not something foreign to the dictatorship of the proletariat but what we are opposed to is the repression by the bourgeoisie. We most certainly are going to systematically and ruthlessly oppress the monopoly capitalist class while we provide the broadest democracy possible for the masses. External oppression can be formulated in scientific terms unless there is some advantage to be gained in muddy waters - the term is imperialism!

The cde should not stumble, if stumble he did, at naming the "SYSTEM" in the Soviet Union. Either he considers it a socialist country or a particular form of state capitalism.

If it is a socialist country then we must rewrite, no throw away, all Marxist economics to date. For we now have a socialist economic system producing imperialist (economic) relations with the rest of the world; to say nothing of a class exercising a fascist (social-

ist? dictatorship over itself.

If this is not the case then the cde should call the "system" what it is, a particular form of state capitalism. Therefore the "essence" of the question is not between the "democratic ideals of China's socialism and the system in the Soviet Union". It is a question of the distinction between imperialism and socialism, between the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

2. "Although I haven't been able to check the figures, it has been said that in the Soviet Union, Gosplan, the state planning commission is responsible each year for fixing the price of 12 million commodities. There is nothing inherently socialist in such a bureaucratic system." CD

What I must again question is the way in which the economic/political methods of the Soviet Union are compared to those of China. It is true there is nothing "inherently socialist" in its pricing system. But as it is not a socialist country we cannot expect to find anything inherently socialist about its methods. It is a bit like arguing that there is nothing inherently socialist about Britain's VAT system. The link appears to be drawn that the Soviet Union and China are not two fundamentally(essentially) opposed systems run by different classes - rather they are presented as two similar systems but one uses wrong methods to attain its goals.

3. "That while the dangers from exploiting classes should not be forgotten under socialism, Stalin's weakness lay not so much in underestimating the danger from the contradiction with the bourgeoisie as in handling contradictions among the people metaphisically and superficially." CD

It is with the arguments on Stalin that the full implications of the above statements are brought home. It is a classic case of using one error to cover another. Specifically, the error of mishandling the contradictions among the people with counter-revolution!

The basis for contradiction among the people economically, politically and ideologically lies in the relations of production. It is the relations of production that engender these divisions, these contradictions. As we have seen above, the relations of production provide the basis for a new bourgeoisie to rise in a socialist society. So to mishandle the contradictions among the people is to ignore (or to be ignorant of) the social basis of these contradictions, which is also the basis for the rise of a new bourgeoisie. The errors of underestimating the dangers of the rise of a new bourgeoisie and mishandling the contradictions among the people are not two separate contradictions that can be contrasted(or used to cover) one with the other, each mutually exclusive of the other. They are not the same phenomena, one is the basis of the other.

So how then can our cde argue that Stalin's weakness lay not in underestimating the potential for the rise of the new bourgeoisie; especially when after counter-revolution has taken place, when a new bourgeoisie has taken power. No matter what other errors were committed, no matter how serious, they cannot be used to cover up this fundamental fact: the proletariat no longer holds state power in the Soviet Union.

It is my opinion that the cde has argue, by implicaiton and omission that the Soviet Union is a socialist country! As to the other errors I have notd I am convinced that if the RCLB accepts the cde's statements as correct theoretical positions then we would be in serious danger of changing the class orientation of the proletariat for that of the bourgeoisie over a period of time. These issues must be subject to democratic debate and struggle.



Revised draft document

## THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION AND ADOPTION OF THE PROGRAMMATIC DOCUMENT

The PD is to be as accurate and scientific a statement of our revolutionary line as we are capable of at the present time. It is not at this stage mainly a rallying call, rather it is a tool for communists; but it is a tool to guide communists in their practice among the masses.

It will serve as an ideological and political focus for the League's unity in action, expressing its highest majority understanding. Through discussion and struggle, minority positions will also be identified. The majority line will be tested in practice and shown to be correct or incorrect.

The PD should give overall guidance, as well as some specific guidance (supplemented by more detailed policies in specific areas) to our revolutionary work. On the basis of this practice, we aim to win workers and progressive people to Marxism-Leninism, and when we come to propagating Marxism-Leninism systematically among those close to our organization, the PD will also come into play. It will need to embody Marxism in its most valuable form, that is, Marxism beginning to take shape in terms of concrete conditions. This means being prepared to break new ground and display a scientific spirit which shrivels away dogmatism and sectarianism, and leads to a forward-looking unity of will.

Our science and our organizational unity are needed by the proletariat and are in its service. In our programmatic work we must take a significant step forward in the coming-of-age of the revolutionary communist movement, systematise the experience we already have, and show what Marxism-Leninism has to offer in a way which makes sense of concrete reality and shows how we can begin to set about changing it. It is only a step and the cycle of our line's development will be never-ending. But we must firmly take this step now in order to hammer out a line which can be tested in practice.

Forward to the Second Congress, to advance the work of building the party among the struggles of the masses!

(Footnote:- The final drafting of the above was overtaken by events when the decision was taken to concentrate on Section VII up to the Second Congress. Nevertheless, it was considered that it would be useful to circulate it now so that we all have this issue before us, and can try to get a clear orientation for our ongoing programmatic work after the Second Congress).

