

PARTY LINE NO 2

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

VIETNAM, KAMBUCHEA AND SOVIET GLOBAL STRATEGY	Page 1.
THE SECOND AND THIRD WORLDS	Page 5.
WHO ARE THE ADVANCED WORKERS?	Page 10.
INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS TO STUDY MATERIALS FOR THE "NEW AGE" WORKING CONFERENCE	Page 11.
THE "CPB(M-L)" AND THE "TWO CLASS" LINE (PART TWO)	Page 16.
SAINT ENVER HOXHA OF TIRANA? (FOUNDER OF A MARXIST THEOLOGY FOR THE MODERN "REVOLUTIONARY")	Page 22.
FROM KOREA- COUNTRIES OF NEW-EMERGING FORCES, UNITE AND FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND ALL OTHER FORMS OF DOMINATIONISM!	Page 25.

**THEORETICAL JOURNAL
OF THE
COMMUNIST WORKERS'
MOVEMENT**

INTRODUCTION

The articles in this issue of "Party Line" were mainly written between the end of 1978 and mid-1980. They are mainly about international affairs. This is a reflection of our concern at that time with certain important developments.

The CWM has long upheld the Three Worlds Theory, and has defended it against opportunist attacks. Just such an attack was launched by the Party of Labour of Albania shortly after Mao Zedong's death. From attacking the Three Worlds Theory, the leadership of the PLA went on to vilify the great communist who put it forward, Mao Zedong. The article "Saint Enver Hoxha of Tirana..." was written by a comrade as an immediate reaction to the PLA leader's attacks on Mao Zedong, exposing the dishonesty and opportunism of Hoxha. It does not claim to be an all round analysis of the stand taken by the Albanian leadership. For this, we recommend readers to see the international bulletin of the Workers' Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist) of Norway, available from New Era Books.

The speech "Vietnam, Kampuchea and Soviet Global Strategy" was made soon after Vietnamese troops occupied Phnom Penh. It states that Kampuchea is a socialist country. When the Vietnamese invaded, Kampuchea was building socialism, but, occupied as it is, the country cannot proceed with that stage of its revolution. All efforts are now turned to driving out the occupiers and defeating their attempts to wipe out the Kampuchean people and seize their country. In recognition of this, the Government of Democratic Kampuchea is now trying to unite all Kampucheans who can be united for these ends in the Patriotic and Democratic Front of Great National Union.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is a socialist country and part of the Third World. The article which concludes this issue of "Party Line" is from the DPRK, and illustrates the very positive role it is playing today. The article shows the independent stand taken by the DPRK, and its solidarity with other Third World countries.

When we decided to produce a theoretical journal, we underestimated the amount of work regular publication would involve, and work on "Party Line" was held up time and time again as other things called for our attention. We wish to apologise to our readers for the delay in the appearance of this issue.

VIETNAM, KAMPUCHEA, AND SOVIET GLOBAL STRATEGY

(The following speech was made by a C.W.M. speaker at a C.W.M.-Revolutionary Communist League of Britain joint meeting in January, galssed in solidarity with the people of Kampuchea. The Soviet-backed Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea can't be seen in isolation from Soviet imperialist's world-wide efforts at expansion. This speech attempted to put it in context. Before beginning this speech, the C.W.M. speaker paid tribute to Malcolm Caldwell, the progressive intellectual and loyal friend of the Kampuchean people who was assassinated by Vietnamese agents in Phnom Penh in late December, '78).

The massive Vietnamese aggression, masterminded by the Soviet Union, against Democratic Kampuchea has evoked strong protest from all parts of the world. Here in Britain we are adding our protest. With so much happening in our own country—struggles of tanker drivers, lorry drivers, low paid public sector workers and others, why are we so concerned about what is happening in Kampuchea, a country thousands of miles away on the other side of the world?

Firstly, because Democratic Kampuchea is a socialist country. As communists, we represent or at least seek to represent the highest interests of the proletariat. The proletariat is an international class and its goal of emancipating itself (and all mankind) can only be achieved in a global context. The socialist countries are liberated base areas and bastions of world revolution. Therefore, defence of the genuine socialist countries is a vital issue concerning the working class of all of all countries who must constantly seek to tip the world balance of forces in favour of the revolution and deny the imperialists freedom to manoeuvre so preparing the conditions for their final defeat.

Does this mean therefore that the only people concerned at the situation in Kampuchea are communists and people sympathetic to communism? Certainly not!

Soviet-Vietnamese aggression against Kampuchea takes place in a certain global context. The context is one of a world rapidly moving toward war—a war brought about by the contention for hegemony (domination) by the two superpowers, the U.S. imperialists and the Soviet social-imperialists who talk about socialism but practices fascism and aggression. Of these two superpowers, Soviet social-imperialism is the rising and late coming superpower and is by far the more dangerous and aggressive. This can be seen by the fact that most recent acts of aggression in the world have been committed by the Soviet Union whilst the United States has had its freedom of movement restricted considerably both by its imperialist revival and particularly by defeats inflicted upon it by the peoples of the world and their vigilance against U.S. imperialism. Thus, Soviet aggression against Kampuchea takes place in the context of unfolding the Soviet strategy for world domination and forms an integral part of that strategy. The Soviet imperialists also aim in this invasion to carry out practical experiments in 'blitzkrieg' (lightning war) which is what they intend to practice in Western Europe where they vastly outnumber the NATO forces in men and materials. They hope to intimidate other countries with their massive show of force so as to impose their will on them and force them to submit without a fight and, like Hitler in the 1930's to create a climate where acts of aggression and domination by big powers become the accepted norm.

The important part that the conquest of Kampuchea plays in the Soviet strategy of world domination is shown by this statement taken from an article in the Soviet paper 'Izvestia':

"By overthrowing the treacherous and corrupt clique (this means the Kampuchean government) the Kampuchean people had made an inestimable contribution to strengthening the national independence of the neighboring countries and to the cause of peace and security in an important region of Asia"

Thus, the attack on the national independence of Kampuchea is part of the Soviet strategy aimed at the national independence of all countries, including Britain. In this context it should be possible to unite an extremely broad range of forces in support of Kampuchea and certainly not just socialists and communists. We should welcome as many people as possible to the campaign to support Kampuchea and this includes making use of inter-imperialist contradictions including those between the two superpowers. There are a number of farsighted statesmen in the west who see the danger represented by the aggression against Kampuchea. Thus, recently in Peking a visiting British Conservative M.P., Mr. Peter Tapsell condemned the Soviet threat to world peace and security. He pointed out that the Soviet Union had used the Vietnamese to launch military aggression against Kampuchea and that it had adopted a new policy of getting its satellite countries to make direct aggression against others. Did Mr. Peter Tapsell make these remarks out of any great love for the Kampuchean people and because of his admiration for their heroic efforts in building socialism? I think not. Rather they were made because he perceives that what serves the interests of Soviet social-imperialism, allows it to gather momentum and accumulate strength runs against the interests of British Imperialism. Should we therefore be reticent about supporting his statement? Certainly not. We should welcome it as a contradiction amongst our enemies which we can use to our advantage to isolate the main enemy on a world scale. Not to support this statement would be to advocate that all anti-socialist forces in the world unite against the revolution, it would be to call upon all the imperialist powers to support Vietnamese and Soviet aggression. Such an absurd position might do wonders for the purity of our revolutionary goals but it wouldn't do much to support the heroic fighting people of Kampuchea and with the Soviet Union increasingly threatening our own national independence and sovereignty it wouldn't do much good for us either.

Indochina lies between the Indian and Pacific oceans and with naval bases here the Soviets will be able to send their fleet down through the Straits of Malacca that lies between Malaysia and Indonesia through the Indian Ocean where it has a base nearby in Afghanistan (which it hopes to use a subversive agent to exploit the national movements in the Pakistani states to gain a Baluchi naval base), to the Red Sea where it has a base in South Yemen and then to Ethiopian-held Eritrea in the Horn of Africa. They will also be in easy reach of the Pacific Ocean and the continent of Oceania. This gives the Soviet Union control of major sources of raw materials and important supply routes, in particular for oil, to Western Europe, the United States and Japan. Having already obtained some temporary successes in Southern Africa, the Horn and Red Sea area and Central Asia, the Soviets want a quick victory in Southeast Asia before turning their attention to some other region. Thus the leaders of ASEAN (the Association of South-East Asian Nations), comprising Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Indonesia see themselves as new potential victims of aggression and are rightly adopting an active policy of collective security. The Prime Minister of Thailand has warned that his country may be the next victim of aggression. To be in a better position to threaten the rest of South East Asia the Soviet Union is pressing Vietnam both to woo and insulate itself with ASEAN as well as to build an Indochina Federation loosely disguised as a "special relationship" between Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. This system, analogous to the Brezhnev doctrine of 'limited sovereignty' practiced by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, will enable the Soviets to use their henchman to rule Indochina and provide an aggressive bloc to threaten South East Asia. The communist parties of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, North Kalimantan, Indonesia and the Philippines are leading important and heroic armed struggles against imperialism. These parties uphold Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong thought and they are opposed to revisionism. They are

therefore a thorn in the flesh of the Soviet social-imperialists who refer to them as "Maoist subversives".

The strategic focus of the rivalry and contention between the two superpowers is Europe, Western Europe in particular. Here, in this strategic and highly industrialised area with a skilled workforce the largest concentration of forces of the two superpowers and their respective allies are deployed directly facing each other. Because Europe is the focus of contention it is not surprising that there is essentially stalemate here. Thus, the Soviet Union has decided on a large scale flanking manoeuvre to weaken Western Europe by isolating and encircling it and with the object of seizing sources of strategic materials vital to the West and controlling the major sea routes that link Western Europe to the United States and those linking the two with the continents of Asia and Africa. Thus weakened, the capacity of Western Europe to resist aggression would be diminished and we would be an easy target of aggression. Therefore in pursuit of its global strategy the Soviet Union continues to intensify its military threat to Western Europe-as seen by its provocations against the sovereignty of Northern European countries, particularly Norway. Its subversive activities in Yugoslavia and its promotion of the terrorists in Italy-as well as stepping up aggression and expansion in Africa, the Middle East, West and South East Asia as well as the Pacific Region, where for example the government of Fiji refused to allow Moscow to set up an embassy after the Russians had been exposed for trying to recruit a small group of traitors to be trained for subversion.

