

Revolution

NUMBER I JUNE 1976 25p.



CONTENTS

- RESOLUTION OF THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE COMMUNIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN
(MARXIST-LENINIST).....page 1
- BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!.....page 4
- REPLY TO THE RESIGNATION LETTER OF THE COVENTRY GROUP.....page 16
- BOLDLY COMBAT SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN THE STRUGGLE TO OVERTHROW CAPITALISM
.....page 23
- SMASH OPPORTUNISM TO WIN THE PROLETARIAN VANGUARD!.....page 29
- LOWER AND DEEPER INTO THE PROLETARIAT - SELF CRITICISM.....page 35

THEORETICAL JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF

THE COMMUNIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN

(MARXIST-LENINIST)

THE COMMUNIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)

The Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) holds that the central task in Britain today is to build the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, the party of the working class. This revolutionary Communist Party must unite the various struggles of the working class into a struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the monopoly capitalist state to set up a dictatorship of the proletariat and build genuine working class socialism.

The Party must be constructed by ideological, political and organisational struggle. By a bold internal struggle the CFB(M-L) has recently decisively defeated serious opportunist errors. One of these was liberalism, which refuses to stand up boldly for what is in the interests of the working class, but believes in unprincipled peace to keep on good terms with everyone. As a result of the internal struggle the CFB(M-L) has taken important steps away from federalism and towards a united and democratic-centralist Party.

The CFB(M-L) is self-reliant in Party-building but it will not be self-sufficient: where it can learn from other British Marxist-Leninist organisations it will do so. We must break down the small group mentality which exists between Marxist-Leninist organisations in Britain, and struggle for unity on correct principles so as to build the revolutionary Communist Party as fast as possible.

We have to apply the general truths of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete practice of the British revolution. In the contradiction between theory and practice, at present theory is the principal aspect. However practice is an important second. Training and tempering comrades in practical work is essential to build the revolutionary Communist Party.

The most important practical task is to build bases in the industrial working class. This will make sure that the future Marxist-Leninist Party is a firm proletarian party with deep and unshakable roots in the working class.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

For information about the Communist Federation of Britain contact:-

National Secretary

c/o New Era Books
203 Seven Sisters Road
London N4.

For criticisms, correspondence or contributions to 'Revolution' write to:-

The Editor, 'Revolution'

c/o New Era Books
203 Seven Sisters Road
London N4.

INTRODUCING 'REVOLUTION'

Building the revolutionary Communist Party to lead the revolution is the central task for all genuine Marxist-Leninists in Britain today. 'Revolution', the theoretical journal of the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) has been founded to be a sharp weapon in the struggle to build that Party.

"If there is to be a revolution then there must be a revolutionary party. Without a revolutionary party built on the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory and in the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary style, it is impossible to lead the working class and the broad masses of the people in defeating imperialism and its running dogs".
(Quotations from Mao Tse-tung!, p1).

Unless we firmly grasp the profound truth of this thesis and really put party building first then there can be no revolutionary party and therefore no revolution. Not putting party building first is objectively condemning the working class and the people of Britain to continued exploitation, oppression and enslavement by British imperialism.

A Marxist-Leninist theoretical journal that really fights for revolutionary communism has for long been an urgent need in Britain. It has been an urgent need because Marxist-Leninist theory in Britain is weak. Communism in Britain is in what Lenin called "a period of theoretical chaos". At a similar stage of Party building to our own Lenin said:

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation with the narrowest forms of practical activity".
(*'What Is To Be Done'*, Peking edition, p28).

'Revolution' will fight for the ideology and politics of Marxism-Leninism. It will apply Marxist-Leninist theory to the concrete problems of Britain and the world. In the first place it will do this by fighting for the policies of the CFB(M-L) and in the second place it will be an arena for ideological struggle to develop those policies.

The past practice of the CFB(M-L) on publications was dominated by essentially right opportunist errors. It did not grasp the need for a propaganda journal which was directly linked to the main task of party building, which fought for policies, and which gave a clear lead. Marxist-Leninist Quarterly was produced as a "discussion" journal in which polemics were begun in an empiricist way, and then ceased, without conclusions being drawn, and without contradictions being resolved. Articles were written in an intellectualist style. They did not give a bold lead in the struggle to build the party. The errors of intellectualism meant that MLQ took the stand of the intelligentsia, not of the working class. Even the name, "Marxist-Leninist Quarterly", sounds like a review type journal produced for progressive intellectuals. For these reasons a clear break with the past is necessary.

'Revolution', in contrast will be produced solely in order to build the party. The CFB(M-L) will not hide in ivory towers of theory. The future party, and the Marxist-Leninists now, must be tireless fighters for the workers and oppressed nations and peoples of the world. This is why we must grasp the truth of Lenin's thesis that *"the role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory"*. (*'What Is To Be Done?'* Peking edition, p 29).

The name of Communist publications is not of major importance, but should convey its purpose. We have called our theoretical journal 'Revolution' because that is its purpose: to take part in the struggle to build the revolutionary Communist Party which will lead the British working class in revolution, overthrowing and smashing the bourgeois state machine and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Executive Committee of the C.F.B. (M-L)

EDITORIAL

'Build The Revolutionary Communist Party To Lead The Revolution'

The appearance of this new journal, and the publication in it of the line of the Communist Federation on Party building are important steps towards the building of the revolutionary Communist Party of Britain. The adoption of this policy statement is the result of a two line struggle inside the CFB between bourgeois ideas and proletarian ideas. It represents the victory of the line against right opportunist errors which were dominant in our past practice. These errors were liberalism, ultra-democracy, small group mentality, empiricism and intellectualism. It clearly states that the principal task in Britain today is to build the new Marxist-Leninist Communist Party to lead the working class in the struggle to overthrow capitalism. The present stage of the revolution in Britain is to rally the vanguard of the working class, to win them to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

The article which follows the statement, explains the two line struggle which led to the victory of this line, and it struggles to win conviction for the line itself. It argues clearly that the essence of the struggle was to transform the class stand of the Communist Federation.

The present task of the CFB is to implement this line by continuing the struggle against bourgeois ideology within our ranks, by struggling for unity in the Marxist-Leninist movement, and by firmly grasping the task of building bases amongst the working class.

Resignation of the Coventry Group

The article 'Build the Revolutionary Communist Party To Lead The Revolution' explains that in the course of the two line struggle, a few comrades took the incorrect stand of refusing to struggle against right opportunist errors. Their liberalism was particularly demonstrated by their refusal to fight for their line at the conference. The letter to the Coventry group published in this issue explains the real cause of the split, and the errors made by the Coventry group and warns that failure to correct these errors will transform that group into a reactionary force, opposed to the interests of the working class. This letter, with the resignation letter of the Coventry group are published so as to draw firm lines of demarcation to educate the Marxist-Leninist movement in two line struggle - and to prepare the struggle for unity on correct principles.

Boldly Combat Social Democracy in the Struggle to Overthrow Capitalism

Through two line struggle in the Communist Federation, the right opportunist errors which were dominant in our past practice on the question of Social Democracy were identified and overthrown. These errors culminated in the 'Resolution on the General Election of October 1974' (published in MLQ 8/9) which was overturned by the National Committee in March 1976. The statement 'Boldly Combat Social Democracy in the Struggle

to Overthrow Capitalism' is the strategic line to guide the necessary attack on social democratic ideas and policies. The policy statement and following articles identify and criticise past errors on this question. At a time when the TUC leaders have struck a further blow against the working class in the shape of the recent deal with Healey, social democracy stands further exposed as the main enemy within the working class movement, and social democrats as the main lieutenants of capital and the principal social prop of the bourgeoisie. The CFB(M-L) statement boldly and correctly points out that the Labour Party is a bourgeois Party, is the most serious threat to the working class, and that it must be smashed in the course of building the revolutionary Communist Party.

'Lower and Deeper into the Proletariat' - A Self-criticism

In MLQ 11 an article entitled 'Lower and Deeper into the Proletariat' made a bold and generally correct attack on tailism on the question of social democracy. It gave a good lead on the question of which sections of the working class are to be regarded as the vanguard. At the same time serious errors were made in the article. The author has made a self-criticism concerning these errors which is published in this issue of 'Revolution'. The main error is that of liberalism, and JT picks out three main weaknesses which were on page 51 of the original article, the description of the British proletariat as the 'labour aristocracy of the whole world', the statement that the proletariat as a whole was corrupted, and the neglect of the internal contradictions of state monopoly capitalism. The self-criticism draws clearer lines of demarcation on the question of the material basis of social democracy which were confused in the earlier article.

MLQ Self-criticism

In MLQ 11 the article 'Oppose Opportunism and Tailism on the Question of Nationalisation' made a bold criticism of the minority line article 'Nationalisation' (MLQ 11, p41-49). In the course of this however, the article made the opportunist error of accusing the writers of the minority article of calling for an 'intensification of the type of activities that the working class have undertaken since its creation'. The authors of the minority article were in fact using the phrase to describe the policies put forward by the National Committee of the CFB. The error here was lack of conscientiousness in studying the section of the minority article and in checking the reply to this article after it was written.

It is important to point out that the main point of this paragraph which contains the error (MLQ 11, p37) is correct. The writers of the minority article fail to distinguish between the consciously Communist political struggle of the working class, which must be led by a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, and the spontaneous economic struggle which Lenin characterised as 'bourgeois working class politics'. They thus fall into tailism on the question of nationalisation and social democracy.

The Editorial Committee.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION
RESOLUTION OF THE THIRD CONFERENCE OF THE
COMMUNIST FEDERATION OF BRITAIN (MARXIST-LENINIST)

A. United States Imperialism and Soviet Social Imperialism, the main enemies of the peoples and oppressed nations of the world, are in essence 'paper tigers'. The struggles of the world's peoples bring revolution nearer in the heartlands of imperialism where working class militancy is rising.

B. In Britain, the bourgeoisie holds state power but as the crisis of imperialism deepens, the objective contradiction between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat becomes openly antagonistic. We will resolutely apply the general lessons of Marxism-Leninism to the concrete conditions in Britain to fulfill our main task: building the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party which will lead the masses in revolutionary struggle.

REVOLUTION IS THE MAIN TREND IN THE WORLD TODAY!

C. The dominant ideology in Britain is the ideology of the ruling class: the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideology attacks and infects every class and strata and the Marxist-Leninist movement itself. We are therefore carrying through active ideological struggle to defeat bourgeois and petty bourgeois errors which at present are the main obstacles in the fight for a proletarian line.

D. From its foundation the Federation stagnated, and nearly split on a number of occasions. This was because we failed to understand that only active ideological struggle can win principled unity. In the last year active ideological struggle and bold criticism and self-criticism have won substantial conviction that these are the main weapons to destroy bourgeois and petty-bourgeois errors. Some significant victories have been won in the struggle.

E. The principal right opportunist ideological error within the Federation is liberalism. The other errors are the small group mentality, ultra-democracy and lack of leadership, empiricism and intellectualism.

IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE IS THE MAIN WEAPON IN PARTY BUILDING!

F. The error of liberalism. Active ideological struggle is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Federation. Clear lines of demarcation must be drawn in inner-party struggle and erroneous lines must be fiercely combated. In this way we will build a unity that will live and will not perish.

BUILD PRINCIPLED UNITY THROUGH ACTIVE IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE!

G. The error of small-group mentality. The leading bodies and all members of the Federation must boldly struggle against the backward 'mountain stronghold' mentality and narrow local self interest which prevents the clear recognition that national tasks are primary and local tasks secondary. The interests of the Federation as a whole must take precedence over those of the groups, and the interests of the future Marxist-Leninist Party must take precedence over those of the Federation.

BOLDLY COMBAT SMALL GROUP MENTALITY!

H. The error of ultra-democracy and lack of leadership. Leadership is an indispensable factor in party building. At national level the Executive Committee will be built as the leading core of the Federation: the principal weapons are active ideological struggle to win conviction for

the correctness of its line, and bold criticism and self-criticism. The National Committee must be built as the principal arena for two line struggle and to establish its authority for policy making. Group Committees will be built as the leading cores in each group.

FIGHT FOR LEADERSHIP IN THE CFB!

I. The error of empiricism. We must conscientiously and at all times apply Marxism-Leninism to concrete practice. The EC will give a bold lead in establishing a definite plan and direction and to define our priorities.