---

## LENIN ON THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY

The concept of fighting for democratic rights has been included in Section VII. The following passage from Lenin gives an indication of the thinking behind that. It is taken from Lenin's "The Right of Nations to Self-Determination" (1915), near the beginning. The essence of it applies not only to the bourgeois democratic revolution, but also to the socialist revolution. It shows that the concept of the struggle for democratic rights is not just a convenient conceptual category, It is a key practical concept-a). tactically, for taking up an enormous range of concrete issues of concern not just to the working class, but to all working people, b). Strategically, for accumulating strength through all the bitty and concrete issues of mass struggle in a way that inevitably leads up to the socialist revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The proletariat cannot be victorious except through democracy, i.e. by introducing complete democracy and by combining every step of its struggle with democratic demands formulated in the most determined manner. It is absurd to contrast the socialist revolution and the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with one of the questions of democracy, in this case the national question. We must combine the revolutionary struggle against capitalism with a revolutionary programme and

and revolutionary tactics relative to all democratic demands; a republic, a militia, election of officials by the people, equal rights for women, self-determination of nations, etc. While capitalism exists, these demands can be achieved only in exceptional cases, and in an incomplete, distorted form. Basing ourselves on democracy as already achieved, exposing its incompleteness under capitalism, we demand the overthrow of capitalism, the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, as a necessary basis both for the abolition of the poverty of the masses and for the complete and allied achievement of all democratic reforms. Some of these reforms will be started before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, others in the process of the overthrow, and others after it. The social revolution is not a single battle, but represents a whole epoch of numerous battles around all the problems of economic and democratic reforms, which can be consummated only by the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It is for the sake of this final aim that we must formulate every one of our democratic demands in a consistently revolutionary manner. It is quite conceivable that the workers of a certain country may overthrow the bourgeoisie before even one fundamental democratic reform has been accomplished in full. It is entirely inconceivable, however, that the proletariat, as a historical class, will be able to defeat the bourgeoisie if it is not prepared for this task by being educated in the spirit of the most consistent and determinedly revolutionary democracy."

### The Fight Against Opportunism

(Excerpt from a document submitted to the CC in July, 1980-"Delivering the Main Blow at the Opportunists or Struggling Against Opportunism in the Course of Struggling Against the Monopoly Bourgeoisie! No-one is putting forward the former line now, but this document played a part in the evolution of the position embodied in Section VII.)

"To my knowledge, Stalin did not say, as XX claimed, that "the main blow should be delivered at the opportunists," but that the main blow should be delivered to isolate the middle elements. Please refer closely to pages 84 and 85 of "Foundations of Leninism" (FLP-Beijing, Chapter VII, Part 2). Here in three separate historical examples Stalin argues that the main blow should be directed so as to isolate the forces of compromise ("compromise" is emphasized by italics in each case).

By contrast I draw comrades attention to the following very interesting passage from "On the Historical Experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" which was published in "People's Daily" on April 5th, 1956, on the basis of a discussion which had taken place at an enlarged meeting of the CC of the CPC after Kruschew's secret speech.

"Stalin put forward a formula that in different revolutionary periods, the main blow should be<sup>so</sup> directed as to isolate the middle-of-the-road social and political forces of the time. This formula of Stalin's should be treated according to circumstances and from a critical, Marxist point of view. In certain circumstances it may be correct to isolate the middle forces, but it is not correct to isolate them under all circumstances. Our experience teaches us that the main blow of the revolution should be directed at the chief enemy to isolate him, while as for the middle forces, a policy of both uniting with them and struggling against them should be adopted so that they are at least neutralized; and, as circumstances permit, efforts should be made to shift them from their position of neutrality to one of alliance with us, for the purpose of facilitating the development of the revolution. But there was a time-the ten years of civil war from 1927 to 1936-when some of our comrades crudely applied this formula of Stalin's to China's revolution by turning their main attack on the middle forces, singling them out as the most dangerous enemy; the result was that, instead of isolating the real enemy, we isolated ourselves, and suffered losses to the advantage of the real enemy. In the light of this doctrinaire error, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, during the period of the anti-Japanese war, formulated a policy of "developing the progressive forces, winning over the middle-of-the-roads, and

isolating the die-hards" for the purpose of defeating the Japanese aggressors. The progressive forces in question consisted of the workers, peasants and revolutionary intellectuals led by, or open to the influence of, the Communist Party. The middle forces in question consisted of the national bourgeoisie, the democratic parties and groups, and democrats without party affiliation. The die-hards referred to were the comprador-feudal forces led by Chiang Kai-shek, who were passive in resisting the Japanese and active in fighting the Communists. Experience, gained through practice, proved that this policy of the Communist Party suited the circumstances of China's revolution and was correct."

Further questions for our practice of course arise from this and they must not be treated in a mechanical way: for example, the need to deal differently with opportunists, and the masses who follow an opportunist petty bourgeois democratic trend, and the need to distinguish both from someone like Callaghan who is a representative of the bourgeoisie. I believe we will only reach clarity if we treat these ideas not as mathematical formulae but test them against the yardstick of what the masses think in any particular situation, in order to win the masses (especially the advanced elements) over more quickly and weaken the opportunists more quickly in the actual class struggle.

In my view, the opinion that we must deliver the "main blow" at the opportunists or opportunism, is a damagingly left-sectarian view which will slow down our ability to weaken the influence of the opportunists in the actual struggle, and can lead to such <sup>left</sup>sectarian blunders as CS saying "The workers are well rid of such careerist"leaders" as Derek Robinson." .....In my view, once we have sought truth from facts on the matter we will find that there is still a significant amount of left-sectarianism in our thinking holding up our ability to integrate Marxism-Leninism closely with the actual conditions and the struggle of the masses, though it is correct to guard against rightism too.

17/7/'80.

## CRITICAL NOTES ON "THE BROADEST UNITY IS NEEDED TO STOP SOVIET EXPANSIONISM"

The first issue of the 'Interim Theoretical Journal' carried a 5½ page article by CG entitled 'The Broadest Unity is Needed to Stop Soviet Expansionism'. We have discussed the line of this article, with CG, and what follows is a brief summary of the main criticisms levelled at it. Unfortunately time does not allow a more comprehensive and systematic refutation of the rightist line of the article. We also know that cde. CG accepts some of the criticisms made. Nevertheless, we think it is useful to record the main points of criticism of the article as it was written, and as they arose from our discussion.

