

# VANGUARD

Politics  
Economics  
World News  
Literature  
Polemics 1/3

VOL. 3 No. 3

MAY/JUNE 1966

## A COMMUNIST PERIODICAL

EDITORIAL

# Wilson's Rhodesian Operetta

IN "VANGUARD" Editorial of December 1965, we wrote that . . . "the visit of Harold Wilson to Salisbury indicated the outright betrayal of the four million Zimbabwe people" and we referred to the Royal Commission that was envisaged to examine "what modifications could be made to the 1961 Constitution." Further, we wrote . . . "Mr. Ian Smith isn't quite "with it" regarding the latest imperialist techniques. It is not whether to keep mighty Africa tied to imperialism that divided Smith from London and Washington, it is what special knot to use. Neo-colonialism has become the historically necessary strategy and tactics of imperialism in the era of vast national-liberation struggle."

Six months have gone by and events have all too grimly confirmed the validity of our comments. The present "secret negotiations" being conducted by representatives of the British Government and the Smith racist regime are doing the work that the still-born Royal Commission was supposed to do. No matter what new tricks they get up to, open or concealed, the "masters" of neo-colonialism will come a cropper.

They have perpetrated a few tricks of late in Africa, which in no way can alter the main current of African revolution. In a hundred years, the colonialist slave-masters have also perpetrated a million evil deeds against the Africans

which can never be forgotten.

The great revolutionary leader of People's China, Chairman Mao tse-tung, has said: "to make trouble, fail, to make trouble and fail again, until their doom — this is the inexorable logic of the imperialists . . ." This formulation entirely conforms to the modern history of emancipation of nations and classes. The Zimbabwe people are standing up and flexing their muscles against the chains which have bound them.

These chains are snapping link by link. They can count on the support of all anti-imperialist Africans and forces in every land, including Britain. To persist in struggle; to distinguish between true friend and traitor; to practice self-reliance; these are the rocks on which are founded the future triumph of the Zimbabwe people.

Sound indeed is the advice of Mr. H. W. Chitepo, Nat. Chairman of ZANU: "our salvation lies in our own hands and intrigues will never deter us from liberating our country" "we will . . . take serious steps, at any cost, to remove the Smith regime by ourselves."

Just to compare this outlook with the advice of certain "friends," including the modern-revisionist renegades, that "Wilson should despatch British troops to Rhodesia," is itself a lesson in distinguishing between true friend and false.

“VIETNAM FOR VICTORY!”



## CONTRASTING VIEWS

by Observer

THERE is a debate going on among anti-revisionists in England, as to the most important task confronting us. There is dispute as to the main contradiction, which has arisen, in our era, within England itself.

We should like to put our views concerning this debate. Firstly, what are the main contradictions within English society today? They are:

1. The contradiction between the English proletariat and the lower strata of the working people on the one hand and monopoly-capitalism on the other.

2. The contradiction between the vast mass of the English people, even including some large-scale capitalists on the one hand and U.S. imperialist interests and at the moment the dominant sector of English monopoly-capitalism on the other.

3. The contradiction among English monopoly-capitalist groupings, in their quest for the maximum profits. There is also a fourth contradiction which should be taken into account. That is the contradiction which exists within the organised English labour movement itself between outright chauvinistic tendencies, which reflect the interests of British imperialism on the one hand and tendencies which favour the principle of

working-class internationalism on the other. This, however, cannot be regarded as a principal contradiction, since objectively, the basic interests of all the British working people are at one with the basic interests of all the exploited peoples in the world, and subjectively the "chauvinists" among our working people will be compelled to take this into due account. Therefore this may be classified as a secondary contradiction. But still, what is the principal contradiction confronting the proletariat and Marxists-Leninists in Britain, today? It is the second contradiction listed above: That which directly confronts more than one class; the majority of people in Britain and which reflects and conforms with the principal contradiction on a world scale, in our era; that between 80% to 90% of the world's peoples and the main prop of imperialism — U.S. imperialism. Why do we stress this as the principal contradiction?

Because, taking advantage of the situation after World War II, the U.S. imperialists have been trying to erect a huge empire, such as never been known before. In order to do this, they must subjugate the entire intermediate area of Asia, Africa and Latin America and so secure the chief sources of cheap raw material, ultra-cheap labour power and dumping markets for their commodities. Such is their economic-strate-

gic goal. Politically and militarily, they strive to reverse the balance of world forces which has become unfavourable to imperialism since the triumph of the Chinese Revolution in 1949, conduct counter-revolution against the Socialist countries and others and ultimately, to subject all the peoples of the world, including those of their "allies" to enslavement by U.S. finance capital. This is an objective reality of our era and a host of facts and figures are available to confirm this truth.

In the words of the Moscow Statement of 1960 . . . "U.S. imperialism has

become the biggest international exploiter . . ." "the mainstay of colonialism . . ." "the main force of aggression and war . . ." "the chief bulwark of world reaction and an international gendarme." Nonetheless, in the face of this there are some anti-revisionists who persist in asserting that it is not U.S. imperialism but British imperialism which should be our chief concern. Of course, it goes without saying, that any comrade who, is unconcerned as to the

continued on page 8

# L.B.J.'S HOCUS POCUS

BY OBSERVER  
(W. GERMANY)

IT IS disgusting to see President Johnson's hocus pocus, whether the "Peace Keeping Operations," "Defending Vietnam's Freedom" or all the rest of the hypocritical themes: like his show of sending "Peace Missions" to so many capitals in the world. Adolph Hitler also did his best to convince the world that his call for peace and negotiations was "sincere"! And Hitler also was most indignant whenever his Peace Show was treated as a smoke-screen for an escalation more brutal and more destructive than before.

Of course, President Johnson is sincere in desiring peace PROVIDED the entire Vietnamese people submit; just as Hitler desired peace for his puppets in the occupied countries of his New Order in Europe PROVIDED the national resistance organisations, which Hitler similarly liked to describe as communist conspiracies, would cease to attack his puppets and occupation forces! But if they refused to submit, Hitler had no other answer save ever more violent escalation of terror, death and destruction.

This is the position of the United States in Southeast Asia today!

Therefore President Johnson should better stick to the plain fact that the U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia is a straight Imperialist Strategy equally familiar in the old colonialist or current neo-colonialist techniques. The objective is to protect and further the world interests of United States Imperialism. And this we all can learn from the American press itself. "The Progressive" of December 1965, quoted William Beecher writing from Washington for the "Wall Street Journal," after conferring privately with Administration officials:

"The 'negotiation chant' served Administration designs quite well. It helped quiet criticism, both domestic and foreign, about our 'militaristic' policy in Vietnam. And, at a time when we were launching a mammoth buildup of combat forces, constant talk of negotiations also served to allay the fears of Hanoi, Peking (sic!) and Moscow about an ultimate U.S. invasion of the North and a forced reunification of the two Vietnams.

"For such benefits as these, some lip service to negotiation ought to continue."

While a lead editorial of the "New York Times" of November 15, 1956, stated:

"We must in the immediate future decide whether we are going to play the global role for which our strength and genius and the developments of modern history prepared us or whether we are going to retire to 'Fortress America.'"

## GLOBAL ROLE

Today we see that U.S. Imperialism seeks the Global Role in order to resist any Change, to roll back National Liberation and Communism wherever possible, and finally to guarantee and strengthen its very existence. That is the reason for U.S. aggression in Southeast Asia. Former President Eisenhower declared on August 4, 1953:

"Indo-China and the whole of Southeast Asia are essential to the U.S. both for strategic and political reasons."

The "U.S. News and World Report" of April 16, 1954, revealed:

"One of the world's richest areas is open to the winner in Indo-China. That's behind the growing U.S. concern... Tin, rubber, rice, key strategic raw materials are what the war is really about. The U.S. sees it as a place to hold — at any cost."

And Senator McGee, of Wyoming, quite outspoken, blurted out the truth why Americans have to fight and die in S.E. Asia. In a speech before the Senate, February 24, 1965, he declared:

"It is my judgment that the area of Indo-China, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, is such a rich enough empire in its total context, with tin, rubber, oil, rice and a number of other important resources, that it makes a difference

to the powers of the world what happens to that segment of resource potential....

"It was worth a war on the part of Japan. The reason she made war in the Pacific was to make this area a part of the Japanese empire. So also was it worth a war by the British, by the French, by the Dutch, and the Portuguese in earlier colonial times."

And so today, in 1966, it is worth a war on the part of U.S. Imperialism! Columnist Joseph Alsop also wrote in the "New York Herald Tribune" of August 5, 1965 (European Edition), quite frankly on what the war in S.E. Asia really is about and what U.S. defeat there would mean:

"The loss of the historic American position as a major Pacific power. Changes of orientation in Japan and the Philippines, even deeper changes in places like Formosa and S. Korea would have led to the virtual expulsion of American power from the Western Pacific. The United States would have to 'pull back to Hawaii,' as General Maxwell Taylor put it to President Johnson."

## NEW FRONT

A new front in the American drive to control S.E. Asia is already opening in Thailand.

"Thailand is in fact ruled by a military dictatorship. For the last seven years it has been under martial law.

"Apologists for the regime argue that this is necessary in a state of emergency posed by the Communist threat. But the small rotating group of military gentlemen who have ruled the country almost without interruption since the revolution of 1932 have all along considered Thailand in a state of emergency, and used their powers accordingly especially whenever the country seemed on the verge of realising the democratic ideals expressed in its first (and almost immediately abrogated) constitution."

Thus wrote Peter S. McGee in an article in "The New Republic" of July 10, 1965, headlined "Thailand — Next Asian Domino?", and after visiting Thailand to make a documentary film for National Educational Television. McGee also noted that

"... in the process of 'preserving the alternatives of democracy and free choice' in S.E. Asia, the United States has strengthened the very forces that restrict those things."

There you have the truth on the fact that the U.S. Military-Industrial Complex is not interested in democracy for the peoples of Asia and so reject any Change which endangers U.S. Imperialism. And the Pentagon has taken over. The "New York Times" of December 12, 1965, wrote:

"The United States has quietly begun the emergency construction of more military installations in Thailand... It was understood that the large complex would give the United States added capability for a major thrust into Laos..."

"Work has already begun at Sattahip on an 11,500-foot runway, the longest in Thailand, which will be able to accommodate the heaviest bombers and transports of the U.S. Air Force. It is scheduled for completion in July. A parallel runway of 10,000 feet is to be put down later, together with large supporting installations..."

"There are 12,000 United States Servicemen in Thailand, two-thirds of whom are in the Air Force."