ESTABLISH A DEFINITE PLAN AND DIRECTION!

J. The error of intellectualism. The characteristic features of intellectualism include trying to solve problems through wide ranging study of many books, setting an impractically large number of tasks without defining which are primary and which are secondary, and arrogantly ignoring the seemingly simple lessons gained by the world Marxist-Leninist movement. We must boldly struggle against intellectualism using the basic Marxist-Leninist texts, with the sole purpose of applying their general lessons to our practice. The most important book for us at our present stage, is the 'Quotations from Mao Tse-tung'. We must militantly take our stand with the working class and not with the intelligentsia and we must be honest and modest in all our work.

TRANSFORM THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE CFB!

K. At the present stage of party building, theory is the principal aspect in the contradiction between theory and practice. Indirect knowledge, the concentrated experience of more than a hundred years of the world Marxist-Leninist movement, is principal, and our own limited direct experience is secondary.

L. Practice will become primary in the course of the struggle to develop and test lines. The prime aim of this practice will be to build Communist bases among the industrial proletariat at the place of work in order to establish and consolidate our roots in the working class. The vanguard of the socialist revolution must be proletarian, not petty bourgeois.

M. Lines so far developed in the Federation have not been generally applied in practice. The main reason for this is not the autonomy of groups but because the authority of the National Committee has not been established through active ideological struggle. We will struggle to establish the authority of the NC as the main arena for two-line struggles and policy making. The power of ideas will be transformed into the power of authority. The two-line struggles must be carried out across group lines and within groups, and in these struggles any local loyalties must be criticised as examples of small group mentality. The ultra-democratic practice of attempting to determine policy by means of General Meetings of the whole membership will cease. At our present stage NC members will continue to be elected from the groups. However they must not be elected as delegates but as leading cadres struggling to build a national leadership in the interests of the working class. The struggle against mandating NC members helps defeat small group mentality. Groups must elect their leading cadres as NC members and each will have a vote.

BUILD THE NC AS THE LEADING BODY OF THE CFB!

N. The EC will be composed of those comrades who are best at boldly applying Marxism-Leninism to concrete practice and who are firmest in their proletarian class stand. Leaders must not be elected or recalled lightly: cadres and their training are a decisive factor once a political line is determined. Their method of election is not of major importance but that laid down by the National Constitution is at present the most appropriate. The principal tasks of leadership are, firstly, working out policies, and secondly, setting tasks and assigning priorities to use cadres well. The EC will do this by boldly winning conviction for its correct policies and proposals, and by urging the lower levels to combat ultra-democratic errors by showing a willingness to understand and implement. The EC will work hard to overcome contradictions between itself and the lower levels by correct leadership, bold criticism and self-criticism.

BUILD THE EC AS THE LEADING CORE OF THE CFB!

O. The Marxist-Leninist principles summarised in this report are applicable to the party building tasks of the whole Marxist-Leninist movement. In our relationships with other Marxist-Leninist organisations we must firmly apply these principles and struggle with these organisations to win conviction on these principles. In this we must be self-reliant and not self-sufficient.

SELF-RELIANCE NOT SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN PARTY-BUILDING!

P. Past errors in the Federation led to pessimism and Menshevism. A bold, firm and principled struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois errors has resulted in a qualitative change in the Federation. The lessons learnt will help carry forward the main revolutionary task of uniting the Marxist-Leninist movement to form a new Marxist-Leninist Communist Party which will lead the working class in revolution to smash the bourgeois state, overthrow the capitalist system and build a new Socialist Britain.

BUILD THE MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

Resolution of the Third Conference
of the CFB(M-L), February 1976.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION

"The attitude of a political party towards its own mistakes is one of the most important and surest ways of judging how earnest the party is and how it in practice fulfils its obligation towards its class and the toiling masses. Frankly admitting a mistake, ascertaining the reason for it, analysing the conditions which led to it - that is the earmark of a serious party; that is the way it should perform its duties; that is the way it should educate and train the class, and then the masses".

(Lenin 'Left-wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder', Peking edition, p50)

The central task in Britain today is to build the Marxist-Leninist Communist Party. The spontaneous struggles of the working class against exploitation and oppression continue non-stop as British imperialism sinks even deeper into decay. This decay is the result of the inherent contradictions of monopoly capitalism, which is intensified by the blows inflicted by anti-imperialist forces of the Third World and the cut-throat competition from other imperialist powers.

But the spontaneous struggles of workers and progressive strata cannot on their own bring about the real answer to imperialist exploitation and oppression in Socialist revolution. The working class must have its own party to lead and unite all these different struggles into a conscious revolutionary movement to seize state power from the bourgeoisie. After the revolution, the class will need the leadership of the Party to build Socialism and forcibly prevent the bourgeoisie from staging a come back.

The genuine party of the working class must be the vanguard of the working class, a disciplined body, capable of leading the struggles of the working people and selflessly serving the masses. It must be the most far-sighted protector of the long term interests of the working class and at the same time must unite with the masses in their immediate struggles. The working class Party must wage an unending battle against all bourgeois ideas which creep into and paralyse the class. It must grasp proletarian ideology and firmly hold to correct communist theoretical principles drawn from the experience of the communist movement, and methods of work, tested over scores of years. These are essential weapons for the working class to overthrow the bourgeoisie. This proletarian ideology, which both sums up the most scientific analysis of the world and which unashamedly serves the working class, is Marxism-Leninism.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung are the great historical leaders of Marxism-Leninism, the champions of the working class in its long struggle with the bourgeoisie. Tremendous victories have been won. In the Russian Revolution of 1917, the working class seized power in the first Socialist state in the world. As a result of the victory of the Revolution in 1949, China, a country with one quarter of the world's peoples, is advancing under the leadership of the great Communist Party of China and its chairman, Mao Tse-tung, in building Socialism.

So powerful is the world wide Communist movement that the imperialists and other bourgeoisie have had to attack it and not just head on, but also by attacking it from within. They have tried to twist Marxism-Leninism and rob the working class of proletarian ideology by 'revising' it, 'modernising' it, making it more 'realistic', in order to disarm the working class.

In this way the Soviet Union, the first Socialist state, which the imperialists could never take by frontal attack has been seized from within by a revisionist clique representing a new bourgeois class. The USSR

is now one of the two superpowers of the world, a social imperialist state, socialist in words and imperialist in deeds, and the most dangerous source of war in the world.

At the same time as the revisionists stole power in the Soviet Union, revisionists grabbed control from genuine proletarian revolutionaries in most of the Communist Parties throughout the world, despite fierce ideological battles. These revisionist 'Communist' parties are now dangerous enemies of the working class, in words talking of Socialism, but in practice everywhere disarming the working class and delivering it up into the hands of the bourgeoisie.

In Britain, as in all other countries of the world, the genuine proletarian revolutionaries, inspired by the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, and the Party of Labour of Albania, have fought against revisionism for the principles of Marxism-Leninism and have struggled to establish once again in each country the genuine revolutionary Communist Party, without which the working class cannot carry out the Socialist revolution.

THE STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN TO BUILD THE MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY.

After many years of revisionism in the Communist Party of Great Britain it is not possible to establish a genuine revolutionary Communist Party overnight. It is not correct just to declare the Party to be in existence and call on the working class to support it. A long process of struggle is necessary to tear up the twisted roots of revisionist lines and methods. A long struggle is necessary to train and temper proletarian fighters in Marxism-Leninism, to attack bourgeois ideology in their ranks wherever it is found, to work in a united, disciplined way practicing democratic centralism, to carry forward the long term interests of the working class and at the same time to lead immediate mass working class struggles - in a word to be a genuine vanguard of the proletariat.

The Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist) was founded in September 1969 to build the revolutionary Communist Party. It consisted of five groups doing local mass work in different cities in Britain. The CFB published a monthly propaganda and agitational paper, 'Struggle', from December 1969. From the spring of 1972 it also published a theoretical journal, 'Marxist-Leninist Quarterly'.

However, for most of its existence the CFB's work was primarily negative. Despite some advances and much dedicated selfless work the CFB stagnated from its beginning. It failed to win ideological unity among its different groups and it failed to build a strong leadership. It seemed it could not advance beyond the federal stage. In July 1974 'Struggle' stopped publication after 56 issues. The external cause of its collapse was a sharp rise in printing costs but the internal cause which was more important, was the inability of the CFB to solve its contradictions and overcome its weaknesses. By the end of 1974 it seemed only a matter of time before the CFB disintegrated.

As the crisis of the CFB deepened the internal contradictions became more acute. A fierce two line struggle on the way forward broke out. This was independent of the will of any individual. One line took a correct working class stand and the other line took a petty bourgeois stand.

The purpose of this article is to explain the great successes of this two line struggle and the importance of the resolution passed at the second

session of the Third Conference of the CFB, held in February 1976. This resolution marked the decisive victory of the struggle within the CFB.

THE TWO LINE STRUGGLE IN THE CFB(M-L)

The first session of the Third Conference met in March 1975 in a state of demoralisation and great theoretical confusion. All the groups presented reports and resolutions to the conference. There were at least four major contradictions.

All comrades agreed that the CFB had to have a more democratic centralist organisation. Some wanted to pass a resolution declaring this to be in existence and to punish those who defied it. This was known as the organisational approach. Others said it was necessary to 'put politics first', and to build organisational unity only on the basis of ideological unity. The situation was so confused that some of these (second) comrades, despite their words, went on to put their main emphasis on organisational changes of the constitution.

Another contradiction was over theory and practice. Most comrades said that what was needed was more practice. "The main weaknesses of Marxist-Leninists at the present time is that we have no real roots in the proletarian struggle", they said. Other such statements were "Collective practice is primary" and "building of bases in the localities must be a priority for the Federation as a whole".

A third contradiction was over whether the groups were primary or the national CFB was primary. Most said the groups were primary. "The best way to build the CFB is to build the constituent groups", they said. They complained about the amount of time national work took up.

A fourth contradiction was about the leading comrades in the CFB. Comrades from some groups made sharp criticisms of them but refused to take national leadership positions themselves.

The first session of the Third Conference was deeply split and unable to solve the contradictions. The only unanimous decision was to meet again at a later date. However, despite these negative features, the meeting was a turning point for the CFB because at it a strong correct Marxist-Leninist line for overcoming the weaknesses of the past was first put forward nationally. Although at first in a small minority within the CFB, in the months after the first session, this line won overwhelming support. It has fundamentally solved the contradictions, has united the organisation in a militant unity and has ensured it will play a progressive part in building the revolutionary Communist Party, the central task in Britain today. The victory of this correct line has been a vivid demonstration of the truth that "the correctness or incorrectness of the ideological and political line decides everything".

The central theme of the correct Marxist-Leninist line is the statement by Mao Tse-tung at the beginning of his article 'Combat Liberalism'. "We stand for active ideological struggle because it is the weapon for ensuring unity within the Party and the revolutionary organisations in the interests of our fight". Active ideological struggle is the weapon for ensuring unity. The reason why the CFB had no unity is because it did not practice active ideological struggle but practiced liberalism. This was the key principle that comrades grasped, first in ones and twos, then in entire groups, then unanimously throughout the whole CFB after a year of struggle.

Active ideological struggle did not just win unity; in Mao Tse-tung's

words, it ensured unity. The only comrades with whom unity was not won were those who refused to struggle, and left instead. The experience of the two line struggle fully proved Mao Tse-tung's words and showed that active ideological struggle is the unbeatable weapon in winning unity in the revolutionary ranks, an essential task of Party building.

The correct Marxist-Leninist line in the internal struggle called on all comrades to grasp the causes for the stagnation of the CFB and to overcome them. One essential method of ideological struggle is the practice of criticism and self-criticism. The correct line called upon every group and every individual to take part in the criticism and self-criticism to understand and overcome the causes of the stagnation.

Comrades identified five major errors that existed throughout the CFB and crippled its work. These errors were hunted down by means of criticism and self-criticism. They are liberalism, small group mentality, ultra democracy, empiricism and intellectualism. These will be explained more fully later. Other errors existed too but the continuing successes resulting from the campaign against these five errors shows that they were correctly identified as the major errors of the CFB at the time, while other errors were secondary.