Firstly though the merit of the article is that it deals with a crucial question which the League has not tackled for at least two years. The points raised are important ones, and they need to be taken seriously. If, as CG argues, a war unleashed by the Soviet Union is imminent then this must have a decisive effect on our policies, and it is just no good ignoring the question. Even if his prediction is, as we believe, incorrect, there can be no doubt that the likelihood of world war within the next 5 years is a very strong one, and that it is absolutely imperative that we have a policy on this question which can integrate the struggle against hegemonism with the struggle against the British imperialist class.

That said, the answers which CG gives are the wrong ones. His analysis is shaky, and his line is an ultra-right dogmatist (!) line and a programme for liquidating the RCLB and the need for a party.

### Weaknesses of analysis

The theoretical basis of the article is extremely weak. We discussed about 20 fairly significant mistakes or weaknesses in analysis. Here are some of the more important.

1. Para. 1 "... it is the Soviet Union which has reacted decisively and made most capital" (to the Iran/Iraq conflict). No evidence or explanation for this is given. It does not seem to be true. Both superpowers have been jostling for position in the Middle East, but neither seems to have made much headway - certainly not decisively so.

2. Para. 4 "The Thatcher government is using the crisis as a cover to attack democracy"  
This is dogmatism. It implies that the bourgeoisie is inherently opposed to (bourgeois) democracy, and that the crisis is some kind of policy which it uses to attack that democracy. In fact the bourgeoisie in Britain has relied on 'democracy' for at least 100 years, and the crisis, which it cannot control, is undermining its ability to use democracy.

3. Para 4. "At present 'communism' means the following: strong unions, nationalisation.., municipal ownership of homes, the welfare state, attacking the trans-national monopolies, opposing British membership of the EEC, unilateral nuclear disarmament"

Although this is ironic, it is a very strange passage. The implication is that this communism - which is the 'communism' of the Labour Party - will be attacked by the bourgeoisie because it weakens the bourgeoisie. This is absolutely not the case. Nationalisation, for instance, is a bourgeois policy; there is nothing 'communist' or even progressive about it. We will not, as CG suggests, defend it, nor will the Bourgeoisie attack it, unless he believes everything he reads in the Daily Telegraph.

4. Para. 7 "We are still bogged down in the mire of ultra-leftism.....  
..... there should be general agreement that today the main target of inner-party struggle must be ultra-leftism"

Well we know something about ultra-leftism, but the picture which CG paints is a lurid one which bears little relation to anything we can actually see. Of course there is some leftism in the league - there is also a good deal of rightism (Vid. CG), but "a mire" of ultra-leftism? In fact the only concrete example given on this point (in para. 8) is a good example of how the RCL takes a stand against ultra-leftism.

5. para. 9. "In Kampuchea we have recently seen self-criticism on the part of the Khmer Rouge, even to the extent of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister declaring that 'Communism is dead' and that socialism was not on the agenda. Both leaders have admitted to mistakes in the Kampuchean revolution--all of the ultra-left variety.....  
.....All the advances they might have made have now been brushed aside by the Vietnamese invasion and occupation. etc. etc."

This passage is wrong, confused and irrelevant.

Firstly it is questionable whether this attributed remark about Communism being dead was ever made. Even if it was, it is hardly a profound analysis of universal significance. It means no more than the fact that socialism is not on the agenda in Kampuchea. How could it be when Kampuchea is occupied, and the very existence of the Kampuchean nation is threatened? And what has this got to do with our tasks in Britain? Nothing at all. Finally the link between these statements and possible ultra-left mistakes in Kampuchea is a spurious one. Ultra-left mistakes may have made it more difficult to organize widespread resistance to the invasion, although we have no evidence of this, but it was not ultra-left mistakes which led the Vietnamese to invade, and it is just untrue to say that the Kampuchians underestimated the threat, as anyone who has read Kampuchean literature from before the invasion can testify.

So based on shaky analysis CG is driving home a universal truth of defeatism and surrender - "there is no virtue in trying to build socialism in a world where the Soviet marauders are on the rampage". On the contrary. We say that the threat of war does not prevent us from struggling to build socialism. It underlines the urgency of that task.

6. Para. 12 "It is worth remembering the Brest-Litovsk treaty..."  
Yes indeed! How ultra-left of Lenin to appease and make concessions to the German Imperialist marauders, in order to get on with the task of building socialism! No we are not so dogmatic as to take this as a model for all time which justifies national concessions to imperialism in the interests of social revolution. But it is incredible that CG should use this example to reinforce a line which states the absolute opposite.

7. Para 14/15. US Imperialism and the coming world war.  
Yes the Soviet Union is the more dangerous of the superpowers. It might become the number one enemy of the people of the world, but this is no reason to be 'soft' on US Imperialism. It certainly will never 'line' up with the main forces of the 2nd and 3rd worlds, although it might be forced to make significant concessions.  
And as for the argument that there cannot be 3 sides in a world war - well yes there can. There was in the First World War. It is thus not inevitable (15) "that the second and third world will find their interests lie in the same direction as one or other superpower" In fact this is a dangerous argument which smacks of the social imperialists of the 2nd. International. It is absolutely imperative that the progressive forces maintain their independence from the superpowers, not that they line up with one or other of them.