And "Newsweek" of January 31, 1966, revealed:

"Thailand is also a country geared for war. Though Thai leaders are highly reluctant to admit it, their nation is already playing a crucial role in the battle for control of Asia. All U.S. air strikes against Communist forces in Laos originate in Thailand. And before the current U.S. peace offensive went into effect, American planes based in Thailand accounted for at least 80% of the bombing raids over North Vietnam."

"Last week, from Takli in the West to Ubon in the east, from Udon in the northeast to Korat in the heart of the country, U.S. jets from nine squadrons reached into Laos to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail..."

"Technically, the planes operate out of Thai — not American — bases; in practice, though, the airfields have

been greatly expanded and integrated into the chain of U.S. bases which rings China from the Sea of Japan to the Indian Ocean. Already, the U.S. presence has caused some friction among the staunchly independent Thais."

President Johnson does his best to spread the myth of "subversion and aggression from the North" however, it is a fact that this myth serves a further purpose than to disguise the real disturber of the peace in S.E. Asia. It is used to justify American aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and also against Cambodia and Laos. For, as was stated by former Secretary of State, J. F. Dulles in April 1956:

"The U.S. must stick to South Vietnam as to South Korea and to Formosa, because these regions are of decisive importance to the U.S. position in S.E. Asia."

"Sticking to S. Vietnam" in order to hold and control S.E. Asia includes military training and military aid for puppet forces, the U.S. Seventh Fleet, almost 300,000 U.S. soldiers, and last but not least subversion, sabotage and espionage groups. C. L. Sulzberger revealed in the "New York Times" of June 27, 1964:

"In 1961 a South Vietnamese 'First Operation Group' was established under U.S. direction to fight secret operations in North Vietnam. Now, as we have shown in Laos, we contemplate backing this kind of action with air support."

And Hedrick Smith admitted in a Washington dispatch in the "New York Times" of October 27, 1963, that U.S. war efforts in Laos continue:

"The United States had been quietly helping to resupply the neutralist and right-wing forces opposing the Pathet Lao."

The "New York Times" of December 21, 1965, revealed that Cambodia is open to U.S. military...

"U.S. field commanders have been authorised to pursue enemy troops into Cambodia in some circumstances, authoritative sources said today. The commanders also have been given permission to call in artillery barrages and tactical air strikes on enemy positions across the border if necessary. This could be done without consulting higher headquarters in Saigon, Honolulu or Washington."

... and to U.S. bombers, as Seymour Topping, after an inspection tour of Cambodia's border area, stated in the "New York Times" of October 14, 1965:

"S. Vietnamese and U.S. planes frequently bomb Tay Ninh forests."

So we do not need to wonder that "U.S. News and World Report" of January 17, 1966, observed:

"One of the gloomiest reports to come out of the Vietnam war was made publicly on January 9 by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Chief finding of the report by Mr. Mansfield and four other U.S. Senators back from Saigon: There is very real danger of the U.S. being dragged into an expanding, general war in Asia. Said the report: ... The war has already expanded significantly into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border while pressures increase in the northeast of Thailand."

This is indeed the most crucial question mankind faces today: Is general war coming in Asia? The doctrine of "preventive war" — also one of Hitler's favourite doctrines — now stalks into public view more and more, and so again the aggressors unmask, under a sort of "act now" hysteria. The din of war preparation rises and the frenzied clamour for instant war "before it is too late" is in the minds of far too many officers and politicians. They all remind me of General Howley, U.S. commander-in-chief in Berlin, who declared boastfully on February 6, 1950:

"Now we have got a head start with the hydrogen bomb, we should lay

down the law — not as diplomats, but as soldiers. We have got to act while we have the advantage."

Aren't those officers and politicians dreaming on the edge of the precipice? "U.S. News and World Report" of July 6, 1964, reported on Admiral Harry D. Felt, who was about to retire as commander of all U.S. forces in the Pacific:

"Under questioning, the following exchange occurred:

Question — Admiral, are you willing to risk war in S.E. Asia?

Answer — The question was: Is the United States willing to risk war with Red China? I said of course we were willing to risk — willing to risk because we believed so strongly that the Communists cannot and must not win.

Question — In other words, you're willing to risk war with Communist China to prevent Communists from taking over Southeast Asia?

Answer — The answer is yes, of course!"

## LIKE HITLER

Adolf Hitler never spoke plainer! Of interest here is also a special report from Saigon in the Washington Star of January 15, 1966:

"Many top S. Vietnamese favour carrying the ground war to North Vietnam and even on to China. This same Vietnamese power group does not share the U.S. belief that victory can be found in South Vietnam alone, since it requires the kind of sweeping social revolution they have no interest in pursuing... The ruling, largely middle-class power group... has no intention of giving up its favoured stead it seeks victory almost solely through military action in an expanded war."

Well, does it require no more effort than some fast talking from Felt, Rusk, McNamara and Johnson, besides others, to depict China as the aggressor in Asia and to present the United States as the angel of mercy for the peoples of Asia? "The New Republic" of January 29, 1966, wrote in an article headlined "War with China?":

"However the war in Vietnam ends, this country plainly isn't getting ready to pull out of the Far East, but intends spending billions more dollars on air bases and ports, in Vietnam itself, in Thailand, on Formosa and Okinawa, and in the Philippines. The idea of course is to 'contain' China..."

"A Chinese watching the busy buildup of American bases close to China might be excused for wondering who is an aggressor, his country or ours..."

"One way to begin being rational is to stop talking about China's 'present course of aggression.' We're the ones who're building all those bases."

Now it is indeed up to the people, to everyone, to wake up and take action to prevent the worst, for, as Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D-Calif.) declared in the House, January 31, 1966:

"There comes a point of no return in the course of events, and we may well have reached that point in Asia. We may now be committed to a course leading to the death of millions and the destruction of any hope for a new order of law and justice in the world in our lifetime... I know as certainly as I know anything in this life that the United States cannot achieve any worthwhile goal from the course it is pursuing in Vietnam."

Certainly, if the United States finds that escalation in Vietnam and intervention in Laos and Cambodia and Thailand do not bring a settlement on its terms — as they are most unlikely to do — it may well decide that "Containment" has failed, and that the time has come to attack China directly. In that event a full-scale all-out war could not be avoided. This is the possibility, so it seems, for which the U.S.A. as well as world opinion is at present being prepared by President Johnson and others. Will they accept it? Or fight against it? That is the issue.

## U.S. STAGED FASCIST COUP IN INDONESIA

U.S. Defence Secretary McNamara, virtually admitted that the U.S. government had made use of Indonesia's reactionary military clique to stage a fascist military coup d'etat in that country, according to a Washington report.

Testifying on U.S. Foreign "Aid,"

McNamara declared that, past U.S. military "aid" to Indonesia had been well invested; the "aid" had enabled the U.S. to maintain "contact" with the Indonesian military leaders "who had much to do with the recent change in government."

# "DESCENT INTO ECONOMISM"

By J. TYRRELL

IN BRITAIN today, there is plenty of resistance, sporadic though it is, to the employers' and Labour Government's attacks on the workers' wages and conditions. As class struggles are sharpening, there is a growing readiness on the part of the workers to ensure that they are not going to bear the brunt of the employers' attacks. These struggles that the working class are fighting spontaneously in defence of their interests, are being carried out on a purely economic and Trade Union level. They are completely devoid of all political content and no serious attempt has been made by the revisionists to elevate the political consciousness of those engaged in such struggles. If anything is an indictment of the abdication of the revolutionary responsibilities of the Communist Party of Great Britain, this is it. This renegade desertion of the class struggle at the point of production has meant that these spontaneous struggles are without political leadership. This economism is a striking characteristic of present-day class struggles in Britain. A Chinese wall between economic and politics exist among the workers.

It should be the job of the Communist Party to break down this barrier, to inject political content into the spontaneous economic struggle and to provide political leadership where possible. This it has signally failed to do; in fact, makes no attempt to do. The revisionists now adopt a typical social democratic attitude towards factory and Trade Union work. "We do not interfere," they say, "we leave it to our own comrades in the Trade Unions and on the shop floor. After all, they know best." In other words, they wash their hands, leaving them free for the more serious business of electoral vote catching.

But the Party still possesses its voting machine in the unions, and C.P. aspirants to office see this voting machine as a means to obtain full-time positions. Opportunism has become rampant. The spirit of self sacrifice no longer exists. The revolutionary interests of the working class have given place to the idea of attaining office and keeping it at all costs.

Although the C.P.G.B. bears a heavy responsibility for this descent into economism, it would be wrong to put all the blame on them. There are other factors involved. The workers have been partly successful in resisting attacks. Unemployment is lower than it has ever been. The papers are forever talking about the balance of payments problem and the approach of national bankruptcy, but it all seems rather remote. It is only when the workers see these problems directly affecting them, that they start to think politically.

This is what makes the present situation so complicated for the Marxist-Leninists. Although it has become comparatively easy to interest workers from a Trade Union point of view in their wages and conditions, they don't want to know about politics and they are certainly not ready to help to form and build a genuine Marxist-Leninist Communist Party.

At present, objective conditions do not exist for the formation of a Marxist-Leninist party. But conditions change, sometimes very quickly. This is what the Trotskyists and other left opportunists, in their petty bourgeois impatience and frustration, are always telling us. But it is the task of the Marxist-Leninists not only to analyse the objective situation but on the basis of this analysis, to determine what are the possibilities for the future. Sometimes, objective conditions can be created for the formation of a party by the use of the subjective factor, which means that if our attitudes and line is correct and we work hard enough, we Marxist-Leninists can create a more favourable objective situation. However, on the basis of our analysis of the objective situation, it is obvious that the Marxist-Leninist party will not be created very quickly and that it is going to be a long job.

Up to now, the capitalist class has had plenty of room to manoeuvre and they still have, although the area of elbow room at their disposal is diminishing. Now they are being forced to take the first steps to inhibit the workers' power to resist. That is what the Incomes Policy, Early Warning System and proposals to make unofficial strikes illegal is all about. But it is only when the crunch comes, when the capitalist class and its Labour Government have no elbow room left and when all Trade Union and other industrial action,

official and "unofficial," come up against a solid wall of resistance, that we are likely to see a return to politics.