At first some comrades objected to naming the errors. They called it 'labelling' and said that it was dogmatic. They said that criticism and self-criticism is a fine thing but it should 'be specific' - that it should only deal with the details of the mistake. But this argument of theirs was a way of preventing the organisation from arming itself against these errors. Of course it is necessary to understand how the error manifests itself in each particular case but it is essential for all comrades to be able to identify the general error by name, in order to hunt it down consistently.

Take small group mentality for example. There had been many cases of small group mentality in the history of the CFB and they had been criticized often. But they were criticized only as particular mistakes and not identified as examples of the general error of small group mentality. The failure to identify this error by name severely weakened all previous efforts to overcome the backward aspects of federalism and to strengthen democratic centralism in the CFB.

Through ideological struggle and through correctly relating the general error to particular cases, and the particular cases to the general error, all comrades in time grasped the importance of identifying and naming the five major errors. This was a further important victory for the correct Marxist-Leninist line.

The correct line insisted that it was not enough just to identify and hunt down the five main errors; it was essential to grasp their class character. They are all ideas that cripple the cause of the proletariat and gladden the bourgeoisie whenever the ruling class sees these errors in the ranks of the working class. These errors are un-proletarian ideas and their class character is bourgeois and petty bourgeois.

At first some comrades wanted only to talk of 'mistakes' - accidental slip-ups - and were offended when they were criticised for having committed bourgeois and petty bourgeois errors. But, with struggle, ideological education and bold criticism and self-criticism, they became convinced.

Bourgeois and petty bourgeois ideas continually worm their way into the working class and the ranks of the Communists as long as class society

exists. The five main errors within the CFB are examples of this fact. It is important for comrades early on to be trained and tempered in grasping that this is not just a struggle against mistakes but a class struggle against bourgeois ideology. It is essential to grasp that the vanguard of the working class must be militant, united and armed with proletarian ideology in order to lead the Socialist revolution.

The two line struggle in the CFB was not original. It repeated many previous struggles against bourgeois ideology in the Communist movement. There will be many more. But in order to help comrades who are not themselves in the CFB to grasp more clearly the nature of the ideological struggle, it is right to give examples of the five main errors.

THE FIVE MAIN ERRORS

Liberalism

Liberalism was the most serious error within the CFB because liberalism rejects ideological struggle and stands for unprincipled peace. Without fundamentally defeating liberalism it would have been impossible to defeat any of the other errors. It was because of the deep liberalism of the old CFB that so many errors had flourished unchecked.

One example of liberalism was that many comrades thought unity would be won by 'sharing experiences' and 'collective practice'. This denied the need for ideological struggle to win unity. Another example was that although at times comrades talked about 'ideological struggle', they really meant 'ideological discussion'. They would talk around the subject in order to stay on good terms instead of thrashing matters out for the sake of real unity.

To overcome this liberal error the correct line pointed to Lenin's famous statement: "Before we can unite and in order that we may unite, we must first of all draw firm and definite lines of demarcation" (What is to be Done? Peking edition, p26)

The importance of drawing lines of demarcation became a banner in the struggle with liberalism. As a result of this, CFB statements have become concise, and every word has a definite meaning. The resolution of the second session of the Third Conference was deliberately made concise in order to draw firm and definite lines of demarcation.

Another banner in the struggle against liberalism bore the words 'bold criticism and self-criticism'. Many comrades used to reluctantly admit the need for criticism and self-criticism but would complain about sectarianism if the criticism was bold. This was a form of liberalism. To checkmate it, the correct line made use of the words of the constitution of the Communist Party of China, 'Be bold in making criticism and self-criticism'. (Chapter II Article 3.5). Far from causing sectarianism this quickly united the great majority of comrades in a comradely spirit of unity and determination to get rid of weaknesses whoever had them.

Small Group Mentality

Because the CFB started as a federation of small groups it was one especially dangerous weakness that small group mentality had never been firmly combated by name.

The line of some of the comrades at the first session of the Third Conference, that the best way to build the CFB is to build the constituent

groups', is an example of small group mentality. It meant giving priority to group work instead of national work and resenting having to give up leading comrades to national work.

Against this the correct line firmly argued that the central task in Britain today is to build the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class. Without strong national leadership, local work cannot progress and will not contribute to this overall task. Therefore national work has to come first, although local work is an important second.

Another example of the small group mentality was the argument repeatedly made that we have to 'recognise' the CFB is a federation. Of course it is true that the CFB was a federation. But what did recognise really mean? It meant that we should not combat small group mentality; on the contrary we should give in to it and not struggle to build national unity.

Small group mentality severely crippled the work of the CFB and had led to gross opportunism. At policy making meetings it was usual for the groups to engage in horsetrading until a majority could be put together on a composite resolution. For example at the Second Conference (Special General Meeting) held in February 1974, 3 groups opportunistically combined to ensure that the Soviet Union was not directly described as being Social Imperialist or as having a new bourgeois ruling class. (This can be seen in the statement on the International situation, published in MLQ 7). This opportunist line on Social Imperialism has now been completely overthrown.

Another example of the way small group mentality led to horsetrading and unprincipled compromises is the CFB resolution on voting Labour in the October 1974 General election. This right opportunist resolution was unanimously overthrown by the National Committee in March 1976.

As a result of the fundamentally successful struggle against small group mentality, an important further conclusion was drawn. In paragraph G of the conference resolution, after stating that 'the interests of the Federation as a whole must take precedence over those of the groups', the words were added 'and the interests of the future Marxist-Leninist Party must take precedence over those of the Federation'. The CFB has not conducted a basically successful struggle against small group mentality in order to consolidate itself as a small group opposed to the other British Marxist-Leninist organisations. On the contrary it will firmly combat any tendency towards this.

Ultra-Democracy

Deep errors of ultra-democracy ran through the CFB from the beginning. Ultrademocracy denies the importance of building leadership for the working class. Leadership was never thought before to be important within the CFB. The resolution of the Third Conference is the first CFB statement to say, that 'leadership is an indispensable factor in Party building'.

Mao Tse-tung describes ultra-democracy as 'letting the lower levels discuss everything first and then letting the higher levels decide'. Until February 1976 the supreme policy making body of the CFB was the 'General Meeting' of all the membership. So the principle was not only to let the lower levels discuss everything first but also that the lower levels themselves should decide! Not one CFB General Meeting ever succeeded in solving a problem in a correct way.

Another example of ultrademocracy, which teamed up here with small group

mentality was that the comrades sent by their groups to the NC were seen as mere 'delegates' of their groups and not as comrades who had to give leadership to the whole Federation in the interests of the working class.

A glaring example of ultra-democracy was that at the first session of the Third Conference, the NC had prevented the EC from presenting a leading report. The result was chaos; every group arrived at the conference with its own report.

One ultra-democratic argument that cropped up in the two line struggle and is common in the Marxist-Leninist movement, says leadership cannot be built until ideological and political unity has been won. It ignores the fact that leading comrades are trained and tempered through the struggle for ideological and political unity, and through criticism and self criticism. It also ignores the fact that ideological and political unity can be won only if comrades combat ultra-democracy and come forward to give leadership on what is the correct line. The argument that leadership cannot be built until ideological and political unity has been won is a way to stop us combating ultra-democracy and building strong proletarian leadership as much as we can.

The resolution of the Third Conference firmly states the importance of building proletarian leadership and sums up the essence of leadership as 'working out ideas and using cadres well'. It states that the Executive Committee will be built as the leading core of the CFB and the National Committee as the leading body. NC members must represent the interests of the working class, and not be delegates of their groups. As a result of the two line struggle great progress has been made in carrying this out and implementing greater democratic centralism on the basis of ideological conviction.

Empiricism

'Empiricism mistakes fragmentary experience for universal truth', Mao Tse-tung says in 'On Coalition Government (Selected Works Vol III p 264). Empiricism denies the leading role of proletarian revolutionary theory and relies only on direct experience, ignoring the vast indirect experience of the International Communist movement, won over decades, often at a very high price. Empiricism exalts direct experience and guarantees that the theoretical ideas of an organisation will be those its members pick up spontaneously in the course of practical political work; these are overwhelmingly the ideas that normally prevail in capitalist society, the ideas of the bourgeoisie. As a result the organisation becomes deeply corrupted by bourgeois reformism, bourgeois trade union politics, social democratic ideology and other forms of bourgeois ideology.

The CFB used to talk about combining theory with practice but in fact it really put practice first and fell into empiricism. This is the real meaning of the statements made at the first session of the Third Conference that 'Collective practice is primary'. This is the meaning of the argument that the most important task at the present time is to build a local base in the working class.

Mao Tse-tung says it is necessary to integrate the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in every country. Instead the CFB used to talk about 'developing theory' - that is to say developing its own theory, separate from the universal truths of Marxism-Leninism and on the basis of its direct experience alone. Theory 'developed' in this way can only be another form of bourgeois ideology dressed up in opportunist clothes.

One variation on the empiricist line of developing 'our own' theory said that Marxist-Leninist theory is very good but it is not relevant to this country. For example they claimed that the 'Quotations of Mao Tse-tung' are very good but are written for Chinese conditions and should not be applied to Britain. It is true that the 'Quotations' were collected with Chinese political conditions in mind but their principal aspect is that they sum up concisely most of Mao Tse-tung's theoretical teachings, based on the history of Marxism-Leninism and the world Communist movement over many decades.

In the contradiction between theory and practice, which is primary? Certainly Marxist-Leninists hold that generally, practice is primary. But in certain conditions the principal and secondary aspects can be reversed. What is the situation in Britain today? Mao Tse-tung provides the answer to this question in 'On contradiction', near the end of section 4. (Selected Readings, p94):-

"The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, 'without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'. When a task, no matter which, has to be performed, but there is as yet no guiding line, method, plan or policy, the principal and decisive thing is to decide on a guiding line, method, plan or policy."

This is the situation in Britain today.

In order to train and temper the future Marxist-Leninist Party it is essential to engage in practice; but to make this the principal task today is to commit unmistakeable errors of empiricism.

As a result of the campaign against empiricism the CFB has already grasped correct lines on Social Democracy, bourgeois nationalisation and building bases within the industrial working class.

Intellectualism

Intellectualism is a widespread collection of ideas typical of the intelligentsia, the stratum in between the working class and bourgeoisie who mainly do mental work. Intellectualism is seen in the divorce between theory and practice, being 'good at words' and bad at practice and writing in a confusing way which is useless as a guide for practical work.

Because the intelligentsia does mental work, intellectualism believes what is real is in the mind alone. "Marxist-Leninist Quarterly" made severe intellectualist errors in being a 'forum' for 'discussion' of 'interesting' political questions instead of a fighting journal arming the proletariat with revolutionary theory to be used in the class struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie. Articles were woolly and confused, there were many footnotes and conclusions were not drawn sharply.

Because the intelligentsia is a stratum caught between the working class and the bourgeoisie, intellectualism prefers to deny the existence of the class struggle and believes that all problems are theoretical or technical ones alone. It denies that in a class society everyone lives as the member of a particular class and every kind of thinking without exception is stamped with the brand of a class.

Intellectualism fails to take a clear proletarian stand. Marxism-Leninism has two features: it openly declares that it is in the service of the proletariat and it also is 'the most complete, progressive, revolutionary and rational system in human history'. Intellectualism relentlessly

attempts to drive a wedge between these two aspects and to treat Marxism-Leninism as a purely scientific question separate from a firm proletarian class stand.

Because the intelligentsia is fairly quick at understanding new ideas it tends to play a relatively large part in the early stages of a revolutionary movement and may bring its errors of intellectualism into the organisation on a large scale. As a result of the two line struggle it became clear that this was a major cause of error in the CFB.

One example of intellectualism is that there is no reference to the working class in the statement on Party building by the Joint Committee of Communists (the organisation from which the CFB was founded). Also 'Origins and Perspectives of the Marxist-Leninist Movement in Britain', previously the main policy statement of the CFB, has an introduction which again does not mention the working class. 'Origins and Perspectives' does not state that the Party that is to be built must be a Party of the working class.

It would be a big mistake to see these omissions as mere accidental oversights: they are sharp examples of the intellectualist error of failing to take a bold and open proletarian stand. One of the tasks of the CFB in the months ahead will be to make a thorough assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of these founding documents.

Another example of intellectualism is that until 1976 the CFB never sang the Internationale, the battle hymn of the working class.