Over the last year the Soviet Union has been most visibly active in Asia and the regions of Africa contiguous to it;

*In two months it engineered three coups d'etat and murdered the Presidents of three countries. The Daoud regime in Afghanistan was replaced by one even more subservient to the Soviet Union, the President of North Yemen, Salem Robaya Ali was murdered and replaced by Soviet puppets because he refused to tow the Soviet line.

*In a few weeks it pushed through so-called 'treaties of friendship and cooperation' with Vietnam, Afghanistan and Ethiopia. These treaties are actually pacts of military alliance through which the Soviet Union wishes to draw these countries into its hegemonic schemes. Article 7 of the Soviet-Ethiopian treaty says,

"In the event of vibrations arising which constitute a threat to, or a breach of, international peace, the Contracting Parties will endeavour to contact each other immediately with a view to co-ordinating their positions in the interests of removing the threat that has arisen or restoring peace."

A similar clause exists in the other two treaties and it is no coincidence that the invasion of Kampuchea took place less than two months after the signing of the Soviet-Vietnamese treaty. It has long been a goal of the Soviets to knock together an Asian collective security system, something long rejected by the peoples of Asia. Having failed to establish it at one go the Soviets are now trying to establish it piece-meal by a number of bilateral treaties which they may later seek to join together into a full scale military pact complementary to the Warsaw Treaty Organisation in Europe.

*It has attempted to encircle Pakistan and Iraq. It had provided arms to one group of secessionists in Baluchistan in order to further dismember Pakistan and it has sought to manipulate the prolonged turmoil in Iran in order to use to its own advantage. The Baluchis are a third world people scattered over Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran. Like the Kurds who are spread over Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Syria and the Soviet Union they face a protracted struggle to obtain their legitimate national rights and this struggle takes place within a wider context of a complicated international environment. Whilst pursuing the struggle for their national rights they should uphold the common interests of the third world and seek a solution that restricts the ability of imperialism, in particular the superpowers, to meddle. The proletariat does not support

all national movements without exception but only those that actually weaken imperialism. In the case of Iran, the mass upsurge of the people against the repressive rule of the Shah has written a glorious chapter in the history of the Iranian people. The Iranian people's struggle is a just one. However, it is still necessary to exercise caution against the Soviet Union hijacking the Iranian national democratic revolution and turning it to its strategic advantage either through direct intervention or through the revisionist party or pro-soviet sections of the national bourgeois National Front. In this context the statements by Ayatollah Khomeini that he opposes all foreign intervention in Iran are to be welcomed.

*The Soviets have attempted to sabotage Arab unity, labelling some countries progressive and others reactionary and forced the confrontation states comprising Algeria, Libya, Syria, South Yemen and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation into alliance with it.

*It has increased its military strength in the Far East and expanded its Pacific fleet. It frequently sends warships and planes to violate Japanese seas and airspace. It refuses to hand back Japan's four northern islands and bullies Japanese fishermen. Moreover, it resorted to crude threats and blackmail to try and prevent the signing of the China-Japan Peace and Friendship treaty. The Soviet Union has recently increased its military forces in the occupied Northern islands.

More importantly the Soviets are using Vietnam as their hatchetman and their "outpost" for expansion in order to bring Laos and Kampuchea under their control, harry China and act against the ASEAN countries.

With Vietnam as its junior partner the Soviet Union can make Asian fight against Asian. This is why Marxist-Leninists refer to Vietnam as the "Cuba in Asia". Vietnam and Cuba have much in common. Both are third world countries which should be concentrating on building their own national economies rather than engaging in aggression and expansion abroad. Both countries staged heroic struggles against imperialism and both now attempt to use the prestige they gained in their revolutionary struggles to disguise their betrayal and to work as Soviet agents. Both must be unmasked and denounced. Both are particularly useful to the Soviets in that they function to split the non-aligned movement from within doing work that the Soviet Union could not possibly do by itself. The non-aligned movement is an extremely progressive force. It is as Comrade Kim Il Sung has said, "a mighty revolutionary current of our times". Communists must defend the unity of the non-aligned movement and not allow the Soviet imperialists to wreck it.

Thus Soviet strategy in Asia is to establish a strategic cordon around the continent from the Red Sea to its own port of Vladivostok (Haishenwei), use Vietnam to conquer the whole of Indochina and dominate South East Asia and so gradually push the United States out of the continent and establish itself as the sole imperialist power in the region. Not only would this be disastrous for the Asian peoples it would also put the United States at a disadvantage and seriously menace Japan and Western Europe.

As Soviet ambition is so overwhelming it is increasingly forcing its allies to come to its aid and share some of the burden. Thus it got Vietnam to join the 'Council for Mutual Economic Assistance' so as to pass some of the aid bill onto others. It has used military personnel from some Warsaw treaty countries in Africa and tried to get them collectively to aid Vietnam. This move was resisted by Romania.

Although bent on achieving world domination the Soviet Union will find this impossible. Even with their hatchetman they will be unable to hold down the peoples who are determined to wipe imperialism off the face of the earth for ever. Already the Soviets are beginning to overreach themselves. Where there is oppression there is resistance—each country the Soviet revisionists invade is another noose around their necks. Already they are meeting armed resistance in Kampuchea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Angola, Afghanistan and Yemen. In Eastern Europe

Romania and Yugoslavia refuse to knuckle under. The more resistance the Soviets meet, the more they are dragged down into the mire of people's war the more desperately they will lash out at new countries putting more nooses around their necks which the peoples of the world will pull with enthusiasm and hang the social-imperialists.

Although they may run riot for a while the social-imperialists face inevitable defeat and ruin and will be cursed throughout history.

THE SECOND AND THIRD WORLDS

(The following speech was made at the second of a series of meetings organized by the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain, a fraternal organization of the C.W.M.. The series was on the Three Worlds Theory, and the C.W.M. was invited to provide speakers. The C.W.M. speakers' talk at the first meeting was published in "Party Line" No.1 and dealt with the role of the third world. The following speech introduced the question of the second world's role (the second world consisting of the imperialist and developed capitalist countries between the third world and the two super-powers).

Today, as the last meeting in this series conclusively showed, it is the two super-powers-U.S. imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism—who are the main enemies of the people of the world. It is they who have troops everywhere, oppress and bully other countries and, each setting exclusive world hegemony as their goal, make frantic preparations for a new world war. As a rising super-power posing under the banner of 'socialism' Soviet social-imperialism represents the greatest danger of war.

Therefore, it is a question of vital importance for the revolutionaries of all countries to determine what is the main force fighting these two superpowers on a world scale, thereby putting off world war and allowing the people more opportunity to build up their forces and prepare themselves.

The theory of the differentiation of the three worlds, elaborated by the great teacher of the international proletariat Comrade Mao Tse tung, shows that it is the third world, the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions, the so-called 'backward' countries that constitute this main force.

To decisively and genuinely affirm that the third world is the main force pushing history forward today is to strike a blow at imperialist social chauvinism*, the No. 1 ideological enemy within the British working class movement. It is from this enemy that many of the precepts of social democracy, modern revisionism, Trotskyism and super-revolutionism originate. The most glaring example is the super-revolutionary organisation, "Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-leninist)" led by Reg Birch. For example in their document, "For an Industrial Revolution", the Birchites state, "Britain was the workshop of the world. We must lead again. Britain must become a workshop of revolution." Such a statement shows that the super-revolutionary Birch as completely failed to understand not only the problems of imperialism but the very question itself. In fact he refuses to recognise the existence of imperialism. Likewise in the latest issue of the Birchite Beano, "The Worker", we find the ludicrous

*Chauvinism is the reactionary attitude of looking down on people of other nations and asserting the superiority of one's 'own' nation; social chauvinism is justifying this attitude with socialist words.

statement, "A characteristic of today's upsurge in worldwide struggle is the leadership of the working class in the industrial countries and especially in Britain. It was the British working class that first wiped out the insulting theory that it had benefitted from imperialist exploitation abroad, the crumbs theory, intended to belittle the working class and damp down its revolutionary zeal. It was the first to denounce the equally poisonous 'theory of the three worlds' and restored the question of revolution to the agenda. That clarity has found echoes throughout the world".

The third world is the main force fighting hegemonism precisely because it is also the main force fighting imperialism and colonialism as well. To see only unity and not struggle between the second and third worlds is to fall victim to the same crude two worldism (there is only the socialist and the capitalist world) of the super-revolutionaries who see only struggle and not unity between the second and third worlds.

With the exception of the socialist countries, all third world countries are exploited and oppressed by imperialism. Some people have attempted to nitpick at the three worlds theory by drawing attention to this difference. However, when China, Kampuchea and Korea all decisively assert that they are members of the third world they are following in the footsteps of the Great Lenin who, at the Second Congress of the Communist International, firmly placed Soviet Russia in the same trench as the oppressed peoples and nations.

Of course, a category such as the third world, comprising such a huge area, cannot be homogeneous. There are different trends within the third world and different social systems. The most consistent fighters against imperialism and hegemonism are the socialist countries—the People's Republic of China, the firm bastion of world revolution, which pursues a consistent foreign policy aimed at isolating the main enemies to the maximum, building the broadest possible united front and actively promoting the world revolution; Democratic Kampuchea, which today stands on the frontline against Soviet social-imperialism and its "Cuba in the east" and the Democratic People's of Korea which is defending itself from the threat of U.S. imperialist aggression and is playing a good role in rallying the third world and the non-aligned movement in a united front against imperialism and domination, laying great stress on what unites the third world and opposing splittist manoeuvres. Korea also firmly supports Kampuchea's just struggle against aggression. Also within the third world the Marxist-Leninist parties and organisations and the national liberation movements represent firm fighters against reaction. Marxist-Leninist parties such as those of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, North Kalimantan, Indonesia and the Philippines are heading some of the most important mass armed struggle in the world today and firmly support the three worlds theory.

Other tendencies in the third world range from non socialist countries such as Tanzania and Guinea-Bissau which take a fairly consistent stand against hegemonism to countries such as Chile, Nicaragua, Cuba and Vietnam whose national independence is practically nominal and who are basically in thrall to one imperialist power generally a super-power, or another.