This is all bound up, of course, with the anti-imperialist, international struggle for national liberation carried out by the peoples of the three continents of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Marxist-Leninists know that their enemy and ours is the same, that our long-term interests are the same as theirs and that international solidarity is a good thing. But it is not true, as the revisionists try to make out, that our short-term interests are the same. If this was the case, there would be more and bigger demonstrations of international solidarity, and industrial actions in support of the Vietnamese and other peoples fighting for their freedom. That is why the revisionist over-simplification of the issue is an insult to the intelligence and does only harm to the anti-imperialist cause. To assert that the millions spent East of Suez is a waste of money without explaining that it is being used to defend investments amounting to £350 million in Malaya alone, is palpable dishonesty. To pretend that the workers gain nothing from these investments, when some of this wealth is obviously being used to damp down the militancy of the working class through judicious concessions here and there, is nothing but downright deception of the working class. The revisionists also fail to point out, and this cannot be entirely accidental, that reduction of the arms bill in the present situation, puts this country more under the thumb of the U.S. In effect, it means that Britain relies more on America to defend their investments East of Suez, as the Tories well know and resent, even if the revisionists conveniently forget these things. The point is that although the long-term interests of the peoples struggling for national liberation and the metropolitan working class are identical, their short-term interests conflict. The metropolitan working class of the industrial countries obviously benefit from the super-profits extracted from the colonies and neocolonies and what is even more important, from robbery in the form of low prices paid for raw materials and primary products, and high prices paid for manufactured goods. Incidentally, non-colonial countries such as Sweden, Switzerland, the German Federal Republic and Italy also benefit from this latter form of exploitation.

So here we have another wall, the wall between the long-term and short-term interests of the British working class, which is actually the same wall as the one between economics and politics. This wall will only be broken down when the peoples on the three continents become so strong during the course of their struggles that they begin to confiscate the investments and property of the imperialists. When this begins to happen, the capitalists will be forced more and more to attack the gains made by the British workers, and only then will they begin to realise that their fight is our fight. Only when the British working class begins to realise in the most concrete terms, that their short-term as well as their long-term interests coincide and that we are both fighting the same enemy, will there be a qualitative change when economic struggle grows into political struggle.

ED. NOTE: This is a polemical article and not necessary the views of "VANGUARD," comments are welcome.

## U.S. FACES SHORTAGE OF MILITARY MANPOWER

by CHANG MEI

THE United States will have to pour one million men into South Vietnam to ensure its stay there, estimated Walter Lippmann, noted U.S. commentator. How can Washington find such troop strength from its strained manpower resources?

The total strength of the U.S. army, navy and air force in active service was 2.7 million men at the end of last October, according to the U.S. Defence Department. Of these 1.5 million were deployed in the United States and 1.2 million overseas. There is obviously a big gap between the U.S. military strength and its role as "world gendarme."

Since Johnson announced the dispatch of large-scale reinforcements to South Vietnam last July, the U.S. troops there have increased to 210,000. But the U.S. Commander in South Vietnam General Westmoreland, is still not satisfied. He estimated "a requirement for some 200,000 more men in Vietnam during the 1966 calendar year, and a proportionate increase in air support." (*New York Times*, February 21).

The Vietnamese war has thus disturbed U.S. global strategic deployment, the U.S. press reports.

The number of U.S. combat troops is very limited. Most of the 2.7 million are in logistics and supply. For example, combat troops in the ground forces amount to only 250,000 men, while non-combatants are three times that number. There is an even smaller proportion of combatants in the navy and air force.

Of the 16 army divisions, eight were originally deployed overseas (five in Western Europe, two in South Korea and one in other areas). As a result of heavy reinforcements to South Vietnam, forces remaining in the United States have dwindled to only six divisions. Of these, two divisions are to meet the Latin American situation, two or three are in support of western Europe and the remainder to deal with the situation at home.

Besides the 16 army divisions, there are three marine divisions. Part of the First and the Third marines have seen action in South Vietnam.

The U.S. naval force in active service numbers about 90,000. It is distributed between the Pacific and the Atlantic. Some warships have been moved from the Atlantic to waters near Vietnam.

With the mounting loss of planes over

Vietnam, the number of pilots is diminishing. As for the military air transport service, "three-quarters of the U.S. air transport potential is mobilised to airlift men and material to Vietnam," stated Howell Estes, who heads the U.S. Military Airlift Command.

Hanson W. Baldwin, noted U.S. military commentator, wrote in *New York Times* (February 21) after a study of U.S. regular and reserve forces, "The nation's armed services have almost exhausted the trained and ready military units, with all available forces spread dangerously thin in Vietnam and elsewhere." He added: "Virtually all of the combat-ready units in the United States have been committed to Vietnam."

Johnson is hard pressed to keep up the flow of U.S. reinforcements to South Vietnam to prop up the deteriorating situation, which 210,000 U.S. troops are failing to improve.

To make up for the losses in Vietnam and to ease the manpower shortage, Washington has tried various measures. But as Baldwin noted, "dependence upon draft calls and enlistments could fill only a fraction of General Westmoreland's requirements." He said: "The transfer of troops from Europe and elsewhere would supply a greater proportion of General Westmoreland's requirements but not all of them." He warned: "Even the mobilisation of the (national) guard and reserves might not supply all his stated needs."

Extensive U.S. diplomatic efforts have been made to persuade its "allies" to supply cannon fodder. But the results are disappointing to Washington.

Now, recruiting centres have been set up in La Paz (Bolivia) and in Spain to collect foreign mercenaries for the U.S. war in Vietnam.

Even if the Johnson administration were able to recruit several hundred thousand more men by any means, this would still be inadequate to deal with the South Vietnam battlefield, let alone "emergencies" in other places in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

## GIANT SOVIET-FIAT DEAL

FOREIGN CAPITAL EN ROUTE VIA YUGOSLAVIA

FIAT, world's 5th. biggest auto-maker, has contracted with the Soviet Union to build a half-million cars per. year plant in the Ukraine, plus two or three spare plants and a huge chain of service stations across the U.S.S.R.

Reports have it that a special steel-mill is also on the FIAT order-book.

Thus FIAT, which is already making cars in YUGOSLAVIA, and is bidding a take-over for a plant in POLAND, enters the first Socialist country with the biggest money deal ever made by the Soviet Union with any capitalist firm - reputed in the region of 800 million dollars.

It is, to say the least, unlikely that FIAT are going into this with philanthropic designs. Motivated by the goal of the highest maximum profits, this monster firm will count on its profits coming from the labour power of thousands of Soviet workers.

It is pertinent to ask: Since Khrushchov and his disciples (who now reign), have caused serious set-backs to the Soviet economy, particularly agriculture, why is it that they are so anxious to flood the country with Fiat cars? Are the big-income Soviet bourgeois stratum so impatient that they can't wait for Soviet-built cars?

How is it that a country which can send a space-ship to the moon, has to call in a foreign capitalist firm to build its cars? Is this another step along the road of capitalist restoration in the Soviet Union?

How long will it be before these renegades, who temporarily are at the helm of the Soviet State, call in Alfred von Krupp to make its steel and chemicals?

The Soviet workers will yet have the final say.

# THIS WON'T DO CDR. YOUNG!

by Dave Volpe

THE November 4 issue of "Advance News"-Bulletin of the Ex-Service Movement for Peace, carries a long article by Cdr. Edgar Young R.N. (Rtd.), its President, entitled — "British People can Stop Vietnam War."

In this article, Cdr. Young, an authoritative writer on S.E. Asia, makes a number of valid and positive points. He also makes a number of invalid and negative ones, with which one is compelled to take issue, so as to contribute to clarity on the nature of the U.S. imperialist war in Indo-china. It turns out that Cdr. Young was recently in the Soviet Union and according to him, spoke with a number of Soviet Marshalls and Admirals, "confirming me in my belief that there will be no Munich in Vietnam so far as the Soviet Union is concerned." "Despite the ideological quarrel still raging between the USSR and People's China, the USSR will certainly not sell out" over Vietnam as Britain and France did in 1938 over Czechoslovakia... nor would it default if the U.S.A. were to use nuclear weapons against China...

It is necessary to cut through the naivette of Cdr. Young's "beliefs" in this respect and to uncover some facts, which after all, count rather more than "faith," "hopes" and "reliance on 'charity.'"

In the first place, I wish to make the point that since Khrushchov and his group seized state-power in 1956, there has been a qualitative gravitation on, the part of the Soviet leaders away from all-out support to national liberation struggles, under the principle of proletarian internationalism, towards a global rapprochement with U.S. imperialism, under the slogan of 'peaceful co-existence.' To quote a few prominent examples:

1. The Soviet leaders withdrew all military and economic aid from Socialist Albania and Socialist China when they saw the impossibility of "lining up" these two countries for "peaceful co-operation" with U.S. imperialism for the purposes of the Khrushchov-Kennedy concept of "peace transition of the world under the Moscow-Washington orbit."

2. To this day, the Soviet leaders are acting together with the U.S. leaders as the supplier of the most modern arms to the Indian Government, a staunch defender of Indian expansionism, capitalism, landlordism and reaction and a vital bulwark against national liberation in Asia. The U.S. and Soviet leaders have encouraged the Indian reactionaries to militarise their budget to the point of bankruptcy, while hundreds of thousands of Indian workers and peasants starve to death.

3. Only very recently, the Soviet Government took part in a "conference" under the auspices of the U.S., at which was present the Chaing kai-shek gang... a meeting aimed at establishing some sort of "Asian Bank" which would supply further funds for bolstering up all sorts of anti-liberation riff-raff and attempts to "head off" the gathering storm in Asia.

4. The notorious "Cuba crisis" was caused by the joint activities of U.S. imperialist counter-revolution and the chauvanistic adventurism-capitulationism of the Khrushchovites.

Lauded to the skies as a victory for "peace" and the "relaxation of tension" it was followed very soon by the escalation of the U.S. imperialist war in Indo-China and the subsequent mass bombing of the Socialist D.R. of Vietnam. The subsiding of the "tension" in the Caribbean and W. Berlin under the baton of "U.S. Soviet understanding," in fact, flashed the green light for an outright and all-out U.S. war against the people of Indo-china. Are not these facts rather than beliefs?

5. Several hundred U.S. planes have been shot down over the D.R. of Vietnam by the small-arms fire of the Vietnamese people. Even the U.S. rulers are curiously silent as to what proportion of aircraft losses are due to Soviet A-A missiles.

In fact, one must bluntly ask: is the military aid provided to the D.R. of Vietnam by the Soviet Union, which is a foremost military Power, commensurate to its strength? Is it the type and amount one has the right to expect a big Social-

ist country to supply to a small Socialist country under constant air attack by a big imperialist Power? The Soviet leaders and their apologists are fond of talking loudly about this marginal and blatantly inadequate 'aid.' But all the talk in the world cannot conceal the truth for very long.