A common example of intellectualism within the CFB was to take on an impracticable number of tasks and be unable to carry them out. There was also a deep intellectualist arrogance about learning and grasping the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. Because the 'Quotations of Mao Tse-tung' are short and quickly read; they were held to be beneath comrades' dignity. It is true they are short and quick to read, but they are difficult to grasp and apply consistently. Applying them must be the main task of the CFB in the field of study.

As a result of the campaign against intellectualism, all comrades, both those from the working class and those from intellectual backgrounds, have united in striving to take an open, conscious proletarian stand, to write and speak simply and clearly, to study in order to apply in practice and to decide on realistic tasks and carry them through to the end. In particular comrades from the intelligentsia must be ready to go through a long period of remoulding and to learn modestly from working class comrades.

In the field of practice, the Conference Resolution states clearly that the first priority is to build Communist bases in the industrial working class in order to establish and consolidate roots in the working class. The Marxist-Leninist Party must be built as the vanguard of the working class. The struggle to do this will be a protracted one but with Marxist-Leninist ideology and methods of work, with ideological struggle and criticism and self-criticism, it can and will be done.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS OF THE TWO LINE STRUGGLE

This has briefly described the five main bourgeois and petty bourgeois errors, liberalism, small group mentality, ultra-democracy, empiricism and intellectualism, and given one or two examples of them. It is not possible to give more here out of the scores of examples. The campaign within the

CFB against these errors won overwhelming support because many examples of them were found and because criticising them by name clearly helped to isolate and defeat weaknesses that had held back the work of the CFB for many years.

As the Resolution points out, they are right opportunist errors. There is a reason for this. The main errors in the British Marxist-Leninist movement in its earlier years were left opportunist. The CFB over-reacted to these and without thinking fell headlong into right opportunism. As Chou En-lai said in the Report to the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of China, 'one tendency covers another'. In criticising the left sectarian style of class struggle and no unity, the CFB fell into liberalism. In criticising the left adventurist error of declaring the Party to be in existence without having built it over a period of time, the CFB tolerated and excused small group mentality. In criticising commandist methods of practising democratic centralism, the CFB fell into ultra-democracy. In over-reacting to left dogmatism and sloganising, the CFB made errors of empiricism and intellectualism. This teaches us yet again that the future Marxist-Leninist Communist Party must be built by means of consistent struggle against both left and right opportunism. While combating one error we must guard against the opposite error coming in by the back door.

Mao Tse-tung does not say Communists must wage active ideological struggle for its own sake or for self-cultivation, but to ensure unity in the interests of our fight. Within a relatively short space of time the ideological struggle in the CFB has brought about a big increase in its fighting ability. The organisation has already overcome certain long standing contradictions such as the question of Social Democracy. Organisationally as a result of winning an understanding of the importance of leadership, advances have been repeatedly made in implementing democratic centralism and overcoming federalism.

The struggle against the five main errors cleared small mountains of rubbish out of the CFB and won overwhelming unity. A minority left who did not desire unity and who did not struggle to win it and overcome the errors of the past. The Glasgow group left early on in the two line struggle shortly after the first session of the Third Conference. They left making the empiricist error of stating that at this stage practice is primary and that "to build a true national Marxist-Leninist movement, the beginnings must arise from group's common practical work". This also makes errors of small group mentality in failing to grasp that building the Party is the central task.

The Coventry group left relatively late in the struggle after failing to correct their liberalism, ultra-democracy and small group mentality. They also tail behind the opportunists in the working class by not combating Social Democracy boldly and by supporting bourgeois nationalisation. These errors are explained in more detail elsewhere.

A few, but only a few, individual members of the CFB also left, when the waves of criticism began to lap around their feet. Instead of struggling to overcome errors and being prepared to make bold self-criticism, they got out.

It is a loss that this minority were not won over to the correct line but it is a loss only from the point of view of numbers. From the point of view of the political strength and unity of the organisation, it is a gain. Since they did not desire unity and did not struggle for unity on a principled basis, it is better that they have left. A clean split is far better than an opportunist unity in building the Party.

The struggle against the five main errors of liberalism, small group mentality, ultra-democracy, empiricism and liberalism, therefore brought large gains all around. The Resolution of the Third Conference of February 1976 marked the decisive defeat of these errors.

That does not mean that they have been wiped out. These errors have their material base in capitalism: they will repeatedly recur. They linger on within the organisation in many hidden ways. Therefore no comrade in the CFB should sit back and relax. On the contrary the key to further progress in building the revolutionary Communist Party is to be wide awake and to CARRY THROUGH THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE FIVE MAIN ERRORS!

This self-criticism has been made not for subjectivist reasons as if the CFB is humbly kneeling in the confessional box, but because the open correction of past errors is essential for training comrades both inside and outside the organisation. Communists become tempered in the struggle to overcome errors. Self-criticism is an unbeatable weapon because it enables us to keep what is right and to get rid of what is wrong. By persisting in this method the ranks of Communists will grow in strength.

The two line struggle within the CFB has underlined two main lessons:

1. Active ideological struggle ensures unity.
2. It is important for Communist to identify bourgeois and petty-bourgeois errors by name and hunt them down, in order to overcome weaknesses holding back their work.

The CFB and the British Marxist-Leninist Movement

The CFB has adopted a policy of self-reliance in Party building. It will use its limited resources in a correct manner to build the Party as quickly and as correctly as possible. At the same time it will not be self-sufficient. It will learn from the positive points of any other British Marxist-Leninist organisation. The struggle to unite the Marxist-Leninist organisations on a correct basis is greatly in the interests of the working class and must be carried out energetically. The CFB has learned the truth that active ideological struggle ensures unity. If we start from the desire for unity and persist in active ideological struggle we can ensure a united Marxist-Leninist Party in Britain. This will take time but there is no doubt it will be achieved once we start on it.

The CFB urges fellow British Marxist-Leninist organisations to learn from its own past negative experience and be on their guard against errors like the five described by the CFB in order to make a better job of the central task of today, building the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class. It urges them to study the CFB statement on relations between Marxist-Leninist organisations in Britain and publicly to declare support for the principles laid down there. Above all it is important to start from the desire for unity and to struggle for the unity behind correct principles using the powerful weapons of active ideological struggle and bold criticism and self criticism.

The CFB pledges itself in accordance with the necessary priorities, seriously and systematically to struggle for unity behind correct principles with all those Marxist-Leninist organisations that genuinely start from the desire for unity.

The CFB urges those individuals who grasp the need for the Marxist-Leninist Party but are not yet in a Marxist-Leninist organisation to support the building of the Party by taking a firm decision to work with a Marxist-Leninist organisation in a systematic and self-disciplined way. It is essential to combat the error of individualism, to take this decision seriously and carry it out.

At present there are a confusing number of different Marxist-Leninist organisations in Britain. This is a temporary phase. Individual comrades must study the party building lines of these organisations and ask to work systematically with the one that is the most correct.

At present British Marxist-Leninist organisations have big weaknesses. This is unavoidable and it will take struggle over a fairly long period of time to get rid of them. It is therefore important that a Marxist-Leninist organisation not only has a good party building line but also has a healthy inner life of active ideological struggle, criticism and self-criticism in order to get rid of weaknesses as soon as possible.

It takes a long time to grasp the principles of Marxism-Leninism and apply them in practice. Individual comrades should combat individualism and learn from the leadership of more tempered Marxist-Leninist organisations. At the same time they will come across errors. They should point these out clearly, not in a carping way or to justify the fact that they are working only as individuals. They should point them out to help the organisation and the Marxist-Leninist movement make a better job of building the revolutionary Communist Party.

The CFB has policies for working with individual non-CFB comrades and gradually raising their level. After due investigation and a period of joint work the CFB will invite to join its ranks those comrades who have a sound grasp of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and who have a firm proletarian class stand.

The CFB calls on all fellow Marxist-Leninist organisations and all comrades to grasp the truth that the central task in Britain today is to build the revolutionary Communist Party of the working class, to take up active ideological struggle to ensure unity in carrying out this task and to practice bold criticism and self-criticism in order to get rid of weaknesses and errors.

BUILD THE MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

REPLY TO THE RESIGNATION LETTER OF THE COVENTRY GROUP OF THE C.F.B. (M-L)

To the Secretary of the Coventry Group.

Dear Comrade,

Thank you for your letter telling us of the resignation of the Coventry Group from the CFBML. We regret the contradictions are as deep as they are and that the desire for unity is not sufficient to overcome them through struggle. However because the Coventry group do not desire to struggle for unity it is a good thing and not a bad thing that the group is leaving the CFB. The executive Committee of the CFB had planned to move the group's expulsion if it did not fulfil the minimum necessary conditions for the struggle for unity to take place. In this the EC has received the unanimous support of the National Committee.

You claim in your letter that the Resolution of the Third Conference shows that "the political line of the CFB has been captured by subjective dogmatism". That is not so. The resolution points out, concisely and clearly the key Marxist-Leninist principles we must apply to the task of building the revolutionary Communist Party, which is the central task in Britain today. These Marxist-Leninist principles sum up lessons won in hard struggle by the proletariat throughout the world over many scores of years. It is not 'dogmatic' to state them clearly and concisely. The resolution is designed to draw clear lines of demarcation and to be a guide to action: it was therefore made concise, without long explanatory argument in the body of the resolution itself.

You claim that a political 'putsch' has taken place in the CFB. That is completely untrue. A long two line ideological struggle has been fought out for over a year. Politics have been put consistently in command. Organisational changes followed the ideological battle and did not precede it. They were carried out by putting the main emphasis on first winning ideological conviction for the principles behind them. Formal changes in the composition of the leading core took place after and not before overwhelming support had been won for the correct line on Party building. There was no putsch. Your talk of a putsch shows your ultra-democratic dislike of building a strong leading core in the CFB through ideological struggle, criticism and self-criticism.

The fact that the chairman and secretary of the Coventry group ultra-democratically failed to attend National Committee meetings explains why the group was taken by surprise by the continual gains in support for the correct line on Party building. Your accusation of a putsch looks like a desperate attempt to disguise the fact that the Coventry group stood for an incorrect line which over time fewer and fewer comrades continued to support.

You claim that it is no longer possible for necessary ideological and political struggle to take place in the CFB. This is the opposite of the truth and again attempts to disguise the fact that the incorrect line of the Coventry group was inevitably losing out in the two-line struggle. The EC repeatedly urged the group to strengthen the composition of its comrades attending the NC. It is Coventry that ultra-democratically failed to do so and failed to carry out necessary ideological and political struggle.

The Coventry group left the Third Conference of the CFBML after only a few hours when its motion to completely reject the Conference resolution was defeated. The comrades from Coventry had not been muzzled in any way.

Their speeches were listened to carefully and answered with well thought-out criticism from all other sections of the CFB. It was they who gave up the struggle. The group should either have continued the struggle or made a bold self-criticism. Instead they left. This was a serious error of liberalism.

The internal practice of the CFB over the last year has proved that even if the correct line is at first in a minority it will in time win overwhelming support. As Mao Tse-tung says, "the correctness or incorrectness of the political line decides everything". If the Coventry group believes its line is correct and in the interests of the working class why does it not dare to fight for it so that the whole CFB takes up the stand? Would that not be a correct way to serve the working class?

You claim that the original policy statement of the CFBML, 'Origins and Perspectives of the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain' and the statement 'On the Question of Party Building' by the Joint Committee of Communists, the forerunner of the CFB, have been completely rejected without open struggle about them. This is not so.

Certainly there is a contradiction between the resolution of the Third Conference and some aspects of 'Origins and Perspectives'. 'Origins and Perspectives' made some important and correct statements, but we now see that it also made some serious errors. In essence the most serious error was its liberal line that the Marxist-Leninist Party will be built by a process of ideological evolution. The CFB now grasps firmly the fact that the revolutionary Communist Party will be built by ideological struggle, not ideological evolution.

Over the next few months the National Committee under the leadership of the EC, will through struggle, make an assessment of the achievements and shortcomings of 'Origins and Perspectives'. Had the Coventry group stayed in the CFB its comrades should have taken part in this struggle and fought for what is in the interests of the working class. At this stage the majority of the comrades on the National Committee in general would have opposed Coventry's line, but even so they might have supported some of the group's views. Whatever the case all comrades would have listened, and if the line was right, the line would have eventually won through.

The fact that the Coventry group's views on 'Origins and Perspectives' will not be heard in the CFB, is not the result of any decision by the CFB but is the result of the group's liberal decision to give up the struggle and leave the organisation.