However the dialectic of imperialism is such that these countries will—for whatever reason—struggle from time to time, however half heartedly, against imperialism and when they do so they should be supported. For example, Chile has recently taken a number of steps against U.S. imperialist interference, in favour of Latin American integration and for the development of its national economy. Most recently a joint communique was signed between the Foreign Ministers of Chile and Peru which criticised the growing trend of U.S. protectionism in international trade that adversely affects third world countries. More dramatic is the case of Zaire. It is not without reason that Mobutu is known as a reactionary and a hireling of

imperialism but on two occasions when his country was the victim of social-imperialist inspired aggression, Mobutu dared to stand up to the social-imperialists and this stand received mass support leading to the defeat of the aggression, with some international assistance.

As Stalin pointed out in "Foundations of Leninism":-

"The same must be said of the revolutionary character of national movements in general. The unquestionably revolutionary character of the vast majority of national movements is as relative and peculiar as is the possible reactionary character of certain particular national movements. The revolutionary character of a national movement under the conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican programme of the movement, the existence of a democratic basis of the movement. The struggle that the Emir of Afghanistan is waging for the independence of Afghanistan is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist views of the Emir and his associates, for it weakens, disintegrates and undermines imperialism; whereas the struggle eaged by such "desperate" democrats and "Socialists," "revolutionaries" and republicans as, for example, Kerensky and Tsereteli, Renaudel and Scheidemann, Chernow and Dan, Henderson and Clynes, during the imperialist was was a reactionary struggle, for its result was the embellishment, the strengthening, the victory, of imperialism. For the same reasons, the struggle that the Egyptian merchants and bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of Egypt is objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the bourgeois origin and bourgeois title of the leaders of the Egyptian national movement, despite the fact that they are opposed to socialism; whereas the struggle that the British "Labour" Government is waging to preserve Egypt's dependent position is for the same reasons a reactionary struggle, despite the proletarian origin and the proletarian title of the members of that government, despite the fact that they are "for" socialism. There is no need to mention the national movement in other, larger, colonial and dependent countries, such as India and China, every step of which along the road to liberation, even if it runs counter to the demands of formal democracy, is a steam-hammer blow at imperialism, i.e., is undoubtedly a revolutionary step.

Lenin was right in saying that the national movement of the oppressed countries should be appraised not from the point of view of formal democracy, but from the point of view of the actual results, as shown by the general balance sheet of the struggle against imperialism, that is to say, "not in isolation, but on a world scale."

Thus whilst we would only expose ourselves as simpletons if we ignored the objective difference existing in the third world and insisted upon treating it as a homogeneous mass we must not fall into the trap set by the social-imperialists of seeing the main contradiction as that pitting so-called progressive and so-called reactionary countries in the third world against one another. (So-called because their nature is judged solely by their attitude to Soviet hegemonism). Imperialism divides the world into oppressor and oppressed nations. Thus we would be better advised to follow the lead given by the third world countries themselves, who are progressively showing the ability to unite on major questions and shelve minor ones. For example in the wake of the success of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), cartels of raw material producing countries for products ranging from coffee and bananas to copper and tin have been set up and they are playing an important role in the struggle for the New International Economic order. Recently, the Baghdad Conference brought together many Arab countries with widely differing views on the Middle East

and other questions. (for example Libya and Saudi Arabia) but faced with a common threat from Zionism and imperialism they managed to achieve unity. Even Iraq and Syria whose bitter feud had led to acts of terrorism found unity on a new basis.

It is particularly encouraging that more third (and some second) world countries are seeing through the true nature of hegemonism which is more insidious than old line imperialism. This trend is represented by the recently signed Sino-Japanese Peace and Friendship treaty with its anti-hegemony clause and the recent joint statements resulting from Kampuchean Deputy Prime Minister Ieng Sary's visits to the Philippines and Indonesia which stressed opposition to hegemony.

Thus, rather than it being the case that supporters of the theory of three worlds ignore real differences in the third world it is rather the new opportunists led by the Albanian party leadership who are unable to rise above superficial phenomena and see the real, objective situation where the third world countries whilst being conscious of their real differences are increasingly able to unite on major issues where they have objective unity.

The division of the world into oppressor and oppressed nations brings us to the complex question of the second world. The second world forms an intermediate group between the first and third worlds in the sense that it exploits and is exploited, it oppresses and is oppressed. The Chinese comrades have explicitly pointed out that they have no wish to gloss over the contradictions existing between the second and third worlds and have pointed out that unity can only be achieved through struggle. In the important document on the three worlds they state:

"Of course, when we refer to the second world as a force that can be united with in the struggle against hegemonism, we certainly do not mean to write off the contradictions between the second and third world countries and the internal class contradictions in the former, nor do we in the least mean that the struggle of the oppressed nations and people against oppression and exploitation should be abandoned. The world can only advance in the course of struggle, and it is only through struggle that unity can be achieved. If unity is sought through struggle, it will live; if unity is sought through yielding, it will perish. This unity can be achieved and enhanced step by step only in the course of the struggle against national betrayal, appeasement and neo-colonialism and in the course of countering the attacks of the reactionary forces against the progressive forces."

(Chairman Mao's Theory of the Differentiation of the Three Worlds is a Major Contribution to Marxism-Leninism)

Therefore the proletariat must struggle with the bourgeoisies of the second world when they pursue a reactionary policy and when they pursue policies that are objectively progressive we must struggle with them to make them more consistently so.

As Marxists we see the British revolution as part of the world revolution. Therefore we are bound to relate the complicated problems and tasks of making revolution in Britain to developments on the international scene, particularly so in the oldest imperialist country in the world, whose wealth was built primarily on the superprofits extracted from the rape and pillage of the third world. In "Foundations of Leninism", Comrade Stalin points out:-

"Formerly, the national question was regarded from a reformist point of view, as an independent question having no connection with the general question of the power of capital, of the overthrow of imperialism, of the proletarian revolution. It was tacitly assumed that the victory of the proletariat in Europe was possible without a direct alliance with the liberation movement in the colonies, that the national-colonial question could be solved on the quiet, "of its own accord," off the highway of the proletarian revolution, without a

revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Now we can say that this anti-revolutionary point of view has been exposed. Leninism has proved, and the imperialist war and the revolution in Russia have confirmed, that the national question can be solved only in connection with and on the basis of the proletarian revolution, and that the road to victory of the revolution in the West lies through the revolutionary alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism. The national question is a part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, a part of the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Proletarian internationalism, and a correct understanding of the international situation is therefore not a question of Saturday night seminars for intellectuals but a life and death question affecting how we make revolution. The CPGB never fully imperialism and anti-imperialism and so collapsed with the onset of the Khrushchovite offensive. Likewise the CPB (ML)'s failure, even refusal, to understand imperialism and internationalism led it into the waiting arms of social chauvinism and revisionism. Therefore there is no revolutionary party to give leadership to the struggle of the workers of this country. Such is the dialectical unity between national and international struggle.

Concretely we must tie in our theoretical understanding of the main role played by the third world to our on-going agitation, propaganda and practical work.

We must-

-Stand up in support of the struggle of the Irish people, including the armed struggle. Whilst supporting the fight against British imperialism, we should guard against attempts by any other imperialist powers to intervene, in particular against the social-imperialists favourite trick of splitting the liberation movement and coming in to liberate Ireland (from the the Irish people!)

-Support all other struggles which are primarily targeted against British Imperialism, such as those of ZANU of Zimbabwe, PAC of Azania and the Communist Party of Malaya. In their statement of June 15 1978 to mark the 30th anniversary of the Nati-British National Liberation war, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Malaya pointed out that whilst it is being weakened by the influx of U.S., Japanese and Soviet social-imperialism, British Imperialism currently remains their main enemy.

-Support those standing up to and confronting Soviet social-imperialism-the most dangerous enemy-in the Horn of Africa, Indochina and the Balkans.

-Uphold the progressive role of the non-aligned movement and expose and oppose the splitting role of Cuba and Vietnam with their pernicious theory of so-called 'positive' non-alignment which is alignment with the social-imperialists, as their words and deeds show.

-Support the united struggles of the third world countries and peoples, such as those for a New International Economic Order, which is in essence a class struggle against imperialism, and the struggle of these countries for the development of their own national economies.

-Support all policies pursued by the second world countries that are in support of the third world and broaden the international united front against superpower hegemonism, i.e. more equitable trading relationships, aid without strings, friendship, equality and unity between the second world countries and Socialist China and all other third world countries as well as military assistance to third world countries threatened by the superpowers when given at that country's request and under its control.*

*The Harrier jet should be sold to China and military assistance should be given to Zambia to enable her to defend herself and the Zimbabwean refugees in Zambia from the piratical attacks of the white settler regime in Rhodesia.

-Support for the tendency in the second world to learn forms of struggle from the third world-i.e. increased territorial limits at sea and exclusive economic zones in the struggle against maritime hegemonism.

-Most importantly we must fight hard to rebuild the revolutionary communist party, to lead the proletariat of this country in making socialist revolution against "our" bourgeoisie. A socialist Britain is surely the greatest contribution we can make to the fight against the superpowers, against war, against imperialism, and for peace, freedom, national independence and the elimination from the earth of the system of exploitation of man by man, this is in keeping with Lenin's teachings on internationalism.

WHO ARE THE ADVANCED WORKERS?

At the "New Age" Working Conference (See below), workshop leaders said that CWM's paper was not aimed, in the first place, at the mass of workers, but at the advanced workers. Some comrades then raised the question, "What is meant by 'the advanced workers?'" They asked how they could be distinguished, and whether we simply meant workers who were already politically active.

These questions came up within the CWM nearly two years ago as well, when we were considering launching a paper. There was an internal struggle over the question of who to aim the paper at, and some comrades said that it was elitist to aim only at the advanced workers. In reply, other comrades showed that, far from being elitist, aiming firstly at the advanced workers was the best way to get our policies and ideas over to the mass of workers, and to get their ideas back to us. What we should try to do with the paper is to apply the mass line. Using the paper, we should, as Comrade Mao Zedong said, "be skilled in uniting the small number of active elements around the Leadership and must rely on them to raise the level of the intermediate elements and to win over the backward elements." (Some Questions Concerning Methods of Leadership). (We considered that our "advanced elements" approximated within the British working class to Mao's "active elements.")