Since the October revolution of 1917, the Soviet Union has received the active support of the exploited peoples, the world over, against its reactionary enemies. Lenin and Stalin often expressed the gratitude of the Soviet workers for this active friendship. Both stressed the fact, that whilst imperialism remained in a large part of the world, then the very existence of the Soviet Union as a Socialist state largely depended on this support. Hence, have not all oppressed peoples and also peoples who have embarked on the Socialist road, the right to expect the unqualified support of the Soviet Union?

Even more so when a Socialist country is confronted with aggression on the part of a Power, which has donned the bloody mantle of Hitler. Is it some sort of 'lordly favour' to extend such unqualified support to the Vietnamese in their present struggle? No, it definitely is not. The Vietnamese patriots today, already stand in the front line of a world war - that is the blunt truth of the matter. This world war has not assumed a general military character, but is this fact thanks to those elements who perceive the defence of world peace, as depending on "U.S.-Soviet collaboration"? No, it is not. The defence of world peace rests on whether all the people of every single country in the world can unite mobilise and resolutely defeat imperialism, headed by the U.S. imperialists.

Imperialism, the pillager, butcher and prison-warder of the peoples, is the source of war. In order to hang on to its shaky positions and bolster its metropolitan economies, it needs to subject millions of people to slavery and loot the wealth of their countries. Imperialism must perforce depend on massacre, terrorism, conspiracy bribery and deceit. These things are its props, since it cannot depend on what it tramples upon. Who ever heard of a murderer depending for support on his victims or a gaoler depending for support on his prisoners? Imperialism, is in the era of its doom. Armed with weapons that even Hitler could only dream of, it is being battered from pillar to post and its positions, hitherto regarded as impregnable, are not worth a pinch of salt. The U.S. escalates its attacks in Indo-china, using the cream of its forces. The valiant and highly conscious patriots of Vietnam and Laos, using no bombers, tanks, warships nor chemical weapons, wipe out one crack unit after another. When Harold Wilson and Kosygin state that "there can be no military solution in Indo-china" they do so only to "help out" U.S. imperialism from a predicament with which it can't cope. Two or three years ago, they would have dismissed with contempt any suggestion that the "mighty" U.S.A. "with nuclear teeth" could be mauled and sent reeling by the "backward" Vietnamese. Faced with the hard facts of the "background" Vietnamese advancing to victory and the "advanced" U.S. forces falling in defeat, they now settle for a status quo. What has Cdr. Young to say to the common knowledge, that, behind the scenes, the Soviet leaders are working for a 'peaceful' negotiated settlement of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam? This may not accord with Cdr. Young's beliefs, but we have the public acknowledgement of this fact by top U.S. leader, McGeorge Bundy.

Said he: "the public position of the Soviets is one of strong support for the conditions set down by Hanoi, however, its clear to us that the Soviet Government hope for a peaceful settlement." How is it, Cdr. Young, that the Soviet leaders have never repudiated Tito's oft-repeated calls for a "negotiated settlement" whilst U.S. troops and bases still occupy S. Vietnam? It can only be because the Soviet leaders completely

agree with this position. Is it not a 'Munich' to work for a position where the aggressor sits on equal terms at the table with the people whom he has wantonly attacked? What, after all, is there to "negotiate" about? The Geneva agreements are in existence. They clearly forbid foreign troops and bases to be stationed in Vietnam. Since the only foreign troops and bases are those of the U.S. and its lackeys then these foreign troops and bases must be removed and the Vietnamese left to settle their own affairs. Any other basis for "negotiations" which may meet the approval of Kosygin, Tito, Johnson, Wilson and Co. is nothing else but a 'Munich' and sell-out whether you are prepared to believe it or not. The Vietnamese patriots, deaf to the "advice" of certain "friends," have stated that they will fight for 20 years or more, if necessary, in order to clear the U.S. aggressor from their country. In doing so, the Vietnamese patriots understand that they are contributing to preventing the outbreak of a third world war, besides ensuring the sovereignty of their country. It is high time that certain "friends" of Vietnam understood this fact.

Cdr. Young, your "beliefs" lead you to some strange conclusions. You advocate, in your article, some sort of 'basis' against 'expansion,' real or imaginary, which would involve Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, guaranteed, by Treaty, presumably, by France, Britain, the U.S.S.R., and China and "to serve her own pretended interests better" as you put it... the U.S.A. So, the Vietnamese, after fighting for more than 25 years for national independence must now put her independence to the jurisdiction of friends pseudo "friends" and enemies alike. To go back to 1938, it was precisely because Czechoslovakia accepted this position, that she ended up with Munich.

No, Commander, to even suggest such a "solution" shows at best, that you fail

to understand in essence what is going on in the world. The Vietnamese have successively fought the Japanese, the French and now the Americans and their corrupt toadies. They proceed from the principle of accepting aid from friends but relying on themselves for genuine liberation. This is the same principle observed by the Chinese in their triumphant, Nat.-democratic and Socialist revolutions. On the principle of self-reliance, the Chinese are producing their own atomic weapons for defence, whilst advocating the total and world-wide destruction of atomic weapons.

This is not 1914 nor 1940. It is the era of the disintegration of imperialism on a world scale and the sweeping victory of national liberation struggle. No matter how small a country and even if it has only bows and arrows to start with, providing it is united, resolute and organised in struggle, it can and will expel any invader. It has need of friends, support and aid. But it definitely has no need for Big Power treaties which "guarantee" its frontiers, interfere with its internal affairs and use it as a pawn on the international chess-board. It is absolutely vital to vanquish the false concept spread by warmongers that "weapons, even nuclear weapons, decide everything." And that everyone must tremble and bow down in terror. It is no accident that certain people who masquerade as "Communist" leaders also spread this illusion. They are the out and out accomplices of imperialism which breeds war and is synonymous with war. Hundreds of millions of working people, welding themselves into a multi-purpose Army of genuine liberation are mightier than all the great weapons in the world. It is they, who, in our era, "decide everything" and will for certain, decide to consign all the weapons, in due course, and all imperialist cannibals and their apologists to the garbage-heap.

## WORKERS MUSIC ASSOCIATION INSTITUTES MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP

IT was to meet a need unprovided by any existing musical organisation that, in 1936, some forty-four choirs and five orchestras in the Labour Movement came together to form a society "to co-ordinate workers' musical activity." They felt the urgent need for music which reflected the world outlook of their members and the means to create and perform such music. This is how the Workers Music Association, now in its thirtieth year, came into being. Its aims — to provide opportunities and means for people to develop their musical instincts and tastes, and to improve the level of their musical understanding as a result of their own striving and experiences, rather than to accept uncritically standards set by commercial or any other interests. It believes that genuine art has in the past moved people to work for the betterment of society and will continue to do so. It insists on the social, as opposed to the individualistic, approach to the arts and is concerned with all popular manifestations of the art of music as an earnest attempt by the people to express themselves.

### Eminent musicians

Alan Bush, the Association's President, and Michael Tippett were among the founders, and the late John Ireland and Rutland Boughton were closely associated with its work. To-day, the Association is honoured to have among its British Vice-Presidents Benjamin Britten, Edric Connor, A. L. Lloyd, Humphrey Lyttleton, Elizabeth Maconchy, Ewan McColl, Peter Pears, Anna Polak, Alan Rawsthorne and Bernard Stevens. The foreign Vice-Presidents include such eminent musicians as Dmitri Kabalevsky, Paul Robeson, Earl Robinson, Franz Szabo and Dr. Ernst Hermann Meyer.

### An inspired organiser

Another founder member of the Association was one JOHN HORROCKS, who

perhaps did more than any of the more famous personalities to bring the W.M.A. into existence, remaining on the Executive Committee as one of its most active members until his untimely death in June last year. A brilliant organiser, composer and performer of topical and satirical songs, typographer and publicity expert, John Horrocks devoted himself untiringly to the task of developing an appreciation of the vital and inspiring role music can play in the working class and progressive movements. For the last five years of his life, he and his wife (who now carries on this work) took over the organisation of the W.M.A. Annual Summer School of Music, extending the range of classes to include every branch of the art (harmony, composition, brass band, folk music, voice production and choral singing, conducting, orchestral and chamber music, and jazz), and greatly increasing the number of students. So successfully was the School publicised among the broadest sections of the Labour Movement that to-day, more than one-third of the 130 students come on scholarships granted by their Trade Union, Co-operative Society, Social Welfare Organisation or Works Council.

### A lasting Memorial

As a lasting and fitting memorial to his inspiring leadership and dedicated work, the Workers Music Association has decided to institute a JOHN HORROCKS MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP. The money with which to finance this award, which will be made every year, is being raised from within the Labour movement, and from past and present Summer School students.

This year's School, the 20th, is being held at Wortley Hall, in Yorkshire, from August 13 to 20.

Enquiries to Hon. Organiser, W.M.A. School, 71, Greenfield Gardens, London N.W.2.

# Albanian leader speaks in China

## EXCERPTS

PEKING, MAY NINTH (HSINHUA) — "CHINA IS TODAY THE POWERFUL BASTION AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND IN SUPPORT OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY AND LIBERATION MOVEMENTS," SAID HYSNI KAPO, MEMBER OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU OF THE C.C. OF THE ALBANIAN PARTY OF LABOUR, SPEAKING AT THE HIGHER PARTY SCHOOL OF THE C.C. OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY.

"THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY," HE SAID, "LED BY COMRADE MAO TSE-TUNG, IS HOLDING HIGH THE EVER-VICTORIOUS AND PURE BANNER OF MARXISM-LENINISM. IT IS CARRYING THE CAUSE OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM FORWARD UNWAVERINGLY, AND IS ENGAGED IN A PERSISTENT AND UNCOMPROMISING STRUGGLE TO SAFEGUARD REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM-LENINISM AGAINST THE REVISIONISTS' ACTIVITIES OF BETRAYAL. PEOPLE'S CHINA IS TODAY AN INSURMOUNTABLE OBSTACLE TO THE PLOT FOR WORLD DOMINATION OF THE U.S. IMPERIALISTS AND THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS," SAID COMRADE KAPO.

### HOLY ALLIANCE

"The aggressive activities and intrigues of U.S. imperialism, which enjoy all-out support from the modern revisionists, have as their main target the great people's republic of China." "There has come into existence a 'holy alliance' of imperialism and revisionism against people's China and its Communist party."

"In the interests of this 'holy alliance,' Johnson, Brezhnev, Kosygin and their like are frantically arming the Indian reactionaries and instigating them to carry out aggressive provocations against China. They are pulling the Japanese militarists into the anti-China activities, fanning anti-China hysteria in Indonesia, and are signing open and secret Soviet-U.S. agreements aimed against people's China. But, in the final analysis, the imperialists, revisionists and their followers have gained nothing from these anti-China machinations."