8. Para. 25 "We should take a hard look at the statement of the CC of the CP of Malaya..."

Again CG extrapolates from one situation to apply to a quite different one, and in so doing completely undermines his own argument. Why do the Malayan Communists say that they are fighting an armed struggle for democratic rights and territorial integrity, and not for socialism? Because Malaya is a 3rd. world country, and socialism is not immediately on the agenda. Do they, as CG, say that "resistance to Soviet hegemonism has to be elevated to the prime task of the present period"? (3) Or that instead of struggling against the ruling class they must "warn" them of the dangers of their repressive policies? No, no and no. They direct their armed struggle against "the reactionary, anti-communist and anti-popular policies pursued

by the government" and they regard the main contradiction in their country as the contradiction between "its own ruling circles and the people"  
These are the lessons from this experience, lessons which CG seems to ignore

#### Small mistakes lead to big errors - Dogmatism and Rightism

These are some of the important errors of analysis in CG's article. Taken together they add up to a definite dogmatist and rightist trend.

The article is dogmatic, because it starts from the principle that the Soviet Union is the main enemy of the world's people, and then twists facts and misuses historical experience to reinforce that view. Instead of attempting to grasp the complexities of the world today, and to explain the links between different contradictions in the world - a task that is indispensable if we are to develop a meaningful programme for action - CG subordinates everything to his main theme of opposition to the Soviet Union. This is dogmatism.

It is also dogmatism of a rightist character. Throughout CG exaggerates the strength of the enemy and belittles the power of the people. His counsel is a counsel of fear and despair, which subordinates the interests of the working class and oppressed peoples to the struggle against Soviet Imperialism, and which holds out only one hope - that our future depends on United States Imperialism.

#### A liquidationist programme

In present circumstances our main immediate task is to fight to defend and extend democratic rights. CG says this, or something like it, in para. 4. He puts this fight, however in the context of the struggle against Soviet Imperialism, not the struggle for socialism. Herein lies the fundamental line of demarcation. The struggle for democratic rights is on the agenda, but in order to improve the terrain for our advance to our long term goal of socialism, not to help the struggle against the Soviet Union. These questions are not of course separate ones, but the main thrust must be clear.

For CG's proposal brings in its train all manner of disastrous consequences.

- a) Unity with the most reactionary forces (paras 6 and 21), at a time when we as an organization have no significant base in the working class.
- b) It prevents us from even building that base by separating us from the actual and existing struggles of the working class and people (22)
- c) Instead of strengthening the overall anti-imperialist core of our work, if implemented it would necessitate unity with our own imperialist bourgeoisie (29)

This is a programme not to win over the vanguard of the class, to build a party, but a programme for liquidating the RCLB and its vanguard role. It is a programme of pessimism and hopelessness which could not be implemented, even if it were agreed.

#### Conclusion - CG not alone

There is nothing new in these ideas and they have some currency in the Marxist-Leninist movement. Both the Norwegian Workers' Party and the Canadian party have recently published articles criticising such views. To give some perspective to this small contribution we will conclude with a quotation from a recent issue of 'The Forge' (Feb 13-19) p.14

"Quite serious problems have appeared in some parties in the advanced capitalist countries.

In essence we are witnessing the growth of a right opportunist line that is capitulating before the power of the bourgeoisie and abandoning its revolutionary tasks.

This tendency questions both the possibility and the necessity of socialist revolution in the imperialist countries, which gives rise to doubts concerning the possibility and necessity of building vanguard communist parties in these countries....."

The article continues to describe the degeneration of the KPD in Germany and the ORT and PTE in Spain, and relates the development of right opportunism to the current ideological offensive of Soviet revisionism and uncertainty caused by the present situation in China. It concludes -

"Since the degeneration of the USSR into capitalism, communisms in many countries around the world have been struggling to rebuild the vanguard of the working class. This is a difficult and complex struggle that requires both patient work sinking roots among the people and ideological and political study. Some parties have shown major weaknesses in this struggle, either by capitulating to difficulties and withdrawing into sectarianism, or by falling into opportunism in the hopes of faster growth. These parties are more vulnerable and less able to deal with the difficulties posed by today's international situation."

It is not our view that CG is an opportunist, and we have already said that the article deals with a crucial question which must be taken seriously. Nor do we think that many comrades will be inclined to follow his line, given its extremely weak theoretical basis. Nevertheless the points made by 'The Forge' are very important ones which will merit further study. In the League we can hardly hold up as a model our record of "patient work sinking roots among the people and ideological and political study". We have recognized that in the past we were inclined to "capitulate to difficulties" by "withdrawing into sectarianism", and despite our differences about the old RCL's Rectification Stage, our sectarian attitudes to mass struggles have been thoroughly criticised.

The danger now is that we might swing the other way, and make right opportunist errors in the hope of faster growth. It is a danger which leaps from the pages of CG's wrticle, and one against which we need to be particularly vigilant in the coming period.

L.

## WAR, REVOLUTION AND THE HEGEMONISM OF THE TWO SUPER POWERS

We must welcome the clear-cut way in which comrade CG argues the position for the broadest unity to stop soviet expansion. The argument is straight-forward in the sense that it does not confuse the reader with complicated formulations regarding how and when to aim secondary blows against U.S. imperialism. Further, it would seem that comrade CG is concentrating on the problem of building the broadest unity against soviet expansion in order to delay the outbreak of war and therefore give the worlds people time to prepare for wars of national resistance or take advantage of the war crisis to advance revolution. If this is comrade CG's orientation he has forgotten about the need for Marxist-Leninists to apply it consistently and not forget about the second part, i.e. taking advantage of a war crisis to advance socialist revolution.