"Advanced workers aren't necessarily those who are politically active already. Indeed, many of these workers might be classed among the most backward, being dyed-in-the-wool revisionists and social-democrats whose "political activity" amounts to manoeuvring for trade union positions and attempting to manipulate workers rather than mobilize them. In essence, their stand is a bourgeois one of putting personal or group interests before those of the working class, and obstructing or opposing the working class organizing itself in a conscious, revolutionary political way.

Lenin wrote about "advanced workers" and said that they were those who understood the need for the working class to have its own party, and for the proletariat to take political power. But in Britain, where social-democracy has long had a strong grip, where Britain's original communist party long ago betrayed the working class, where the Marxist-Leninist movement is still weak, and where the ruling class's education system and media has had some influence on the working class, if we applied Lenin's definition, we would find very, very few advanced workers indeed. So our definition of the "advanced workers" is not the same as Lenin's.

In fact, the definition of "advanced workers" cannot be the same for all countries at all times, for that would mean taking no account of the concrete conditions under which communists of different lands work. We need our own definition. At the conference, as during the earlier internal struggle, it was explained that the advanced workers were not necessarily those who seemed the most militant, but were those who identified strongly with their fellow workers, and who were prepared to make personal sacrifices sometimes for the sake of their colleagues. These workers show a consciousness of class solidarity and a selflessness which earns them the respect of those they work with, which can be built on, so that they become good communists or supporters of the communist organization. As for finding out who the advanced workers are, this can only be done through work over a fair period of time.

INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS TO STUDY MATERIALS FOR THE "NEW AGE" WORKING CONFERENCE

(The "NA" working conference was held to help develop the paper. It's participants were members of "NA" and a number of regular readers).
CWM

The Communist press pools the collective wisdom and experience of the working class and other working people. It serves the key tasks of the revolutionary movement. At the present stage, it is particularly necessary to bring about conditions for the founding of the revolutionary Communist Party, so our press must serve this task.

We want to build a paper which will be recognised and welcomed by workers as their own paper, so that they also recognise the Communist (Marxist-Leninist) movement as their own movement. It is certainly possible to succeed in doing this. There are two particularly favourable things going for us. First, we have comrades involved in the thick of class struggle in industry, in the community, in anti-fascist work and other fields; this means that, even though our resources are small at present, we can draw on articles of a quality which no bourgeois publication could possibly match. Second, we have the weapon of Marxist dialectics, which reveals the fundamental laws of society. But hard work is needed if we are to tap the potential of these two favourable factors.

Our CWM's publications

At the moment, our publications work has five main aspects:

1) the mass paper New Age; 2) leaflets on specific topics; 3) the theoretical journal Party Line; 4) internal publications; 5) programmatic publications. Each has its own aims, and complements the others. We want soon to introduce a sixth kind, that is pamphlets giving a systematic treatment of important issues.

To help define the specific role of New Age it is worth making a few comments about our publications. Leaflets supplement the work of New Age. We have produced quite a number of these. They help in getting ~~of or prepare the ground for~~ certain parts of our line across to a wider audience. Leaflets arise out of or prepare the ground for articles appearing in New Age. The publication of Party Line was an important step forward. We hope it will be read by people who regularly take New Age and want to get to know about our line more systematically. A programmatic ~~statement~~ is needed to give our work a central point of reference. In ~~the~~ early days of the CWM the book Why Paul Foot should be a Socialist played an important part: using the negative example of the SWP, it put forward a fairly thorough statement of how Marxist-Leninists see things. Now we have produced the CWM's Programme, which should help along all the other aspects of our work.

New Age - the background

When the CWM was first set up in 1977 it published something called Workers' Notebook. This had some good features. It was fairly lively and avoided stereotyped language and jargon. On the negative side, it was produced in a slapdash way (which showed), and was irregular and expensive. More serious - reflecting our weakness at that stage - it didn't have a firm ideological line.

The first national conference of the CWM and a special publications conference shortly afterwards tried to improve things. A statement put forward at that time criticised Workers' Notebook and called for its replacement by a new paper. The following passage from that statement helped to form our new policy:

"At this stage, a CWM mass publication should be orientated towards, first and foremost, the advanced workers, and then the other advanced sections of the masses. It should follow the line of 'From the masses, to the masses'. CWM members involved in mass work in industry, in trade unions, in students' unions, communities, etc., should draw on their experiences and those of the masses they are in contact with, concentrate their ideas, and write them up for leafletting and for a national

publication in this way, our publications will be made to fit in with best of our work; they will be of real use in extending our influence, spreading revolutionary consciousness, and in building the organization. When we produce publications which the advanced sections of the masses can take up as their own, they will help distribute them and sell them (and even write for them and help technically) and propagate the ideas contained in them among the intermediate and backward sections."

It was also pointed out that "we shouldn't fall into the error made by some organizations and allow producing and selling literature to take over from the rest of our work as our main activity". This is true: the paper should be a focus for our mass work, and not replace it (if this did happen it soon wouldn't be much good as a paper, because its strength is the fact that it reflects our participation in class struggle).

Character of the paper

Another statement dealt with the content of the new paper. It argued: "We have to try and relate our politics more closely to the conditions under which the British working class lives, something we've not been too good at in the past, when we've found it far easier to talk about China, Albania, Soviet social-imperialism or the Three Worlds than we have about what's going on within our own country. This should be rectified, and it's a job for all members. We need reports on industrial struggles, particular aspects of growing fascism, tenants' work, etc., and we need to be good at summing them up too, so we actually promote Marxism-Leninism, not the bourgeois news with a 'Left' slant."

We decided to carry regular series of articles on some of the major industrial struggles, and also regular features on: the struggle against racism and growing fascism, the anti-super-power struggle, women, the socialist countries, Ireland, the international M-L movement, Scotland and Wales, youth.

Another document argued that we couldn't and shouldn't expect every article to be a considered and comprehensive policy statement. The following guidelines were laid down:

Articles should:

- * uphold the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and show how this is concentrated on the question of state power;
- * apply the Marxist-Leninist understanding of capitalism and imperialism, showing how the capitalist system is the major source of all the evils of the present-day world;
- * expose reformism and revisionism and show the need for revolution;
- * promote M-L unity and party building;
- * promote the unity of working people against capitalism;
- * promote the unity of workers of different nationalities in Britain and particularly oppose racism;
- * promote the unity of proletarians of all countries and the unity between the proletariat and oppressed nations and peoples;
- * promote the unity of all progressive people against fascism and against superpower aggression;
- * expose the limitations of class struggle at present and show the need for a revolutionary Communist Party;
- * expose the two superpowers and their aggressive plans to unleash a new world war, and promote the international united front against them.

Within this framework, the editorial body should encourage writers to develop their initiative. We don't imply that every article is expected to do all of these things; we are in fact careful not to include formalistic statements like "this shows the need for a Party" at the end of every article. Each article should do one or more of these things and shouldn't run counter to any of them.

Target of the paper

Among the controversial questions raised at the first publications conference, one stands out as having lasting importance. This is the question of who exactly we are writing for, and what should be the approach, character and tone of the paper. One document circulated at that time argues for a paper having "the truths of Marxism-Leninism and the readability of the Daily Mirror". This is correct insofar as we should try to be readable and not offputting. But it is idealistic to think that we can offer working people an alternative to the Sun and the Mirror at this stage; even when we do reach this stage we won't be aiming at a paper which looks at first glance like the Sun but turns out to be full of Marxism-Leninism. The proletarian press has to take its own path to readability.

Another document circulated at the first conference approached the question in a more dialectical way. It pointed out that the Sun is a working class paper only in the sense of being aimed at a working class market; it's not a proletarian paper in that it doesn't reflect the fine qualities of the workers as a class.

Agitation and propaganda

It is generally agreed that we are at the stage of rallying advanced elements among the working class (though Lenin warns against making a rigid distinction between "enlightened" workers and the rest). One point which we have to study is the distinction between agitation and propaganda. Agitation means presenting one or a few ideas to a large number of people, propaganda means presenting many ideas (comprehensive ideas) to a smaller number of people.

Lenin points out that on the whole propaganda is carried out in print and agitation by word of mouth. Thus most publications will on the whole be propagandist. The point at this stage is to provide the kind of material in our paper which the advanced workers will use agitationaly in working among the masses.

Proletarian class-consciousness

The essential purpose of the Marxist-Leninist press is to develop proletarian class-consciousness. This is true at the present stage and will also be true in the future when the movement is able to produce a different sort of paper for really broad circulation. Lenin was very clear about this point: proletarian class-consciousness does not come about through workers reading or hearing a lot about factory conditions etc. It is essentially political; it involves workers knowing about the proletariat's role as the basis for the entire capitalist economy, about the historical origins and destiny of the capitalist mode of production, about the nature of the state, about the role of all other classes in contemporary society, and of course about the international context of the British revolution.

Armed with this consciousness the proletariat is no longer a "class-in-itself" acting spontaneously and unconsciously, and becomes a "class-for-itself" able to take the initiative and change the world.

New Age's specific task

Each of our publications has its role to play in this respect. New Age's specific task is to present a composite picture of all the different facets of class struggle, in such a way that workers will be able to draw conclusions about the struggle's general outlines.

Lenin pointed out that the way to begin revolution is to induce people "to summarize and generalize all the diverse signs of ferment and active struggle." He went on to say that

"the masses will never learn to conduct the political struggle until we help to train leaders for this struggle, both from among the enlightened workers and from among the intellectuals; and such leaders

can acquire training solely by systematically appraising all the everyday aspects of our political life, of all attempts at protest and struggle on the part of various classes and on various grounds". (What is to be Done?, Peking ed. pp. 199-200)
It is to this task that we turn our attention in New Age.

Organisational role

The transformation of the proletariat into a consciously-acting class-for-itself has two aspects - ideological and organisational. The working class can only set about changing the world under the leadership of its Party. The mass paper has an important role to play both in the period leading up to the Party's foundation, and also when the Party is expanding its influence. While on the one hand the paper helps create the ideological basis for the Party (political class consciousness of the working class), on the other hand its organisational importance lies in the way we have to build up a network of contacts in the place of work, the community and elsewhere, who regularly read and contribute ideas to the paper, and in this way become involved with the organised Marxist-Leninist movement.

Summing-up

At the moment the class struggle among the masses exists and the Communist (Marxist-Leninist) movement exists, but the two are not fused together. Mao and Lenin said how important it is for Communists to really get close to the broadest masses of workers and build a communist mass movement. Being a coterie is no good and being a "communist propaganda society" is insufficient.