"It is today the lofty internationalist obligation of every true revolutionary and every true Marxist-Leninist," he said, "to unite with people's China and to safeguard it against any plot of aggression by U.S. imperialism."

Kapo pointed out that the U.S. imperialists' barbarous aggression against Vietnam "is not simply to stifle the liberation movement of the heroic South Vietnamese people and to perpetuate U.S. rule over there, but, in so doing, it also attempts to show its strength to the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America who have risen in struggle against imperialism, and to intimidate them and force them to give up. This aggression is also a means to intimidate the socialist countries, to test their strength and force them to give up their support for the revolutionary liberation struggle of the people of the enslaved countries. Finally, this aggression is a component part and a link of the whole project of U.S. imperialism against the people's republic of China."

He said: "It is in Vietnam that the weakness of imperialism and the invincible power of the peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence are being demonstrated most clearly."

"The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people is not only a sacred struggle to defeat foreign aggressors for national liberation, but also a great internationalist struggle in support of the world liberation movement against imperialism and in defence of the interests of socialism throughout the world."

Kapo pointed out that, on the whole, the current international situation is favourable for the people of all countries, for the forces of progress, and for opposing imperialism, colonialism, the forces of reaction and the modern revisionists.

He said: "Neither imperialist aggression nor the temporary ascendancy of revisionism in the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries can turn back the wheel of history." It was the forces of socialism, he said, which determined the course of contemporary history. The powerful waves of the national liberation struggles of the enslaved peoples had swept Asia, Africa and Latin America, thus wrecking the rear of imperialism and dealing it most powerful and direct blows. Contradictions within the imperialist camp itself were becoming increasingly acute.

### ARCH ENEMY

Describing U.S. imperialism as the arch enemy of the people of the whole

world, Kapo said that it was making use of the modern revisionists' activities of betrayal, and, particularly in recent times, had greatly intensified its aggressive activities against the socialist countries and was attempting to strangle the liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"As the imperialists draw nearer to their doomsday," he said, "their counter-attack against the people everywhere is becoming more vicious. To maintain their own existence and to regain lost ground, they will not hesitate to use the most barbarous means and commit the most heinous crimes. As comrade Mao Tse-tung says: 'make trouble, fail, make trouble again, fail again . . . till their doom; that is the logic of the imperialists and all reactionaries the world over in dealing with the people's cause, and they will never go against this logic. This is a Marxist law.' This thesis is entirely correct, very important and of practical significance."

He stressed that in order to achieve the defeat of imperialism and its agent, modern revisionism, in order to achieve the liberation of the oppressed colonial people and countries, the final world-wide victory of the revolution, and the establishment of a new world without oppression and exploitation of man by man, "continuous revolutionary struggle must be waged, particularly armed struggle that will lead to the victory of the revolution."

### OUR JUST CAUSE

Kapo pointed out: "A fundamental characteristic that distinguishes a thorough-going revolutionary from an opportunist and traitor to revolution is the stubborn struggle to carry the revolution on and on in the teeth of difficulties and obstacles, unwavering confidence in the victory of our just cause, despising the enemy no matter how strong and fearful he may appear and an ability to counter enemy attacks resolutely, expertly and with a vengeance."

"The present course of the international situation has provided new, concrete evidence that the policy advocated and pursued by the modern revisionists for what they called peace and peaceful co-existence, the policy of capitulation because of faint-heartedness before imperialist threats and resolute refusal to oppose imperialism is a very dangerous policy of betrayal. This policy is not in the least helpful to the cause of peace. On the contrary, it does great harm to the cause, and encourages and prompts imperialism to aggression and bellicose action."

"Experience has shown that the only correct attitude is to maintain high revolutionary vigilance and to be alert at all times, so as to smash any imperialist venture in aggression, wage firm and unrelenting struggle against it, support the liberation struggle of the people of all countries against imperialism by all means without reservation, make use of contradictions within the imperialist camp to deepen its split, isolate U.S. imperialism — the main enemy — and unite all genuine anti-imperialist forces in the world into a broad front against this main enemy. This is also the only correct and effective way to defend peace. The Albanian Party of Labour, like the Chinese Communist Party, has always persisted unwaveringly in this Marxist-Leninist revolutionary stand."

He stressed that the struggle to smash modern revisionism must be carried through to the end. "The struggle

against imperialism is inseparable from the struggle against revisionism. It is impossible to wage resolute struggle against imperialism without waging resolute struggle against revisionism at the same time, and vice versa. Today, U.S. imperialism and Khrushchov revisionism constitute the two greatest common enemies of socialism and the people of the world," he said.

"The Chinese Communist Party," he said, "has all along held high the banner of Marxism-Leninism, and has continually raised it to still greater heights. It is safeguarding and developing the revolutionary qualities and traditions of the international communist movement. The Chinese Communist Party has to its credit the major historic merits of not only defending our invincible theory against the attacks of the Khrushchov revisionists, but of further developing it in the new circumstances of the present times. Today the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese people's republic have become the invulnerable bastion of socialism and the powerful base of world revolution."

"The present generation of communists highly appreciates the immense role and contribution of the Chinese Communist Party and comrade Mao Tse-tung. So will the future generations. Comrade Mao Tse-tung is the loyal successor to the great cause of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin who fought for the revolution of the international proletariat and the people all over the world. The C.P.C. has become a great and brilliant example which inspires all communists and revolutionaries, and it enjoys the profound respect and love of the people all over the world, because of its highly principled stand, its consistent revolutionary spirit, its boundless faith in revolution and the socialist cause, its courage and staunchness and its heroic struggle in defending Marxism-Leninism."

### SOVIET REVISIONISTS

Kapo said that modern revisionism, headed by the Khrushchov revisionists, had emerged on the stage of history as an offshoot of the imperialist policy of blackmail and subversion. Both during the period of Khrushchov and after his removal from office, the principal objective set by the Soviet Revisionists for their foreign policy had been Soviet-U.S. co-operation whatever the conditions or cost. They were creating every opportunity for U.S. imperialism to implement its policies of enslavement, reaction and aggression against the socialist countries and the peoples who had risen to struggle for liberation.

He condemned the Soviet leadership for working hard to make a new deal on the so-called "non-proliferation of nuclear weapons," with the aim of preserving the nuclear monopoly of the two big powers in order to oppose China. The revisionist leaders of the Soviet Union, he said, had once again put forward Khrushchov's proposal to build a "U.N. Standing Army," a kind of international gendarmerie for imperialism and revisionism to suppress the world revolutionary movement and the liberation movement. He said that the revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union was bending every effort to help the U.S. imperialists extricate themselves from their impasse in Vietnam, by hook and by crook, to bring about so-called "peace talks" on Vietnam.

"Where U.S. imperialism runs into snags, there the Khrushchov revisionists and their followers come to its aid."

"The historical mission of revisionism

is to preserve the system of capitalism indefinitely where it is still in power, and to restore capitalism where it has been overthrown."

Kapo denounced the Khrushchov revisionists for hurling the dirtiest slanders at the socialist system, the Communist Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat, declaring Marxism-Leninism "outmoded" and abandoning class struggle socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, substituting class-reconciliation, social reform and bourgeois democracy.

He said that following in the footsteps of the older revisionists and the modern social democratic parties the revisionists, headed by the Soviet leadership, had in fact erased all lines of demarcation between friend and foe. They collaborated with imperialism in opposing socialism, with the United States in opposing the peoples, with all the reactionaries in opposing revolutionaries, and with the Tito clique and all kinds of renegades from the working class in opposing Marxism-Leninism and those parties faithful to Marxism-Leninism.

### "UNMASK THEM"

Faced with this situation, the Communist Party of China, the Albanian Party of Labour and all genuine Marxist-Leninists must undertake this great historic task: resolutely to safeguard Marxism-Leninism and to conduct a tit-for-tat struggle against the modern revisionists, turn-coats of Marxism-Leninism, to conduct the struggle to the end so as to unmask completely and defeat the Khrushchov gang and their followers.

"Like all other Leninist parties and forces, the Albanian Party of Labour, in the struggle against revisionism, persists in the revolutionary line set by the Moscow declaration and the Moscow statement, and opposes the treacherous line of the 20th and 22nd Congresses of the Khrushchov revisionists; it defends the line of uniting the people throughout the world against U.S. imperialism and its lackeys, and opposes the revisionist line of uniting with U.S. imperialism and its stooges; it defends the line of carrying out the revolution against imperialism and capitalism, and opposes the revisionist line of safeguarding imperialism and capitalism; it defends the line of advancing the revolutionary cause of the people of the countries which have taken to the socialist road, and opposes the revisionist line of restoring capitalism; it defends the line of uniting the socialist camp and the world Communist Movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and opposes the line of splittism and big-nation chauvinism of the Khrushchov revisionists."

### SPEARHEAD

"The Albanian Party of Labour realises that these are the only lines which comply with the interests of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations and peoples. These lines unite all the revolutionary courses and movements of the present period and direct the spearhead against the U.S. imperialist counter-revolutionary global strategy. These lines are pushing the world revolution forward."

The Albanian Party of Labour would completely unite as one with the glorious C.P.C. and all other Marxist-Leninist parties and Marxist-Leninist forces in the world, join hands with them and resolutely carry through to the end the struggle against modern revisionism, the main enemy of the ranks of the present international Communist movement and thoroughly smash imperialism.

## Liberation At Any Cost—ZANU

DAR ES SALAAM — The four million African people in Zimbabwe know that "their salvation lies in their own hands" and the British Government's intrigues on Southern Rhodesia will never deter the Zimbabwe people from liberating their country, stated the Zimbabwe African National Union on May 13.

By entering into talks with the Smith colonial regime, Prime Minister Wilson "is playing colonial politics of kith and kin," and "has already given Smith

de facto recognition."

H. W. Chitepo, National Chairman of the Zimbabwe African National Union, pointed out that the only purpose of the talks in London between the British Government and the Smith regime is to reach a compromise through which the interests of the four million Zimbabwe Africans would be sold out.

"The Zimbabwe people would take serious steps at any cost to remove the illegal Smith regime by themselves."

# ALBANIAN YOUTH UNION SAYS "NO" TO SOVIET INVITATION

**TIRANA, May 11** — The C.C. of the Albanian Union of Working Youth has justly refused an invitation from the Soviet Y.C.L. (Komsomol) to attend its 15th Congress. This was announced by the paper, "Zeri i rinise" (Voice of the Youth), here in an article by its editorial department.