The article in 'Interim Theoretical Journal (1)' states:-

- "14 There is a marked aversion among comrades to face up to another 'unpleasant' consequence of the Soviet aggression and expansion. That is the strong possibility that the U.S. will line up with the main forces of the second and third worlds against the Soviet Union.
- 15 In being opposed to both super-powers, we must remember that if it is true that the Soviet Union is the more dangerous, then it is only logical that opposition to it is more important and takes precedence over opposition to U.S. imperialism on a world scale. No amounting of twisting or writhing can avoid the logical fact that there cannot be three sides in a world war. There can only be two sides, it is thus inevitable that the second and third worlds will find their interests lie in the same direction as one or other super-power. For the foreseeable future that super-power is U.S. imperialism which is in decline."

Comrade CG says that there cannot be three sides in a world war as if this is the end of the matter. All that remains for communists to do is to decide which side they support in the war. This approach takes us no further forward and, in fact, liquidates any Marxist analysis of the world war that is looming. That there will be two sides cannot be brought into the matter. Lenin in analysing the first world war made concrete analysis of the objects of the great powers in that war. He studied political developments and history leading up to the outbreak of war. He studied wars that had taken place in the nineteenth century and the positions held by Marx and Engels during the different stages of the Franco-Prussian war. Lenin was scathing in his opposition to anarchist phrasemongering when dealing with the question of war and insisted that different wars must be judged concretely. But Lenin did indeed uphold a third side in analysing the 1st World War. That side was the stand of the international proletariat and the oppressed peoples of the colonies. It is also the case that Lenin and the bolsheviks stood alone in opposing the war and upholding a consistent revolutionary stand based on proletarian internationalism.

The Second World War went through different stages. The stage of the beginning of the war in the East with Japan's invasion of Manchuria. The civil war in Spain which was anti-fascist. The Munich period of appeasement and betrayal of Czechoslovakia, which was motivated by British imperialism's aim to encourage German imperialism east, to the outbreak of World War which was correctly analysed at this stage as being mainly inter-imperialist. During this period the CPGB exposed the war as inter-imperialist and held a strong line of opposition to social-democracy. They inevitably suffered persecution from the



...state. The Walter Citrine case was brought against the 'Daily Worker'. German fascism's invasion of the Soviet Union changed the character of the war from inter-imperialist to an anti-fascist war in defence of socialism. The war went through further stages which are difficult to analyse now. But this much can be said. The CPGB sacrificed its independence in the period of the united front against fascism to the extent that they supported the continuation of the national government, failed to take advantage of the prestige communism had won to advance socialist revolution and spread illusions about the nature of British imperialism.

In criticizing comrade C.G.'s article I seek to make a contribution towards promoting discussion on the nature of the war crisis that is developing and thus contribute towards analysing it in a Marxist and not a bourgeois, indeed pro-imperialist, way.

#### WHAT REFINANCE 'ULTRA-LEFTISM'?

First let me say that I believe this term 'ultra-leftism' to be high-sounding but really empty of content. It is yet to be satisfactorily defined. Even more so, the label 'ultra-left idealism' confuses two errors. The RCL's errors of line may have resulted from idealism but they have been more of a rightist nature than a leftist one. Attitude to NATO, Britain's war in Northern Ireland and our line towards U.S. bases in Britain number among these. However, comrade CG believes that 'ultra-leftism' is the error which we must eradicate in analysing the developing world war. To substantiate this comrade CG refers to left errors committed in the Kampuchean revolution of trying to introduce socialism and communism too rapidly. He refers to the measures of the Kampucheans to openly correct their mistakes and form a broad front to liberate their country and save the Khmer nation from extinction. This should not be judged opportunistic, their line accords with Marxism-Leninism Mao-Ze-Dong thought comrade CG correctly explains. A firm grasp of the situation it would seem. But then the article goes on to say:-

"What has been demonstrated in Kampuchea in very stark fashion is that there is no virtue in trying to build socialism in a world where the Soviet marauders are on the rampage. Kampuchea has lessons for the world which we cannot and must not ignore."

An apparently firm grasp melts away into confused opposition to building socialism in a world where Soviet Social-imperialism is expanding. Concretely, why is the struggle for socialism not on the agenda in Kampuchea? Is it because socialism is unsuited to the conditions of a third world country like Kampuchea? If so we must revise the Marxist-Leninist position that only socialism can ensure the independent development of the third world and recommend to the Chinese comrades that they stop trying to build socialism. Such a position is clearly incorrect. So why is socialism not on the agenda at present in Kampuchea? The answer to this must be that Kampuchea has fallen under the heel of imperialist domination once again. The victorious national liberation struggle which culminated in the defeat of U.S. imperialism and its puppet regime of Lon Nol has been frustrated. This time by Soviet social-imperialism operating through its catspaw - the Le Duan regional hegemonists. Protracted struggle for national liberation is back in the forefront. This is a reversal for the Kampuchean people. But how many years did Vietnam itself have to fight to gain national liberation? Over thirty years. During this time after the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu and an armistice signed, U.S. imperialism took over where they had left off. Kampuchea has suffered a similar reversal at the hands of imperialism. But had Kampuchea been liberated at a time when it

would or could have had a longer respite from imperialist aggression, the Khmer Rouge would have had time to correct the mistakes made in the extreme circumstances that they faced and build socialism suited to their own conditions. But socialism would have been the aim. Building capitalism is not open as a choice to the oppressed nations which seek to remain independent/imperialist control.

But comrade CG shows more than just confusion regarding the stages of the revolution in the third world. He goes on to conclude that there is no virtue in fighting for socialism or building socialism in the world at the present time. It would be one thing to say that the crisis has not yet matured sufficiently for the working class of Europe, say, to make direct assaults on the power of capital. But it is another thing altogether to ask the working class to shelve the struggle for socialism in the developed capitalist world, which must mean seeking unity with the bourgeoisie on the basis of opposition to the Soviet-Union, in disregard to the nature of the impending war and the attitude of the proletariat towards it. Comrade CG isn't opposing 'ultra-leftism' on the question of war he asking communism to shelve its long term aims.