The real causes of the Split between the CFB and the Coventry Group

In order to draw firm and definite lines of demarcation in the Marxist-Leninist movement in Britain we set out below the real causes of the split between the CFB and the Coventry group.

There has been no 'putsch' in the CFB, the organisation has not been captured by 'subjective dogmatism' and ideological struggle is not suppressed. The causes of the split with Coventry are overwhelmingly the errors of the Coventry group, which it failed to tackle through bold self-criticism. These errors are mainly three: 1. liberalism; 2. an ultra-democratic failure to put party building first; and 3. tailism behind the opportunists in the working class movement.

1. Liberalism

Mao Tse-tung points out, 'liberalism rejects ideological struggle'. In words the Coventry group support the principle of ideological struggle but in practice they reject it. This is clear from the points already made in this letter.

In words the Coventry group said they supported the essence of the correct motion to the first session of the Third Conference, held in March 1975, which declared that active ideological struggle is the weapon for ensuring unity in building the Party. In words the members of the Coventry group on the National Committee supported the important NC resolution 'On Relations Between Marxist-Leninist Organisations in Britain', which points out that active ideological struggle is the key to advance in building the party out of the different Marxist-Leninist organisations at present in existence. But the practice of the group was different and quite liberal.

The Coventry group liberally and ultra-democratically failed to send their leading comrade to National Committee meetings. As a result their members on the NC did not fight strongly in the struggle for a correct line in building the Party of the working class. The group liberally resented the Executive Committee's criticism of their reports and instead of making bold self-criticism or criticism of what they thought were errors in the leadership of the EC, they stopped making the reports and gave up the struggle. They attended only the first few hours of the second session of the Third Conference and walked out. Now they have resigned from the CFB and given up the struggle internally altogether.

The letter of resignation from the Coventry group says, "we are sure that we will continue to struggle with comrades in the CFB". On the contrary on their present liberal conduct we must expect the Coventry group not to struggle. If they intend to struggle, why are they leaving the CFB? If they know they can't struggle any further because their line is wrong then they must not be liberal with themselves and must make a bold self-criticism.

In words the Coventry group cannot reject ideological struggle but in practice they do reject it, and fall headlong into liberalism.

2. Not Putting Party-Building First

The Resolution of the Third Conference, which the Coventry group opposed, firmly stated that the central task in Britain today is to build the Marxist-Leninist Party. Without the leadership of a democratic-centralist revolutionary Communist Party it is impossible for the working class to seize state power and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. To deny this central task is to make a serious error of ultra-democracy - to deny the importance to the working class of revolutionary Communist leadership. In words the Coventry group could not reject this truth, but in deeds it is work in the trade union movement that the group puts first.

The leading comrade in the group could not find the time to be a National Committee member and attend its meetings about every two months, but he does find time to be on the executive committee of a section of a trade union, involving continuous responsibility for trade union tasks. His priorities are clearly wrong. The same goes for all members of the group, who take part energetically in trade union work but who repeatedly failed to carry out national CFB tasks. These are not accidental mistakes but are the result of deep ultra-democratic and economist errors.

Another example of this ultra-democracy is the failure in Coventry ever to set up a group committee despite repeated criticism. This is a further reason why the group was unable to carry out national CFB tasks and carry out only spontaneous political activity.

In putting trade union work before building the Party the Coventry group are making errors of economism and spontaneism as well as the error of ultra-democracy. It is objectively sacrificing the long term strategic interests of the working class for momentary gains.

The Coventry group has fallen into ultrademocracy and failed to grasp the fact that the working class needs scientific proletarian leadership to carry the struggle against the bourgeoisie through to the end.

3. Tailism Behind the Opportunists in the Working Class

The other groups in the CFB all made errors of liberalism and ultrademocracy and failed to put party building first; but after a period of struggle they came round, made bold self-criticisms and threw themselves into fighting for the correct line on party-building.

At first the Coventry group, although liberal and vague, had given generally sympathetic support to the correct line in the internal struggle within the CFB. Then less than a month before the second session of the Third Conference, they announced their decision to move the total rejection of the Conference Resolution, clearly threatening resignation. Why had the two line struggle led to an antagonistic contradiction in the case of Coventry but not in the case of other groups?

Because they had fallen into liberalism, refused to make bold self-criticism and had dug themselves into an opportunist position on voting Labour and on supporting bourgeois nationalisation. As the struggle on these questions developed within the CFB side by side with the closely related principal struggle on Party-building, the Coventry group came increasingly into sharp contradiction with the majority of the CFB.

The stand the group took can be seen in articles by their leading comrade in Marxist-Leninist Quarterly number 7 ('Expose the Reformists of Every Stripe and Hue') and number 11 ('Nationalisation'). These articles have been firmly criticised in MLQ 11 in articles titled 'Nationalisation and the crisis of British Imperialism' and 'Oppose Opportunism on the Question of Nationalisation'.

In his article in MLQ 11 the comrade from Coventry fawns on the opportunists in the working class movement and complains about the way they are criticised in the National Committee statement on nationalisation (also published in the same issue). He writes: "Unsubstantial statements like 'oppose the reformist policies of Labour's hangers on - the revisionist and trotskyists - who support British capitalism' do nothing to improve the central theme of the line presented and can only provide ammunition to the enemies of Marxism-Leninism".

Th words of Lenin in the 'Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat' closely apply to this position of the leading member of the Coventry group:

"You are fawning on the opportunists, who are alien to the proletariat as a class, who are the servants, the agents of the bourgeoisie and the vehicles of its influence, and unless the labour movement rids itself of them, it will remain a bourgeois labour movement. Your advocacy of 'unity' with the opportunists... is objectively a defence of the enslavement of the workers by the imperialist bourgeoisie with the aid of its best agents in the labour movement". (Lenin's emphasis throughout)

In his article the leading Coventry comrade characteristically uses the word 'revolutionaries' instead of 'Marxist-Leninists' in order to flatter the opportunists in the working class. This goes hand in hand with his argument that 'the people who currently operate under the headings' of 'reformists, revisionists and Trotskyists' are the ones whom we aim to convince of the correctness of the analysis and action of Marxism-Leninism! (MLQ 11 page 41). Therefore presumably according to him, we must unite with them, flatter them, and avoid pointing out that they are objectively serve the bourgeoisie.

In the article in MLQ 7 on page 3, this leading Coventry comrade carefully avoids accusing all Trotskyist organisations of a contemptuous attitude towards the working class: for him it is only 'some' Trotskyist organisations that do this not all. In fact in the same month in which the Coventry group resigned from the CFB, their chairman and secretary both made speeches to a so-called 'Right to Work March' which was wholly under the leadership of the Trotskyist, economist and opportunist 'International Socialists'.

In Lenin's words, the Coventry group is indeed "fawning on the opportunists".

The struggle within the CFB over Social Democracy showed how far the Coventry group has fallen into tailism behind the opportunists. The group repeatedly talks about 'exposure' of Social Democracy rather than boldly combating Social Democracy. By this they mean exposure crab-wise - by approaching it sideways rather than by firmly criticising it head-on. They criticise Social Democracy only in a way that will not cause too much offense to its supporters. For example in MLQ 7 their leading comrade deliberately starts off his article by praising the aims of the Labour Party Manifesto of 1974 as 'very laudable'!

For the Coventry group the revisionists, Trotskyists and Social Democrats are the working class. The group does not grasp Lenin's key idea in the struggle against opportunism that we must go "lower and deeper into the real masses" in order to rally the staunchest and most reliable proletarian fighters.

On the question of bourgeois nationalisation, the Coventry group supports and broadcasts the opportunists' campaign for bourgeois nationalisation even though this strengthens state monopoly capitalism, brings us nearer the corporate state and social fascism and does not save workers' jobs because nationalisation is rationalisation. For example in both MLQ 7 and MLQ 11 their comrade calls on revolutionary Communists to campaign for the nationalisation of North Sea Oil!

The CFB says firmly that the campaign for nationalisation is the work of the opportunists and not a real demand of the working class. The real demand of the working class is the right to work.

The way the Coventry group bow to the campaign for bourgeois nationalisation is another example of how they do not dare to stand up to the opportunists in the working class.

Summary

The Coventry group have made major errors of liberalism by failing to carry out active ideological struggle, and of ultra-democracy by not putting Party-building first and by tailing behind the opportunists in the working class. We call on them to make a bold self-criticism.

None of the errors have been unique in the CFB and it is not a crime to commit errors; even ones as serious as these. Making errors is an inevitable part of political work. The important thing is to have a bold, self-critical attitude and to correct them quickly.

At the same time we warn the Coventry group that unless they speedily correct their errors they will degenerate from comrades making opportunist errors into full-blown opportunists.

The contradiction with the Coventry group became antagonistic not because they committed errors but because they resented and rejected criticism and dug themselves into an opportunist position.

We know that subjectively comrades in Coventry desire proletarian revolution and work hard and long. But objectively they have taken up a thoroughly opportunist stand. What started as a number of innocent mistakes has, through lack of bold self-criticism, become a weapon of reaction. Unless the Coventry group quickly corrects its mistakes it will become an obstacle to its members and those under its leadership preventing them militantly supporting the building of the revolutionary Communist Party.

For these reasons, unless the Coventry group quickly corrects its errors it is in the interests of the working class that the group should disintegrate. Instead of this we hope before long to read a bold self-criticism.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

Executive Committee of the CFB(M-L)
April 1976

Letter of Resignation from the Secretary of the Coventry Group to the Executive Committee, 3.3.76.

Dear Comrades,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Coventry Group to inform you of our decision to sever all organisational links with the CFB.

As we pointed out at the Third SGM (Conference) the policy document accepted by that meeting demonstrates that the political line of the CFB has been captured by subjective dogmatism. The organisational steps taken at the conference, included in and based on the accepted document, no longer allows the ideological and political struggle to take place that is necessary for the development of a Marxist-Leninist Party in Britain. The political putsch that has taken place in the CFB is illustrated by the complete rejection of 'Origins and Perspectives', with only brief reference to it at the SGM and no open struggle against it prior to this meeting.

An even more glaring example of this putsch was the absolute rejection of the JCC statement 'On the Question of Party Building' by the Third SGM.

The 'Documents of the CFB' were accepted after protracted struggle and the involvement of all comrades and whilst they must always be open to criticism amendment, or even total rejection, they cannot be overthrown without examination and without struggle. That is the method of manipulation and is the antithesis of the style of work required to build a revolutionary party based on democratic centralism. No matter how sincere the desire of the comrades may be, that desire can never replace the concrete situation, if the goal is to be a Marxist-Leninist Party.

For the record, we would point out that we did not move an amendment at the Third SGM as the EC letter of 17.2.76 states, but we in fact moved rejection of the EC statement in its entirety.

Finally we would say that we are sure that we will continue to struggle with comrades in the CFB in fighting to establish a revolutionary party of the working class in Britain, and we will watch with great interest the progress of those comrades for we know that time and struggle will win many of the CFB comrades away from the arena of putsch politics and for the path of Marxism-Leninism. We look forward to reuniting organisationally with those comrades on the principled basis of the integration of Marxist-Leninist theory with practice in the concrete conditions of Britain.

Yours fraternally.

Signed by the Secretary of the
Coventry Group

BOLDLY COMBAT SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN THE STRUGGLE TO OVERTHROW CAPITALISM

(RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE CFB MARCH 1976)

Introduction

There have been serious, and at some times dominant right opportunist errors in the Federation on the question of social democracy. The ideological errors have been those of liberalism, empiricism, economism and tailism. To fail to boldly combat social democracy when it is very clearly fulfilling its role of the principal prop of the bourgeoisie is tantamount to surrendering leadership of the working class to the social democrats.

Right opportunist errors on social democracy must be ruthlessly exposed in the CFB. We must build the Marxist-Leninist Party in bold relentless struggle against social democratic and all other forms of bourgeois ideology in the working class.