So how do we make the transition from where we are now? The paper itself and our work around it should be developed as a two-way transmission belt linking the mass struggles with the presently-existing rudiments of Marxist-Leninist organisation.

We must consciously plan the paper's contents so as to present a composite picture of the different facets of class struggle. This picture is built up firstly by the range of the paper's coverage, and secondly through editorials which draw the threads together and analyse questions systematically.

Keep on absorbing fresh experience

The present conference is our first attempt to sum up New Age's experience in an all-round way, but we have tried, during the year-and-a-quarter of its publication, to keep learning how to improve it.

One important way is to learn from advanced experience of Marxist-Leninists abroad. The CWM encourages its comrades to read foreign Marxist-Leninist papers, especially those published in English from the USA, Canada, Australia, Norway etc. From New Age's point of view we study these papers as a source of foreign news items, but mainly to learn about the content, style and technical details of a good paper.

Class Struggle, published by the Revolutionary Communist League of Britain, is another good Marxist-Leninist paper. The CWM's work for unity with the RCLB is an important aspect of our party-building tasks, and our members are all encouraged to read RCLB publications. New Age and Class Struggle each have their strong points. The process of learning from each other's experience in publications is a significant part of the unity process. Our relations with the RCLB are ones of socialist emulation: we each strive to do better, but we are also happy when the other does better, and keen to pass our experience on.

In the CWM's branches we regularly discuss members' views of the contents of the paper, and particularly the comments and criticisms which readers have passed on to them. Such comments and criticisms have been the main source for those improvements which we have made.

We would like to conclude by mentioning certain problems with New Age which have been pointed out to us and which we are conscious of, but haven't yet been able to resolve properly.

Some points which need working on

* We need more contributions from non-members, and in particular we are very keen to receive letters.

* It should be possible for people to get at least a very rough impression of New Age's political perspective after a fairly brief look at the front page of each issue.

* There is a need for more pictures, and particularly cartoons.

* In addition to the regular features we already have, we need to develop more. Women have been very inadequately dealt with, and cultural questions hardly at all.

* As well as direct reports from the place of work, the community etc., New Age needs more articles based on interviews, and also more articles based on research into published material (e.g. statistics about the economy).

* Leading on from the last point, we need ideas about the sort of reference material, news agency reports etc. which New Age should receive.

* The layout is not nearly as good as readers deserve.

* A particularly serious problem is distribution. Content is the most important thing, but if distribution is poor this will react back to undermine the quality of content, since we won't be benefitting from people's ideas. In solving this problem, the main thing is to develop sales linked with our political work, but other sales (e.g. through bookshops) are also important.

In grappling with these and other problems, the most important thing is to draw on the widest pool of ideas. This is why the present conference is so significant. We wish comrades attending every success.

With warm fraternal greetings,

The Publications Committee
of the CWM

THE CPB(M-L) AND THE "TWO CLASS" LINE (PART TWO)

(The first part of this article, published in "Party Line" 1, showed how important it is for a revolutionary movement to discover, as Mao Zedong said, "Who are our enemies? Who are our friends?" The Communist Party of Britain (Marxist-Leninist)-a so-called Marxist-Leninist organization headed by Reg Birch-did great harm in many ways, particularly through its political line holding that there are only two classes in Britain-proletariat and bourgeoisie. The effect was to include among the proletariat some elements that should properly be considered allies (present or potential), to include also some people (including the top trade union bureaucrats like Birch himself) who are actually, taken as a whole, class enemies, and to include some potential allies among the bourgeoisie. This line muddies the distinct character of the proletariat, enlarges the definition of the enemy and in reality, and eliminates from consideration the middle strata which should be won over. The damage done by this wrong line can be turned into good if we use the CPB(M-L) as a teacher by negative example. This article was circulated inside the CWM before our 1978 conference, and shows how we have tried to do this; the time when it was produced explains why, in one or two places, it uses terminology which is different from that which we use now. The fullest statement of CWM'S positive views on the class question can be found in our Programme.-Editor)

The working class consists of those who work at the points of production, distribution and exchange, in other words, those who by their labour in producing and circulating commodities provide capitalism with profit, its life-blood. It owns no means of production, and therefore sells its labour power to the capitalist class in order to live, receiving wages in return as the price of its labour power.

In this, the working class is distinct from all previous oppressed classes. By raising itself to the position of ruling class, it will pave the way for the abolition of all class oppression. It is only the working class, as here defined, that is capable of smashing the capitalist system. In saying this, we do not want to minimise the importance of allies, simply to stress the central role played by the working class by virtue of its direct association with the most advanced means of production, its concentration, organization, discipline, lack of vested interests in the continuation of capitalism, and ideology which-in its purest and highest form-is the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

The working class is the only consistently revolutionary class, and there can be no successful revolution in Britain if it is not under the leadership of this class and its party. Furthermore, among all sectors of the working class, it is the industrial working class which has the key role to play in socialist revolution as the most highly organized, most disciplined sector, and the one that may most readily and effectively cut the lifelines of the capitalist system. The miners' strike of '74, though it was not a revolutionary struggle, illustrates this point.

It is clear that the working class has a particular character and a particular role to play in society; Marxist-Leninists should grasp this well. The Birchites, however, deny the working class its character and its destiny by lumping together within the ranks of the proletariat, both the working class

proper and many non-proletarian strata. Students, teachers, doctors, local government personnel, etc., have no (or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, only the most distant) relation to the means of producing wealth; nor are they engaged in the distribution and exchange of commodities, whereby profits are realised. Their income is therefore derived from the wealth produced by the working class, by and large: rates, rents and taxation, for example, provide salaries for government personnel, local and national, and these come directly or indirectly from the working class. These strata are not highly concentrated together in general, are poorly organised (even if most are union members, union membership can't necessarily be equated with organisation), undisciplined, and have a petty-bourgeois ideology.

This latter point is very important. The Birchites count the strata mentioned above, and other, as part of the working class, without an ideology of their own. Therefore, in their work among students, teachers, etc., they do not stress the need for these strata to ally with the working class and accept its vanguard role in revolution. This means giving the weaknesses of these elements full play, and not drawing them closer to the proletariat. It means that their petty-bourgeois ideology is accepted as proletarian ideology, and no re-moulding is necessary. According to this view, the only things which need combatting on the ideological front are general things like social-democracy which concern the whole "working class" (as defined by the Birchites).

The "two-class line" had its social base within the CPB(M-L). As the line became consolidated, so did the social base.

Thus the CPB(M-L) became a thoroughly revisionist organisation, incapable of grasping Marxism-Leninism. Its leading clique is not working-class in the main. Most come from the strata between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. At the head stands Birch the labour aristocrat. Rather than transform their ideology and class stand, they saved themselves the trouble by "transforming" the working class so as to include themselves! It's small wonder that they think it's reactionary to talk of a "middle class", and they say Lenin was wrong in speaking of the existence of a labour aristocracy!

The "two-class line" was attractive to intellectuals who wanted socialism and wanted to identify with the working class, but who didn't want to remould their ideology or change their life style. A Marxist-Leninist organisation should encourage and help them make these changes, but the Birch party just panders to their weaknesses. The people who were recruited on this opportunist basis have by and large helped the slide of the CPB(M-L) deeper and deeper into revisionism. As this has happened, there has been a decline in the proportion of industrial members and a rise in the proportion of students, etc. The claims of the Birchites to be the "party of the working class" sound more and more hollow, as does the claim that their rag "The Worker" is written "by workers, for workers" - it could be written by lawyers, soldiers, Home Office officials or the TUC General Council, and according to the Birchites' class analysis it would still be written by workers!

Incidentally, it should be noted that capitalism was restored in the Soviet Union after the CPSU went revisionist. One of the important reasons for the regeneration of the Soviet party and state lies in the fact that there was insufficient attention paid to the problem of certain strata, particularly officials, becoming bureaucrats divorced from the working class. They were regarded simply as workers, not needing to remould their ideology. Any socialist country which followed the Birch line would go the same way as the Soviet Union.

The Birchite analysis also places in the camp of class enemies some people who could be won over as allies (even though wavering allies only, in some cases) in the struggle for socialism; for example small farmers, or some of the self-employed who may exploit the labour of one or two people but who find themselves being gradually crushed under the weight of competition from big monopolies and taxation. These allies may not be very reliable or numerous in comparison to the working class and its stable allies, but it would be a big mistake to discount them; they have their role to play, for example in a situation of severe repression they could be very useful in providing revolutionaries with shelter and provisions.

The above comments indicate that the Birchite "two-class line" is not only idealist and one-sided, but is thoroughly reactionary and serves the bourgeoisie by weakening the working class and its allies and strengthening the capitalist class.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST ALTERNATIVE TO THE BIRCH LINE - SOME CONCLUSIONS

In order to consolidate their ranks and advance, the British Marxist-Leninists need to criticise the Birch line on the class question, as well as other matters.

The Birchites did not grasp dialectical and historical materialism, and therefore came to idealist conclusions. Without grasping the philosophical foundation of Marxism-Leninism, the CPB(M-L) could not understand and act upon the politics and economics of Marxism-Leninism, and became a revisionist organisation. The lesson of this is that the British Marxist-Leninists must deepen their study of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, and devote considerable attention at the present time to works on philosophy.

The Birchite line on the "two classes" is typical of opportunist lines. It is full of vagueness; it glosses over differences within what it calls the working class and shrugs them off. It refuses to attempt a Leninist class analysis. In order to carry out their revolutionary work well, Marxist-Leninists have to try to get away from vagueness and diffuseness; applying dialectical materialism, they have to try to be as precise in their analyses as possible. Only in this way will they begin to learn how to solve the problems of the British revolution. Integrating theory and practice and all along striving to understand problems in an all-round way, the Marxist-Leninists will learn to master them all the more readily if they reject vagueness and force themselves to be concrete in their analyses and clear-cut and precise in their conclusions.

What can the British Marxist-Leninists put forward at the present time as an alternative to the "two-class line"? Certain preliminary conclusions on the class structure of Britain and our tasks can be drawn, though a lot of investigation still needs to be done.