The article was printed under the title, "demagogy cannot save the revisionist leadership of the Komsomol of the Soviet Union from being exposed."

"On May 17, the revisionists of the Komsomol of the Soviet Union will hold their 15th Congress in Moscow," the article says. "They invited, among others, the Albanian Union of Working Youth to send a delegation to the Congress. This is a tricky move on the part of the revisionist leaders of the Komsomol of the Soviet Union and is part of the underhand tactics and the unceasing renegade activities of the Khrushchovite revisionists to oppose our party, our people and our youth. The invitation overflows with hypocrisy and demagogy and is unacceptable to us. Furthermore, it seriously impairs the honour of the Soviet Youth in whose name it pretends to speak.

"To express the revolutionary thoughts and sentiments of our youth, the C.C. of the Albanian Union of working youth has returned the invitation and refused it with contempt.

"Growing today under the mother-like care of our Marxist-Leninist party, the Albanian youth will at no time forget their genuine friendship with the Soviet youth. They will not fail to make a distinction between Lenin's countrymen and the Komsomol on the one hand and the Khrushchov revisionist leadership of the Soviet Union on the other which has betrayed the theories of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian international-

ism, has gone counter to the ideals of the Soviet people, the youth included, and is serving U.S. imperialism.

"We scornfully refuse the invitation of the Khrushchov revisionist chiefs of the Komsomol because the Soviet revisionists are leaders of a crusade against the international communist and workers' movement. They have basely slandered our fatherland, our party, our people and our youth. They have tried, by blackmail, intimidation and threats, to force us to our knees. Seeing that all this failed to achieve any results, they finally broke off diplomatic relations with our country.

"The revisionist leaders of the Komsomol support these moves against our people, against our youth, against Albania and against Marxism. They turned their 14th Congress into a forum for slander and attack against the party of labour of Albania and the union of working youth of Albania. Having made their absurd charges and committed a series of acts of betrayal and hostility against our people and our youth, they now invite us to send a delegation to the 15th Komsomol Congress. This is really grotesque.

"We reject with contempt the demagogic invitation of the 'junior' Khrushchovites because they are concocting plans against the revolutionary struggle of the youth, they are sabotaging the struggle of heroic Vietnam, they strenuously attack the national liberation movement, they spread panic and demoralisation in the ranks of the world youth.

"If we were to accept such an invitation which departs from the revolutionary line, it would mean for us to collaborate with renegades from Marxism-Leninism. The revisionist leadership of Komsomol knows very well that this can never happen.

# CANADIAN MINERALS ARE RAW MATERIALS TO U.S. WAR MACHINE

(From 'Left Leaf' Toronto, Canada)

THE U.S.A. has led the world in the exploitation and development of mineral resources in almost every part of the globe. U.S. Imperialism, due to its own monopoly-capital logic of "maximum profits" and "expand or die" consumes 18% of the world's output of metals and controls a vast percentage moreover. In 1964 U.S. industry imported ALL of its TIN and CHROMITE, 99% of its NICKEL, 70% of its IRON-ORE, 77% of its ALUMINUM, 69% of its COPPER, 54% of its TUNGSTEN, 48% of its ZINC, 32% of its SILVER, 29% of its MERCURY, 25% of its LEAD, and who knows how much of its GOLD. Large percentages of the rare earth minerals — URANIUM, VANADIUM, BERYLLIUM, etc. — all have to be imported.

Not only do the imperialists exploit and bleed their own territorial resources but also those of every land to which they can extend their investment. Most of these metals and minerals, vital to the U.S. economy, are now being threatened with takeover by the peoples of the oppressed and exploited countries. It can be readily seen what would happen to the imperialist system if the super-profits obtained from minerals and mining were cut off.

When the Cuban workers and peasants denied the U.S. Imperialists cheap labour and their countries natural wealth — for example the Mao Bay nickel-cobalt deposits, the imperialists were ready for a war of retribution. They also killed Congolese leader Patrice Lumumba in

an attempt to insure that the Republic of the Congo would continue supplying them with 47% of their cobalt.

Since the U.S. imports ALL of its CHROMITE it is readily seen why the U.S. Imperialists support South Africa's "Apartheid System." South Africa supplies 45% of the chromite used in U.S. industry.

In southeast Asia the U.S. war of aggression is "necessary" (among other things) in order to protect TIN interests. So-called Malaysia supplies 59% of U.S. tin and Indonesia 17%.

A number of countries supply the U.S. military-industrial complex with one or two minerals but no country's mineral output is as vital to U.S. imperialism as that of Canada. Canada supplies the war-machine economy of the U.S. with 39% of its iron ore imports, 20% of its copper imports, 36% of its silver imports, 20% of its lead imports, 37% of its zinc imports, 67% of its aluminum imports and 91% of its nickel imports. Even though Canada supplies the U.S. with 57% of its gold the Canadian dollar is now worth only approximately .925 U.S. dollars. Canada also exports to the U.S. large quantities of oil and gas, asbestos and other minerals.

The U.S. considers Canada part of "Fortress North America." To think that U.S. Imperialism will peacefully allow the loss of super profits obtained by exploitation of Canadian minerals is naive indeed. To preach peaceful transition to socialism through parliament as the right-wing Social Democrats and Revisionists do is a crime.

## POLEMICS

# Seaman's Strike

By J. TYRRELL

IT has always been one of the main tenets of Marxist-Leninist theory that the Communist Party aspires to become and eventually does become the one working class organisation which is capable of unifying all forms of working class activity and struggle.

With the gradual degeneration of the revisionist-led Communist Parties, however, this tenet has been thrown to the wind and now, the spontaneous working class resistance to the attacks of the class enemy is allowed to take its course. What does this mean in practice?

In industry, on Shop Stewards' Committees and in the Trade Unions, there has always been a militant wing ready to defend the interests of the working class with greater vigour than the right wing T.U. leaders in control, T.U. knights such as Sir William Carron and others. As we know, there are prominent C.P. members such as Jack Dash of the dockers who also adopt such a position. In effect, there is not one whit of difference between these people and other militants except that the former are members of the Communist Party of Great Britain and call themselves "Communists," while the other militants do not. There is, in fact, no qualitative difference whatsoever between these self-styled Communists and other militants — not one of them has ever risen above the level of "economist" forms of struggle and as things are going, it doesn't look as if any of them are ever likely to.

Of course, the burden of blame for this situation cannot be placed upon the shoulders of Jack Dash & Co. It is the CPGB itself which is to blame, because of its treacherous abandonment of its principled role as a revolutionary party and its opportunist descent into revisionism.

"No army at war can dispense with an experienced General Staff, if it does not want to be doomed to certain defeat. Is it not clear that the proletariat can still less dispense with such a General Staff if it does not want to give itself up to be devoured by its mortal enemies? But where is this General Staff? Only the revolutionary party of the proletariat can serve as this General Staff. The working class without a revolutionary party is an army without a General Staff. The Party is the General Staff of the proletariat."

Stalin: Foundations of Leninism  
So it means that without a genuine Communist Party, it is enormously difficult for the level of struggle to rise

qualitatively and even if it does, without a General Staff, it has not the remotest possibility of achieving success.

For the genuine Communist, the most important thing is the political education of the working class through their own experiences and struggle. Different forms of struggle will be tried out and tested, official strikes, "unofficial" strikes, solidarity actions, even general strikes and each one, in its turn, will teach the working class, first its vanguard, then the masses, the limited nature of all these "economist" forms of struggle.

But the CPGB is not in the least concerned about the elevation of the struggle from the economic to the political plane. And some of its representatives on the job and in the Trade Unions are only concerned about getting a reputation as a militant and "left" opposition to the right wing T.U. leaders.

Others do not even do this, and this especially applies to full-time officials who are determined to hang on to their jobs at all costs. In fact, we find no greater "defenders of the rule book" than people of this ilk, who dutifully act as office boys and run all the errands for the right wing T.U. leaders.

But let us return to the others, the "militants" of the National Union of Seamen. They are really cock-a-hoop about the official strike. The full extent of their ambition, other than that of gaining actual control of the union machinery, has been achieved. If they attain something like a victory, they will be cock-a-hoop, although from the point of view of the long-term interests of the working class and the seamen, nothing of substance will have been achieved and nothing will have been learnt. Because as we know under capitalism, what is given with one hand is taken back with the other.

It will be the task of the genuine Communists in the future to look at every industrial and T.U. struggle from the principled point of view of the long-term interests of the working class. The struggle must be taken through to its furthest point so as to educate the militant workers on the nature of the bourgeois state, on the perfidy of certain T.U. leaders whether of the right wing, "left" wing or revisionist varieties, on the limited effectiveness of 'purely economist' forms of united action and on the necessity for newer and higher forms of struggle.

J.T., Surrey

## LITERATURE

FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM  
(J. V. STALIN)

"LEFT-WING COMMUNISM"  
(V. I. LENIN)

STATE AND REVOLUTION  
(V. I. LENIN)

THE RENEGADE KAUTSKY  
(V. I. LENIN)

"TWO TACTICS" — (V. I. LENIN)

OPIUM-WAR TO LIBERATION  
(I EPSTEIN)

LETTERS FROM CHINA  
(A. LOUISE STRONG)

LENIN ON REVISIONISM AND  
OPPORTUNISM

COMMUNIST MANIFESTO  
(MARX & ENGLES)

WAGE LABOUR AND PROFIT  
(K. MARX)

20 YEARS OF SOCIALIST ALBANIA  
VIETNAM TODAY (SELECTION)

EYE-WITNESS IN VIETNAM  
(R. HOLLIS)

ARE BUT A FEW FROM OUR STOCKS.  
Send s.a.e. for Catalogue to: "VANGUARD" BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS,  
c/o 18 Lincoln Road, London, E.13.

# Scotland Today—But What Of Tomorrow?

by TOM MURRAY

WHAT IS Scotland though? Is it the remarkable scenic beauty of its highlands and lowlands, its beautiful and its ugly towns and villages, its great shipyards, collieries and steelworks, its commercial businesses, its transport system and its handsome or ugly houses and academic and cultural buildings? No, not at all.

Scotland is 5,204,000 people, mostly born here, but including welcome immigrants, vigorous men, energetic women, lively boys and girls, the elderly and the babes in arms. This is Scotland, a Nation? No, two nations.

The vast majority are the under-privileged wage and salary earners — the working-class — the "have-nots." By contrast, the highly privileged minority — the "haves," whose God is profit, enjoy such wealth as gives them security from all fear of want, unemployment, bad housing, or the necessity of leaving Scotland in the hope of steady and lucrative employment.