Strategic Principles

1. Fierce class struggles are inevitable between the working class and the bourgeoisie, but they cannot result in socialist revolution until the working class is led ideologically, politically and organisationally by the proletarian party.
2. The principal task in Britain today is to build the Marxist-Leninist Party of the proletariat. Marxist-Leninists in Britain must struggle to accomplish what Lenin called the "first historical task" in revolution: that of winning over the "class conscious vanguard" to "soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat". Until this task is essentially completed it is an opportunist error to attempt to carry out the second historical task, that of being able to lead the masses to the new position that can ensure the victory of the vanguard in the revolution.
3. One of the main obstacles to the socialist revolution is the influence of bourgeois ideology within the working class. Lenin pointed out that the proletarian party could not win over the class conscious vanguard without the complete ideological and political victory over opportunism:

"One of the indispensable conditions for the preparation of the proletariat for its victory is the protracted, determined and merciless struggle against opportunism, reformism, social-chauvinism and the influence of the bourgeois currents of this kind, which are inevitable as long as the proletariat acts in conditions of capitalism".

(Constituent Assembly Elections and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat) that has taken place in the CFB is illustrated by the complete rejection of the Albanian comrades have further elaborated this thesis by pointing out that struggle against it prior to this meeting.

"Without this struggle, without the complete preliminary victory over opportunism in the labour movement there can be no question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only by writing under the revolutionary banner of the Marxist-Leninist parties can the working class realise its historic world mission, the revolutionary destruction of the capitalist order and the construction of the new socialist society".

- 4.1 Bourgeois ideology penetrates the working class in many forms. Social democracy is a bourgeois ideological trend. Although revisionism is a serious enemy within the working class, the most serious ideological and political enemy is social democracy. Lenin pointed out long ago that the social

democratic parties are detachments of the bourgeoisie, its agents in the working class movement and its principal social prop.

4.2 Social democracy purports to struggle on the behalf of the workers but makes the workers believe that they can only hope for reforms within the existing capitalist system. In other words it preaches bourgeois reformism, while the working class remain wage slaves. Social democracy opposes the idea of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead it preaches 'pragmatism' - complete surrender to the daily requirements of capitalism - or alternatively that society will be changed not through revolution but by the ethical re-education in bourgeois 'socialist' values. Social democracy opposes the vanguard role of the proletariat. Instead it talks of the national interest and preaches class conciliation between the working class and the bourgeoisie. In other words it defends the right of the bourgeoisie to exploit the labour of the workers.

4.3 The Marxist-Leninist Party must liquidate the ideological influence of social democracy in the working class.

5.1 Social democracy is at present organised politically in Britain in the Labour Party and among the trade union leadership. Marxist-Leninists must win the ideological leadership of the working class from the social democratic Labour Party by prolonged ideological and political struggle. The Labour Party must be unrelentingly exposed at all times as an agent of the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie.

5.2 When in opposition the Labour Party opposes particular policies of the bourgeoisie only in words and from an entirely reformist standpoint. It disarms the working class ideologically and politically and thus prevents it from defending itself from attacks by the bourgeoisie.

5.3 In power the Labour Party serves the interests of the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie and launches fierce attacks on the working class on behalf of the bourgeoisie. In the course of these attacks the Labour government tries to hamstring the working class by posing as a genuine government of the class, and by bringing pressure on all reformist trade union leaders to accept its anti-working class policies.

5.4 The increasing dependence of the bourgeoisie on state monopoly capital means that the social democratic Labour Party is being transformed from an alternative party of the bourgeoisie into its principal party. The growing corporate state and the erosion of bourgeois democratic rights shows that *"Objectively social democracy is the moderate wing of Fascism"*. (Stalin)

5.5 What limited concessions Labour governments make to the working class have almost always already been won by the working class through their own struggle, and would have had to be conceded by the monopoly capitalist class in any case. This was so for the repeal of the Industrial Relations Act.

5.6 Other apparent concessions introduced by the Labour government in fact serve the interests of the state monopoly capitalist wing of the bourgeoisie, in taking further steps towards the state monopolization of the means of production. Examples of this are the Labour government's policy of bourgeois nationalisation and of providing increased investment in monopoly capitalist companies by using large sums of money taken from people through taxes, or by massive budget deficits which cut the living standard of workers through inflation and on which large interest payments have to be made to finance capital.

5.7 On the few occasions when reforms introduced by the Labour government do not serve these purposes they are trivial changes which in no way transform the relative strength of class forces in the country, and are the absolute

minimum necessary for the Labour Party still to be able to pose as a party of the working class, so that it can continue its political service to the bourgeoisie of winning acceptance by the working class of the continued existence of the capitalist system.

5.8 The working class, including its more militant industrial sections, still look to the Labour Party for guidance and reforms. The majority are though now disappointed in the Labour Party because it does not serve their interests or solve their problems. However their understanding is from within the limits of bourgeois ideology: in a reformist way they vote Labour as the 'lesser evil' rather than for the Conservative Party. In addition social democratic and revisionist trade union leaders ensure that the trade union movement is closely bound to the Labour Party.

5.9 We must relentlessly and vividly expose the bourgeois nature of the Labour Party and actively call on the vanguard of the working class to support the building of the Proletarian Marxist-Leninist Party.

6.1 A major arena for struggling for political and organisational leadership of the working class is at the place of work and in the trade unions. Here the Marxist-Leninist Party must give a consistent and far-sighted leadership of the working class in both the short and long term interests. The Party members must be tribunes of the people and not merely good trade union secretaries. They must energetically criticise the service of the bourgeoisie of the social democratic trade union leaders and deprive these leaders of their following.

6.2 A specific campaign must be waged in trade unions against giving support to the Labour Party. Campaigns must be waged for the unions to disaffiliate from the Labour Party and to end their support in the form of the political levy.

7.1 In the relentless struggle against social democratic ideology, politics and organisation, Marxist-Leninists must be skilled in uniting the advanced elements around the leadership and must guide them to raise the level of the intermediate elements and win over the backward elements. The advanced elements are characterised by their class consciousness, by their firm understanding of the bitterness of the exploitation and oppression of the working class by the bourgeoisie. Advanced elements are not characterised by their present level of activity.

7.2 Many active leaders in the workers' movement are at present active only because of their social democratic desire for reforms within the continuing capitalist system. Their social democratic politics and style of work are directly opposed to and are obstacles in the way of mobilisation of the broad masses of the working class. It is essential that these activist members are not described as advanced elements. Their activism is in fact the impediment to the active participation in the class struggle of the mass of the workers, because their ideology, politics and organisation are bourgeois.

Tactics

8.1 These general strategic principles for struggle against social democracy must at all times be energetically carried out and related to concrete practice. They must also be applied at election time.

8.2 The tactics of carrying out this struggle must be subordinate to, support and illustrate the overall strategic principles. Tactics must not be used as an opportunist excuse for going diametrically against the main strategic principles. As Stalin said, "*Tactics are a part of strategy, subordinate to it and serving it.*"

9. The Lesser Evil Argument

9.1 Two right opportunist arguments have been put forward to provide excuses for us to tail behind the Labour Party and call on workers to vote Labour. One is the argument that workers should support the Labour Party as "the lesser evil". In other words, in a situation "~~where~~ *no British Party represents working peoples' real interests and ambitions*", the working class must look for temporary, limited and even trivial reforms from one bourgeois party or the other. Instead of stressing that the only real gains for the working class result from the exercise of working class power and strength, this line surrenders hopelessly to and propagates reformism looking for reforms within the existing capitalist system. It is an example of economism, of bourgeois trade union consciousness as described by Lenin in 'What Is To Be Done'. In fact it is only from the narrowest economist viewpoint that the Labour Party seems to be the 'lesser evil'. Objectively the Labour Party is a greater danger than the Conservative Party because it presents itself as the friend of the workers and cripples their capacity to fight the capitalists' attack. It is for this reason that the Labour Party is the principal social prop of the bourgeoisie.

9.2 This economist error of calling the Labour Party the 'lesser evil' goes hand in hand with right opportunist defeatism about the prospect of building the Marxist-Leninist Party, and lack of boldness in fighting social democracy. Instead of saying defiantly "*our own right hands our chains shall sever*" in the words of the "Internationale", this line abjectly advises workers to rely on saviours from on high to deliver one or two crumbs to the working class. Instead of giving the working class and in particular the advanced elements leadership in breaking out of their economist views of the Labour Party as the 'lesser evil', this line tails after them and plays back to them what they think already. It forgets Stalin's words, "*The Party cannot be a real party if it limits itself to registering what the masses of the working class feel and think*".

The Expose Labour Argument

10.1 The other right opportunist argument for calling on workers to vote at election time is that it is easier to expose the Labour Party when it is in power. But the main factor in helping the workers comprehend that the Labour Party is a bourgeois party is whether Marxist-Leninists make ~~correct bold, lively and concrete exposures of the Labour party.~~ By contrast this right opportunist line says that the main factor in exposing the Labour Party lies within the realm of bourgeois politics and in the hands of the bourgeoisie; it pins hopes on adjustments within the bourgeois party political system which will put and keep the Labour Party in government. This line fails to carry out the task of bold uncompromising exposure of the Labour Party for fear of being in a temporary minority. It fears that the masses will never come over to a correct proletarian line. It shows a lack of faith in the masses.

10.2 The line of using elections to support the return of a Labour government prevents Marxist-Leninists from waging all-round attacks on social democracy's ideology and political record. As always right opportunism acts to "*bind one's hands, divert one from the path, force one to forget what is relatively far off and without which small gains are but the vanity of vanities*". (Lenin - The Proletarian Revolutionary Party of a New Type, p10).

II, The Labour Party and Lenin's Advice in 'Left Wing Communism'

11.1 Although in 1920 the advanced elements of the working class had been in and around the new Communist Party, Communists often found it hard to

get a hearing from the mass of the workers. The middle elements of the working class were militant supporters of the Labour Party.

11.2 At that time the Labour Party was in essence a bourgeois Party on account of its bourgeois ideology and leadership. But because of the class conscious militancy of its members and the relatively open federal structure of its organisation, it could be an arena for mobilising the mass of British workers around the Communist Party which already contained the vanguard of the workers.

11.3 The rightist line opportunistically makes use of Lenin's arguments in 'Left Wing Communism', while distorting some of them and not bothering to examine whether those arguments apply to the concrete conditions of today. Lenin never said "vote Labour to smash Labour". Nor did he say that it was necessary to support the Labour Party as a rope supports a hanged man. He said it was necessary to support Henderson as a rope supports a hanged man, and the difference is significant.

11.4 In 1920 the Labour Party had never yet been in power, and therefore it would have been considerably more difficult for the mass of the working class to become disillusioned in Labour leaders like Henderson until they had seen him in power. However Lenin did not argue that the working class needed prolonged experience of a state capitalist regime before they could grasp the necessity to seize state power. In fact he never proposed simply voting for the Labour Party. He proposed also the offer of an electoral alliance with a division of the seats and the right of freedom of criticism and propaganda. He argued this in a situation when the masses needed to be convinced of the essentially bourgeois nature of the Labour Party, and where the Liberal Party in its death throes, was proposing an electoral pact with Conservatism as a means of unifying a divided ruling class.

11.5 In addition in 1920 the extremely severe post-war crisis of capitalism and the stirring example of the Soviet revolution made rapid progress towards the British revolution not only possible but probable. Lenin wrote in 'Left Wing Communism' (Peking edition, p286) "*conditions for a successful proletarian revolution are clearly maturing*".

11.6 None of these conditions apply today. It is incorrect to mechanically apply the line of 1920 to the changed conditions of today. To apply the line of 1920 today is objectively right opportunist. It provides an apparently Marxist excuse for tailing behind the Labour Party and failing to attack it boldly. It is an example of revisionism, for revisionism is precisely the twisting of Marxism to serve bourgeois politics.

12. Guard Against 'Left' Opportunism

While actively combating these right opportunist lines, we must guard against the danger of 'left' opportunism. The 'left' opportunist line makes the general agitational call to the masses of "Don't vote" at election times. This is left in form only. It appears revolutionary - making a break with reformism - but is right in essence. It makes use of the disillusionment of the masses in bourgeois democracy, but without giving bold leadership to the advanced elements. It helps push them in the arms of Fascism. It enforces bourgeois pessimism without struggling for its revolutionary alternative. We must get the advanced workers to break with social democratic ideology and embrace Communism.

13. The Correct Line

13.1 The line on social democracy must correctly serve the present central task for the socialist revolution in Britain. That is, the building of the

Marxist-Leninist Party. We are confronted with the "first historical task". Therefore the correct line must concentrate on propaganda work in rallying the advanced elements, on smashing the chains - ideological, political and organisational - binding them to social democracy and specifically the Labour Party.