Britain is an advanced imperialist country. Pre-monopoly capitalism polarised society more and more into two main classes - the bourgeoisie and proletariat - but with the advent of imperialism there were big changes. On a world scale, the exploitation of colonies and neo-colonies led to the proletarianization of millions upon millions of poor peasants, handicraftsmen and others. But in the imperialist countries like Britain - while there was still a trend (largely countered by working class resistance) towards a polarization in incomes - imperialism reversed the trend towards the simplification of class divisions. The emergence of the labour aristocracy was directly linked with the rise of imperialism, but other changes also occurred which were not the direct consequences of imperialism, but which were made possible by it.

Since the beginning of this century, the living conditions of the working class have (for the great majority, at any rate) improved considerably. Housing, incomes, health, working hours and educational levels are generally much better than they were 80 or 90 years ago. This improvement within the capitalist system has been won from the ruling class by the struggles of the working class for reforms, better wages and conditions; the bourgeoisie gave nothing willingly, nor has it given anything of its own away. The working class has simply won, in one form or another, a larger portion of the value it produces. The winning of this depended not only on the fighting strength of the working class, but also on the capacity of the capitalist class to make concessions when it was forced to. Under pre-imperialist conditions, it did not have this capacity, and reacted to pressure for reforms and better living conditions with brute force and lock-outs. But under imperialist conditions, when the bourgeoisie had vast colonial superprofits behind it and the labour aristocracy as a reformist fifth column in the working class movement, ready to channel working class struggles in "safe" directions, it was able to make some concessions to working class demands, though it has never given up the use of force, of course. It has tried to turn all the working class's gains to its own advantage - most notably, it has used them to lend substance to the claims of those who say capitalism can be reformed.

Since the rise of imperialism, competition between imperialist countries, between companies, etc. has spurred on the development of advanced technology and more sophisticated production techniques; these have required a better-educated, healthier working class. In trying to rule mainly through bourgeois democratic means over a more sophisticated population, the ruling class has had to improve its techniques of ideological control, via education, television, papers, etc.

The results of the developments mentioned above as they affect Britain's class structure may be summarized as follows:

- a) There has been a major shift in employment into unproductive work. Over half the working population does not perform productive work; the industrial proletariat, who produce nearly all the wealth in the country, form less than 40% of the "economically active" population and number about 8 million.
- b) There has been a great increase in the numbers of the intelligentsia (the term "intelligentsia" means those who are employed in mental, rather than manual work). Universal education up to the age of 16 has meant the employment of tens of thousands more teachers since the early 20th century; state education and large scale training and recruitment has led to a lowering of their professional status and a certain shift away from older, generally conservative views. Despite the fact that many teachers have progressive views, as a profession they are still unavoidably bound to promote bourgeois ideology and learning among the young. The growth in the teaching profession and the changes in it are only one example of what has happened to the intelligentsia since the rise of imperialism. There has also been a great increase in the numbers of state and private administrative personnel and of smaller groups such as university and polytechnic teachers, actors, journalists, etc.
- c) The role of the state, as the representative of the capitalist class collectively, has grown enormously. There is a great state bureaucracy, in the ministries, in local government, in nationalised industries and in the armed forces, who do not formally own means of producing wealth or exploit the labour of others, but who must nevertheless be counted as part of the capitalist class. The state, or state sector of the economy, extracts surplus value from the working class, directly in the case of the nationalised industries, or indirectly otherwise, (via taxation, national insurance, etc.)

The Marxist-Leninists of Britain must give great attention to correctly assessing who are the friends and enemies of the British revolution; they must not only weigh up the role of each class and stratum in British society, but differentiate between reactionary and progressive elements within them - for example, the upper reaches of the intelligentsia generally serve the capitalist class, but most of the lower ones are potential allies of the working class who can be won over if the correct tactics are adopted towards them. This is true of other strata too - small farmers will be won in struggles against high taxation and monopoly competition, when they become convinced that they have no future under capitalism; a straight appeal to stand by the proletariat would not win them.

It is particularly important to differentiate the various elements which compose the middle strata between the two main classes in British society, since many of them are drawn towards both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. This is most obvious in the case of the students. People are students for only three or four years in general; under 10% are from the families of industrial workers; most come from families of the middle strata, and the remainder from bourgeois families. All the same, many become progressive or even revolutionary through the intellectual life of college, students' union activities etc. The problem is that they are generally won on an intellectual basis, are impractical and have very individualistic outlooks and petty-bourgeois culture and fads, which make many prone to being influenced by the revisionists and trotskysts, who pander to their weaknesses instead of struggling against them. The consolidation of a strong revolutionary student movement will require Marxist-Leninist leadership, alliance with the working class and acceptance of its leading role. These points have to be borne in mind by Marxist-Leninists working among students.

We must be clear that the main contradiction in Britain today is between the monopoly capitalist class and the proletariat, but must not neglect the many secondary contradictions that exist. Two factors that must be taken into account are first the threat of the bourgeoisie imposing fascism - a development which has to be countered by building a united front including the working class and all who can be united around it, involving the problem of winning over people who are anti-communist and may even go over to the enemy in a socialist revolution - and secondly the role of the two superpowers (to a lesser extent also other imperialist power) in oppressing or threatening the British peoples. The USA is a major exploiter of the British working class (through Fords, Chrysler, Esso etc.) and has armed forces based in Britain. The Soviet Union would not only be glad to step into the place of US imperialism but is also the more aggressive of the two superpowers and the main source of war in the contemporary world. Different factions of the ruling class hold different views about how Britain's international relations should develop (for instance, a sizeable part of the labour aristocracy admires the policies of the Soviet ruling clique and favours their international line), and Marxist-Leninists need to do some work on this question.

Finally, though this does not strictly come within the scope of our comments one more point, which the Birchites always neglect, must be made: the socialist countries, Marxist-Leninist parties, national-liberation movements, oppressed peoples and nations of the world and the working class of all lands are our friends and allies in our fight for a socialist Britain.

* APPENDIX *

MARX AND ENGELS' ANALYSIS OF CLASSES - NOTES

The CPB(M-L) quotes from Marx and Engels to back up their two class line, but they rely on a handful of passages taken in isolation and interpreted one-sidedly.

Marx and Engels wrote a lot about classes. Their terminology was not on the whole so precise and consistent as that later used by Mao, Stalin and to a certain extent Lenin. In a general context Marx and Engels often used "bourgeoisie", "middle class" and "capitalist class" as interchangeable terms, but in writings mainly concerned with political matters they usually used "bourgeoisie" and "middle class", while they generally stuck to the term "capitalist class" when talking about economics.

This suggests that Marx and Engels themselves made a distinction between these terms, although not always consistently. "capitalist class" referred to the key role played by the bourgeoisie as controllers and owners of the means of production, distribution and exchange, while "bourgeoisie" or "middle class" were terms which embraced this, but also included those firmly tied to the capitalists, or whose life-style, ideology and means of making a living tied them in some way to the capitalist system, plus the petty-bourgeoisie.

In a note to the 1888 English edition of the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" (reproduced by the CPB(M-L) in support of its stand), Engels wrote: "By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour". In the "Manifesto" itself (p. 68, Peking edition), Marx and Engels refer to "a part of the bourgeoisie" which

"belong economists, philanthropists, humanitarians, improvers of the condition of the working class, organizers of charity, members of societies for the prevention of cruelty to animals, temperance fanatics, hole-and-corner reformers of every imaginable kind".

These people, referred to by Marx and Engels as the "socialistic bourgeois" who "desire the existing state of society minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements", are all part of the bourgeoisie, but certainly not all "owners of the means of production and employers of wage labour".

In the article "The English Middle Class" (included in the volume "Marx and Engels - Articles on Britain"), Marx refers to:

"every section of the middle class from the 'highly genteel' annuitant and Fundholder who looks upon all sorts of business as vulgar, to the little shopkeeper and lawyer's clerk" (p. 216)

The lawyer's clerk would not own means of production or employ wage labour, but, because of his place in the economic and political system and his class stand, Marx includes him in the "middle Class". This is hardly consistent with the CPB (M-L)'s definition of "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat",

In "Anti-Dühring", Engels refers (Peking edition, p. 167) to "the three classes of modern society, the feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat." (He doesn't mention the peasantry here, but other works show he took it into account whenever it existed). Later (p. 330) he writes:

"The classes directly or indirectly exploiting the workers are enslaved by the instrument of their activity through the division of labour; the empty minded bourgeois by his own capital and his own mania for profit, the lawyer by his ossified legal concepts, which dominate him as an independent power;..."

Further material could easily be quoted to show the incorrectness of the CPB(M-L)'s interpretation of Marx and Engels. More serious however is the unmarxist method which pretends to establish the truth from quotations. Even if the Birchites were honest and correct in their interpretation of Marx and Engels (which they aren't), it would still be wrong to proceed in this way. The thing is to start with the facts of contemporary society and use the methods and principles of dialectical and historical materialism to understand and analyse further the laws which underly society's workings. This is what Lenin did, and he was able to show that, consistent with the general trends analysed or predicted by Marx and Engels, capitalist society had moved into the era of imperialism, in which some characteristics of pre-monopoly capitalism had turned into their opposites. One feature of the Birchites has been their consistent rejection of Leninism. This means that they don't understand imperialism and have nothing to say about the international context of the British revolution or about the effects of imperialism upon British society (such as the problem of racism).

As Marxist-Leninists we must (in conjunction with our practice) study Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought in an all-round and systematic way, and use this knowlege as a guide to understanding the concrete realities of our society. We must particularly learn the general method and approach used by the great Marxists, so that we can apply these ourselves whenever we come up against problems which they didn't directly deal with.

SAINT ENVER HOXHA OF TIRANA? (FOUNDER OF A MARXIST THEOLOGY FOR THE MODERN 'REVOLUTIONARY')

The Party of Labour of Albania, at the instigation of Enver Hoxha, has recently come fully into the open and has completely negated Comrades Mao Tse Tung, Chou-en-lai and indeed the Chinese Communist Party. The vicious lies and slanders coming regularly from radio Tirana remind us of an earlier historical parallel. We refer to the complete negation of Comrade Stalin by Khrushchev and the revisionists in the CPSU who prepared the way for the degeneration of the Soviet Union from a socialist state to a hegemonist social-imperialist power.

Our Chinese comrades showed us the correct Marxist-Leninist approach to the assessment of the life and achievements of a person, and we would recommend reading of the second of the polemical articles produced by the CPC in 1963, titled 'On the Question of Stalin'.