The workers of Scotland are talented, their productive capacity is enormous and the actual and potential wealth of our country is quite adequate to provide security and a rising standard of living for everyone. Why then the annual emigration from Scotland of between forty and fifty thousands of our young people, and, despite much trumpeting about new industries for Scotland the actual number of new jobs gets less? A gloomy picture, but true.

## DEMOCRACY

Much is said about "Democracy," "The Will of the People," and the workers are the vast majority. Yet, in fact, they do not rule themselves. Scottish self-government, dominated by the majority, the working-class, is essential. Any notion that the United Kingdom Parliament can solve their problems is obsolete, it never was true. London-based financial control of Scotland's economy, coupled with a growing financial and military invasion by the imperialist U.S.A. must be rejected outright. There can be no free Scottish self-government whilst United Kingdom, American and West German military units occupy and use Scottish territory.

The Marxist scientific view of the CLASS structure of society, and the nature of THE STATE, and taking special account of the teaching of such great Marxists as John Maclean, Lenin and Mao Tse Tung, applies to Scotland, as to every other country, with the same force today as ever and in the context of a rapidly changing world.

Regardless of the activities of the few Scottish members of the U.K. Parliament it is an absolute right of the workers of Scotland to secure such changes in the class relationships, the structure and the methods of THE STATE, as THEY deem necessary and by whatever means THEY may choose. THIS IS VITAL AND MUST BE THE CENTRAL GUIDING PRINCIPLE OF ACTION. No pre-conceived forms must be allowed to mar the freedom of choice of the basis and structure of self-government, and in no circumstances must there be any interference with the absolute right of the workers to give or to withdraw their labour when THEY find this to be necessary for any purpose.

## FREE TO CONTROL

The Scottish people must be completely free to control and negotiate its own foreign relations, to ally itself with the workers of England, Wales and Ireland and with all other countries and to play the part of a sovereign state in all international organisations.

Not one of the established political parties in Scotland today supports these basic requirements: The Tories—organ of the landlords, the capitalists and the ultra-monarchists; The Liberals — a degree more flexible than the Tories; The Labour and Co-operative Parties — social democrats who long ago deserted socialism; The Communist Party of Great Britain, with its Scottish "District" — deserted Marxism to embrace "Brittania," and the Scottish National Party — an expression of a healthy and rapidly growing dissatisfaction with the present situation, but accepting without question, The U.K. Parliament, The NATO and the Monarchy, with all that these imply in continued capitalist domination and frustration of the great longing of our people in common with the masses of mankind, for lasting peace and economic security.

In Scotland a new Marxist Party is urgently called for. A Party which will serve to express the aspirations of the

majority in Scotland, which will provide realistic leadership, which WILL HAVE ITS ROOTS DEEP IN THE RANKS OF THE INDUSTRIAL WORKERS. It must also be a Party which will attract those sincere and courageous people, who may regard themselves as middle-class and outside the ranks of the working-class, but who are deeply concerned to gain security for themselves and their families and to uphold the creative aspects of Scottish traditions, culture and intellectual self-expression. Such a Party must, of course base its programme on public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange of commodities.

Whilst recognising that freedom of thought and religious belief are the private rights of all individuals, a Marxist party condemns outright those wealthy Scottish Catholic and Protestant capitalists, who, whilst jointly pocketing the profits the workers produce, nudge each other and snigger with pleasure at the ludicrous but tragic sight of workers fighting each other "Billy" and "Dan," instead of linking arms to unite in opposition to their common enemy. An enemy whose common God, profit, controls their practical activities whilst they amicably agree to differ on their lesser religions.

## COMMON BASIS

There is A COMMON BASIS FOR THE UNITY OF ALL THE WORKERS OF SCOTLAND in their demand for full, well paid and secure employment, generous provision for the veterans, loving care for every child and a spacious and attractive home for every family. This common basis exists at all times and in all circumstances for the workers, regardless of quite honest differences of view on religious, philosophical, artistic, moral or any other subject.

Ample funds, produced entirely by the workers of Scotland, but over which they have no control whatever, exist to enable all their immediate aspirations to be realised right now. At present these resources are diverted into the pockets of Scottish, English, American and other profiteers. Vast sums of Scottish wealth are spent on the enormous U.K. Arms bill and the maintenance of the great banking, finance corporations, stock exchange and other money-lending institutions, whose functions are neither necessary nor desirable in a Socialist State, and over which again the people have no control whatever. These are powerful organs of capitalism, the present system of the private ownership of the means of life, and are carefully protected by a system of laws, built a structure of "legality," created over a long period by these same private owners, and having no basis in a people's democracy. Not only do they exploit the workers in Scotland but they are used extensively to exploit the natives of many colonial and other subject peoples abroad.

## REVOLUTIONARY POLICY

These capitalists will not surrender willingly or voluntarily. Their displacement and the establishment of Socialism by the workers is a REVOLUTIONARY POLICY. This fact must be faced, OTHERWISE THE TYRRANICAL CLASS RULE OF THE FEW MUST CONTINUE. There is no evidence in the whole of history that the dictatorship of a ruling minority, however camouflaged by "Mother of Parliaments," has been overthrown, except by the united political and physical efforts of the people.

The remarkable extent to which "Social democratic," "British Road," "Chauvanistic Nationalist" and other such-like nostrums influence the workers of this country is the measure of the agitational, organisational tasks which confront a Marxist-Leninist Party today. This must be faced by those who are convinced of their urgency, with all the conviction and power derived from knowledge and understanding based upon dialectical and historical materialism.

All in general agreement with these

## THEN AS A FARCE

by Alf Cross

VIEWING the antics of our "Labour" Government and the revisionist leaders of the British Communist Party, one is hard put to find a correct description. Is it a farcical tragedy or a tragical farce?

The intended legislation against wage-claims and strikers, the State subsidies to industrialists remind one of Mussolini's corporate State measures.

Wilson and Co's plan is clear enough.

It is to tighten the nuts and bolts of the existing monopoly-capitalist State structure, so as to harness even more securely the Trade Unions into it.

Under the slogan of "increased productivity," in order to balance the external trading accounts, he counts on a still greater expropriation of the value of labour power so as to underwrite the mounting difficulties of capitalism.

Correctly assessing that the T.U. rank and file will fight back, his legislation is the "stick" with which to accompany the carrot.

Fascism is the armed terrorist guardian of monopoly-capitalism in a period when the working masses are brushing aside the palliatives of bourgeois "democracy."

Although in England this period is not yet with us, is not the proposed legislation, in essence, a form of coercion of the working masses? Does not this expose the 'social-democrats' as, (not for the first time in history) the heralds and pathfinders of fascism?

It is worthwhile to restudy the role of Karl Kautsky, Bernstein, through to the 'social-democratic' parties of pre-1925 Italy and pre-1936 Germany, onwards to France and England and discover the common features of all these despicable traitors. Was it not Marx who said — "History repeats itself, the first time as a tragedy, then as a farce?" The role of modern revisionism, which is a renegade anti-Leninist, anti-working class, counter-revolutionary and pro-imperialist faction within the world labour movement, should also within this context be restudied. For, taking its cue from the renegade centre in Moscow, revisionism is doing a job of a special kind.

It tries to orientate the working-class and national liberation movements to "peaceful co-existence" with imperialism headed by the U.S., within the framework built and manipulated by the imperialist themselves.

Thus, objectively, opposition to imperialist aggression becomes accommodation to it, so as to serve the vile ends of U.S.-Soviet global domination and 'spheres of influence.'

It tries to "head off" the militancy of the more advanced sections of the proletariat against its exploiters, into channels that are constructed and guarded by the exploiters themselves and because of this characteristic, often serve as ambushes for the workers. Thus, in effect, struggle against capitalism becomes service to capitalism, so as to perpetuate its class rule.

Does not this treachery on the part of so-called "Communist" leaders, morally disarm the working class and make easier coercive legislation against it, including (when the ruling class see fit) open fascist terrorist measures?

Modern revisionism, with Moscow as its core at the present day, catigates as "out-moded" all the fundamental teachings of Marx, Engles and Lenin including Lenin's teachings on the role of the State.

It is a vital task for Marxists-Leninists to raise the ideological and political level of the working people, concretely and in a practical way, applying the great classical truths to their conditions in their respective countries.

views must create, with confidence and energy, the new Marxist organisation and launch an inspiring campaign of the people to save themselves from recurring crises. Our people must establish a sovereign Scotland, placing it firmly in the revolutionary ranks of the peoples of the world whose advance, in this twentieth century, has been unprecedented.

COMMENTS ARE INVITED - Ed.

## VIGILANCE IN AFRICA

CAIRO — The Nationalist Revolutionary forces of Africa must be on the alert against U.S. neo-colonialism, urged "Al Massa" on May 12.

The article drew attention to the recent coup in Ghana as well as the previous coups in Africa. It said, "the nationalist revolutionary forces of Africa must maintain vigilance against the arms of the octopus which are moving simultaneously in Asia, Africa and Latin America in carefully planned operations trying to destroy all that has been achieved at the historic and revolutionary conference of Bandung."

Exposing U.S. infiltration into Africa since the Second World War, the article noted that the United States pretended to be the protector of African Nationalist forces, with the definite intention to strengthen its political and economic position in Africa.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. had been doing its utmost to carry out its plan for plunder. It had not only infiltrated by hiding itself behind other colonial interests, but also worked directly through American monopolies.

The U.S. had stepped up its C.I.A. activities in Africa. So military coups had come in succession upon Africa.

## Colombian Guerrillas In Action

Colombian guerrillas in destroying a Govt. military base in Coyaima City recently, inflicted casualties on Govt. troops according to a report from Bogota.

Govt. troops' crimes against them incited the local people's hatred. In retaliation the guerrillas attacked and set fire to the base.

In last April, the Colombian National Liberation Army launched five attacks in Antioquia Dept.

## Guatemalan Guerrillas In Action

GUATEMALAN guerrillas recently attacked oil trucks of the "ESSO" and "SHELL" oil companies, causing them a loss of 50,000 dollars, according to a Guatemala report.

The guerrillas controlled the highway from Guatemala city to the port of Barrios. They opened fire on the oil trucks with machineguns. Their action closed the highway to transport.

Guerrillas of the same front ambushed 60 government soldiers in Zacapa Province.

# SEAMEN — A JUST STRIKE

At time of writing, Britain's merchant seamen are entering the fourth week of their strike. The demands of the seamen are:

- (a) A 40 hour week at sea, to be worked in five days.
- (b) An increase of 12/6, to bring monthly pay to £60 for Able Seamen.
- (c) Overtime payments for week-end work at sea.