13.2 As part of a constant unity and struggle with these elements, the leadership we give at election times must be in essence: "Don't vote Labour - Build the Revolutionary Communist Party". During elections, as at all times, we struggle to get them to break with social democracy, while uniting with them in the fight to build the proletarian Party which will lead and serve the working class. At this stage, before the first historical task is even partially completed, a general "Vote Labour" call is right opportunist and a general abstentionist call is 'left' opportunist.

14. The Historical Task in 1920 and Today

14.1 The incorrect right and 'left' lines on the tactics of fighting social democracy have not made a concrete analysis of concrete conditions. The essential difference between Britain in the 1920's, when Lenin wrote 'Left Wing Communism', and Britain today is that we have a qualitatively different 'historical task' confronting us now, than then.

14.2 As Lenin says the first historical task, that of winning over the vanguard, "could not be accomplished without a complete ideological and political victory over opportunism and social-chauvinism". ('Left Wing Communism, Peking edition, p98). Today we would say 'opportunism and social democracy'. Communists in Britain have not accomplished this. We will only do it by building the proletarian Marxist-Leninist Party, having a base in the working class and boldly combating social democracy.

14.3 Britain in the 1920's had reached its 'second' historical task, Lenin then said that Communists have to "lead the masses (his emphasis) to the new position that can ensure the victory of the vanguard in the revolution". ('Left Wing Communism', Peking edition, p98). This meant eliminating 'left doctrinairism'.

14.4 We are not now at that stage in the struggle to build the Marxist-Leninist Party: because of the degeneration of the Communist Party of Great Britain and its capitulation to revisionism, we have to accomplish the first historical task once again. We cannot give practical political leadership to the masses until we have struggled with and largely won over, the advanced elements in the working class to Communism.

the involvement of the masses in the class struggle. This line was
concretely

The National Committee of the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)

SMASH OPPORTUNISM TO WIN THE PROLETARIAN VANGUARD!

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

(*'Quotations from Mao Tse-tung'*, p261)

As part of the rectification campaign against right opportunism which the CFB(M-L) has been engaged in for the past year (see the CFB(M-L) Third Conference Resolution in this issue of 'Revolution'), the CFB(M-L) has begun to grasp firmly the profound truth of this thesis of Comrade Mao Tse-tung.

The National Committee of the CFB(M-L) has recently triumphantly hammered out the policy statement 'Boldly Combat Social Democracy in the Struggle to Overthrow Capitalism'. We have won a militant unity around a policy statement which gives a bold lead to our members and the Marxist-Leninist movement generally: a unity which has been won through active ideological struggle.

But ideological struggle alone is not enough: we must militantly put our policy into practice. As Mao Tse-tung says ideological struggle is the weapon for ensuring unity in the interests of our fight. This is why the policy statement says that we must combat social democracy in the struggle to overthrow capitalism.

THE 'FIRST HISTORICAL TASK'

If right opportunism is to be defeated and guarded against in the struggle to build the revolutionary Communist Party it is essential that we grasp the distinction between the two different tasks of revolution - a distinction which Lenin clearly made:

"While the first historical task (that of winning over the class conscious vanguard of the proletariat to Soviet power and the dictatorship of the working class) could not be accomplished without a complete ideological and political victory over opportunism and social-chauvinism, the second task, which now becomes the immediate task, and which consists in being able to lead the masses to the new position that can ensure the victory of the vanguard in the revolution - this immediate task cannot be accomplished without eliminating left doctrinalism, without completely overcoming and eliminating its mistakes". (*'Left Wing Communism'*, Peking edition, p98)

Clearly Communists have not yet won over the class conscious vanguard. Failure to grasp this fact has been one of the major reasons for opportunism in fighting social democracy. Until we have broken the grip of all currents of bourgeois ideology on the vanguard - principally reformism, but also revisionism and trotskyism - and won them over to Communist ideas there can be no question of leading the masses, and to attempt to do so will lead inevitably to opportunism. As Lenin said:

"The proletarian vanguard has been won over ideologically. That is the main thing. Without this not even the first steps towards victory can be made!" (*'Left Wing Communism'*, Peking edition, p97. (our emphasis))

What is the essence of accomplishing this first historical task? It is understanding who the class conscious vanguard are and resolutely and fiercely fighting opportunism in order to win them over to Marxism-Leninism.

WHO ARE THE CLASS-CONSCIOUS VANGUARD?

"Engels draws a distinction between the 'bourgeois Labour Party' of the old trade unions - the privileged minority - and the 'lowest mass', the real majority, and he appeals to the latter who are not infected by 'bourgeois respectability'. This is the essence of Marxist tactics!... it is therefore our duty, if we wish to remain Socialists, to go down lower and deeper, to the real masses. This is the whole meaning and the whole purport of the struggle against opportunism." (Lenin - "Imperialism and the Split in the Socialist Movement". Quoted in 'Lenin on the Struggle against Revisionism', Peking edition, p75.)

The class-conscious vanguard then are not the opportunist activists of the official labour movement but the ordinary workers, those most conscious of the bitterness of their exploitation and oppression. It is essential that the counter-revolutionary reformists, revisionists and Trotskyists who are dominant in the labour movement are not described as the vanguard. (For a generally correct analysis of this question see the sections entitled "What Must Marxist-Leninists Do", "Who are the Advanced Workers?" and "To Fight in the Midst of the Masses" in the article "Lower and Deeper into the Proletariat" in MLQ 11).

BOLDLY COMBATING OPPORTUNISM.

Marxist-Leninist theory is the crystallised experience of well over one hundred years of the international Communist Movement. At this stage of party-building theory is primary over practice. (See the Third Conference Resolution and supporting article in this issue of "Revolution".)

This truth is inseparably linked with the question of fighting opportunism. Winning over the class-conscious vanguard is essentially a matter of resolutely fighting to win them over to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, to establish the hegemony of proletarian ideology over bourgeois ideology. Without accomplishing this task there can be no question of the vanguard eventually leading the masses in revolution.

Communism in Britain today is in a period of theoretical chaos. For decades the working class movement has been dominated by opportunism. We must firmly grasp that the reformists, revisionists and Trotskyists are not simply well-meaning people with incorrect ideas, they are objectively counter-revolutionaries, agents of the bourgeoisie, purveyors of its ideological and political influence in the working class and impediments to the involvement of the masses in the class struggle. This line was concisely summed up by Lenin:

"Practice has shown that the active people in the working class movement who adhere to the opportunist trend are better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie itself... This is where our principal enemy is: and we must conquer this enemy." (Lenin on the Struggle Against Revisionism', Peking edition, p74).

We cannot conquer this enemy unless we master Marxist theory and master it for the sole reason of smashing opportunism in the interests of the revolution. Guided by Marxist theory the revolutionary Communist Party will be the vanguard of the revolution; *"The role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory."* (Lenin - 'What is To Be Done?' Peking edition, p29).

Spontaneism, an infatuation with practical activity, is a serious right opportunist error in the Marxist-Leninist movement. Engaging in practical activity without grasping the need for that activity to be guided by theory inevitably leads to opportunism. In particular working in the trade union movement in this way will lead to tailing behind social democracy. (For a clear example of this right opportunist and tailist error, see the article 'Nationalisation' by DJ and DS in MLQ 11)

The inseparable link between blind practical activity and opportunism was boldly made by Lenin in 'What Is To Be Done';

"Without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement. This thought cannot be insisted upon too strongly at a time when the fashionable preaching of opportunism goes hand in hand with an infatuation with the narrowest forms of practical activity." (Peking edition, p28)

Communism in Britain is only in the process of formation; it has not yet settled accounts with opportunism. To argue that we must engage in yet more blind practice; that practice, is more important than theory, that those who argue for the crucial importance of theory are dogmatists or 'academicist', is as Lenin said, like *"wishing mourners at a funeral 'happy returns of the day'"*.

SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IS A SERVANT OF IMPERIALISM

Social democracy is, as our policy statement says, a bourgeois ideological trend. It disarms the working class by preaching reformism and class collaboration. It denies the need for revolution and the dictatorship of the working class. It defends the right of the bourgeoisie to exploit the working class.

Social democracy is being transformed from an alternative party of the bourgeoisie into its principal party. This is an objective process independent of the wishes of the bourgeoisie. It is a result of the increasing dependence of the bourgeoisie on state capital. That is why the social democratic Labour Party has been in power for eight of the last twelve years.

In power the Labour Party fiercely attacks the rights of the workers. It attacks bourgeois democratic rights (as in the recent anti-terrorist legislation). It extends the role of the state in all aspects of the economy, particularly through nationalisation and investment subsidies, thus lowering the living standards of the masses through inflation and increased taxation. It incorporates the trade union movement, notably its leadership, into the state and thus increases the threat of the corporate state. (TU leaders like Jones, Scanlon and Murray are now part of the bourgeoisie and help the bourgeois state control the wages and living standards of their members.)

"Objectively social democracy is the moderate wing of fascism" (Stalin). Social democracy and its hand maidens in the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) and the trotskyist movement are social fascists. They are a far greater threat than the National Front.

For all these reasons social democracy is the main enemy in the working class movement. It is the chief vehicle for opportunism and it must be our principal target for attack. The revisionist CPGB is a lackey of the Labour Party and is a secondary enemy. Trotskyists are revealed by their support for social democracy as 'left in form and right in essence' and as a further enemy.

All these tendencies must be boldly and vigorously opposed as servants of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Failure to do this is the grossest betrayal of the working class and the revolution.

RIGHT OPPORTUNISM ON SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN THE CFB(M-L)

"To fail to boldly combat social democracy when it is very clearly fulfilling its role of the principal social prop of the bourgeoisie is tantamount to surrendering leadership of the working class to the social democrats." (NC policy statement).

The CFB(M-L) has made serious right opportunist errors on the question of social democracy and at times right opportunism has been dominant. In September 1974 a general meeting of the CFB(M-L) passed an opportunist resolution saying that we should tell the working class to vote Labour. (see editorial).

Two separate right opportunist arguments have been put forward for supporting voting Labour. The common factor in both of them is that we are still only at the stage of winning the vanguard and that attempting to lead the masses will in consequence lead to opportunism.

THE VOTE LABOUR TO EXPOSE LABOUR ARGUMENT

This argument dogmatically and opportunistically applies Lenin's tactical advice from 'Left Wing Communism' and elevates it to the level of a strategy. It fails to examine Lenin's advice in the light of the vastly changed conditions of today. (For a more detailed discussion of the specific difference, see the section of the NC policy statement entitled "The Labour Party and Lenin's Advice in 'Left Wing Communism'").

The crucial difference between 1920 and now is that Communists had rallied the vanguard around them, that it was then the question of leading the masses in a situation where *"conditions for a successful revolution are clearly maturing"*. ('Left Wing Communism', Peking edition, p86).

We will ignore at our peril the difference in a situation where we are still engaged in rallying the vanguard and one where it was a question of leading the masses. Lenin's advice to British Communists was written to guide their work when it was:

"... a question of practical action by the masses, of the disposition, if one may so express it, of vast armies, of the alignment of all the class forces of the given society for the final and decisive battle". ('Left Wing Communism', Peking edition, p98. (emphasis in original))

The article in MLQ 7 "Expose the Reformists of every Stripe and Hue" by DJ is the best (or worst) example of the line which argues that we should "Vote Labour to Expose Labour".

This opportunist statement argues that the aims of the 1974 Labour Party were "very laudable" (p2) and that;

"An important feature in the coming months will be the campaigns inside and outside of the official Labour movement for the Labour government to honour its manifesto and for it to be answerable to its policy making conference. It will be an act of criminal infantilism for Marxist-Leninists to stand aside from these campaigns and to say that we know the inevitable role of Labour governments, and therefore we will stand aside from the struggles." (p5).

This is an inevitable result of his failure to understand the stage of revolution. Attempts to lead the masses until we have won the vanguard inexorably lead to failure to boldly combat opportunism: in the case of this

comrade to even fail to grasp the essence of reformist opportunism, he does not even see the aims of the Labour Party manifesto are not 'very laudable' but are rather a programme for Social Fascism.

Working in leading positions in the trade union movement without winning a base in the vanguard of the working class can only lead to opportunist compromise and tailism behind the left wing of social democracy. (See the letter of the EC of the CFB(M-L) to the Coventry group in this issue of 'Revolution').