Amongst other things, the CPC insisted on "an overall objective and scientific analysis of Stalin's merits and demerits by the method of historical materialism and the presentation of history as it actually occurred, and is against the subjective, crude and complete negation of Stalin by the method of historical idealism and the wilful distortion and alteration of history."

Let us remind ourselves that it was the CPC, (and other Marxist/Leninist parties which adopted this correct approach)-which carried forward the revolutionary banner of Marxism/Leninism. We confidently predict that it will be those M/L parties and elements, which are applying this correct method to the assessment of the life and achievements of Comrade Mao Tse Tung, which will continue to work out and apply the correct road to socialism, and then to the final goal of communism. The present leadership of the CPC is precisely following this correct M/L analysis, and we have no doubt but that is exactly what Mao would have wished.

On the other hand, he would have been shocked and astounded at the "subjective and crude" total denigration now reached by Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labour, when they talk about his life, and the history of the CPC.

We, for our part, do not intend to follow the crude and complete negation of Stalin by Khrushchev, and of Mao by Hoxha. No! We don't say Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labour have never been genuine and sincere Marxist/Leninists.

In the 1963 polemic the CPC ended their pamphlet on Stalin with these words:-

"We would like to offer a word of sincere advice to Comrade Khrushchev. We hope you will become aware of your errors and return from your wrong path to the path of Marxism-Leninism."

We think this would be good advice now to Hoxha and all those who follow the Albanian Party of Labour in their puerile dismissal of Mao and the CPC.

Enver Hoxha's report on the activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, at the 5th Congress, 1st Nov 1966

---"The People's Republic of China, this great socialist power, which holds aloft the banner of the revolution and of the struggle against imperialism."

---"The invincible, economic, political, military and moral might of the 700 million Chinese people, united as one single body around the glorious Communist Party of China, led by Comrade Mao Tse-tung."

---"The internationalist, fraternal and unsparing aid given to us by the People's Republic of China, at a time when she herself was forced to encounter the great natural calamities and the blockade organised against her by the Khrushchevite revisionists and the U.S. imperialists, was of great importance for the fulfilment of the tasks set by our Third Five-Year Plan."

---"the great, sincere and militant friendship between Albanian and Chinese Peoples and our two Marxist-Leninist Parties."

---"People's China, under the leadership of the CPC and Mao Tse-tung's thought, marks triumphantly ahead."

And contained in a report by Hoxha on Sept. 14, 1967. -

---"the outstanding Marxist-Leninist Chairman Mao Tse-tung."

---"There is no force in the world capable of stopping the progress of the 700 million Chinese people towards socialism and communism."

---"the CPC is a standard bearer of Marxism-Leninism."

And contained in a Hoxha speech as comparatively recently as Oct. 3rd, 1974:-

---"The Albanian people and all the people of the world nurture an ardent love and place deep trust in great Socialist China, in her glorious Party and in Mao Tsetung, the great and beloved leader not only of the Chinese people and communists, but also the dear and respected leader of all the peoples and communists of the world."

---"a great reality, the construction of socialism in China, which is being carried on in a correct way, according to the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and the teachings of Mao Tsetung."

---"China, relying on its own efforts, has made continual progress towards the development of socialist economy, and today has set up a modern industry, an advanced socialist agriculture."

---"Under the leadership of the CPC and Chairman Mao Tsetung, Peoples' China has been transformed into a powerful socialist state."

---"China helps unsparingly and disinterestedly develop our industry, intensify our socialist agriculture, all-round strengthen our country and raise the well-being of our people."

and only just over 2 years ago, in a Hoxha speech at the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, Nov. 1st, 1976:-

---"Our Party and people will constantly strive to keep the fraternal friendship and collaboration with the great Chinese people, their glorious Communist Party, great People's China, pure and strong."

---"The Albanian communists and the Albanian people are immensely rejoiced at the successes achieved by the fraternal Chinese people under the leadership of the CPC in the socialist revolution and socialist construction in China."

---"The work of this outstanding Marxist/Leninist, Mao Tsetung, represents a contribution to the enrichment of the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. The Albanian communists and people will always honour the memory of comrade Mao Tsetung, a great friend of our Party and people."

(The above 3 quotes are all subsequent to the death of Mao on 9th Sept. 1976).

Almost exactly 2 years later, on Nov. 8th 1978, Hoxha was referring to "the Chinese leadership, Mao Tsetung, Chou-En-lai and company and those who now lead the party and the government of China---"

"China has not been and is not a socialist country and it has not been guided by the Marxist-Leninist ideology."

"what is called Mao Tsetung thought, which cannot be and has never been Marxist-Leninist."

SAINT ENVER HOXHA OF TIRANA? (FOUNDER OF A MARXIST THEOLOGY FOR THE MODERN 'REVOLUTIONARY')

The Party of Labour of Albania, at the instigation of Enver Hoxha, has recently come fully into the open and has completely negated Comrades Mao Tse Tung, Chou-en-lai and indeed the Chinese Communist Party. The vicious lies and slanders coming regularly from radio Tirana remind us of an earlier historical parallel. We refer to the complete negation of Comrade Stalin by Khrushchev and the revisionists in the CPSU who prepared the way for the degeneration of the Soviet Union from a socialist state to a hegemonist social-imperialist power.

Our Chinese comrades showed us the correct Marxist-Leninist approach to the assessment of the life and achievements of a person, and we would recommend reading of the second of the polemical articles produced by the CPC in 1963, titled 'On the Question of Stalin'.

Amongst other things, the CPC insisted on "an overall objective and scientific analysis of Stalin's merits and demerits by the method of historical materialism and the presentation of history as it actually occurred, and is against the subjective, crude and complete negation of Stalin by the method of historical idealism and the wilful distortion and alteration of history."

Let us remind ourselves that it was the CPC, (and other Marxist/Leninist parties which adopted this correct approach)-which carried forward the revolutionary banner of Marxism-Leninism. We confidently predict that it will be those M/L parties and elements, which are applying this correct method to the assessment of the life and achievements of Comrade Mao Tse Tung, which will continue to work out and apply the correct road to socialism, and then to the final goal of communism. The present leadership of the CPC is precisely following this correct M/L analysis, and we have no doubt but that is exactly what Mao would have wished.

On the other hand, he would have been shocked and astounded at the "subjective and crude" total denigration now reached by Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labour, when they talk about his life, and the history of the CPC.

We, for our part, do not intend to follow the crude and complete negation of Stalin by Khrushchev, and of Mao by Hoxha. Not to do so, say Hoxha and the Albanian Party of Labour have never been genuine and sincere Marxist/Leninists.

In the 1963 polemic the CPC ended their pamphlet on Stalin with these words:-

"We would like to offer a word of sincere advice to Comrade Khrushchev. We hope you will become aware of your errors and return from your wrong path to the path of Marxism-Leninism."

We think this would be good advice now to Hoxha and all those who follow the Albanian Party of Labour in their puerile dismissal of Mao and the CPC.

Enver Hoxha's report on the activity of the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania, at the 5th Congress, 1st Nov 1966

---"the People's Republic of China, this great socialist power, which holds aloft the banner of the revolution and of the struggle against imperialism."

---"the invincible, economic, political, military and moral might of the 700 million Chinese people, united as one single body around the glorious Communist Party of China, led by Comrade Mao Tse-tung."

---"The internationalist, fraternal and unsparing aid given to us by the People's Republic of China, at a time when she herself was forced to encounter the great natural calamities and the blockade organised against her by the Khrushchevite revisionists and the U.S. imperialists, was of great importance for the fulfilment of the tasks set by our Third Five-Year Plan."

---"the great, sincere and militant friendship between Albanian and Chinese Peoples and our two Marxist-Leninist Parties."

---"People's China, under the leadership of the CPC and Mao Tse-tung's thought, marks triumphantly ahead."

And contained in a report by Hoxha on Sept. 14, 1967:-

---"the outstanding Marxist-Leninist Chairman Mao Tse-tung."

---"There is no force in the world capable of stopping the progress of the 700 million Chinese people towards socialism and communism."

---"the CPC is a standard bearer of Marxism-Leninism."

And contained in a Hoxha speech as comparatively recently as Oct. 3rd, 1974:-

---"The Albanian people and all the people of the world nurture an ardent love and place deep trust in great socialist China, in her glorious Party and in Mao Tsetung, the great and beloved leader not only of the Chinese people and communists, but also the dear and respected leader of all the peoples and communists of the world."

---"a great reality, the construction of socialism in China, which is being carried on in a correct way, according to the doctrine of Marx and Lenin and the teachings of Mao Tsetung."

---"China, relying on its own efforts, has made continual progress towards the development of socialist economy, and today has set up a modern industry, an advanced socialist agriculture."

---"Under the leadership of the CPC and Chairman Mao Tsetung, Peoples' China has been transformed into a powerful socialist state."

---"China helps unsparingly and disinterestedly develop our industry, intensify our socialist agriculture, all-round strengthen our country and raise the well-being of our people."

And only just over 2 years ago, in a Hoxha speech at the 7th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania, Nov. 1st 1976:-

---"Our Party and people will constantly strive to keep the fraternal friendship and collaboration with the great Chinese people, their glorious Communist Party, great People's China, pure and strong."

---"The Albanian communists and the Albanian people are immensely rejoiced at the successes achieved by the fraternal Chinese people under the leadership of the CPC in the socialist revolution and socialist construction in China."

---"The work of this outstanding Marxist/Leninist, Mao Tsetung, represents a contribution to the enrichment of the revolutionary theory and practice of the proletariat. The Albanian communists and people will always honour the memory of comrade Mao Tsetung, a great friend of our Party and people."

(The above 3 quotes are all subsequent to the death of Mao on 9th Sept. 1976).

Almost exactly 2 years later, on Nov. 8th 1978, Hoxha was referring to "the Chinese leadership, Mao Tsetung, Chou-En-lai and company and those who now lead the party and the government of China---"

---"China has not been and is not a socialist country and it has not been guided by the Marxist-Leninist ideology."

---"what is called Mao Tsetung thought, which cannot be and has never been Marxist-Leninist."

We can only be amazed at the arrogance of Hoxha, when we see the statements he made up to 1976, and compare them with the recent condemnations. One is struck by the absoluteness and extravagance of his language by the complete contradiction between his earlier and later assertions,--and above all by the fact that nowhere does he even exercise a grain of self-criticism!