In further justification of the view that 'ultra-leftism' is the error which is preventing us from arriving at a correct analysis of war, comrade CG presents an explanation of Lenin's stand in opposition to Trotsky on the signing of the treaty of Brest Litovsk. Trotsky resisted signing the peace because he regarded it as a compromise on principle with the German imperialists. The Soviet Union needed a respite in order to consolidate Soviet power. The expected proletarian revolution had not come in the rest of Europe, so the Bolsheviks were compelled to sign a treaty with Germany granting huge areas of Soviet territory. However, comrade CG seeks to convince us that this example reveals general principles which can be applied in Britain. What these "general principles" are and how they can be applied to Britain is not clear. What CG is concerned to emphasize is that it is 'ultra-left' to automatically assume that the class struggle is primary at all times. But the example chosen does not really help him. Lenin insisted that it was necessary to sign the treaty of Brest Litovsk with Germany because Soviet power depended on it. Now if that is not putting the interests of the class struggle first, then I don't know what is. Anyway, prior to the Bolsheviks being compelled to sign this treaty, they had successfully led a proletarian revolution in the teeth of opposition from the Kerensky (Menshevik) provisional government who wanted to continue Russian participation in the war.

Comrade CG wants Marxist-Leninists in Britain to abandon the aim of socialist revolution, in spite of the fact that British imperialism is more than just decaying it is rotting alive, in favour of class peace with British and U.S. imperialism in a united front against Soviet Social-Imperialism. No doubt there will be objections to the phrase "class peace". After all doesn't comrade CG call for continuing the struggle for democratic rights and withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland. But this is mere window dressing if we have lost sight of the nature of British imperialism. Let's not forget that the same approach to the question of democratic rights has been used by the CPGB with regard to Northern Ireland, i.e. a Bill of Rights. Before the second world war the CPGB curtailed its support for

the  
 the right of/colonies to national self-determination and began demanding that British imperialism introduce democratic rights into the colonies. There is little that is new in comrade CG's approach to the question of democratic rights. But there is a lot that is old and can only serve to mislead the working class on the nature of the British state.

Finally, on the question of 'ultra-leftism' and its relevance to our conditions in Britain. The errors characterized by the Gang of Four were undoubtedly leftist and these have been of international significance in as much as their distortions of Marxism-Leninism Mao Ze-Dong thought have caused confusion of a leftist kind. But just as it is un-Marxist to say that western communist parties became revisionist because Khrushchev came to power, it is wrong to say that Marxist-Leninists in Britain are leftist because of the Gang of Four. I'm leaving aside the parroting of the 'Institute of Marxism-Leninism Mao Ze-Dong Thought' and the one-time Communist Party of England for the moment. Their slavishness was always despised by the Communist Unity Association, Communist Federation of Britain and the East London Marxist-Leninist Assn. These organizations attempted to use their own heads. The CFB even adopted a position, at one stage, that the foreign policy of the Communist Party of China could necessarily be in contradiction with the needs of the revolution on a world scale. This was at a time when the CFB's line was correctly characterized as rightist on the question of social-democracy and Soviet Social-imperialism.

So in studying which ideological errors characterize Marxist-Leninists and working class organizations in Britain, we must look

to conditions prevailing in Britain - a decaying imperialist power and not some 'ultra left-idealism' emanating from incorrect lines in the CPC. Britain is an imperialist power and an extremely parasitic one at that. The errors of the working class movement are characterized by the influence of imperialist ideology on the working class and its organizations and not too much zealotry to overthrow British imperialism through adventurist and leftist means.

On fundamental questions of line, except for some leftist errors during Neil Redfern's leadership, our lines have suffered more from rightism than leftism. This rightism has been combined with a peculiar form of dogmatism and rigidity in matters of organization. Perhaps it is this which leads comrades to judge that errors of leftism and sectarianism are primary. What is unnecessary for maintaining the strict discipline of the RCL should be discarded, but on fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism we should be firm and not drift with the stream. I count struggling against social-chauvinism in the working class movement as a matter of strict principle which can only have effect if we stand firm. In a revolutionary movement of our infancy, errors of a leftist kind are unwanted, but to a certain extent are inevitable and a punishment for the prevalence of opportunism and social-chauvinism.

#### WAR IS A CONTINUATION OF POLITICS BY OTHER MEANS

Is this dictum out of date? One would think so the way it is avoided like the plague in discussing the question of war and revolution. But it is essential that it is born constantly in mind so that we are not swept along by the bourgeoisie and can make sense of world politics. A brief look at political developments since WWII will serve to remind us of the tremendous changes that have taken place

in the past 35 years.

The end of the second World War saw the total defeat of the axis powers Germany, Italy and Japan and the enlargement of what was beginning to be called the socialist camp as communist parties seized power on the ruins of German and Italian defeat in Eastern Europe. The liberation of China from Japanese imperialism was followed by the renewal of the liberation war against the U.S. backed Chang Kai Shek regime. The U.S. economy had not suffered the decimation that Europe had suffered, and was, therefore, able to extend its imperialist tentacles into Europe. U.S. influence expanded into Asia, Africa and Latin America and independence movements from the British and French colonialists gained backing from the U.S. in order to remove political restrictions on its economic expansion. The alliance with the Soviet Union broke up as Britain and America stepped up anti-Sovietism. Through anti-Soviet treaty organizations the United States was able to tighten its hold in Europe and the Far East. As the U.S. took over the role as world policeman it embroiled itself and the allies in a war to annex North Korea and attack the Peoples Republic of China and later took over from the French in Indo China. Here the scale of U.S. imperialism's defeat by the mid 70's marked a complete reversal in the fortunes of U.S. imperialism. But by then the U.S. had found the going tough in many respects. The U.S. could no longer count on the support of Europe. U.S. imperialism seized its opportunity to impose its hegemony in Europe after WWII. But there was no way that the European capitalist/imperialist powers would reconcile themselves to subservience to the United States. The beginning of European co-operation soon after the war was a major development in countering U.S. supremacy.