Significantly it is the comrades who support the opportunist line on social democracy and nationalisation who reject the vital need for our work to be guided by the most advanced theory, who preach opportunism and who are "infatuated by the narrowest forms of practical activity" and who thus tail behind social democracy.

THE LESSER OF TWO EVILS ARGUMENT

This argument says that temporary and in many cases illusory gains resulting from the election of a Labour government are a correct reason for voting Labour. An article by PJ in MLQ 8&9 points out that the Labour government repealed the Industrial Relations Act and Housing Finance Act and promised a referendum on the EEC and the comrade says that:

"All the above listed points represent short term gains, and at the same time represent material reasons why many sections of the working class still retain their support for the Labour Party: there is every reason for the working class to avail themselves of every short-term gain. This is the main reason why we should support voting Labour in the current situation." (p11)

This line forgets the words of Marx and Engels that:

"The Communists fight for the attainment of the immediate aims, for the enforcement of the momentary interests of the working class; but in the movement of the present, they also represent and take care of the future of the movement." ('The Communist Manifesto', Peking edition, p74)

The lesser of two evils argument sacrifices the 'future of the movement' for 'momentary interests'. Reforms introduced by the Labour governments nearly always serve the interests of the bourgeoisie, either by being reforms which are illusory, such as nationalisation which extends state monopoly capitalism and in no way serves the interests of the working class, or by being the minimum possible concessions necessary to retain working class support and thus keep intact the social base of the Labour Party. Other reforms, such as the repeal of the Industrial Relations Act, were already won in struggle by the working class and would have been conceded by whichever bourgeois party was in office.

The line sacrifices the 'future of the movement' by failing to see that bold struggle against right opportunism is our principal task at this stage of the revolution. If this struggle is neglected, if opportunist concessions to social democracy are made, then there can be no question of winning the vanguard and therefore no question of eventually leading the revolution. Objectively the proponents of this line are condemning the working class to perpetual enslavement by capitalism. They forget Lenin's warning that right opportunism acts to;

"bind one's hands, divert one from the path, force one to forget what is relatively far off and without which small gains are but the vanity of vanities." ('The Proletarian Revolutionary Party of a New Type, Peking edition, p10)

PESSIMISM IN REVOLUTION

Both right opportunist lines show a lack of faith in the masses and deep pessimism in Party building. A basic aspect of all right opportunism is despair in revolutionary potential of the masses, and thus relying on short term gains to the neglect of vivid revolutionary propaganda and mass work.

2. The line of the lesser of two evils fails to defiantly build the Party and rally the advanced elements around it. It asks the working class to rely on crumbs from the bourgeoisie rather than boldly giving the advanced elements leadership in grasping the need for revolution. The line of vote Labour to expose Labour meekly hands over responsibility to the bourgeois state and parliament to expose the Labour Party. It ignores the fact that it is bold and uncompromising exposure by the revolutionary Party which is the main factor in demonstrating to the working class the reactionary nature of social democracy.

Both lines fail to see that with correct leadership by Communists, first the advanced elements and then the masses, will be won over to Communism.

Both lines fail to grasp that the proletariat is an objectively revolutionary class and that they will be eventually won over to a correct proletarian line and that therefore revolution is inevitable.

THE MATERIAL BASIS FOR OPPORTUNISM

A significant weakness of the NC policy statement is that there is no line on the question of the material base for opportunism and reformism in Britain. This has been a source of struggle and debate in the Marxist-Leninist movement for years. It is also a question on which ideological struggle is now taking place in the CFB(M-L). When that struggle is completed we will argue for our line and the policy statement on social democracy will be significantly strengthened. However the NC policy statement as it stands gives a bold and militant lead to our comrades in the struggle against social democracy and it would be an intellectualist error to withhold that lead until we had reached unity on the material base for opportunism.

BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY TO LEAD THE REVOLUTION!

Building the revolutionary Communist Party is the principal task in Britain today. At this stage of the revolution it is smashing the ideological, political and organisational chains which bind the working class to opportunism and social democracy which is the main aspect of this task. Particular attention must be paid to the advanced elements. The Albanian comrades have pointed out that;

"Without the complete preliminary victory over opportunism in the labour movement there can be no question of the dictatorship of the proletariat."
(*'Social democracy in the service of the bourgeoisie and reaction' - 'Albania Today', September 1973.*)

We must boldly carry out this task in order to rally the vanguard of the working class around the revolutionary Communist Party.

SMASH OPPORTUNISM - BUILD THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNIST PARTY!

'LOWER AND DEEPER INTO THE PROLETARIAT' - SELF CRITICISM

I am now convinced that serious liberal errors were made in the first part of this article. These errors showed in the following ways:-

- a) in a failure to be conscientious enough and to make rigorous analysis.
- b) in resorting to description at times, instead of factually analysing.
- c) in using words loosely, and failing to use Marxist-Leninist language.
- d) in failing to draw clear lines of demarcation with positions taken up by other parts of the Marxist-Leninist movement.

The general line throughout this article is correct. However, I wish to make three specific criticisms of points on page 51, in the light of the above self-criticism. I do this in order that the struggle will not be diverted away from the line, into trying to sort out the unscientific language used in the article.

1. "Turning the whole of the proletariat into a 'labour aristocracy' in the world laid the basis....."(First full paragraph)

It is liberal and un-Marxist to use a phrase like 'labour aristocracy' in a different context than usual, without political argument to back it up. It is liberal and sloppy to put it in inverted commas to indicate that it is an analogy, a description. In an article like this, I should have put a clear theoretical position. It is objectively intellectualist to revive a long standing polemic in the British Marxist-Leninist movement, when this can only detract from the main point of the article. This is bound to divert attention from the central argument, and help fudge lines of demarcation on this question.

2. "In recent years, because of the unrelenting struggles of the peoples of the world...."(second paragraph)

Again, the lack of thoroughness and clarity has led to confusion. The article overstated the external contradictions of imperialism and understated the internal ones. Essentially, this is correct since I was trying to highlight points which have been ignored in the polemic so far. The internal contradiction between the proletariat and the monopoly capitalist bourgeoisie have been adequately dealt with elsewhere. However, this should have been clearly stated so as to avoid confusion. Even given this, it is wrong to objectively deny the internal contradiction. The sentence should, therefore, have said that the crisis was partly due to these struggles.

3. "...shows just how persuasive and deep rooted is the ideological corruption of the proletariat..." (third paragraph)

This is inconsistent with the rest of the article; this, again, is due to liberalism. Everywhere else in the article, I have referred to the proletariat's contamination by reformism. Only certain strata and individuals were characterised as corrupt. This part also should have said 'contamination'. It is important to distinguish between the two. In bourgeois society, bourgeois ideology is dominant; this in no way implies that the class is totally filled with that ideology, but it does imply that the class, without Marxist-Leninist leadership, cannot be impervious to it. This is recognising reality and in no way contradicts my position that the proletariat is the revolutionary class.

I hope this self-criticism will aid in drawing clear lines of demarcation in this crucial polemic.

JT.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CFB(M-L) advance the struggle for the principal task of building the Marxist-Leninist party in Britain.

REVOLUTION. The theoretical journal of the National Committee of the CFB(M-L).
1 year - £1.50 2 years - £3.00 3 years £4.00

CLASS STRUGGLE. Newspaper of the National Committee of the CFB(M-L). The working class itself must come forward, lead the people and overthrow the capitalist class by force. "Class Struggle" is being published to help the working class rally its forces and build a truly revolutionary Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class.

1 year - £1.60

CHINESE AND ALBANIAN BOOKS AND PERIODICALS give a lead in applying Marxism-Leninism to the present struggle against imperialism and social-imperialism, and for the building of socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

PEKING REVIEW is a political weekly on Chinese and World affairs.
£1.80 per year. £2.70 for 2 years.

CHINA PICTORIAL. Large format monthly with fine pictures and short articles on China's achievements in all fields.

£1.50 per year. £2.25 for 2 years.

CHINA RECONSTRUCTS is an illustrated monthly of general coverage on the building of socialism in China.

£1.20 per year. £1.80 for 2 years.

ALBANIA TODAY is a bi-monthly political review. Detailed analysis of the achievements and problems of construction of socialism in Albania.

£1.50 per year.

also

VIETNAM is a monthly review of the Vietnamese struggle for socialism and against the remnants of US imperialism.

£1.50 per year.

VIETNAM COURIER is a monthly paper of political analysis of events in Vietnam and South East Asia.

£0.80 per year.

ORDER FORM (cheques payable to NEW ERA BOOKS)

I wish to subscribe to: (list periodicals and duration of subscription)

I enclose payment of.....

NAME

ADDRESS

Mail Order from NEW ERA

Mail Orders welcomed and promptly attended to: send 10p for further details and catalogue

New Era Books

A PROPAGANDA WEAPON IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MARXIST-LENINIST COMMUNIST PARTY!

REVOLUTIONARY THEORY - *"Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement."* (Lenin.)

NEW ERA BOOKS stocks and distributes MARXIST-LENINIST CLASSICS, the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao Tse-tung. The ideology of the class conscious workers is Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tse-tung thought, and the principal aspect of party building in Britain today is to build theory from the historical experience of the international Communist movement.

CHINESE AND ALBANIAN BOOKS AND PERIODICALS give a lead in applying Marxism-Leninism to the present struggle against imperialism and social imperialism, and for the building of socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE CFB(M-L) AND OTHER MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATIONS IN BRITAIN advance the struggle for the principal task of building the Marxist-Leninist party in Britain.

PUBLICATIONS OF MARXIST-LENINIST ORGANISATIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES are an important source of revolutionary theory, for *"theory is the experience of the working class movement in all countries taken in its general aspect."* (Stalin.)

PROGRESSIVE LITERATURE New Era Books stocks ANTI-IMPERIALIST BOOKS, PAMPHLETS AND JOURNALS, which publicise the great achievements of countries fighting for independence, nations fighting for liberation and people fighting for revolution throughout the world. They expose and condemn the vicious nature of imperialism and social-imperialism.

Literature on the struggles of the working class against exploitation, racism and for women's emancipation, and progressive novels, document the class struggle in Britain and abroad.

New Era Books also stocks handicrafts, posters and artwork from the socialist countries which emphasise and publicise the achievements of socialism in a concrete way.

NEW ERA BOOKS
203 SEVEN SISTERS ROAD
LONDON N4,
Tel. 01-272-5894.

Nearest Tube - FINSBURY PARK.
Opening hours 10 - 6pm.
Monday - Saturday.
Late Night Thursday till 7.30pm.

CLASS STRUGGLE

Today the two superpowers, Soviet Social Imperialism and United States imperialism threaten the peoples of the whole world. The two superpowers speak 'détente' and prepare for war.

British imperialism, wounded and limping, still throws its weight around, tries to oppress and exploit countries like Ireland, the Arab countries, Southern Africa, and Iceland. At home it steps up its attacks on the working class with massive job cuts, pay cuts, and cuts in essential services, in a desperate attempt to resolve the crisis of decaying capitalism.

There is only one answer to these problems. The working class itself must come forward, lead the people in opposition to the superpowers, and overthrow the British imperialist ruling class by force.

The working class must speak out loud and clear. It must speak out in its own voice, the voice of no other class. It must speak out strongly to rally its forces and build a truly revolutionary Communist Party, the vanguard of the working class.

'Class Struggle' is being published to help the working class rally its forces and build that revolutionary Communist Party. It is the organ of the National Committee of the Communist Federation of Britain (Marxist-Leninist).

'Class Struggle' is primarily a propagandist paper aimed at the class-conscious vanguard. Its main aspect is to present 'many ideas to the few', to win over the advanced workers to Marxism-Leninism.

The central task of building the revolutionary Communist Party guides every aspect of the paper. In the task of rallying the working class vanguard to build the Party, it serves the central mass work task: building Communist bases in the industrial working class.

It shows how the working class and progressive forces fight back against oppression and exploitation. 'Class Struggle' upholds Comrade Mao Tse Tung's profound analysis of the present era:

COUNTRIES WANT INDEPENDENCE!

NATIONS WANT LIBERATION!

PEOPLE WANT REVOLUTION!

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO 'CLASS STRUGGLE' ARE AVAILABLE FROM NEW ERA BOOKS
£1.60p a year.