If Hoxha said in 1967 that Mao was an "outstanding Marxist/Leninist!" and that "the CPC is a standard bearer of Marxism/Leninism" (and he did say both those things), - presumably he believed them to be true.

Then one would expect some glimmer of apology and self-criticism when in 1978 he pontificates "Mao Tsetung thought cannot be and has never been Marxist/Leninist."

For the Albanian comrades, - and all those elsewhere who follow the Albanian line, - it appears to be simply a question of papal "infallibility". Yours not to reason why,---Hoxha said it,---so it must be true. We wonder what Pope Hoxha will be declaring as the infallible truth next year,---or next year,---or---

Finally, another little gem of Hoxha's extreme dogmatic, subjective and ultra-rationalist utterances:-

"It is known world-wide that when the Albanian pledges his word of honour and strikes a friendship with a true friend he will lay down his life for him, and this he does to defend the truth and justice, which have always been second nature to him."

Perhaps if the rest of the world enjoyed such perfection, our troubles too, would be ended.

Unfortunately we have to start from a very different reality, - a real world, inhabited by real people, and not by a pure idealist abstraction like "the Albanians!"

[EROL Note:

'Countries of New-Emerging Forces, Unite and Fight against imperialism and all other forms of Domination' was reproduced in *Party Line* 2. It was originally from:

LET US STEP UP SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION UNDER THE BANNER OF THE JUCHE IDEA

KIM IL SUNG

Report at the National Celebration of the 30th Anniversary of the Foundation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea
September 9, 1978]

3. COUNTRIES OF NEW-EMERGING FORCES, UNITE AND FIGHT AGAINST IMPERIALISM AND ALL OTHER FORMS OF DOMINATIONISM

Comrades,

Today a fierce struggle is going on in the international arena between the forces of independence and dominationism, between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution.

Alarmed at the daily growth of the revolutionary forces of the world, the old and new dominationists are making desperate efforts to maintain their supremacy.

In pursuance of their invariable wild designs to bring the world under their domination, the American imperialists are stepping up war preparations while fooling peoples of the world by putting up the specious sign of "peace". They continue with armament expansion under the sign of "disarmament", carry on nuclear tests under the sign of "prohibitions on nuclear weapons" and go on with military intervention under the sign of "easing tensions". As their economic crisis deepens and their position gets more straitened, the imperialists intensify their manoeuvres for aggression and war.

The imperialists are turning the spearhead of aggression against the countries of the new-emerging forces. The principal method they employ in their aggression against non-aligned states, countries of the third world, is to divide and disrate them from one another and destroy them one by one. The imperialists are seeking to pit the non-aligned states, countries of the third world, against one another and fish in troubled waters, by shrewdly taking advantage of the border disputes—aftermaths of colonial rule—and various other delicate problems to drive wedges between these countries, to sow discord and cause disputes and conflicts among them.

The imperialists and dominationists are making a vicious attempt to establish their political and economic control over the new-emerging countries. They are trying to subordinate newly independent states politically by varied crafty and wicked methods such as threat, blackmail, appeasement, cheating, subversive and sabotaging activities, and are attempting to seize hold of the lever of control over the economy of the developing countries under the name of so-called "aid" and "joint development of backward countries".

The imperialists and dominationists, intent on extending their sphere of influence, are scrambling feverishly to bring third world countries under their control. On the plea of "assistance" and "protection" they are vying with each other to poke their noses into the disputes between third world countries, interfering openly in them, and are contending to bring these countries under their thumb.

The current international situation is overstrung and complicated due to the machinations of the imperialists and dominationists. Owing to their manipulation and

Intrigues, cases of subversion, sabotage and assassination take place every day, disputes arise in all parts of the world, and even such a tragic situation develops as fraternal countries fight, exchanging fire. Consequently, the countries of the third world face many difficulties and the non-aligned movement is undergoing an ordeal.

The present situation urgently demands that socialist countries, non-aligned states, third world countries and all the oppressed nations of the world unite firmly and intensify the struggle against imperialism and other forms of dominationism.

Dominationism is a counter-revolutionary trend going against the contemporary current towards independence; it is a common target of struggle of the revolutionary peoples of the world. It is in the nature of dominationism to override the independence of other countries and oppress and control other nations and peoples. Dominationism means, in one way, openly colonizing other countries and oppressing them and exploiting them undisguisedly and, in another way, putting other countries under the yoke of slavery by various crafty methods to dominate and control them. Dominationism is practised by big, comparatively small, capitalist and other countries. In short, all those countries which seek to control other countries represent the dominationist forces, irrespective of their size and social system, and it is all dominationism to control others overtly or covertly.

All people of the countries of the new-emerging forces should turn the spearhead of attack against imperialism and dominationism. Only by waging a resolute struggle against imperialism and dominationism can the people of the new-emerging forces consolidate national independence, assure the independent development of their countries and build a new world free from all sorts of domination and subordination.

In order to fight stoutly against imperialism and other forms of dominationism, it is imperative to form a broad united front of new-emerging countries.

This united front is a decisive guarantee of victory in the struggle against imperialism and dominationism. Forming such a united front acquires still greater importance especially because the imperialists and other dominationists are stepping up their moves to divide and estrange newly independent states from one another and win them over to their side.

The new-emerging countries should counter the dominationists' manoeuvres for division, alienation and scramble with the strategy of unity. Non-aligned countries, third world countries, should form a broad united front and smash by concerted action the divisive, alienating and scrambling moves of all dominationists.

To fight against the common enemy, the new emerging countries should attach prime importance to unity and subordinate everything to this, and should closely band together transcending the differences in the social system, political view and religious belief. The difference in the social system, political view and religious belief can in no way be a barrier to the unity of the new-emerging countries. The commonness of the new-emerging countries is greater than their distinction and the force uniting them together is stronger than the force estranging them from one another.

Non-aligned countries should not be fussy about which countries are progressive and which not, but endeavour to find common denominators and unite with each other. Classifying the non-aligned states into this or that side contradicts the essential character and idea of the non-aligned movement. This will lead, in the long run, to forming new blocs within the movement to split it. As for the progressive nature of a country, independence is its criterion, and a nation maintaining independence is precisely a progressive nation. Since the non-aligned states are all opposed to domination and subordination and aspire after independence, they can unite on the basis of this common feature-aspiration for independence.

Non-aligned states should base themselves on the principle of unity in settling differences and disputes that arise between individual countries. However serious they may be, the differences and disputes between non-aligned states are internal affairs of brothers who are advanc-

ing hand in hand towards a common goal; they are not matters to be settled by fight or through involvement of outside forces. They should be settled through negotiations by the parties concerned in keeping with their national interests and the interests of the non-aligned movement as a whole, free from any interference from outside. Should non-aligned states antagonize or fight each other, trapped by the intrigues of dominationists, they will play into the hands of the latter, only to make losers of themselves.

For the new-emerging countries to fight in unity against imperialism and all other brands of dominationism, they should maintain independence.

Non-aligned states, third world countries, must categorically reject all sorts of foreign interference and keep from following other countries blindly or acting as their henchmen. And new-emerging countries should respect each other's independence and refrain from picking holes or meddling in the behaviours of other countries. This will preclude any dominationist forces from gaining foothold in the non-aligned movement, render any nation's baton impotent and enable the new-emerging countries to strengthen their unity and wage a determined struggle against dominationism.

National independence must be guaranteed by an independent national economy. Without a powerful independent national economy a nation cannot exercise its sovereign rights nor can say its say nor do as it likes.

If non-aligned countries, developing countries, are to build an independent national economy successfully, they should tap their own potentialities to the maximum and, at the same time, strengthen economic and technical cooperation with other new-emerging countries. The third world countries have vast territories and rich natural resources, as well as various good experiences and techniques they have acquired in the course of creating a new life. They should exchange raw materials and technical skills on the principle of filling one another's needs and, in particular, sincerely help and teach one another by exchanging their native technical personnel. Then, they will be able, even without turning to the imperialists and dominationists for help, to shake off economic and technical backwardness, to lay the solid foundation of an independent national economy and to build a prosperous independent and sovereign state.

The old international economic order is an issue of the colonialist system and the imperialists' lever for domination, control, exploitation and plunder. As long as the old international economic order is kept intact, developing countries cannot emerge from destitution nor build an independent national economy successfully. They should strive hard to abolish the absurd old international economic order advantageous only to the imperialists and dominationists and to establish a new fair international economic order suited to the interests of the peoples of the new-emerging forces.

The most pressing task in the struggle against imperialism and dominationism at the present time is to check and frustrate imperialism's moves for aggression and war.

The peoples of the new-emerging forces should mercilessly expose and denounce the crafty manoeuvres of imperialism for aggression and war, and press and administer blows to the imperialists in all places to which they have stretched their aggressive tentacles. The peoples of the new-emerging forces should energetically struggle to put a stop to the arms race of the imperialists, to achieve general disarmament and to make the imperialists completely withdraw their aggressive troops from and dismantle their military bases in foreign territories.

As yet colonies remain on different continents of the globe, and the imperialists and dominationists are manoeuvring craftily to bring the newly independent states once again under their domination and control. The peoples of the new-emerging countries and oppressed peoples should fight on still more stoutly to clear all continents of colonialism for good and of neo-colonialism and all other forms of dominationism completely. Only when Asia, Africa and Latin America are clear from colonialism and all forms of dominationism will the liberation of nations be complete and final.

The Government of the DPRK and the Korean people make it an important foreign policy to fight against imperialism and dominationism in unity with the peoples of socialist countries, non-aligned countries, developing countries and all other new-emerging countries of the world.

As hitherto, so in the future, the Government of the Republic will make unabated efforts to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the socialist forces and develop the relations of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of the socialist countries.

The Government of the Republic and the Korean people will make every effort to strengthen unity and cooperation with the peoples of the non-aligned states, peoples of the third world countries and will always cast in their lot with them in the common struggle against imperialism and dominationism and for social progress and national prosperity.

The Korean people actively support the Asian, African and Latin American peoples in their struggle for freedom and independence and express firm solidarity for all oppressed peoples of the world in their liberation struggle.

The DPRK Government and the Korean people will continue to fight strenuously against imperialism and all other forms of dominationism, and for peace, democracy, national independence and the building of a new society, in unity with all revolutionary peoples of the world who advocate independence.