The movement of colonies for independence, partly supported by the U.S. for its <sup>own</sup> hegemonist reasons, not only undermined old colonialism it began the movement for nominally independent but still oppressed nations of the third world to speak as a single voice in world bodies. U.S. imperialism had used the U.N. to rubber stamp its own interests and ambitions in the world. However, a turning point came with the vote to allow the Peoples Republic of China its seat on the security council and the expulsion of the Chang Kai Shek usurpers from the world body. The unity and struggle of the third world was becoming clearly defined as the main force against imperialism.

During the period up until the end of the 60's, 1968 at the time of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia to be precise, it was correct to talk in terms of U.S. Imperialism being the main enemy of the world's peoples. However, the scene of Russian tanks rolling into Czechoslovakia revealed that Soviet revisionism had become Soviet social-imperialism. It was no longer correct to talk in terms of one super-power being the main enemy of the world's peoples. There had emerged two super-powers who at this time were primarily colluding with whilst rivalling each other in the world. A prime example of this was the USSR's support for Lon Nol in Cambodia who had been installed by the U.S. after a coup against Prince Sihanouk. The <sup>US</sup> overturned Sihanouk in order to aid their war in Vietnam. They of course lifted a rock to <sup>later</sup> drop it on their own feet. But the point is, <sup>that</sup> the USSR were colluding with the US in recognizing Lon Nol and thus harming the interests of the Kampuchean and the Vietnamese and Laotian people who they were supplying with arms. Such opposition to and sabotage of the peoples armed struggle against U.S. and western imperialism when the United States was strong and the people needed resolute

support is an important point to remember. However, the third world has utilized successfully the contradictions between the first and second world and between the two super-powers to step up its struggle. This is an expression of the third world continuing to play its role as the main force against the hegemonism of the two super-powers. The aim of Soviet Social-imperialism in backing liberation movements is to supplant western imperialist domination with its own social-imperialist domination. The Soviet Union can have no other aim and it is inevitable in the modern world that the super-powers will seek to turn the just struggles of oppressed nations and peoples to their own advantage.

To return to Comrade CG's article and world politics as they stand now.

"The defeat of Soviet social-imperialism (or hegemonism as it is better categorized) is now very necessary for any progress to be made anywhere. Azania cannot be liberated until they stop sabotaging and subverting the liberation movements. We must warn the Western imperialists that they are damaging the anti-Soviet united front by clinging to the white supremacy regime in Azania, and not allowing Namibia full self-determination. We must warn the British imperialists of the dangers of their Irish policies and of opposing the working class. We must support UNITA in its efforts to liberate Angola. Zimbabwe and Mozambique cannot develop full economic independence until the Soviet-backed Cuban mercenaries get out of Angola."

The imperialists will no doubt be touched at our concern for where their true interests lie. But it will not do. We can leave such ideas to the liberal wing of the imperialist bourgeoisie who are fighting it out with the likes of Haig in the Whitehouse. However, it is incorrect to say that Azania cannot be liberated until the USSR stop interfering. This underestimates the strength and developing consciousness of the masses. Did the Soviet social-imperialists not interfere in and try and subvert the Zimbabwean revolution? They most certainly did. Did we not go as far as considering Nkomo a puppet of the Soviet Union? But what has happened. Mugabe and Zanu have skillfully combined unity and struggle with Nkomo and ZAPU. Nkomo has shown himself to have a dual nature. If ZANU had pursued the line of forgetting to struggle for unity with Nkomo and listened to some of the lines existing in the RCL, the Soviet Union may well have been able to have made gains by provoking all-out civil war. Zanu's success is certainly recognized by the Zimbabwean people who have returned candidates with increased majorities in the Salisbury City Council elections.

Comrade CG declares that Zimbabwe and Mozambique cannot develop full economic independence until Cuban mercenaries get out of Angola. The Cuban mercenaries are a threat in Africa. But CG's view is really going too far. We are told that we must support UNITA but nothing is said about South Africa which claims the right to invade Mozambique, Angola and no doubt at some time Zimbabwe. The question of continuing economic dependence has got more to do with the power of South Africa which is imperialism's bulwark in Africa. If adopted, CG's line would have the effect of driving Africans engaged in the struggle against South Africa away from Marxism-Leninism and into the arms of pro-Soviet elements.

It is correct to put the main emphasis on opposing Soviet expansionism on a world scale. But this must not be made the prime consideration when judging just struggles being carried out against U.S. Imperialism. And this is what Comrade CG does do. El Salvador

is very much news at the present. Reagan has drawn the line there and made it into a straight struggle with Soviet Social imperialism. This no doubt helps Reagan to gain allies in the world on the question. It is enough for the U.S. to declare that arms are being supplied by the Cubans for even Marxist-Leninists to deaf and practically ignore why the guerrillas are fighting. Such facts as; 16% of the population has full time employment with wages as low as £6 per week; 75% of children under 5 suffer malnutrition; Sanitary facilities and electricity are luxuries for the few; In San Salvador, the capital city, over 50% of the workers live in mud or tin shacks; 60% of the land is owned by 14 families growing tobacco and coffee for export whilst peasants starve.