The present situation provides for seamen working a 56 hour, 7 day week.

The ship-owners counter-offer is predictably miserly, strung out over a protracted period and completely unacceptable to the seamen. The seamen's strike is, in form, a purely economic struggle for pay and improved working conditions, which approximate those won by British industrial workers since 1945.

Even in the event of total concession on the part of the employers, the result would be no more than an improvement on the pay and conditions, which rank among the worst of any major maritime country. The seamen's leaders have emphasised that the fight is against the employers and was never envisaged as a fight against the "Labour" Government. None-the-less, the intentions and activities of Wilson and Company are driving home to all with eyes to see, the harsh fact that the "Labour" Gov-

ernment is nothing else but a political agent of the monopoly-capitalist state. This reality, added to the very nature of the strike, in the present situation of Britain, is already assuming a political content and a sharp one at that. True, one may argue that this important development was never the intention of the National Union of Seamen's leaders — or indeed, of the plausible Mr. Wilson. Fair enough. However, Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of the working class, teaches us that the objective essence of a situation is, in the main, determined by the conflict of material factors, each reflecting an antagonistic class interest and this is exactly what is setting the course of the seamen's strike. The desires of this or that leader, in this respect, assume a secondary role. Consider these facts:

feudalists, then in the struggle against Chiang Kai-shek, the rich landlords and the U.S. imperialists, the C.P.C. leaders continually made careful analyses of who constituted the main enemy at the given period and which particular classes could be mobilised to oppose him. Thus, both these historic revolutions were able to develop in essence, uninterruptedly — both the unity and the struggle between the opposites being constantly under close review.

An important common feature of both these revolutions was that at all stages the working class, its most advanced militants, headed by the Communists, always strove for political leadership. It is the attempted burial of this truth that constitutes a foremost crime of the modern revisionist renegades.

Lenin, in "Left-wing Communism — An Infantile Disorder," refers to the party of the proletariat . . . "how is it tested and reinforced? First, by the class-consciousness of the proletarian vanguard and its devotion . . ."

Secondly, by its ability to link itself with, to keep in close touch with and to a certain extent . . . to merge with the broadest masses of the toilers — primarily with the proletariat, but also with the non-proletarian toiling masses.

Thirdly, by the correctness of its political leadership exercised by this vanguard, by its political strategy and tactics, provided that the broadest masses have been convinced by their own experience, that they are correct; and further in criticising the "Socialist-Revolutionary" Party . . . this Party, rejecting Marxism, refused or was unable to understand the need for a strictly objective appraisal of the class forces and their interrelations, before undertaking any political action."

Marxism-Leninism holds that each class proceeds from its own interests and its actions are dictated by those interests. Within English society today, each class but principally the bourgeoisie (or "middle-class" is sub-divided into stratum. Our anti-revisionist ultra-"leftists" attempt to cover up their refusal to analyse the concrete interests of the different classes and stratum in rapidly changing situations in a rapidly changing world, by shrill cries of devotion to the proletariat and that in all and every situation the proletariat needs no allies and every non-proletarian is an enemy. They thunder out the necessity for working-class leadership (correctly), only to drown the fact that the working-class and its vanguard must and the more so in capitalist England, today, advance the slogans and formulate the programme that will reflect, simultaneously with its own independent interests, the interests also of all the people in English society, who are feeling the blows of English monopoly-capitalism and its main prop, U.S. imperialism. They laugh with scorn at the mere suggestion that even English monopoly-capitalism will struggle to break loose from the tightening stranglehold of U.S. imperialism as the "main prop" transforms itself into its opposite . . . a wrecker of the edifice of English finance-capital.

They ignore the example of French monopoly-capitalism and the objective and subjective factors which are com-

1. Within hours of the commencement of the strike, Prime Minister Wilson broadcast to the nation and in characteristic mealy-mouthed fashion, pretended to "sympathise" with the seamen and simultaneously to utter dark threats against them . . . this performance was soon followed by a declaration of a State of Emergency.

2. The Government has made it clear that they would regard capitulation by the ship-owners as a hard blow against its Prices and Incomes Policy — a ruse intended to depress the living standards of the working people in order to underwrite the neo-bankrupt position of British monopoly-capitalism.

3. The U.S. and European bankers are anxiously watching the situation, temporarily holding on to sterling so as not to unduly embarrass our "Labour" Government in its attempts to defeat the strike and press on with the Prices and Incomes Policy.

4. In spite of the setbacks to the unstable British economy, the strike is undoubtedly inflicting, the rich ship-owners, in collusion with the Government, consider it expedient to "hold out" . . . speculating that the long-term advantages of defeating the strike, outweigh the short-term losses that "holding out" implies.

Does not all this abundantly testify that ranged against Britain's seamen, as implacable class enemies, are the ship-owners; international finance — capital; the dominant sector of British capitalism and its hired lackey, the "Labour" Government?

Does not all this call into militant solidarity action the seamen of all coun-

tries; the workers of all countries; (in particular, the port-workers); the national liberation movement, whose common foe has drawn the sword against Britain's seamen and all in Britain who perceive yet another vicious betrayal of the working class by the "Labour" Government? Does not all this emphasise the fact that what began as a just claim for higher wages and better conditions is already assuming a political character?

We are in no position to predict the final outcome of this heroic worker's struggle. Whatever the final outcome, we are certain that the seamen, the British workers and the working people everywhere will learn important lessons on the nature of the exploiting class and its contemptible political vassals, who insolently steal the glorious name of Labour.

Let every worker in all countries raise the banner of unqualified solidarity action with the valiant seamen of Britain, unite with them and defeat our common enemy.

D. V., London.

continued from page 1

machinations of British imperialism today, is no Marxist-Leninist. To ignore this factor would be entirely inexcusable. But must we not recognise that the day when British imperialism could have a decisive, qualitative impact on world affairs has long since sunk into history? That whereas it temporarily is impeding the national liberation, anti-imperialist struggles in its two chief remaining bastions, the Persian Gulf and "Malaysia," its only significance, on a world scale, is dependent on the "prop" of U.S. imperialism? In this context, it is necessary to restate the Marxist-Leninist position on world revolution. The weakest links of the imperialist chain are in its "strategic rear." It is precisely in Asia, Africa and Latin America that the contradictions between imperialism, headed by the U.S. and the exploited peoples have matured into revolutionary situations. These national-democratic revolutions, in our era, can no longer be regarded as separate entities from proletarian revolution in the metropolitan countries. They at once nourish and mature the objective revolutionary situations in the metropolitan heartlands and at the same time, needs transforms themselves into Socialist revolutions under the principle of self-reliance. It would be a "left" — sectarian error to imagine that in the absence of victory over imperialism in the intermediate "villages of the world," a revolutionary situation will arise, say in England and that the English working masses will be won to shatter the capitalist state and establish Socialism.

Can it be said that the victory of the "villages of the world" depends entirely on utterly defeating U.S. imperialism? Yes, it can. It follows that the most urgent task in the present situation, facing the British Marxist-Leninists, is to alert the entire working people, in fact all of the nation who can be united and principally the proletariat to oppose U.S. imperialism, both on a world scale and in Britain itself.

Marxism-Leninism holds and all experience of revolution in history confirms, that a revolutionary situation in any country matures on the basis of various classes being orientated and mobilised against the principal enemy, stage by stage. To identify the principal enemy and analyse precisely which are the antagonistic classes at each particular stage, is a vital measure of correct revolutionary leadership. In 1917, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, having assimilated both the negative and positive lessons of the Paris Commune, gave powerful support to the anti-Tsarist revolution of March, whose chief content was a mass popular movement, involving nearly all the classes in Russian society. Vigorously resisting the false lines of Trotskyists, ultra-"leftists" and right deviationists, the Bolsheviks, correctly analysing the new distinguishing features arising from the defeat of Tsarism, the main one of which was a proletariat-peasantry alliance, under proletariat leadership, rapidly passed on to the Socialist revolution. The history of the Chinese revolution testifies that in the struggle against Japan and compradore-

selling France to break loose from and oppose U.S. imperialism . . . factors from which England enjoys no special immunity. Energetically intent on being "theoretically creative" but lacking the years of practical experience, on which genuine Marxist-Leninist creativeness is founded . . . they go so far as to equate the power of Britain with that of the U.S.A., when debating as to which imperialism is the main enemy of the peoples. In essence, by even attempting to obscure the truth concerning U.S. imperialism's predominant role, they do a service precisely to U.S. imperialism! Thus their central line on this vital issue assumes parallelism with the modern revisionists and both "left" and right opportunism find themselves in one tent. The importance of this debate to all concerned, lies in the question of the correct attitude to the chief world aggressor and exploiter. Whether, if we are to seriously oppose him then how seriously, how vigorously.

Whether we are to give marginal support to the raging national-liberation struggle or all-out support. This is the crux of the matter.

URGENT

Will you help to sell and circulate "VANGUARD"? Will you order extras to introduce to friends? Write us.

"VANGUARD" is also obtainable (single copy or subscription) from —

COLLETS BOOKSHOP,  
64 CHARING CROSS ROAD,  
LONDON, WC1.

and —

MICHAEL KATANKA (BOOKS) LTD.,  
160 EDGWAREBURY LANE,  
EDGWARE, MIDDX.

K. HOULISON,  
21 CASTLE ROAD,  
NEWTON MEARNS,  
GLASGOW, SCOTLAND.

PLEASE NOTE

All correspondence for CDRCU and "VANGUARD" should be mailed to:  
c/o A. G. CROSS,  
18 LINCOLN ROAD,  
LONDON, E13.

"VANGUARD" is a bi-monthly Marxist-Leninist Journal and is published by the Committee for Communist Unity.

All correspondence and subscription enquiries to: "Vanguard", c/o 18 Lincoln Road, London, E.13.

Advertisement Rates on application.

Printed by Goodwin Press Ltd., 135 Font-hill Road, N.4.

## AN APPEAL

We appeal to all who are against imperialism, the source of modern wars.

To all who recognise in U.S. imperialism the No. 1 and most vicious enemy of world peace.

To all who stand for national liberation and independence from neo-colonialism.

To all who recognise in "Social Democracy" and renegade modern revisionism the real splitters and deceivers of the working peoples.

To all who are for right against wrong, for justice and an end to exploitation of man by man.

WE APPEAL FOR DONATIONS to help keep going the struggles, to help the "VANGUARD."

Please send what you can to:—

The Treasurer,  
"Vanguard,"

18 LINCOLN ROAD,  
LONDON, E.13

(Receipt and acknowledgment by return of post.)

THE EDITORS.