It is not unusual for liberation organizations to get arms from whatever source they can. It is also not new for the reactionaries who are ruling or benefitting from such ruthless exploitation to claim that they are waging a war against Soviet expansion. Ian Smith, of Rhodesia fame, regularly justified atrocities on the grounds of countering Soviet backed guerrillas. There is even a similar pattern to the atrocities committed by the Salvadorean puppets to that of Rhodesia. <sup>For example</sup> the murder of priests and missionaries suspected of harbouring guerrillas in order to terrorize the peoples struggle against the dictatorship. There is undoubtedly super-power rivalry in the region and the SU is trying to muscle in on a just struggle that is going on against the dictatorship. But there is no doubt of the justification of the freedom fighters taking up arms and for that reason we must give our full support whilst warning against the Soviet Union entering through the back door.

Comrade CG would not ask us to support the racist South African regime which is denying independence to Namibia, committing acts of aggression against ANC camps in Mozambique and invading the border territory of Angola. So what is the purpose of putting the struggle against SSI first in this region. What good will it do lecturing imperialism that they are harming the united front against the Soviet Union by backing white supremacy? Not one bit of good. Reagan has asked the U.S. Congress to repeal a law banning American military aid to UNITA in Angola. In fact to any force fighting MPLA and the Cubans in Angola. South African troops can easily act under this cover with U.S. backing. What should our attitude to this be? Again the main question is not that UNITA receives arms from the U.S. But we must say that the Super-powers are rivalling each other <sup>the</sup> by backing different organizations and, whilst supporting <sup>the</sup> just struggle against Soviet domination, warn against U.S. attempts to regain control.

We must back a third side and that is the struggle of the oppressed peoples and nations and we must be guided by having faith in the masses. The guerrillas in El Salvador are not fighting U.S. domination in order that its mantle be taken over by Soviet Social-imperialism. Such careerists who do see the way forward through subservience to the Soviet Union are few. And events in Afghanistan are a sobering reminder for any would-be puppet, of the SU's ruthless dominating nature. Both Taraki and Amin in Afghanistan were murdered.

#### THE QUESTION OF DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

In stating that the 'struggle for socialism has to be

temporarily relegated to a secondary position' Cde CG states that internally the main task is to defend democratic rights. I am not underestimating the importance of defending democratic rights. Unless we struggle to defend the workers rights and against repressive legislation we will be unable to educate the working class on the need for socialist revolution. But linked as it is to the question of war, I must take issue with Comrade CG. The RCL quite rightly mobilizes on important demonstrations and in support of campaigns against the Nationality Bill, the Employment Act, and the right of political status for the blanketmen to name a few. But in spite of our mobilization and the so-called 'left', democratic rights are being continually eroded. What is more, the prospect is for this to get considerably worse. In the event of the outbreak of war what is likely to happen? Emergency legislation will be rushed through Parliament. Strikes and demonstrations will be banned. Certain publications of political parties are likely to be prohibited. Fighting such legislation is unlikely to change matters. It would be no good us crying that the bourgeois state is preventing us organizing. We would have to organize secretly and take part in what will be illegal activity. And what will be the object of organizing and our activity? This will need to be judged concretely depending on how the war relates to our task in Britain i.e. whether or not Britain's participation is on the side of a just or an unjust war. But the struggle for socialism must be in the forefront of our strategy and tactics and we must be watching for opportunities in the struggle of the masses to take advantage of the British imperialist states weakness when they are unable to rule in the old way and the masses are unprepared to be ruled in the old way. On the question of national defence against invasion by the Soviet Union, we must counter the British states reliance on U.S. imperialism with demands that the people be given arms and civilian military training/organized. For it is the people who will be fighting Soviet troops on British soil. Bourgeois state resistance is likely to collapse. The demand that the people especially the workers be trained in the use of arms is the greatest democratic demand of all and if the bourgeois state refuses to do it, it will be up to genuine revolutionaries.

## CONCLUSIONS

On a world scale we must be putting the emphasis on the struggle against the expansionism of Soviet Social-imperialism. Support for the peoples war in Afghanistan, Kampuchea and Eritrea should be the main aspect of our agitation and propaganda in international affairs. By so doing we are giving aid to peoples in/vanguard of the struggle against Soviet Social-imperialism and helping to stay the hand of the Soviet Union and delay the outbreak of war. But this cannot mean that opposition to SSI is used to rob those oppressed people and nations struggling against U.S. and western imperialism of support. The developing armed struggle in Azania should be popularized and supported. The armed struggle in El-Salvador should be explained as necessary for the peoples liberation from U.S. domination, and super-power contention in the region exposed. Support for the struggle in Northern Ireland against British domination are an essential component of the struggle against our own ruling class.

Finally, in the era of imperialism when war between the slave-owners is inevitable we need the kind of perspective on war held by Mao in 'On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People' written in 1957. Under the sub-heading 'Can bad things

be turned into good things' Mao said:-

"People all over the world are now discussing whether or not a third world war will break out. On this question, too, we must be mentally prepared and do some analysis. We stand firmly for peace and against war. But if the imperialists insist on unleashing another war, we should not be afraid of it. Our attitude on this question is the same as our attitude towards any disturbance: first we are against it; second, we are not afraid of it. The first world war was followed by the birth of the Soviet Union with a population of 200 million. The Second World War was followed by the emergence of the socialist camp with a combined population of 900 million. If the imperialists insist on launching a third world war, it is certain that several hundred million more will turn to socialism, and then there will not be much room left on earth for the imperialists; it is also likely that the whole structure of imperialism will utterly collapse.

WD

APRIL 1981